

Crossover of the dimensions of work-family and family-work conflict in couples:

Protocol for a qualitative study

Ewelina Smoktunowicz^{1*}, Magdalena Lesnierowska¹, Justyna Ziolkowska², Marta Roczniowska^{3 4}

¹StresLab Research Centre, Institute of Psychology, SWPS University, Warsaw, Poland

²Institute of Psychology, SWPS University, Wroclaw, Poland

³Institute of Psychology, SWPS University, Sopot, Poland

⁴Procome Research Group, Department of Learning, Informatics, Management, and Ethics, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden

*Corresponding author

Email: esmoktunowicz@swps.edu.pl (ES)

1 **Abstract**

2 Conflict between work and non-work is a bidirectional and a multidimensional
3 construct that has garnered much attention from researchers and practitioners alike.
4 Previously, studies with a dyadic design demonstrated that interrole conflict can cross over
5 between partners in romantic relationships. The aim of the present study is to explore—from
6 an individual and dyadic perspective—how partners perceive dimensions of interrole conflict
7 (that is: time, strain, behaviour, and possibly others) and whether crossover between partners
8 is dimension-dependent. This protocol outlines a qualitative interview study. Participants (N
9 = 40) will be dual-earner couples that meet two inclusion criteria: both partners need to be
10 professionally active, and the couples need to have lived together for at least a year.
11 Interviews will be conducted separately with each partner. To analyse the data at the
12 individual level we will use reflexive thematic analysis. To analyse the data at the dyadic
13 level we will apply an adapted version of the framework method. We anticipate that findings
14 of this study will have the potential to advance theoretical models depicting crossover
15 processes and, more generally, the interface between work and family lives. Moreover,
16 insights into how couples experience dimension-based interrole conflict will be important for
17 the development of targeted interventions.

18 **Keywords:** work-family conflict, family-work conflict, WFC, FWC, crossover, dyads

19 Introduction

20 Conflict between work and family is a concept that has long interested not only
21 researchers but also, or perhaps mostly, those of us who balance job responsibilities with
22 being a partner, a friend, or a parent. What is less known outside the walls of the scientific
23 community is that interrole conflict does not stop with the person who experiences it but
24 carries tangible consequences for their partner [1]. Greenhaus and Beutell, in their seminal
25 paper [2], defined the work and family interface as “a form of interrole conflict in which the
26 role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some
27 respects” (p. 77). Despite the seemingly straightforward definition, interrole conflict is quite
28 complex. First, it is bidirectional, meaning that we distinguish between work-family conflict
29 (WFC) and family-work conflict (FWC). Second, each of these conflicts is thought to be
30 comprised of three dimensions: time, strain, and behaviour [2,3]. Third, interrole conflict
31 affects not only those who experience it but also the people around them in a so-called
32 crossover process [1]. Hence, for people in relationships, interrole conflict might become a
33 bidirectional and multidimensional dyadic phenomenon.

34 Distinguishing between six forms of interrole conflict (i.e., time-based WFC and
35 FWC, strain-based WFC and FWC, and behaviour-based WFC and FWC) on the conceptual
36 and measurement level matters as there is evidence that they are differentially associated with
37 antecedents and outcomes [2]. Less is known about the way those conflicts transmit (i.e.,
38 cross over) across persons in close relationships, and specifically, whether crossover
39 mechanisms are dimension specific. It is important to know this because capturing
40 mechanisms behind the dyadic transmission of each dimension could advance theoretical
41 models of crossover and allow them to make better predictions on how interrole conflict of
42 one person in a dyad affects another one. Furthermore, identifying those forms of interrole
43 conflict that are the most detrimental for the well-being of others and the way they transmit

44 might help couples create strategies to address the problem. Subsequently, that might
45 improve their outcomes both at home and at work, such as stress and satisfaction with various
46 domains of life. In the current study we apply qualitative methods to explore dimension-
47 based interrole conflict and we pay particularly close attention to the process of its crossover
48 between partners in dual-earner couples.

49 **Interrole conflict: directions and dimensions**

50 WFC and FWC vary in their relationships with predictors and outcomes. Meta-
51 analytical findings show that while WFC and FWC are associated with both work and family
52 demands, the effect sizes are larger *within* domains, that is, WFC is predominantly related to
53 work, and FWC to the family/non-work context [4,5]. Conversely, while a cross-domain
54 pattern was expected for the consequences of interrole conflicts (with WFC mostly affecting
55 the non-work domain, and FWC the work one), data indicates that the consequences of WFC
56 and FWC span across all domains. Although meta-analyses have found that WFC is actually
57 more closely linked with work outcomes, and FWC with family ones [6–8], ultimately, they
58 predict a variety of outcomes, including those that do not clearly belong to one domain only,
59 such as health. Moreover, although gender differences in both WFC and FWC are considered
60 too small to bear meaningful consequences, a meta-analysis has shown that the effect is
61 slightly larger for FWC than WFC: It is more often reported by women [9]. Finally, a genetic
62 component in interrole conflict explains more variance in WFC than in FWC but, at the same
63 time, controlling for dispositional factors does not significantly reduce the relationship
64 between job demands and WFC, whereas it does for the relationship between family demands
65 and FWC [10]. Study authors suggest that people might be better at looking at job demands
66 objectively and identifying when they interfere with their family life, but their perceptions of
67 family demands and FWC itself overlap. Taken together, these findings require that both
68 directions of interrole conflict be investigated.

