



Questionnaire Translation and Validation of Problem-Focused Coping in Increasing Work to Family Enrichment in Context of Laos

Soulideth KEOBOUALAPHETH¹, Surena Sabil² and Tan Kock Wah²

University of Malaysia Sarawak, Malaysia

¹Correspondence:

Soulideth
KEOBOUALAPHETH,
Office of the President,
Souphanouvong University,
Lao PDR, Tel: +856 20
28622347, Email:
dethsu@yahoo.com

²University of Malaysia
Sarawak, Malaysia

Article Info:

Submitted: jun 05, 2022

Revised: Jul 11, 2022

Accepted: Aug 08, 2022

Abstract

This study aims to translate and validate a questionnaire of problem-focused coping in increasing work to family enrichment in the context of Laos. The questionnaire is translated by using forward and backward translation process with two Lao bilingual translations: then this questionnaire is evaluated through three validity criteria (content validity, face validity, and construct validity) and reliability process. The findings show that the questionnaire translation is available locally, culturally acceptable, and conceptual equivalence for Lao language. Lao questionnaire version is fulfilled acceptable standards of validity and reliability analysis. This study suggests that the Lao questionnaire version is locally accepted to proceed for further actual study in Lao context.

Keywords: *Questionnaire translation, questionnaire validity, problem-focused coping, work to family enrichment.*

1. Introduction

Research questionnaires have mostly been widely used and validated in Western cultures; however, there is a need of validating them to be used in the Eastern cultures (Powell et al., 2009; Hassan et al., 2010; Kwok et al., 2014). This is especially for the cross-cultural study is important to validate the questionnaire for locally acceptable (Ahmad et al., 2014). With regard to this, the validated questionnaire in the Western cultures needs to be translated into the local language (Sun, 2009; Chen, Haniff, Siau, Seet, Loh, & Jamil, 2014). Subsequently, the questionnaire translation is then evaluated through the validity and reliability process to declare the translated questionnaire ready to be used (Sun, 2009). As recommended by Chen et al. (2014), validating the questionnaire is needed to achieve equivalence between two different

languages and to achieve the requirement of acceptable validity and reliability of the questionnaire standards (Sun, 2009). Unfortunately, most studies are conducted in Western and some Eastern countries (Powell et al., 2009; Annor, 2016). In Lao context, however, the study of problem-focused coping with increasing work to family enrichment is still limited.

Work to family enrichment refers to the process by which experiences in work role improve the quality of life in family role (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). Subsequently, Stoddard and Madsen (2007) reached out by making three estimations of work to family enrichment that included development, affection, and capital sources. Development occurs when involvement in work leads to the acquisition or refinement of skills, knowledge, behaviors, or ways of viewing things that help and individual

be a better family member. Affection is defined as a positive emotional state or attitude which results when involvement in work helps the individual be a better family member. Capital occurs when involvement in work promotes levels of psycho-social resources such as a sense of security, confidence, accomplishment, or self-fulfillment that helps the individual be a better family member (Stoddard & Madsen, 2007). The source roles were fundamentally connected with work to family enrichment in increasing work-family satisfaction, job commitment and performance, and psychological and physical well-being, and employees' quality of life (Gareis et al., 2009; Chen, Powell, & Cui, 2014; Hamid & Ahmad, 2015).

With regard to increase work to family enrichment, problem focused coping is recognized as an important predictor of work to family enrichment (Mauno & Rantanen, 2013). It is portrayed as behavioral coping which joins searching for and to make direct action in controlling stress and needs and seeking social support to manage the problem situation (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). This coping focusses not only on presenting the problem, planning, generating alternative and measuring the alternatives to the extent their costs and points of interest. It also emphasizes on picking a choice, and performing to apply control and to resolve issues. Previous studies found that employees who experienced using problem-focused coping was positively related to work to family enrichment in supporting to work-family balance with Finnish nurse employees (Mauno & Rantanen, 2013) and in increasing working parents' well-being (Shinn et al., 1989; Mathur & Swami, 2015). At the same time, this coping is the most part seen to help managing individual's stressors and needs (Lapeierre & Allen, 2006) and decreasing work stress among Malaysian working women (Yi Lian & Lian Tam, 2014).

To overcome these shortcomings, this study aims to validate through two approaches in

the context of Laos: (1) the appropriate translation of the questionnaire and (2) to validate the questionnaire for validity and reliability acceptable.

