Work-Family Interface, Workplace Well-Being and Psychological Detachment on Work from Home System

Michael[1], Zamralita[2]
Faculty of Psychology, Tarumanagara University, Indonesia[12]

Zamralita@fpsi.untar.ac.id

Abstract

The COVID-19 pandemic has impacted employees in numerous ways, notably through the shift to work-from-home (WFH) arrangements. This transition has disrupted employees' workplace well-being (WWB), with blurred boundaries between family and work life becoming more common. The challenge of balancing work and family demands under WFH conditions is referred to as the work-family interface (WFI). This study explores the effect of WFI on WWB and examines whether psychological detachment—defined as a recovery experience that allows individuals to mentally disengage from work to restore personal resources—moderates this relationship. The implementation of WFH during COVID-19 pandemic has posed a challenge of balancing the interaction between work and family or can be known as work-family interface (WFI). Psychological detachment as a form of recovery experience to replenish an individual's resource is assumed to moderate the relationship between WFI and WWB. So this study aims to look at the impact from WFI to WWB and also the moderation effect of psychological detachment. The study was conducted on 143 employees using convenience sampling, a non-probability sampling method. The instruments utilized in this study are the Work Family Interface from the Work-Family Interface Scale, with a reliability score of $\alpha = .728$; the Workplace Well-being from the Workplace Well-being Questionnaire, with a reliability score of $\alpha = .893$; and the Psychological Detachment from the Recovery Experience Questionnaire, with a reliability score of $\alpha = .825$ and $\omega = .828$. The results demonstrated that the Work-Family Interface (WFI) exerts a significant influence on workplace well-being (WWB) ($p = .000$). Furthermore, the findings substantiated that the four dimensions of the WFI markedly impact WWB ($p = .000$). However, the hypothesis that psychological detachment acts as a moderator in the relationship between WFI and WWB was not supported ($p = .263$, $p > .05$).

Keywords: psychological detachment, work-family interface, workplace well-being, work from home

Abstract

sampling method. The instruments utilized in this study are the Work Family Interface from the Work-Family Interface Scale, with a reliability score of α = .728; the Workplace Well-being from the Workplace Well-being Questionnaire, with a reliability score of α = .893; and the Psychological Detachment from the Recovery Experience Questionnaire, with a reliability score of α = .825 and ω = .828. The results demonstrated that the Work-Family Interface (WFI) exerts a significant influence on workplace well-being (WWB) (p = .000). Furthermore, the findings substantiated that the four dimensions of the WFI markedly impact WWB (p = .000). However, the hypothesis that psychological detachment acts as a moderator in the relationship between WFI and WWB was not supported (p = .263, p > .05).

Kata kunci: keterpisahan psikologis, interkoneksi-keluarga kerja, kesejahteraan di tempat kerja, bekerja dari rumah

Introduction

United Nations (2020) states that studying the impact of COVID-19 on society, the economy and vulnerable groups is an important and fundamental step. This is an effort to adjust the response of the government and related parties to recover from the crisis. Therefore, efforts to understand the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic is one of the focuses of researchers in this study. Reporting from jawapos.com, since the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic, various impacts have been felt by the community. Starting from the implementation of health protocols such as the use of masks and hand sanitizer, restrictions on activities such as traveling, and other lifestyle changes (Virdhani, 2020). One of the most frequently discussed impacts since the beginning of the pandemic was the large number of people who lost jobs. Based on data from the Ministry of Manpower reported by kompas.com (2020) in April 2020, there were 39.977 companies in the formal sector that chose to lay off their employees or terminate their employment (PHK). This happened because many companies were unable to operate due to various restrictions during the COVID-19 pandemic. The latest data from the Ministry of Manpower, reported by tribunnews.com, even states that as many as 29.4 million employees have been affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. They are people who have experienced layoffs, laid off without pay, as well as reduced working hours and wages (Triatmojo, 2021).

However, the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on employees does not only appear in the form of job losses and employment. Another important phenomenon which is also a big impact of COVID-19 is work from home (WFH). This is because companies must implement WFH with various limitations and risks during the COVID-19 pandemic. According to lokadata.id (2020), there were 4.057 companies in Jakarta that were recorded as conducting WFH in May 2020.

This massive WFH phenomenon certainly has a certain impact on employees. Recent research from Xiao et al. (2021) shows that many workers who do WFH suddenly experience a decline in health, both physically and mentally. Working conditions significantly affect employee well-being, with different outcomes based on the ownership of the organization (Ogunola, 2024). About two thirds of the respondents to this study reported one or more physical problems and three quarters of the respondents experienced at least one new mental health problem during WFH. WHO defines mental health as a condition of well-being where individuals realize their own abilities, are able to deal with normal stresses in life, and are able to contribute in their communities (2004).

Another study from Crawford et al. (2011) is systematic review against workers remote & mobile (workers who do not do their work in the office). One of the results of this study is workers remote & mobile those with longer working hours indicate the level of well-being is lower. This further strengthens the risk of disrupting the well-being of someone during WFH because data from the National Bureau of Economic Research reported by CNN Indonesia (2020) states that people who do WFH spend an average of 49 extra minutes per day working. Workers said they worked longer hours than people in similar jobs who did not work from home. In addition, a recent study from Bakker & Wingerden (2020) also states that contemplation of the COVID-19 pandemic has a negative correlation with the well-being of employees.