69 WFC and FWC are even more nuanced; they are conceptualised to be comprised of
70 three dimensions: time, strain, and behaviour [2,3]. *Time-based conflict* is probably the most
71 intuitive one and occurs when there are pressures in one role that lead to people being either
72 physically unable or too preoccupied to perform in another one. People experience *strain-*
73 *based conflict* when demands in one role leave them too anxious or fatigued to meaningfully
74 take part in their other life roles. Finally, a need to behave differently at home and at work,
75 due to external standards, may lead to *behaviour-based conflict*. A model proposed by
76 Greenhaus and Beutell [2] and empirical evidence indicate that these dimensions show
77 varying associations with their predictors and outcomes [11–13]. There also seem to be
78 gender differences [9]. Specifically, men report experiencing more time-based WFC than
79 women, and women report more strain-based WFC and FWC than men. Importantly,
80 interrole conflict dimensions have not received equal attention as there is more data on time
81 and strain dimensions than on behaviour [13]. It is possible that behaviour-based conflict is
82 less intuitive for people to evaluate, and hence it is imperative to find a way to explore it and
83 deepen our understanding of it.

84 Potentially, there are more dimensions of interrole conflicts. For example, Greenhaus
85 et al. [14] added an *energy* dimension to reflect that performance in one role can be
86 diminished in another due to exhaustion. This would make it different from strain-based
87 conflict, which is a manifestation of symptoms such as irritability, anxiety, and apathy [2].
88 Kengatharan and Edwards [15] proposed that the three existing dimensions did not cover
89 being too preoccupied (emotionally and cognitively) with one life domain to perform
90 adequately in another. Hence, they proposed adding a *psychological* dimension. Yet,
91 Greenhaus and Beutell [2] previously included role preoccupation in the time dimension.
92 What stems from these propositions is that the dimensional structure of WFC and FWC might
93 need revising [13]. One way to do this is to identify manifestations of interrole conflict and

94 see whether they surpass what is captured by the current dimensions of time, strain, and
95 behaviour.

96 **Crossover**

97 Twenty years after introducing the original definition of work-family conflict,
98 Greenhaus et al. [14] proposed refining it to highlight that we can only speak about interrole
99 conflict when “(...) experiences in the work (family) role result in diminished performance in
100 the family (work) role” (p. 65). This emphasis on reduced performance seems particularly
101 important when we look at the dynamics of interrole conflict in couples. When one person in
102 a dyad experiences work-family or family-work conflict, this might become salient to the
103 other person only when that experience leads to a less than satisfactory contribution to family
104 life. For example, if a man struggles due to emotionally draining work but still manages to
105 meet demands at home, such as completing household chores or caring tasks, this stress
106 would not be seen as strain-based interrole conflict and might go unnoticed by the man’s
107 significant other and thus not affect them. However, if the same work demands prevent him
108 from performing all these tasks on the family front, then, what we define as strain-based
109 WFC might affect his partner. This across-individuals transmission of experiences, such as
110 stress and interrole conflict¹, is called crossover [16,17].

111 In her influential paper, Westman [17] proposed that crossover occurred via one of
112 three routes. The first is a direct empathic crossover: When one partner experiences stress, it
113 initiates an empathic reaction from their partner. The second potential mechanism is called a
114 common stressor: When both parties share a stressor (e.g., a sick child) it is likely to elicit a
115 response from both of them. Finally, crossover can be indirect, that is, an effect of one
116 partner’s stress on another one’s well-being can be mediated and/or moderated by factors

¹ Although outside of the scope of this study, we want to highlight that a crossover of positive experiences also occurs [e.g., 18, 1].

117 such as coping strategies, communication strategies, social support, or social undermining. In
118 their spillover-crossover model (SCM), Bakker and Demerouti [1] propose that negative
119 states and experiences from work can flow to the family/non-work domain via work-family
120 conflict (spillover), leading to loss in well-being. Subsequently, the other person in a dyad
121 becomes affected (crossover) either because negative states cross over directly between
122 partners or indirectly, via mechanisms such as social undermining. Further research on those
123 potential mechanisms in the realm of interrole conflict [18] has highlighted the role of
124 negative marital interactions. Furthermore, meta-analytical findings [19] have confirmed both
125 the direct crossover between a person's WFC and their partner's psychological distress and
126 family satisfaction, as well as an indirect one; specifically, people who experience WFC tend
127 to reduce their positive social behaviours which is linked to their partner's well-being. What
128 is missing in this exchange though, is how partners react to those behaviours in terms of their
129 own thoughts, emotions, and behaviours. Moreover, although common stressors as a
130 crossover mechanism have not been investigated specifically, Li et al. [19] acknowledged
131 that some of their findings could be attributed to this mechanism.