2 Materials and Methods

2.1 Participants and Analytical Procedures

2.1.1 Questionnaire Translation

With regard to the questionnaire translation, two bilingual professional translators who expertise in English and Lao language, were invited to participate this questionnaire translation. The original English version was blindly forward translated into the Lao language by the first translator, and then the Lao version was blindly backward translated into English by the second translator. The original English version and English backward translation was compared for accuracy. This process is repeated multiple times until the meaning of the translated document is mutually agreed to be equivalent and unambiguous. The items might be revised through the forward and backward translation process again in order to ensure conceptual equivalence instead of achieving linguistic equivalence (Sun, 2009).

2.2 Questionnaire Validation

Sun (2009) suggested that the appropriate sample size for validation study should be at least 100 participants. The participants should be involved with employees in organizations, namely genders, administrative and managerial staff, different work contexts, and job positions (Carlson et al., 2006; Ghislieri et al., 2011; Rantanen et al., (2013), and experience different pressures (Baltes et al., 2011; Yi Lian & Lian Tam, 2014). Hence, official letters were sent to 11 organizations in Luangprabang province, Laos for approval. Then the questionnaires were left to employees to complete on their own and returned in two weeks.

A total of 150 questionnaires was distributed for the collection of data. A total of 117 questionnaires was returned with a response rate of 78%. Therefore, there were 117

employees of the questionnaire for evaluation, participating with complete data by 76 males (65%), 41 females (35%), 89 married (76.1%), and 28 single (23.9%). These employees who had different working experiences of below 10 years (a total of 70 with 59.8%), 11-30 years (a total of 36 with 30.8%), and above 31 years (a total of 9 with 7.7%). In addition, who had different job positions, including 59 general staffs (50.4%), 1 deputy head of unit (1.7%), 14 deputy heads of division (12%), 26 heads of division (22.2%), 10 deputy directors (8.5%), and 5 directors (4.3%).

This questionnaire validation aims to validate through content validity, face validity, and construct validity, and reliability (Ahmad et al., 2014). Data analysis was employed by using SPSS version 20. Tables, statistics, and descriptions are used to present results of the study.

Content validity focuses on the assessment of the items on the instrument (Ahmad et al., 2014) and can be assessed by six expert panels review whether the wordings used in the translated questionnaire are appropriate (Sun, 2009). Therefore, six experts in Lao language were invited to evaluate the content validity of the Lao questionnaire version. They were invited to provide their agreement based on a four point Likert scale, namely 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Agree, 4=Strongly Agree. The value of CVI is greater than 0.80 is considered an acceptable CVI score for well-developed instrument evaluated by 6 linguistic experts (Polit & Beck, 2006).

Face validity aims to evaluate in order to ensure that (1) all items were at an acceptable level of variation for the target employees and the appropriate meaning (based on Lao culture), (3) to test the difficult task of response, the respondent's interest, and attention (Ahmad et al., 2014) and (3) to ensure for the readability and possible offensiveness of the language (Lu, 2007). Three panels who have experience of the organizational management and five respondents

were invited to give comments and recommend to the questionnaire (Ying Lu, 2009). On the other hand, they were also evaluated the content validity of the questionnaire to be used. If an average score is greater than 3 the item would be retained (Lynn, 1986; Ying Lu, 2009).

Construct validity is based upon statistical process (Ahmad et al., 2014) and looks into the agreement between a theoretical concept and a specific measuring procedure (Chen, 2009). Principal components analysis was used to show the validity of the measurement scales. The acceptable standard of the construct validity, highest weight value of the factor loading of all variable items remains higher than 0.4 (Field, 2009). Similarly, values of KMO and Bartlett's of Sphericity statistic (significant at $P=0.000$) will be remained higher than 0.5 (Field, 2009). All research variables will have eigenvalues larger than 1.

Reliability is based on the internal consistency and stability of the survey instrument (Chen, 2009; Rusli et al., 2014). The reliability analysis approach was measured in terms of scale reliability coefficient. In addition, the measurements of reliability were tested separately to the variables through their internal consistency. A Cronbach's alpha of 0.70 or higher is considered an acceptable reliability coefficient (Nunally & Bernstein, 1994).

2.2 Research instruments

Work to family enrichment refers to multiple roles of development, affection, and capital, which can assist individuals to become healthier employees. The work-family enrichment questionnaire was developed by Carlson et al. (2006) with 9 items. For instance, *"My involvement in my work helps me understand different viewpoints and this helps me be a better family member"*. The items of questionnaire were scored based on a four-point Likert scale, namely 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Agree, 4=Strongly Agree. Higher scores indicated high levels of work to family

enrichment, while low scores indicated low levels of work to family enrichment. The value of internal consistency which was accepted with Cronbach alpha 0.92.