The study concludes that prolonged work-from-home (WFH) during the COVID-19 pandemic poses potential risks to employee well-being, but it does not definitively prove that all employees experienced low well-being during this period. The impact of WFH is complex and varies, with some studies, such as Oakman et al. (2020), indicating that WFH can both alleviate stress and strain or, conversely, enhance well-being. This variability suggests that the well-being of employees working from home during the pandemic requires further investigation. Given the importance of well-being on employee performance and company outcomes, as highlighted by Xenia et al. (2023), continued research is critical to better understand these dynamics.

Well-being has many definitions. Shah and Marks (2004) said well-being is not just a feeling of happiness. Well-being means developing personally, feeling whole and contributing to society. Meanwhile Diener (1984) says that well-being is an individual's feelings and evaluation of his life as a whole which includes life satisfaction, positive and negative effects.

Definition well-being by Ryan and Deci (2001) to argue that there is no understanding of well-being. Well-being is relative and highly dependent on various external factors that exist in the environment and culture. Therefore, when talking about well-being at work it is important to review well-being with a specific context in the work environment (Hyett & Parker, 2014). Bartels et al. (2019) states that the subjective evaluation of employees regarding their ability to develop and function optimally in the workplace is called workplace well-being (WWB).

Apart from being at risk of well-being, another impact of the WFH phenomenon during the COVID-19 pandemic is the disruption of interactions between the world of work and family. Recent research shows that the COVID-19 pandemic has had an impact on the interaction between time sharing for work and family or work-family interface. This study states that a few weeks after the sudden change in work style from working in an office to teleworking or WFH, a change has occurred in the work-family interface (WFI) of many employees. This results in the risk of conflict between work and family. When individuals experience change work-family interface which is negative, then the rate job satisfaction decreased and turnover intention (Vaziri et al., 2020).

Regarding the findings of Vaziri, et al. (2020), another study from Chen, et al. (2020) suggested that employees who experience work-family conflict (WFC) as one of the work-family interface dimensions indicates the level of workplace well-being is lower. This is because work-family conflict will spend the resources that are owned thereby worsening individual attitudes towards work such as workplace well-being. In addition, Setyawan and Lestari (2020) stated that more than 50% of employees are aware that collaborating during WFH is challenging because it is difficult to separate work life and life at home. While remote working has the potential to enrich both work and family life, its effectiveness depends on managing boundaries, reducing excessive demands, and promoting recovery. Failure to address these issues may lead to increased work-family conflict and negative health outcomes, especially during periods of mandatory remote work, like the COVID-19 lockdowns (Ghislieri et al., 2023).

Based on the evidence of this research, it can be said that with the implementation of WFH, the interaction between the world of work and the family of each employee on work-family interface (WFI) potentially changes. Along with changes in work-family interface, workplace well-being also has the potential to decrease or increase. This is the basis for researchers to examine further the relationship between work-family interface and workplace well-being among employees who did WFH during the COVID-19 pandemic. Work-family interface (WFI) itself is a combined function of the interaction of individual experiences within the family and work. Work-family interface consists of four dimensions are work-family conflict, family-work conflict, work-family enrichment, and family-work enrichment (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000).

Chen et al. (2020) in their research also stated that further research needs to carry out further investigations regarding variables that have the potential to become moderators in the relationship between work-family conflict and workplace well-being. Suggestions from previous research make researchers want to use psychological detachment as a moderator in this study. Psychological detachment

is the individual's ability to psychologically detach from work by not thinking about or contemplating work-related problems and opportunities (Sonnentag & Bayer, 2005).

Psychological detachment it is interesting to study as a moderator of the relationship between work-family interface and workplace well-being because this variable is part of the process recovery that is needed when someone experiences psychological strain (Sonnentag & Kruel, 2006). Recovery is the reverse process strain that has occurred as a result of exposure of the individual to stressor (Sunday & Bayer, 2005).

Work family conflict which is part of has been shown to improve psychological strain owned by employees (Lizano, 2020). According to Menard et al. (2021) psychological detachment is able to minimize negative mood impact caused by the COVID-19 pandemic at the end of the day. Psychological detachment can be said to be effective for recovery strain that individuals experience and has the potential to replenish resources that will impact on well-being. This makes researchers assume that the process recovery which was created by psychological detachment can reduce strain caused by work family conflict to employees who do WFH during the COVID-19 pandemic so workplace well-being can be achieved.

The researchers' assumptions are supported by previous studies which prove that employees who are able to disengage from work outside working hours can experience positive benefits in the form of increased well-being and performance. In addition, employees who are able to do psychological detachment also proved to be more satisfied with their lives overall and experienced less psychological strain (Sonnentag, 2012). Based on previous research as well, psychological detachment proven to be a moderator of Work-family conflict with psychological strain. The same study also demonstrated a moderator effect of psychological detachment can be seen in the relationship work-family conflict with life satisfaction (Jimenez, et al., 2009). However, in another study from Murphy (2008) psychological detachment did not prove to be a moderator of the relationship work-family conflict with work engagement and burnout.