132 There are some important gaps in the current state of the art. First, FWC has been less
133 researched overall, including the studies on crossover. The spillover-crossover model (SCM)
134 [1] focuses on the flow of experiences from work to family. The authors acknowledge that
135 the transmission can also occur with family demands spilling over to the work domain but
136 when it comes to crossover, they point only to other employees as recipients in this
137 transmission. This is in line with the SCM premise that for the crossover to take place people
138 need to share the domain. Yet, there is some empirical evidence suggesting that FWC might
139 also affect people at home. First, as we mentioned earlier, meta-analytical data show that
140 FWC, just as with WFC, to a certain extent, has consequences in all life domains, including
141 the family domain. Those consequences, in the form of stress or decreased satisfaction with

142 non-work life might affect people at home. More directly, Smoktunowicz and Cieslak [20]
143 found in their dyadic study with heterosexual couples that men's family-work conflict
144 mediated the relationship between men's family demands and women's family-related
145 perceived stress. Yet, the authors did not test for the mechanisms behind this transmission. In
146 sum, although we have some insight into how the crossover of WFC occurs, we know
147 substantially less about how this process looks for FWC. Second, while the dimensions of
148 interrole conflict manifest varying associations with their antecedents and outcomes, no study
149 has explored whether this dimensionality matters in the crossover process. For example,
150 when one partner is often late from work due to external pressure to put in long hours and is
151 hence not present for the family, their partner might be forgiving of this reduced
152 performance, knowing that 'the fault' lies elsewhere. Under such circumstances, it might be
153 less likely that this time-based conflict will cross over through negative family interactions,
154 but it might do so through another mechanism, namely empathy. On the contrary, it is
155 plausible to expect that when behaviour-based WFC manifests in underperformance as a
156 spouse or a parent, this will result in tensions, and subsequently family member well-being
157 will deteriorate. With this qualitative study we aim to explore whether, in their stories about
158 work and family, partners perceive these nuances in interrole conflict and react differently to
159 the various forms it takes.

160 **Study aims**

161 This study aims to explore the subjective experiences of WFC and FWC in a dyadic
162 setting. The primary goal is to investigate whether, and if so, how the dimensions of WFC
163 and FWC cross over between partners in their narratives about their private life and work.
164 Specifically, we formulated two research questions.
165 RQ1: What dimensions of WFC and FWC do partners identify in a) themselves and b) their
166 partners?

167 RQ2: How do different dimensions of WFC and FWC cross over between partners?

168 The secondary goal for this study is to inform a planned internet intervention [21] that
169 will aim to reduce WFC and FWC at the individual and dyadic level. We know that people
170 utilise strategies to cope with interrole conflict [22] including negotiating a division of labour,
171 outsourcing demands and seeking social support. Yet, we are not aware of any evidence-
172 based program that would directly target couples' WFC and FWC. To inform such a program
173 we aim to identify the strategies that dual-earner couples already employ and the situational
174 factors that can facilitate or prevent their participation in an internet intervention. This goal
175 translates into the following two research questions:

176 RQ3: What coping strategies with WFC and FCW on an individual and dyadic level do
177 partners identify?

178 RQ4: What potential barriers and facilitating factors in participating in an internet
179 intervention designed to reduce WFC and FWC do partners recognise?

180 **Materials and methods**

181 **Study design**

182 This research will employ an experiential qualitative approach to gain an in-depth
183 understanding of lived experience of conflicts between work and family (WFC and FCW)
184 and how they cross over between partners [23]. The decision to use an experiential approach,
185 results from the study goal of gaining a bottom-up perspective on conflicts between work and
186 family and their crossovers to provide a more nuanced understanding of them. The theoretical
187 paradigm underpinning this research is post-positivism [24]. We assume that knowledge has
188 a provisional nature and understanding of reality is always limited and subject to change.
189 Still, through reflexivity and careful methodological procedures, we can aim for a reliable
190 understanding of reality [25].

191 This protocol follows the Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research [26] and has
192 been preregistered at the Open Science Framework: <https://11nq.com/tLY3E>. The study was
193 approved by the departmental Ethical Review Board (decision number 32/2023 issued on
194 July 11th, 2023). Participation in this study is voluntary and study participants can withdraw
195 at any time. Informed consent that outlines the purpose of the study, the procedures involved,
196 participants' rights as well as information about confidentiality, anonymity and the storage of
197 the data, will be obtained from each individual before the commencement of the interview.

198 **Participants and recruitment**

199 We plan to recruit 20 heterosexual, dual-earner couples. Sampling will be convenient
200 with inclusion criteria ensuring that we will get a sample that is likely to actually experience a
201 conflict between work and life, that is, a sample of couples who are professionally active and
202 live together. Specifically, both partners need to be employed, work a minimum of 50%, and
203 have lived together for at least a year. These criteria are often applied in dyadic studies on
204 interrole conflict [20]. We will recruit couples both with and without children and those that
205 live in various places across the country. We do not set any criteria when it comes to
206 partners' age, relationship length or organisational tenure, yet couples will be excluded if one
207 of the partners is under the age of 18, refuses to participate in the study or does not speak
208 fluent Polish. To determine the sample size, we used the concept of information power
209 [27,28]. We estimated sample size based on: (1) the specificity of study aims, (2) the
210 specificity of the study sample, (3) the theoretical background of the study, (4) the quality of
211 the interviews with study participants and, finally, (5) analysis strategy (cross case vs. case).
212 To avoid confirmation bias and selecting participants who support our expectations, the
213 recruitment of participants will be performed in collaboration with a specialised research
214 agency, which will facilitate access to a relatively diverse sample in terms of inclusion

215 criteria and allow for participant reimbursement while keeping their data anonymous to the
216 researchers. Recruitment will begin as soon as the study protocol is accepted.