Problem-focused coping refers to individual behavioral efforts in terms of seeking a solution problem and taking a direct action to manage the problem situation. The problem-focused coping questionnaire was developed by Guppy, Edwards, Brough, Peter-Bean, Sale, and Short (2004) with three items for symptom reduction and Carver, Scheier and Weintraub (1989) with four items for seeking support. For instance, *"I focus my efforts on changing the situation"* and *"I ask people who have had similar experiences what they did"*. The items of questionnaire were scored based on a four point Likert scale, namely 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Agree, 4=Strongly Agree. The higher scores point out more problem-focused coping and emotion-focused coping. The value of internal consistency which was accepted with Cronbach alpha 0.77 and 0.75.

In this study, the four Likert scale is chosen due to it needs to avoid neutral having a neutral and ambivalent midpoint (Lynn, 1986; Polit & Beck, 2006). This is particularly as the midpoints may not really represent the opinion of neither agree nor disagree as recommended by Kulas, Stachowski, & Haynes (2008) and Tsang (2012). As a concept of "agree and disagree" is employed in the current study. Therefore, the four Likert scale is conducted for this study.

3. Results

3.1 Questionnaire Translation

This study revealed that the original source of the English version was blindly forwarded for translation to Lao version by the first linguistic translator and then Lao version was backward translated by the second linguistic translator. Then the English and the Lao questionnaire translation were compared for their accuracy, particular to on achieving conceptual equivalence. The results showed that the English

version and the Lao version found to be achieved the conceptual equivalence as compared with their accuracy. Therefore, the Lao questionnaire version was accepted for the conceptual equivalence and locally acceptable in Lao context. The details are presented in Table 2.

3.2 Lao Questionnaire Validation

Content Validity:

Table 3 showed that a value of content validity for WFE was 0.87 and problem-focused coping was 0.85. These values are greater than 0.80 which is considered acceptable and all items are retained. Thus, the content validity has achieved the required level in this study.

Face Validity:

Results of face validity showed that three panels and five respondents were provided opinions to the questionnaire to be used. They recommended that (1) *"the context and contents are interested and suitable for employees in organizations for managing the balance concerning work, family, and living. They are also appropriate for Lao context, culture, working environment, and social economy"*. (2) *"The meaning of each item was clear enough, but some items had similar meaning feasible for academic worlds and needed more linking with the meaning between items or sections. They recommended that some items would be written with less academic words, easy to understand, and to ensure that all levels of employees can respond and understand all items"*. (3) *"The data collection method was comparable clearly in the instructions and easy for understanding how to complete the questionnaire"*. (4) *"The language term was consistent with the norm and conceptual of Lao culture"*. Therefore, the questionnaire was revived back in term of similar meaning, less academic words, and improved linking meaning through the procedure of forward and backward translation again. The details are presented in Table 4.

Further, three panels and five respondents were evaluated questionnaire to ensure for the

readability and possible offensiveness of the language. Based on dichotomous analysis, the score was calculated for each item and an average score means. The average value was calculated by the sum of panel value divided by the number of panels or respondents. Table 4 revealed that a face validity of WFE was 3.3 for three panels and 3.42 for five respondents. While problem-focused coping was 3.2 for panels' face validity and 3.6 for five respondents' face validity. All variable scales have achieved the face validity level with average value higher than 3.0. Thus, the face validity was acceptable and all items were retained.

Construct Validity:

Results of principal components analysis showed that construct validity was acceptable of measurement scales. The values of the factor loading for WFE items have ranged from 0.826 to 0.542 and KMO of 0.897. While problem-focused coping items have ranged from 0.732 to 0.515 and KMO of 0.660. The measurement value scales of the factor loading are greater than 0.4, values of KMO are higher than 0.5, Bartlett Test of Sphericity is significant, and the eigenvalues are larger than 1. Therefore, the construct validity has achieved the required level of the measurement scales.

Reliability:

Results revealed that the reliability coefficient of a variable for the WFE scale was 0.882 and problem-focused coping scale was 0.892. Most instruments are acceptable with the value of Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient is higher than 0.70 (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994; Hair et al., 2010). Therefore, these scales are considered acceptable for the required levels.