Because of the prolonged implementation of WFH, one of the aspects of employee life that has changed is work-family interface. This work-family interface change is proven to be at risk of affecting the level of workplace well-being owned by employees. The novelty of this research lies in its exploration of the relationship between work-family interface (WFI) and workplace well-being (WWB) among employees who worked from home (WFH) during the COVID-19 pandemic. Unlike previous studies, this research introduces psychological detachment as a moderating variable to examine whether the ability to mentally disengage from work affects the impact of WFI on WWB. This approach addresses the unique stressors introduced by prolonged WFH arrangements, where work and family boundaries often blur, and assesses how recovery strategies like psychological detachment can potentially alleviate strain. Through this research, the study aims to contribute to a better understanding of employee well-being in remote work environments, providing insights that could inform organizational policies to support employees' mental health and work-life balance. The COVID-19 pandemic has had various impacts on society. Through this research, researchers hope to contribute to efforts to understand the conditions of work-family interface, workplace well-being and psychological detachment employees during the COVID-19 pandemic so that the right initiatives and policies can be taken by the company.

Hypothesis Development

Work-family interface and workplace well-being

The COVID-19 pandemic forced employees to experience sudden changes to new ways of work from home (WFH). One of the impacts of this sudden change on employees is demonstrated by Xiao et al. (2021) which states that many employees experience mental health decline during WFH.

Mental health is a condition of well-being owned by individuals (World Health Organization, 2004). Well-being itself is a broad concept and difficult to universally define (Ryan & Deci, 2001). So this research is in relation to the WFH phenomenon which is the work setting that will use workplace well-being (WWB) as the research variable. Workplace well-being is a condition in which an individual is able or has the potential to function optimally in accordance with the individual's values at work (Bennet et al., 2017).

There is a decrease on employee well-being, this happens because of the increasing number of distractions faced by individuals during WFH (Xiao et al., 2021). According to Setyawan and Lestari (2020), one of the most frequent challenges during WFH is the difficulty in separating work life from home life. Chen, et al. (2020) stated that when a person experiences conflict between work and family life, the workplace well-being level will be lower. In addition, changes in the way of work to WFH are also proven to create a shift between interactions that are owned by family and work. The interaction between family life and work is also called work-family interface (WFI) (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000).

H1: There is a significant influence between work-family interface and workplace well-being

Work-family interface and workplace well-being with psychological detachment as moderator

There is a decreasing well-being on employees during WFH can occur due to shifts in work-family interface owned by employees. This can happen because when someone has a conflict within work-family interface or work-family conflict (WFC) then this event is considered a stressor which produce psychological strain and reduce individual resources. Psychological strain accumulated resulted in a negative impact in the form of a decrease well-being (Chen et al., 2020).

Sonnentag and Bayer (2005) stated that recovery experience is the reverse process strain. Recovery can eliminate or at least reduce the negative effects of stress mood and performance, until it returns well-being and individual performance potential. One of the most important things that a person must have in order to process recovery can happen is psychological detachment. Psychological detachment is the ability of individuals to separate themselves from work. This separation not only refers to physical separation but also psychological. This means that individuals must be able to stop thinking about the problems and opportunities that exist at work (Sonnentag & Kruel, 2006).

There is psychological detachment as a process of recovery that lead researchers to assume that the relationship between work-family interface and workplace well-being can be moderated by psychological detachment. This is in line with suggestions from previous research which stated that further research is needed on variables that might moderate the relationship between conflict within work-family interface and workplace well-being from Chen et al. (2020). Thus, researchers will see the effect of the work-family interface (WFI) against workplace well-being (WWB) with psychological detachment as moderator.

H2: Relationship between work-family interface and workplace well-being moderated by psychological detachment.

Methods

Research Design

This research is quantitative research with a non-experimental form because there is no treatment given by the researcher to the participants. This research is moderation research, which describes the effect of moderation psychological detachment in relationship work-family interface and workplace well-being. Based on this formulation, this research consists of three variables. The three variables are work-family interface, workplace well-being and psychological detachment. This study was designed by taking a sample of employees who are actively work from home (WFH) using questionnaire distribution online.

Data processing uses the SPSS version 22.00 program to carry out item, normality tests, descriptive data tests, regression tests and moderation effect tests with regression techniques PROCESS by Hayes and reliability testing using Jeffreys's Amazing Statistics Program (JASP).

Participants

Participants are adult individuals who were active employees worked as WFH during the COVID-19 pandemic. This research does not limit participants in terms of race, age, ethnicity, religion, gender, or socioeconomic status. This study uses a sampling technique non-probability sampling that is convenience sampling. This technique is used by considering the efficiency and effectiveness of research.

Instruments

This study used three instruments, including the work-family interface scale to measure the work-family interface, the Recovery Experience Questionnaire (REQ) to measure psychological detachment and the workplace well-being questionnaire (WWQ) to measure workplace well-being. All the instruments using five ranges scale.

Measuring work-family interface using work-family interface scale developed by Kinnunen et al (2006) with Cronbach Alpha reliability is α = .728. This measuring instrument consists of four dimensions namely work-family conflict (α = .866) with item e.g "My job demands interfere with my family life", work-family enrichment (α = .725) with item e.g "The skills I use at work help me manage family life better.", family-work enrichment (α = .631) with item e.g "Being part of a family helps me relax and be more productive at work", and family-work conflict (α = .826) with item e.g "My family responsibilities reduce the time I need to focus on work. The first dimension is work-family conflict which is the level of conflict caused by work life on family life.