217 **Data collection**

218 Data will be collected through semi-structured interviews [29] with both members of a
219 couple, but separately. We chose the semi-structured interview because it allows for in-depth
220 subjective perspectives from the interviewees, while providing a consistent framework for all
221 interviews to increase the reliability of the data [30]. The decision to use separate rather than
222 dyadic interviews was based on a literature review of the different types of interviews in
223 dyadic studies [31–35]. As we aim to capture the individual perspective within the dyad
224 without forging a couple perspective, we decided to collect individual interviews, which
225 allow subjective views to be obtained and the opportunity for self-reflection [31,36]. We plan
226 to conduct the interviews with partners simultaneously by two members of the research team,
227 but if this turns out to be unfeasible for a given couple, we will conduct them consecutively,
228 aiming to prevent partners from discussing their interviews beforehand.

229 The semi-structured interview guide consists of a series of open-ended questions
230 designed to elicit the subjective perspectives of the study participants (see a table in S1). The
231 guide was developed on the basis of a literature review and the study objectives and includes
232 main questions as well as possible follow-up questions. This will allow the interviewer to
233 maintain flexibility during the interview by deepening the interviewee's narrative and/or
234 developing new topics that emerge during the interview.

235 Given the characteristics of our study group (working age group), the widespread use
236 of online communication during the Covid pandemic, combined with the advantages of
237 online research interviews (e.g., the possibility of recruiting participants from different parts
238 of the country, cost and time efficiency as well as accessibility), we decided to conduct
239 interviews online using virtual communication platforms and applications such as Skype or

240 Zoom. As we are aware of the challenges associated with such communication channels (e.g.,
241 privacy issues, challenges in creating an intimate and private research setting), technological
242 limitations (e.g., access to equipment and software and skills to use them), as well as
243 challenges related to establishing rapport and maintaining contact (for an overview of
244 advantages and disadvantages of online interviewing and recommendations, see, e.g., [37,
245 38]), we plan to implement a number of precautionary measures to mitigate the potential
246 risks. Firstly, the interviews will be conducted by an experienced researcher who has received
247 training in qualitative interviewing techniques and is competent in establishing rapport
248 (including in online settings), using probes, listening and maintaining confidentiality.
249 Secondly, in terms of technological challenges, study participants will be able to choose their
250 preferred platform or application for data collection. They will also receive written
251 instructions on how to use the platforms/applications. Finally, in terms of providing a safe,
252 private and quiet space for an interview, participants will be given instructions on how to
253 prepare for an interview. For example, they will be instructed on how to set a blurred or
254 artificial background on the platform to ensure privacy. In addition to the interviews, we will
255 ask the participants to fill out a demographic survey with basic questions about gender, age,
256 being a parent, and job type, as well as a scale to measure dimension-based interrole conflict
257 [39]. The objective of the latter is to gather descriptive data about the sample, i.e., to what
258 extent did they experience interrole conflict.

259 Transcription of the interviews will be anonymised to protect the identity of the study
260 participants, and the audio recordings will be deleted immediately after transcription.

261 Transcriptions will be stored in password protected files that will be accessible only to the
262 research team. Importantly, signed informed consent will be stored separately, in another
263 password protected file, and it will not be possible to link them to the transcripts.

264 **Data analysis**

265 Analyses will be conducted at the individual and dyadic levels. We will employ two
266 forms of thematic analysis (TA) [25] which is a widely used qualitative method that allows
267 for a nuanced understanding of rich and complex data by identification, analysis, and
268 interpretation of meanings within qualitative data [40]. At the individual level we will be
269 guided by the principles of reflexive TA [40]. As we are interested in partners' lived
270 experiences of complex and multifaceted conflicts between work and family (WFC and
271 FCW), reflexive TA is best suited to obtaining such a bottom-up individual perspective. We
272 will apply reflexive TA to all research questions. With regard to Research Question 1 (RQ1),
273 we will analyse which dimensions of WFC and FWC (i.e., time, strain, behaviour and
274 possibly others) partners identify in themselves and in their partners, e.g., are there
275 differences in how study participants see WFC and FWC in themselves and how they see
276 them in their partners? In relation to Research Question 2 (RQ2), reflexive TA will help us to
277 explore lived experiences of the transmission of different dimensions of WFC and FWC
278 between partners. We will also use reflexive TA to analyse statements about coping strategies
279 at the individual and dyadic level (RQ3), e.g., do partners differentiate strategies according to
280 the level (individual vs. dyadic) or dimension of FWC and FCW? Finally, reflexive TA will
281 also be used to elicit partners' perspectives on barriers and facilitators to participating in an
282 internet intervention designed to reduce WFC and FWC.

283 The analysis will be carried out in six stages, as recommended by Braun and Clarke
284 [40,41]. Phase one will be preceded by a transcription of the data and, as part of this phase,
285 team members will familiarise themselves with the data. The second phase will involve the
286 production of preliminary codes from the data. We will use the MAXQDA software to
287 facilitate the analysis. In phase three, two members of the team (ES as a researcher of work-
288 life conflicts and JZ as a qualitative researcher) will review the codes and look for a pattern
289 of meaning (initial themes) from coded and collated data. In the next phase, a revision of the

290 preliminary themes will be undertaken to ensure their correspondence with the codes and
291 patterns identified in the dataset. The fifth phase involves defining and naming themes. So,
292 following Braun and Clarke [41], an entire research team will seek to identify the ‘essence’ of
293 what each theme is about. Finally, in the writing-up phase, the themes will be linked in a
294 coherent narrative.