4. Discussion

This study provides two important contributions. First, the questionnaire translation can be examined by three criteria of the forward translation, backward translation, and harmonized forward translation. Second, the questionnaire validation can be examined by three criteria of

validity evaluation, reliability evaluation, and analysis. The processes are presented in Chart 1.

Questionnaire Translation

This study contributes to the validation of the Lao questionnaire version. The Lao version was well validated for the standard acceptance through three criteria of validity and reliability acceptable. This study was confirmed with Polit and Beck (2006), Ying Lu's (2009), Sun's (2009), and Ahmad et al.'s (2014) study. These studies suggested that the value of content validity index is greater than 0.80 is considered an acceptable CVI score for well-developed instrument evaluated by 6 linguistic experts (Polit & Beck, 2006), if an average score is greater than 3 the item would be retained for face validity as valuated by three panels and five employees (Ying Lu, 2009), and construct validity of an instrument could be based upon statistical process (Ahmad et al., 2014) in terms of the value of the factor loading is greater than 0.4, KMO is higher than 0.5, Bartlett Test of Sphericity is significant, and eigenvalue is larger than 1 (Field, 2009). Similarly, this study was in line of Ying Lu's (2009) and Chen et al.'s (2014) study who found well validation of the content validity, face validity, and construct validity of the translation from the English questionnaire version into Chinese version and Malay version.

Questionnaire translation is a well-known method for cross-cultural research (Lee et al, 2008; Sun, 2009; Ying Lu, 2009). Even though, the questionnaire is first developed in the English language, it could still be possible to translate them into other languages (Sun, 2009). This is due to cross-cultural differences, the translation needs to be carried out carefully to achieve equivalence between two different languages (Lee et al, 2008). Sun (2009) recommended that the questionnaire translation process should focus on achieving conceptual equivalence instead of achieving linguistic equivalence. This is then followed by the process of the correcting validity and reliability.

Based on the Brislin model (1970), the procedure of forward and backward translation is carried out by two bilingual professional translations. The original English questionnaire is blindly forward translated to Lao language by the first bilingual translator, and then Lao questionnaire is blindly backward translated to English by second bilingual translator. These processes are recognized as forward and backward translation (Brislin, 1970; Sun, 2009). Ying Lu (2009) found that the forward and backward translation process conducted by two bilingual professional translators was feasible for the pilot study in Taiwan and most of the research instruments were well validated and reliable. Thus, the procedure of forward and backward translation is used to validate the questionnaire for the conceptual equivalence between English and Lao questionnaire.

Questionnaire Validation

This study provides important contribution for the questionnaire validation in the context of Laos. The translation of the English questionnaire version into Lao version was available locally, culturally acceptable, and conceptual equivalence between English and Lao Language. This study was confirmed with the forward and backward translation process by two bilingual professional translations (Brislin, 1970). Similarly, to the cross-cultural translation is needed locally acceptable (Chen et al., 2014), to achieve the conceptual equivalence (Chen, 2009) rather than equivalence between two different languages (Lee et al, 2008). Further, this result was in line with past studies who found that the questionnaire translation was well validated, reliable, and accurate feasibility between English and Chinese (Ying Lu, 2009) and between English and Malay (Chen et al., 2014).

Ventilation of questionnaire validity is one of the most difficult stages in any research; however, it is an important thing to maintain (Ahmad et al, 2014). Sun (2009) recommended

that validation of the translated questionnaire should examine its psychometric properties. Psychometric properties are defined as the elements that contribute to the statistical adequacy of the instrument in terms of validity and reliability (Sun, 2009). The validity can be examined by three criteria of content validity, face validity, and construct validity, and then testing reliability (Ahmad et al., 2014).

Content validity is an important role for the well-developed instrument evaluated by experts (Lynn, 1986; Polit & Beck, 2006; Sun, 2009). It is primarily based on a logical link between the questions, or items and the objectives of the study (Ahmad et al., 2014). Polit and Beck (2006) recommended that content validity is the acceptable level if the value of content validity is greater than 0.80 evaluated from 6 to 10 experts. Each item rated by using a 4-point rating scale, avoid to have a neutral and an ambivalent midpoint (Lynn, 1986, Polit & Beck, 2006). Asún et al. (2016) found that developing a four-point Likert rating scales using the item factor analysis procedures might be equivalent and accurate parameter estimates.