Recovery experience questionnaire (REQ) to measure psychological detachment. This measuring tool was developed by Sonnentag and Fritz (2007). Psychological detachment is unidimensional and consists of four positive items, item e.g "During time after work, I distance myself from my work". This instrument have Cronbach Alpha reliability is α = .825 and McDonald reliability is ω =.828.

Workplace well-being questionnaire (WWQ) developed by Hyett and Parker (2014) to measure workplace well-being with Cronbach Alpha reliability is .893. WWQ have four dimensions are work satisfaction (WS) with Cronbach Alpha reliability is α =.893 and item e.g "Do your daily work activities give you a sense of direction and meaning", organizational respect (OR) with Cronbach Alpha reliability is α =.917 and item e.g "In general terms, do you trust the senior people in your organization?", employer care (EC) with Cronbach Alpha reliability is α =.917 and item e.g "Is your boss caring?" and intrusion of work into private life (IW) with Cronbach Alpha reliability is α =.792. and item e.g "Do you find yourself thinking negatively about work outside of working hours?"

Results and Discussion

In this study, 143 participants were active employees. The demographic data of the participants is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Demographic Data of Participants

Categories		Frequency
Gender	Male	87
	Female	56
Age (Year)	21 – 25	31
	26 – 30	69
	31 – 35	31
	36 – 40	10
	41 – 45	2
Marriage Status	Single	78
	Married	63
	Widow/Widower	2
Tenure	<1 year	14
	1 – 2 years	62
	3 – 4 years	32
	4 – 5 years	26
	>5 years	9
Position	Staff	102
	Supervisor	16
	Manager	25
Department	Operation	60
	Technology	34
	Sales	24
	Human Resources	18
	Marketing	4
	Finance	3

Variable Overview

General description of the variables from the results of the data collected is workplace well-being from employees it can be said to be quite high, based on an average mean of 3. For detail interpretation of each dimensions are Work Satisfaction (WS), Organizational Respect (OR), Employer Care from (EC) dan intrusion of work into Private Life (IW) can be seen in Table 2.

Table 2. Workplace Well-being Overview

Dimensions/Variable	Min	Max	SD	Mean	Interpretation

Work satisfaction	1.00	5.00	.575	3.75	High
Organizational Respect	2.00	5.00	.597	3.71	High
Employer Care	1.50	5.00	.745	3.75	High
Intrusion of Work into Private Life	1.57	5.00	.666	2.78	Low
Workplace Well-being	1.93	4.68	.487	3.58	High

Work-family interface dimensions are Work-Family Conflict (WFC), Work-Family Enrichment (WFE), Family-Work Conflict (FWC) dan Family-Work Enrichment (FEW) the highest dimension is Family-Work Enrichment for more complete can be seen in Table 3 for an overview of the variables. Psychological detachment in this company is low (Min=1.00, Max=5.00, M = 2.87, and SD = .844) based on the results from the four items.

Table 3. Work-family Interface Overview

Dimensions/Variable	Min	Max	SD	Mean	Interpretation
Work-family conflict	1.00	5.00	.846	2.52	Low
Work-family enrichment	1.00	5.00	.684	3.46	High
Family-work conflict	1.00	4.25	.810	2.30	Low
Family-work enrichment	1.67	5.00	.677	3.63	High
Work-family interface	2.00	4.00	.393	2.99	Moderate

Hypothesis I: There is a significant influence between work-family interface with workplace well-being

The first hypothesis was conducted to see the effect of work-family interface on workplace well-being. The results of the analysis show that the four dimensions of work-family interface have a significance = .000, which means that there is an influence of work-family interface on workplace well-being. Therefore, H1 is accepted and H0 is rejected. The influence that occurs from work-family interface to workplace well-being is positive or negative depending on the dimensions possessed by the individual. Work-Family Enrichment and Family Work Enrichment proved to have a positive influence on workplace well-being. On the other hand, Work-Family Conflict and Family-Work Conflict have been shown to have a negative effect on workplace well-being. So it can be explained that an employee will have a better level of workplace well-being if they experience enrichment good of work to family nor family to work. Meanwhile, when an employee experiences conflict of work to family nor family to work then their workplace well-being will be lower.

The results also show the coefficient of determination R^2 = .100 for work-family conflict. This means that work-family conflict contributes 10.0% to explain WWB. In addition, Work-family enrichment has a coefficient of determination R^2 = .411. So Work-family enrichment contributes 41.1% to explain WWB. Furthermore, family-work conflict produces a coefficient of determination R^2 = .044. This means that family-work conflict contributes 4.4% in explaining workplace well-being. Lastly, family-work enrichment shows the coefficient of determination R^2 = .278. So it can be said that family-work enrichment has a contribution of 27.8% to explain WWB. Therefore, it can be concluded that of all work-family interface dimensions, work-family enrichment has the greatest effect on workplace well-being on employee.