295 At the dyadic level, we will use the framework method (FM) [42,43] as adapted by
296 Collaco et al. [44]. The FM was chosen because we wanted to complement the analyses at the
297 individual level with a perspective within couple dyads. Thus, the use of the framework
298 method will add to the reflective TA and answer the question of whether the identification of
299 WFC and FWC dimensions match across partners’ narratives (RQ1). In relation to RQ2, the
300 framework analysis will allow us to see how different dimensions of WFC and FWC cross
301 over between partners in dyads (RQ2) and what similarities and differences there are in the
302 stories of coping strategies within dyads (RQ3). The latter will be a very important
303 perspective in the context of the planned intervention. A key advantage of FA is that it allows
304 data to be compared within dyads, with the analysis focusing on overlaps and contrasts in the
305 narratives of the couples. In addition, being more structured and systematic than a reflexive
306 thematic analysis, FA is also efficient and easy to apply even for inexperienced qualitative
307 researchers [40]. The FA process is based on the adapted by Collaco et al. [44] version of the
308 framework method [42,43]. The adapted dyadic analysis using the framework method
309 consists of eight stages, the first three of which (transcription, familiarisation with the data
310 and development of a data coding system) are consistent with the steps of reflexive TA. In
311 the next step we will produce tables of themes and sub-themes, including dyadic
312 codes/summaries for each couple. Step 5 analyses of the degree of agreement between the
313 partners in the couple and how each theme influenced the other. On this basis, dyadic codes
314 will be created. Stages 6 and 7 will involve the creation of new themes based on the dyadic

315 sub-codes and then apply them throughout the corpus. The final stage is to analyse and
316 interpret variations in dyadic couples in reference to a theoretical model. As in the reflexive
317 thematic analysis, the leading roles in the analysis will be played by ES and JZ, with the other
318 team members stepping in as a reflexive team.

319 **Trustworthiness**

320 An important part of our study design and analysis is to ensure the trustworthiness of
321 our research [44]. To enhance the credibility, transferability, dependability, and
322 confirmability of our study, we follow established procedures in qualitative research [44,45].
323 Above all, it is the process of reflexivity [46]. Our research team is diverse in terms of past
324 interests, preconceptions, standard methodology and personal experience. This translates into
325 discussions about the differences between us and their potential impact on the study design,
326 data collection and analytical process. In order to maintain the process of reflection, we will
327 meet regularly to discuss differences between us in relation to the research process. In
328 addition, we plan to incorporate a wide range of strategies to ensure the trustworthiness of our
329 research, as proposed by Nowell and co-authors [44]. For example, we plan to involve all
330 team members in key stages of the research process. We plan to collect and provide readers
331 with rich, detailed and contextual information about the dataset and the subsequent stages of
332 the research process. The research protocol serves as a peer debriefing. In the later stages of
333 the research, we also plan to use peer debriefing [45] to get an external perspective.

334 **Discussion**

335 This paper presents a protocol for a qualitative study aimed at reporting on couples'
336 experiences with conflict between work and family. Specifically, we are interested in whether
337 people in relationships identify time, strain, behaviour and possibly other dimensions in their
338 own and their partners' experiences of interrole conflict, and in how those dimensions cross

339 over within couples. Identification of the crossover mechanisms behind dimension-based
340 WFC and FWC is important for the advancement of theoretical models: Those that pertain
341 directly to crossover, such as the spillover-crossover model [1] and those that attempt to
342 depict work and family lives more broadly, such as the job demands-resources model [47].
343 For example, if FWC dimensions of one person in the relationship carry consequences for
344 their partner—directly and/or indirectly—it might imply that SCM should be extended with
345 yet another dyadic exchange. Furthermore, if one of the WFC or FWC dimensions turned out
346 to be more salient than others to partners in a dyadic setting, it would suggest that demands
347 behind such a dimension have far reaching consequences; knowing this would be important
348 from a theoretical but also a practical standpoint. Traditionally, research on mitigating
349 interrole conflict has focused on the organizational side, in particular on flexible work [48].
350 While investigating these solutions is essential and should be continued, it is imperative to
351 simultaneously look for means to manage interrole conflict on the family front. This could be
352 achieved through programs dedicated to supporting working couples, and one way to deliver
353 those is online. Internet interventions [49–51] have gained significant popularity over the past
354 three decades with randomised controlled trials repeatedly demonstrating that they are
355 effective in improving people’s well-being, including in the context of work [52,53]. Yet, to
356 the best of our knowledge, no such intervention has targeted interrole conflict and its
357 crossover directly. Findings from this qualitative study have the potential to inform the
358 content of the ensuing intervention, in particular, when it comes to providing examples of
359 how the conflict tends to manifest itself in order to help participants identify the signs and
360 support their partners. Internet interventions are highly accessible, ensure privacy, and can be
361 scalable, which is critical considering that access to evidence-based psychological support is
362 limited [54]. On the downside, depending on their design, these interventions can suffer from
363 low adherence and high dropout [55]. It is crucial to foresee and address barriers that

364 potential participants might face, and to enhance those conditions that make it easier for them
365 to join. Hence, our secondary goal in this study is to collect information on what can persuade
366 couples to participate in interventions that are delivered online and dedicated to coping with
367 interrole conflict.