Face validity is primarily based on a logical link between the questions, or items and the objectives of the study (Ahmad et al., 2014). The experts' comments and recommendations are needed to ensure that (1) all items were at an acceptable level of variation for the target employees and the appropriate meaning, (2) to test the difficult task of response, the respondent's interest, and attention (Ahmad et al., 2014) and (3) to ensure for the readability and possible offensiveness of the language (Lu, 2007). Face validity test, if an average score is greater than 3 the item would be retained evaluated by 3 experts (Lynn, 1986) and 5 respondents (Ying Lu, 2009).

Construct validity of an instrument will be based upon statistical process (Ahmad et al., 2014) and looks into the agreement between a theoretical concept and a specific measuring

procedure (Sun, 2009). Construct validity test, factor analysis is displayed the acceptable standards of factor loadings (Hair et al., 1998; Field, 2009). Therefore, the questionnaire validation should be met the required levels based on the content validity, face validity, and construct validity.

As recommended by Chen et al. (2014), the importance in establishing equivalence is to ensure reliability of the translated instrument. Reliability is based on the internal consistency and stability of the survey instrument (Sun, 2009; Ahmad et al., 2014). A Cronbach's alpha or scale reliability coefficient of 0.70 is considered an acceptable reliability coefficient (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). In Lao context, the value of Cronbach's alpha should be 0.7 or over which will be acceptable reliability coefficient.

5. Conclusion

There is a good strength of agreement was observed between English and Lao versions of problem-focused coping with increasing work to family enrichment. The Lao version was available locally, culturally acceptable, and conceptual equivalence. Most instruments were acceptable standards of validity and reliability analysis. For cross-sectional study, therefore, the questionnaire should be validated through the process of translation, validity, and reliability for proceeding actual study.

Implications and Recommendations

This study has two important implications to this questionnaire validation. A first implication is that the procedure of forward and backward translation was conducted by two bilingual translations resulting with the conceptual equivalence between the English version and Lao version. For instance, the original English version was blindly forward translated into the Lao language by the first translator, and then the Lao version was blindly backward translated into English by the second translator. Then two versions were compared for accuracy. Items should be revised through the forward and backward translation process again in order to ensure conceptual equivalence instead

of achieving linguistic equivalence. Hence, the current study recommended that the procedure of forward and backward translation by two bilingual translations could be an important implication to present the conceptual equivalence between the English version and Lao version. However, there is a need of testing validity and reliability for further measurement.

A second implication is that the Lao questionnaire version was presented with well validated and accepted with the standard of the required level. Two variables of problem-focused coping and work to family enrichment were met the required level for evaluating the content validity by six experts, face validity by three panels and five employees, and construct validity by at least 100 employees as well as reliability acceptable. Therefore, this study recommended that the Lao questionnaire version could be proceeding to further actual study.

There is a limitation in terms of validating Lao version. This face validity test revealed that the meaning of each item is clear enough, but some items are more academic worlds and difficult to understand. Therefore, this version should be revised more practical words, easy to understand the meaning, and be ensured that all levels of employees can respond and understand all items.

6. Conflict of Interest

We certify that there is no conflict of interest with any financial organization regarding the material discussed in the manuscript.

7. References

- Ahmad, R., Usop, H., Ismail, A., Bujang, S., & Mansor, N. N. A. (2014). *Conducting Research in Social Sciences and Management Studies: Practical and a Step-by Step Guide* (2nd ed). 93250 Kuching, Sarawak, Malaysia: RS Publishing House, Lot 3321, Sinar Budi Baru, Batu Kawa.
- Annor, F. (2016). *Work-Family Conflict: A Synthesis of the Research from Cross-*

- National Perspective. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 12(1), 1–13.
- Boyce, C., & Neale, P. (2006). *A Guide for Designing and Conducting In-Depth Interviews for Evaluation Input*. Pathfinder International, USA.
- Chen, W.-S., Haniff, J., Siau, C.-S., Seet, W., Loh, S.-F., & Jamil, H., A., M. (2013). Pilot Study of the Malay Maslach Burnout Inventory and Malay Work-Related Quality of Life Scale in Malaysia. *Studies in Asian Social Science*, 1(1), 20-26.
- Hassan, Z., Dollard, M. F., & Winefield, A. H. (2010). Work-family conflict in East vs Western countries. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, 17(1), 30–49.
- Mauno, S., & Rantanen, M. (2013). Contextual and Dispositional Coping Resources as Predictors of Work–family Conflict and Enrichment: Which of These Resources or their Combinations are the Most Beneficial? *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 34(1), 87–104.
- Nielsen, J., & Landauer, T. K. (1993). A Mathematical Model of the Finding of Usability Problems. In *Proceedings of the INTERACT '93 and CHI '93 Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (pp. 206–213). New York, NY, USA: ACM.
- Parr, A. S. (2012). Work, study and home demands: an investigation of their interrelationship, coping, and satisfaction. Massey University, New Zealand.
- Powell, G. N., Francesco, A. M., & Ling, Y. (2009). Toward culture-sensitive theories of the work-family interface. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30(5), 597–616.
- Shinn, M., Wong, N. W., Simko, P. A., & Ortiz-Torres, B. (1989). Promoting the well-being of working parents: Coping, social support, and flexible job schedules. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 17(1), 31–55.
- Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (2003). *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social & Behavioral Research*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Zikmund, W. G. (2010). *Business research methods*. Mason, OH: South-Western Cengage Learning.