Table 4. Hypothesis 1 Test Result

Dimensions	t	Sig.	R^2
Work-family conflict → Workplace Well-being	-3.95	.000	.100
Work-family enrichment → Workplace Well-being	9.92	.000	.411
Family-work conflict → Workplace Well-being	-2.54	.012	.044
Family-work enrichment → Workplace Well-being	7.36	.000	.278

Hypothesis 2: Relationship between work-family interface with workplace well-being moderated by psychological detachment

Hypothesis 2 shows that p value from psychological detachment as a moderator is .263 ($p > .05$). Therefore, the moderating effect does not occur until H1 is rejected and H0 accepted. It means psychological detachment unable to moderate the relationship shared by work-family conflict and workplace well-being.

Table 5. Result Hypothesis (Psychological Detachment as Moderator Work-Family Conflict and Workplace Well-being)

Dimensions	*Coeff.*	*p*	*t*
Work-family conflict → Workplace Well-being	.153	.029	-2.20
Psychological detachment	.134	.910	-.113
Work-family conflict * Psychological detachment	.051	.263	1.12

Table 6. Result Hypothesis (Psychological Detachment as Moderator Work-family enrichment and Workplace Well-being)

Dimensions	*Coeff.*	p	*t*
Work-family enrichment → Workplace Well-being	.165	.040	2.069
Psychological detachment	.211	.724	-.353
Work-family enrichment * Psychological detachment	.058	.510	.661

The results presented in the table 6 indicate a significant positive relationship between work-family enrichment and workplace well-being (Coefficient = .165, p = .040, t = 2.069). This suggests that as work-family enrichment increases, so does workplace well-being. Nevertheless, psychological detachment does not significantly predict workplace well-being (Coeff. = .211, p = .724, t = -.353). Furthermore, the interaction between work-family enrichment and psychological detachment is not statistically significant (Coeff. = .058, p = .510, t = .661), indicating that psychological detachment does not significantly moderate the relationship between work-family enrichment and workplace well-being.

Hypothesis 2 shows that p value from psychological detachment as a moderator of .162 It means p value greater than .05 (p > .05). Therefore, the moderating effect does not occur until H1 rejected and H0 accepted. This means psychological detachment not a moderator in the relationship between work-family enrichment and workplace well-being.

Table 7. Result Hypothesis (Psychological Detachment as Moderator Family-Work Conflict and Workplace Well-being)

Dimensions	Coeff.	p	t
Family-work conflict → Workplace well-being	.151	.029	-2.202
Psychological detachment	.124	.891	-.138
Family-work conflict * Psychological detachment	.068	.162	1.407

Hypothesis 2 shows that *p value* from psychological detachment as a moderator (.235, $p > .05$). Therefore, the moderating effect does not occur until H1 is rejected and H0 accepted. This means psychological detachment nor is it a moderator of the relationship between family-work conflict and workplace well-being.

Table 8. Result Hypothesis (Psychological Detachment as Moderator Family-work Enrichment and Workplace Well-being)

Dimensions	Coeff.	p	t
Family-work enrichment → Workplace well-being	.054	.000	6.694
Psychological detachment	.054	.013	2.510
Family-work enrichment * Psychological detachment	.014	.235	-1.194

Discussion

The results of the research conducted show that the conflict dimension of work-family interface (work-family conflict & family-work conflict) has a negative influence on the workplace well-being of employees who engage in WFH during the COVID-19 pandemic. This is in line with research from Chen et al. (2020) which states that when individuals experience interference either from family to work or from work to family, then the level well-being the individual will decrease. There is a decrease well-being of employees happens because individuals are more susceptible to experiencing negative affect which produce emotional exhaustion and finally lowered the rate well-being.

Enrichment from work-family interface (work-family enrichment & family-work enrichment) has a positive effect on workplace well-being. These results are in line with research conducted by Faradinna et al. (2019) enrichment from family to work or from work to family has positive benefits for well-being. Mullen et al. (2008) also stated something similar regarding enrichment. Mullen et al. (2019) say there is a growing body of evidence on the relationship enrichment with increasing well-being. This can happen because the resources generated from certain roles (family or work) have a direct influence on the quality of other roles (family or work) (Mullen et al., 2019).

The second hypothesis of this study was not proven because psychological detachment does not act as a moderator in the relationship between the four dimensions of work-family interface (work-family conflict, *work-family enrichment*, family-work conflict & family-work enrichment) and workplace well-being. This result is not in line with research from Jimenez et al. (2009) psychological detachment is proven to be able to moderate the relationship between one of the work-family interface dimensions, is family-work conflict and well-being. Even so, in the same study it was also proven that psychological detachment is not shown to moderate work-family conflict relationship with workplace well-being. The results of this research that are still inconsistent make researchers conduct further investigations.

Reason psychological detachment not being able to moderate the relationship between work-family interface and WWB may occur due to measurement mismatch with the culture and way of working of the company during the COVID-19 pandemic. Psychological detachment focuses on individual conditions outside of working hours. The measuring instrument reads something like "Outside of working hours, I don't think about work at all". This was considered to be irrelevant to the working conditions of WFH during the COVID-19 pandemic because the definition and limitations of working hours became unclear. During WFH employees often have to finish work and hold meetings during hours outside working hours. Conversely, sometimes employees have free time to rest in the middle of the day, which should still be working hours. So it can be said that working hours during WFH become irregular. This shift in habits and culture can be one of the reasons for not participating in psychological detachment as a moderator of the relationship between work-family interface and workplace well-being.