368 This study has a few potential limitations. First, our study aims require that we
369 explore interrole conflict at the granular level. However, differentiating between directions of
370 the conflict (i.e., WFC vs. FWC) and particularly its dimensions (i.e., time, strain, behaviour
371 and possibly others) might prove difficult for the interviewees. We plan to address this in two
372 ways. Couples will fill out an interrole conflict scale before the interview which will
373 familiarise them with this concept and provide time to reflect. Additionally, we will conduct
374 pilot interviews to test the interview guide to ensure that our questions are clear and that we
375 are able to meet study goals. If necessary, we will modify the interview scenario. The second
376 limitation is that we will only focus on the negative aspects of balancing work and family
377 life, whereas crossover of enrichment is also possible [56]. We choose to limit our
378 investigation due to feasibility but acknowledge that capturing the work-family interface in
379 its full complexity requires taking into account not only the losses but also the gains. Possible
380 limitations are also related to the design of the study and qualitative methods of data analysis.
381 The main challenge concerns recruitment. Recruiting couples where both partners are willing
382 to share their experiences can be challenging [33,57], particularly as the research interview
383 may involve difficult experiences and couples may be reluctant to share details of work-
384 family conflicts in their relationship. To mitigate the risks of bias in the selection of couples
385 for the study due to potential unwillingness to participate in the study, recruitment was
386 delegated to an external agency. Recruitment by an external agency will also allow
387 respondents to feel more anonymous, as the researchers will not have access to their personal
388 information. Furthermore, given that research interviews may involve difficult experiences

389 for the couple being interviewed, there are challenges associated with the interview and the
390 process of managing confidentiality between partners [58]. Although we will encourage study
391 participants to maintain their privacy during the interview, we cannot rule out the possibility
392 that participants may overhear each other if there are no conditions for simultaneous
393 interviews, or that they may not consult with each other to establish a shared narrative of their
394 experiences. It will therefore be crucial to ensure that, prior to the interviews, participants
395 receive detailed information about the aims and ethical principles of the study, including how
396 we will manage confidentiality. Equally important will be the competence of the experienced
397 interviewer to manage confidentiality, especially in the face of competing accounts in
398 subsequent interviews with partners. Finally, as we are using two methods to analyse the data
399 at two levels - individual and dyadic - this presents challenges for the analytical process with
400 a potential risk of oversimplifying complex phenomena and reducing the richness of the data
401 [40]. In order to avoid errors within the research process, a number of trustworthiness
402 strategies are planned.

403 **Conclusion**

404 In sum, this study has the potential to provide a more nuanced understanding of the
405 interface between work and family in dual-earner couples. By performing qualitative
406 interviews with couples, we will gain a more-in-depth knowledge on the facets of the
407 conflicts between the work and non-work domains, as well as how they transfer (cross over)
408 between partners. As a consequence, not only theoretical models could be refined and
409 extended, but also practical implications about how to mitigate the consequences of conflicts
410 and their crossover could be developed for future interventions.

412 **References**

- 413 1. Bakker AB, Demerouti E. The spillover-crossover model. In: Grzywacz JG, Demerouti
414 E, Grzywacz JG (Ed), Demerouti E (Ed), editors. *New frontiers in work and family
415 research*. New York, NY, US: Psychology Press; 2013. pp. 55–70.
- 416 2. Greenhaus JH, Beutell NJ. Sources of Conflict between Work and Family Roles. *The
417 Academy of Management Review*. 1985;10: 76–88. doi:10.2307/258214
- 418 3. Carlson DS, Kacmar KM, Williams LJ. Construction and Initial Validation of a
419 Multidimensional Measure of Work–Family Conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*.
420 2000;56: 249–276. doi:10.1006/jvbe.1999.1713
- 421 4. Byron K. A Meta-Analytic Review of Work-Family Conflict and Its Antecedents.
422 *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 2005;67: 169–198.
- 423 5. Michel JS, Kotrba LM, Mitchelson JK, Clark MA, Baltes BB. Antecedents of work-
424 family conflict: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 2011;32:
425 689–725. doi:10.1002/job.695
- 426 6. Amstad FT, Meier LL, Fasel U, Elfering A, Semmer NK. A meta-analysis of work–
427 family conflict and various outcomes with a special emphasis on cross-domain versus
428 matching-domain relations. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*. 2011;16: 151–
429 169. doi:10.1037/a0022170
- 430 7. Nohe C, Meier LL, Sonntag K, Michel A. The Chicken or the Egg? A Meta-Analysis of
431 Panel Studies of the Relationship Between Work-Family Conflict and Strain. *Journal of
432 Applied Psychology*. 2015;100: 522–536. doi:10.1037/a0038012
- 433 8. Peeters MCW, ten Brummelhuis LL, van Steenbergen EF. Consequences of combining
434 work and family roles: A closer look at cross-domain versus within-domain relations.
435 In: Grzywacz JG, Demerouti E, Grzywacz JG (Ed), Demerouti E (Ed), editors. *New*

- 436 frontiers in work and family research. New York, NY, US: Psychology Press; 2013. pp.
437 93–109.
- 438 9. Shockley KM, Shen W, DeNunzio MM, Arvan ML, Knudsen EA. Disentangling the
439 relationship between gender and work-family conflict: An integration of theoretical
440 perspectives using meta-analytic methods. *The Journal of applied psychology*.
441 2017;102: 1601–1635. doi:10.1037/apl0000246
- 442 10. Allen TD, Regina J, Wiernik BM, Waiwood AM. Toward a better understanding of the
443 causal effects of role demands on work–family conflict: A genetic modeling approach.
444 *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 2023;108: 520–539. doi:10.1037/apl0001032
- 445 11. Allen TD, Johnson RC, Saboe KN, Cho E, Dumani S, Evans S. Dispositional variables
446 and work–family conflict: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 2012;80:
447 17–26. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2011.04.004
- 448 12. De Gieter S, De Cooman R, Bogaerts Y, Verelst L. Explaining the effect of work–
449 nonwork boundary management fit on satisfaction and performance at home through
450 reduced time- and strain-based work–family conflict. *Applied Psychology: An
451 International Review*. 2022;71: 129–153. doi:10.1111/apps.12314
- 452 13. Hetrick AL, Haynes NJ, Clark MA, Sanders KN. The theoretical and empirical utility of
453 dimension-based work-family conflict: A meta-analysis. *J Appl Psychol*. 2023.
454 doi:10.1037/apl0000552
- 455 14. Greenhaus JH, Allen TD, Spector PE. Health consequences of work-family conflict:
456 The dark side of the work-family interface. In: Perrewé PL, Ganster DC, editors.
457 *Employee health, coping and methodologies*. Elsevier Science/JAI Press; 2006. pp. 61–
458 98. doi:10.1016/s1479-3555(05)05002-x

- 459 15. Kengatharan N, Edwards C. The development and application of a scale to measure the
460 extent and forms of work-family conflict in collectivist cultures. *Int J Manpow*.
461 2021;42: 581–603. doi:10.1108/ijm-04-2019-0199
- 462 16. Bolger N, DeLongis A, Kessler RC, Wethington E. The contagion of stress across
463 multiple roles. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 1989;51: 175–183.
464 doi:10.2307/352378
- 465 17. Westman M. Stress and strain crossover. *Human Relations*. 2001;54: 717–751.
- 466 18. Steiner RS, Krings F. How was your day, darling? A literature review of positive and
467 negative crossover at the work-family interface in couples. *European Psychologist*.
468 2016;21: 296–315. doi:10.1027/1016-9040/a000275
- 469 19. Li A, Cropanzano R, Butler A, Shao P, Westman M. Work–family crossover: A meta-
470 analytic review. *International Journal of Stress Management*. 2021;28: 89–104.
471 doi:10.1037/str0000225
- 472 20. Smoktunowicz E, Cieślak R. How job and family demands impact change in perceived
473 stress: A dyadic study. *International Journal of Occupational Medicine and*
474 *Environmental Health*. 2018;31: 199–215.
- 475 21. Andersson G. Internet interventions: Past, present and future. *Internet Interventions*.
476 2018;12: 181–188. doi:10.1016/j.invent.2018.03.008
- 477 22. Shockley KM, Clark MA, Dodd H, King EB. Work-family strategies during COVID-
478 19: Examining gender dynamics among dual-earner couples with young children. *The*
479 *Journal of applied psychology*. 2021;106: 15–28. doi:10.1037/apl0000857
- 480 23. Willig C. *Introducing Qualitative Research in Psychology*. 2nd edition. Maidenhead:
481 Open University Press; 2008.

- 482 24. Guba EG, Lincoln YS. Competing paradigms in qualitative research. Handbook of
483 qualitative research. Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc; 1994. pp. 105–
484 117.
- 485 25. Clarke V, Braun V. Successful Qualitative Research: A Practical Guide for Beginners.
486 2013.
- 487 26. O’Brien BC, Harris IB, Beckman TJ, Reed DA, Cook DA. Standards for reporting
488 qualitative research: a synthesis of recommendations. Acad Med. 2014;89: 1245–1251.
489 doi:10.1097/ACM.0000000000000388
- 490 27. Malterud K, Siersma VD, Guassora AD. Sample Size in Qualitative Interview Studies:
491 Guided by Information Power. Qual Health Res. 2016;26: 1753–1760.
492 doi:10.1177/1049732315617444
- 493 28. Braun V, Clarke V. To saturate or not to saturate? Questioning data saturation as a
494 useful concept for thematic analysis and sample-size rationales. Qualitative Research in
495 Sport, Exercise and Health. 2021;13: 201–216. doi:10.1080/2159676X.2019.1704846
- 496 29. Kvale S, Brinkmann S. InterViews: Learning the craft of qualitative research
497 interviewing, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc; 2009. pp. xviii,
498 354.
- 499 30. Brinkmann S, Kvale S. Doing Interviews. SAGE Publications Ltd; 2018.
500 doi:10.4135/9781529716665
- 501 31. Eisikovits Z, Koren C. Approaches to and Outcomes of Dyadic Interview Analysis.
502 Qual Health Res. 2010;20: 1642–1655. doi:10.1177/1049732310376520
- 503 32. Manning J, Kunkel A. Qualitative approaches to dyadic data analyses in family
504 communication research: An invited essay. Journal of Family Communication. 2015;15:
505 185–192. doi:10.1080/15267431.2015.1043434