In addition, researchers found previous studies that also tested the moderating effect of psychological detachment. The results of these studies indicate that psychological detachment failed to moderate the relationship between job stress and performance. This study also emphasizes the shortcomings of measuring instruments psychological detachment which only has four points and is self-report (Sari et al., 2017). Based on the results of previous research and the results of this study, the researcher feels the need to carry out further studies regarding measurement methods psychological detachment especially during WFH.

The research results from Sari et al. (2017) also indicated the possibility of cultural differences in Indonesian society. This study stated that even though the participants did not like and were not willing to bring work home. However, participants still often reply to short messages and pick up the phone outside working hours because they are still within tolerance limits. Therefore, there is a possibility that Indonesian people are not used to making clear boundaries between family life and work. So that concept psychological detachment in Indonesia still needs to be studied further.

The research findings are subject to several limitations. The study's focus on work-from-home (WFH) during the COVID-19 pandemic may not be generalizable to other contexts, as the pandemic caused unique disruptions to traditional work-life boundaries. The failure of psychological detachment to moderate the relationship between work-family interface and workplace well-being may be attributed to cultural differences or measurement inconsistencies. The detachment scale used might not accurately reflect the fluidity of work hours during WFH, especially in Indonesia, where social norms around work boundaries differ. The research highlights several recommendations to improve workplace well-being for employees working from home (WFH). It emphasizes the importance of clear work-family boundaries to prevent conflict, which is shown to reduce well-being. Organizations are encouraged to foster environments that support work-family enrichment, allowing positive interactions between work and home life. This can be achieved by promoting flexible schedules and establishing clear boundaries for working hours. Furthermore, while psychological detachment was hypothesized to be a potential moderator between work-family interface and well-being, the results suggest that WFH challenges traditional detachment practices due to irregular hours. Future research should focus on culturally specific approaches to psychological detachment and develop measurement tools that capture the complexities of remote work, particularly in non-Western settings like Indonesia, where work-life boundaries are more fluid.

Conclusion

The intent of this study is to examine how the work-family interface, including both conflicts and enrichments, impacts the workplace well-being of employees working from home during the COVID-19 pandemic. The findings highlight that while work-family and family-work enrichment positively influence workplace well-being, conflicts in these domains negatively impact it. However, psychological detachment, a factor theorized to moderate this relationship, failed to do so, likely due to cultural

differences and irregular work hours during WFH in Indonesia. The importance of the paper lies in its contribution to understanding the nuanced relationship between work-life boundaries and employee workplace well-being during remote work, particularly in a non-Western context. Future research could improve on the measurement of psychological detachment to better capture the fluidity of work hours during WFH, explore the role of cultural factors in shaping work-family dynamics, assess these relationships in more stable work environments beyond the pandemic and should explore alternative measurement more fits with culture contexts.

References

Allen, T. D. (2012). The work and family Interface. The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Psychology (pp. 1163-1198). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199928286.013.0034

American Statistical Association. (2017). GPower Manual 3.1. Retrieved from https://www.psychologie.hhu.de/fileadmin/redaktion/Fakultaeten/Mathematisch-Naturwissenschaftliche_Fakultaet/Psychologie/AAP/gpower/GPowerManual.pdf

Aryanti, R. D., Sari, E. Y. D., & Widiana, H. S. (2020). A Literature Review of Workplace Well-Being. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Community Development 2020.* https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.201017.134

Bakker, A. B., & Wingerden, J. V. (2020). Rumination About COVID-19 and Employee Well-Being: The Role of Playful Work Design. *Canadian Psychology*. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/cap0000262

Bartels, A. M., Peterson, S. J., & Reina, C. S. (2019). Understanding well-being at work: development and validation of the eudaimonic workplace well-being scale. *Plos one,* 14(4),e0215957. https://doi.org/10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0215957

Bennett, J. B., Weaver, J., Senft, M., & Neeper, M. (2017). Creating workplace well-being: Time for practical wisdom. In C. L. Cooper & J. C. Quick (Eds.), *The handbook of stress and health: A guide to research and practice* (pp. 570–604). Wiley Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118993811.ch35

Chen, Y., Zhang, F., Wang, Y., & Zheng, J. (2020). Work-Family Conflict, Emotional Responses, Workplace Deviance, and Well-Being among Construction Professionals: A Sequential Mediation Model. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, *17*(18), 6883. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17186883

CNN Indonesia. (2020). Studi soal WFH: Kerja lebih panjang dan rapat lebih banyak. Retrieved from https://www.cnnindonesia.com/gaya-hidup/20200901102717-284-541464/studi-soal-wfh-kerja-lebih-panjang-dan-rapat-lebih-banyak

Crawford, J. O., MacCalman, L., & Jackson, C. A. (2011). The health and well-being of remote and mobile workers. *Occupational medicine (Oxford, England)*, *61*(6), 385–394. https://doi.org/10.1093/occmed/kqr071

Danna, K., & Griffin, R. W. (1999). Health and well-being in the workplace: A review and synthesis of the literature. *Journal of Management,* *25*(3), 357–384. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639902500305

Diener, E. (1984). Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin,* *95*(3), 542–575. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.95.3.542

Dodge, R., Daly, A. P., Huyton, J., & Sanders, L. D. (2012). The challenge of defining wellbeing. *International journal of wellbeing, 2*(3). 222-235. http://dx.doi.org/10.5502/ijw.v2i3.4

Dorio, J. M., Bryant, R. H., & Allen, T. D. (2008). *Work-Related Outcomes of the Work-Family Interface: Why Organizations Should Care.* Handbook of Work-Family Integrations: Research, Theory, and Best Practice. Elsevier, Inc.

Ducharme, J. (2020). World Health Organization declares COVID-19 a 'Pandemic.' Here's what that means. Retrieved from https://time.com/5791661/who-coronavirus-pandemic-declaration/

Faradinna, S., Halim, F. W., & Sulaiman, W. S. W. (2019). The Effects of Positive Spill over and Work-Family Conflict on Female Academics' Psychological Well-Being. *Psikohumaniora: jurnal penelitian psikologi. 4*(2). https://doi.org/10.21580/pjpp.v4i2.3522

Fisher, C. D. (2014). Conceptualizing and Measuring Well-Being at Work. *Work and Well-being,* 3. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118539415.wbwell018

Frone, M. R. (2003). Work-family balance. In J. C. Quick & L. E. Tetrick (Eds.), *Handbook of occupational health psychology* (pp. 143–162). American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/10474-007

Ghislieri, C., Molino, M., & Dolce, V. (2023). To Work or Not to Work Remotely? Work-to-family Interface Before and During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *La Medicina del lavoro*, *114*(4), e2023027. https://doi.org/10.23749/mdl.v114i4.14095

Grzywacz, J. G., & Marks, N. F. (2000). Reconceptualizing the work–family interface: An ecological perspective on the correlates of positive and negative spillover between work and family. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5*(1), 111–126. https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.5.1.111

Holmes, E. K., Thomas, C. R., Petts, R. J., & Hill, E. J. (2020). The work-family interface. In W. K. Halford & F. van de Vijver (Eds.), *Cross-cultural family research and practice* (pp. 323–354). Elsevier Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-815493-9.00010-7

Hyett, M. P., & Parker, G. B. (2014). Further Examination of the Properties of the Workplace Well-Being Questionnaire (WWQ). *Social Indicator Research,* 124(2). http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11205-014-0805-5

Kinnunen, U., Feldt, T., Geurts, S., & Pulkkinen, L. (2006). Types of work-family interface: well-being correlates of negative and positive spillover between work and family. *Scandinavian journal of psychology*, *47*(2), 149–162. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9450.2006.00502.x

Kompas.com. (2020). Pandemi Covid-19, Apa Saja Dampak pada Sektor Ketenagakerjaan Indonesia. Retrieved from https://www.kompas.com/tren/read/2020/08/11/102500165/pandemi-covid-19-apa-saja-dampak-pada-sektor-ketenagakerjaan-indonesia-?page=all

Koutiva, M., Belias, D., Nietos, I. F., & Koustelios, A. (2020). The Effects of Workplace Well-Being on Individual's Knowledge Creation Outcomes: A study research among hotel employees. *Springer Proceedings in Business and Economics. Springer, Cham*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-36126-6_118

Leiter, M. P., & Cooper, C. L. (2017). The State of the Art of Workplace Wellbeing. Retrieved from https://www.routledgehandbooks.com/doi/10.4324/9781315665979.ch1

Lizano, E. L. (2020). The Impact of Work-family Conflict on Psychological Well-being: A cross-sectional study of salvadoran social workers. *Journal of ethnic & cultural diversity in social work,* 31(1),51-61. https://doi.org/10.1080/15313204.2020.1827333

Lokadata.id. (2020). Perusahaan yang menerapkan WFH Jakarta, 2020. Retrieved from https://lokadata.id/data/perusahaan-yang-menerapkan-wfh-jakarta-2020-1590488637

Ménard, J., Foucreault, A., Leduc, H., Meunier, S., & Trépanier, S. G. (2021). A Diary Study on When and With Whom Recovery Experiences Modulate Daily Stress and Worry During a COVID-19 Lockdown. *Frontiers in psychology*, *12*, 620349. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.620349

Moreno-Jiménez, B., Mayo, M., Sanz-Vergel, A. I., Geurts, S., Rodríguez-Muñoz, A., & Garrosa, E. (2009). Effects of work-family conflict on employees' well-being: the moderating role of recovery strategies. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, *14*(4), 427–440. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016739

Mullen, J., Kelley, E., & Kelloway, E. K. (2008). Health and well-being outcomes of the work-family interface. *Handbook of work-family integration,* 191-214. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-012372574-5.50014-4.