- 506 33. Mellor RM, Slaymaker E, Cleland J. Recognizing and Overcoming Challenges of
507 Couple Interview Research. *Qual Health Res.* 2013;23: 1399–1407.
508 doi:10.1177/1049732313506963
- 509 34. Morris SM. Joint and individual interviewing in the context of cancer. *Qual Health Res.*
510 2001;11: 553–567. doi:10.1177/104973201129119208
- 511 35. Zarhin D. Conducting joint interviews with couples: Ethical and methodological
512 challenges. *Qualitative Health Research.* 2018;28: 844–854.
513 doi:10.1177/1049732317749196
- 514 36. Morgan DL, Ataie J, Carder P, Hoffman K. Introducing Dyadic Interviews as a Method
515 for Collecting Qualitative Data. *Qual Health Res.* 2013;23: 1276–1284.
516 doi:10.1177/1049732313501889
- 517 37. Lobe B, Morgan DL, Hoffman K. A Systematic Comparison of In-Person and Video-
518 Based Online Interviewing. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods.* 2022;21:
519 160940692211270. doi:10.1177/16094069221127068
- 520 38. Khan T, MacEachen E. An Alternative Method of Interviewing: Critical Reflections on
521 Videoconference Interviews for Qualitative Data Collection. *The International Journal*
522 *of Qualitative Methods.* 2022;21: 1–12. doi:10.1177/16094069221090063
- 523 39. Matthews R, Kath L, Barnes-Farrell J. A Short, Valid, Predictive Measure of Work-
524 Family Conflict: Item Selection and Scale Validation. *Journal of occupational health*
525 *psychology.* 2010;15: 75–90. doi:10.1037/a0017443
- 526 40. Braun V, Clarke V. *Thematic Analysis: A Practical Guide.* SAGE; 2021.
- 527 41. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in*
528 *Psychology.* 2006;3: 77–101. doi:10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

- 529 42. Ritchie, J. and Spencer, L. (1994) Qualitative Data Analysis for Applied Policy
530 Research. In Bryman, A. and Burgess, R., Eds., *Anal. Qual. Data*, Routledge, London,
531 173-194.
- 532 43. Gale NK, Heath G, Cameron E, Rashid S, Redwood S. Using the framework method for
533 the analysis of qualitative data in multi-disciplinary health research. *BMC Medical*
534 *Research Methodology*. 2013;13: 117. doi:10.1186/1471-2288-13-117
- 535 44. Collaço N, Wagland R, Alexis O, Gavin A, Glaser A, Watson EK. Using the
536 Framework Method for the Analysis of Qualitative Dyadic Data in Health Research.
537 *Qual Health Res*. 2021;31: 1555–1564. doi:10.1177/10497323211011599
- 538 45. Nowell L, Norris J, White D, Moules N. Thematic Analysis: Striving to Meet the
539 Trustworthiness Criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative*. 2017;16.
540 doi:10.1177/1609406917733847
- 541 46. Lincoln YS, Guba EG. *Naturalistic Inquiry*. SAGE; 1985.
- 542 47. Finlay L, Gough B. Reflexivity: A Practical Guide for Researchers in Health and Social
543 Sciences. 2008. p. 255. doi:10.1002/9780470776094
- 544 48. Demerouti E, Nachreiner F, Baker AB, Schaufeli WB. The Job Demands-Resources
545 Model of Burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 2001;86: 499–512.
- 546 49. Allen TD, Johnson RC, Kiburz KM, Shockley KM. Work–family conflict and flexible
547 work arrangements: Deconstructing flexibility. *Personnel Psychology*. 2013;66: 345–
548 376. doi:10.1111/peps.12012
- 549 50. Carlbring P, Hadjistavropoulos H, Kleiboer A, Andersson G. A new era in Internet
550 interventions: The advent of Chat-GPT and AI-assisted therapist guidance. *Internet*
551 *Interv*. 2023;32: 100621. doi:10.1016/j.invent.2023.100621
- 552 51. Karyotaki E, Ebert DD, Donkin L, Riper H, Twisk J, Burger S, et al. Do guided
553 internet-based interventions result in clinically relevant changes for patients with

- 554 depression? An individual participant data meta-analysis. *Clinical Psychology Review*.
555 2018;63: 80–92. doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2018.06.007
- 556 52. Smoktunowicz E, Barak A, Andersson G, Banos RM, Berger T, Botella C, et al.
557 Consensus statement on the problem of terminology in psychological interventions
558 using the internet or digital components. *Internet Interventions*. 2020;21: 100331.
559 doi:10.1016/j.invent.2020.100331
- 560 53. Cieslak R, Benight CC, Rogala A, Smoktunowicz E, Kowalska M, Zukowska K, et al.
561 Effects of Internet-based self-efficacy intervention on secondary traumatic stress and
562 secondary posttraumatic growth among health and human services professionals
563 exposed to indirect trauma. *Frontiers in Psychology*. 2016;7.
- 564 54. Heber E, Lehr D, Ebert DD, Berking M, Riper H. Web-Based and Mobile Stress
565 Management Intervention for Employees: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *J Med*
566 *Internet Res*. 2016;18. doi:10.2196/jmir.5112
- 567 55. Lal S, Adair CE. E-mental health: a rapid review of the literature. *Psychiatr Serv*.
568 2014;65: 24–32. doi:10.1176/appi.ps.201300009
- 569 56. Ryan C, Bergin M, Wells JS. Theoretical Perspectives of Adherence to Web-Based
570 Interventions: a Scoping Review. *Int J Behav Med*. 2018;25: 17–29.
571 doi:10.1007/s12529-017-9678-8
- 572 57. Greenhaus JH, Powell GN. When work and family are allies: A theory of work-family
573 enrichment. *The Academy of Management Review*. 2006;31: 72–92.
574 doi:10.2307/20159186
- 575 58. Blake S, Janssens A, Ewing J, Barlow A. Reflections on Joint and Individual Interviews
576 With Couples: A Multi-Level Interview Mode. *International Journal of Qualitative*
577 *Methods*. 2021;20: 160940692110167. doi:10.1177/16094069211016733