Murphy, L. A. (2008). Psychological Detachment as a Moderator in Work-Family Conflict Relationships. *Journal of Occupation Health Psychology,* 24(2). http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000116

Oakman, J., Kinsman, N., Stuckey, R., Graham, M., & Weale, V. (2020). A rapid review of mental and physical health effects of working at home: how do we optimise health?. *BMC public health*, *20*(1), 1825. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-020-09875-z

Ogunola, A.A. (2024). Working condition as predictor of employees' well-being in selected broadcasting organisation in southwestern Nigeria. *Tazkiya Journal of Psychology,* 12(1), 97 – 111. http://dx.doi.org/10.15408/tazkiya.v12i1.37845

Parker, G. B., & Hyett, M. P. (2011). Measurement of well-being in the workplace: the development of the work well-being questionnaire. *The Journal of nervous and mental disease*, *199*(6), 394–397. https://doi.org/10.1097/NMD.0b013e31821cd3b9

Parker, L. (2020). For young people, two defining events: COVID-19 and climate change. Retrieved from https://www.nationalgeographic.com/science/2020/04/gen-z-pandemic-will-define-formative-years-coronavirus-climate-change/

Priyadharshini, R. A., & Wesley, R. J. (2014). Personality as a Determinant of Work-Family Conflict. *Journal of industrial engineering and management.* 7(5). https://doi.org/10.3926/jiem.1156

Rajadhyaksha, U., Korabik, K., Lero, D. S., Zugec, L., Hammer, L. B., & Beham, B. (2018). The Work-Family Interface Around The World: Implication and recommendations for policy and practice. *Organizational dynamics,* 49(2):1-11. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2019.01.001

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2001). On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52,* 141–166. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.141

Ryff, C. D., & Keyes, C. L. M. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*(4), 719–727. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.69.4.719

Sari, A. D. P., Rostiana, & Lie, D. (2017). Peran Psychological Detachment sebagai Moderator Hubungan Stres Kerja dan Kinerja. *Jurnal muara ilmu sosial, humaniora, dan seni. 1*(2). https://doi.org/10.24912/jmishumsen.v1i2.916

Setyawan, F. E. B., & Lestari, R. (2020). Challenges of stay at home policy implementation during the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic in indonesia. *Jurnal administrasi kesehatan indonesia. 8*(1). https://doi.org/10.20473/jaki.v8i2.2020.15-20

Shah, H., & Marks, N. (2004). A well-being manifesto for a flourishing society. London: The New Economics Foundation. Retrieved from https://neweconomics.org/uploads/files/813660812dc0c82af5_vkm6vve98.pdf

Simone, S. D. (2014). Conceptualizing wellbeing in the workplace. *International journal of business and social science*. *5*(12). http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9781118539415.wbwell018

Sonnentag, S. (2012). Psychological detachment from work during leisure time: The benefits of mentally disengaging from work. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 21*(2), 114–118. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721411434979

Sonnentag, S., & Bayer, U. V. (2005). Switching off mentally: predictors and consequences of psychological detachment from work during off-job time. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, *10*(4), 393–414. https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.10.4.393

Sonnentag, S., & Fritz, C. (2007). The Recovery Experience Questionnaire: Development and validation of a measure for assessing recuperation and unwinding from work. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 12*(3), 204–221. https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.12.3.204

Sonnentag, S., & Kruel, U. (2006). Psychological detachment from work during off-job time: The role of job stressors, job involvement, and recovery-related self-efficacy. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 15*(2), 197–217. https://doi.org/10.1080/13594320500513939

Sonnentag, S., Binnewies, C., & Mojza, E. J. (2010). Staying well and engaged when demands are high: The role of psychological detachment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*(5), 965–976. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020032

Triatmojo, D. (2021). Kemnaker: 29,4 Juta Pekerja terdampak pandemi Covid-19, di-PHK Hingga Dirumahkan. Retrieved from https://www.tribunnews.com/bisnis/2021/03/27/kemnaker-294-juta-pekerja-terdampak-pandemi-covid-19-di-phk-hingga-dirumahkan

United Nations. (2020). COVID-19: Socio-economic impact. Retrieved from https://www.undp.org/coronavirus/socio-economic-impact-covid-19

Vaziri, H., Casper, W. J., Wayne, J. H., & Matthews, R. A. (2020). Changes to the work–family interface during the COVID-19 pandemic: Examining predictors and implications using latent transition analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 105*(10), 1073–1087. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000819

Virdhani, M. H. (2020). Perubahan gaya hidup selama 2020 karena pandemi Covid-19. Retrieved from https://www.jawapos.com/lifestyle/28/12/2020/perubahan-gaya-hidup-selama-2020-karena-pandemi-covid-19/

Wendsche, J., & Haislah, A. L. (2017). A Meta-analysis on antecedents and outcomes of detachment from Work. *Frontiers Psychology,* 7. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.02072

World Health Organization. (2004). Promoting mental health: Concepts, emerging evidence, practice (Summary Report). Retrieved from https://www.who.int/mental_health/evidence/en/promoting_mhh.pdf

Xenia, C.V., Zamralita., & Budiarto, Y. (2023). Peranan tuntutan pekerjaan terhadap kesejahteraan di tempat kerja dengan sumber daya pekerjaan sebagai moderator pada karyawan. *GEMA EKONOMI (Jurnal Fakultas Ekonomi), 12 (2).*

Xiao, Y., Gerber, B. B., Lucas, G., & Roll, S. C. (2021). Impacts of working from home during COVID-19 pandemic on physical and mental well-Being of office workstation users. *Journal of occupational and environmental medicine*. *63*. https://doi.org/10.1097%2FJOM.0000000000002097