Table 2: Results of Questionnaire Translation

Dimension	English Version	Lao Version
	(1) Work to family enrichment	ວຽກ ມີຜົນກະທົບດ້ານບວກ ຕໍ່ ຄອບຄົວ
Development (ການພັດທະນາ)	My involvement in my work helps me understand different viewpoints and this helps me be a better family member.	ວຽກງານ ເຮັດໃຫ້ຂ້ອຍເຂົ້າໃຈແນວຄິດທີ່ແຕກຕ່າງ ກັນແລະ ເປັນຄົນດີຂຶ້ນໃນຄອບຄົວ
	My involvement in my work puts me in a good mood and this helps me be a better family member.	ວຽກງານ ເຮັດໃຫ້ຂ້ອຍມີອາລົມຈິດທີ່ດີ ແລະ ເປັນຄົນດີຂຶ້ນໃນຄອບຄົວ
	My involvement in my work helps me to gain this knowledge and helps me be a better family member.	ວຽກງານ ເຮັດໃຫ້ຂ້ອຍມີຄວາມຮູ້ໃໝ່ ແລະ ເປັນຄົນດີຂຶ້ນໃນຄອບຄົວ
Affection (ການຊຸກຍູ້ສົ່ງເສີມ)	My involvement in my work helps me feel personally fulfilled and this helps me be a better family member.	ວຽກງານ ເຮັດໃຫ້ຂ້ອຍມີຄວາມພໍໃຈກັບຊີວິດ ແລະ ເປັນຄົນດີຂຶ້ນໃນຄອບຄົວ
	My involvement in my work helps me acquire skills and this helps me be a better family member.	ວຽກງານ ເຮັດໃຫ້ຂ້ອຍໄດ້ຮັບທັກສະໃໝ່ ແລະ ເປັນຄົນດີຂຶ້ນໃນຄອບຄົວ

	My involvement in my work makes me feel happy and this helps me be a better family member.	ວຽກງານ ເຮັດໃຫ້ຂ້ອຍມີຄວາມສະບາຍໃຈ ແລະ ເປັນຄົນດີຂຶ້ນໃນຄອບຄົວ
Capital (ການໃຫ້ກຳລັງໃຈ)	My involvement in my work provides me with a sense of success and this helps me be a better family member.	ວຽກງານ ເຮັດໃຫ້ຂ້ອຍມີຜົນສຳເລັດ ແລະ ເປັນຄົນດີຂຶ້ນໃນຄອບຄົວ
	My involvement in my work makes me cheerful and this helps me be a better family member.	ວຽກງານ ເຮັດໃຫ້ຂ້ອຍມີກຳລັງໃຈ ແລະ ເປັນຄົນດີຂຶ້ນໃນຄອບຄົວ
	My involvement in my work provides me with a sense of accomplishment and this helps me be a better family member.	ວຽກງານ ເຮັດໃຫ້ຂ້ອຍບັນລຸຜົນ ແລະ ເປັນຄົນດີຂຶ້ນໃນຄອບຄົວ
	(2) Problem-focused coping	ການຮັບມື້ບັນຫາ
Changing Situation (ການຊອກຫາທາງອອກ)	I try to change the situation to get what I want.	ຂ້ອຍ ພະຍາຍາມປ່ຽນແປງສະຖານະການທີ່ເກີດຂຶ້ນໃຫ້ໄດ້ຕາມຈຸດປະສົງ
	I focus my efforts on changing the situation.	ຂ້ອຍ ໄດ້ເອົາໃຈໃສ່ແກ້ໄຂເຫດການທີ່ເກີດຂຶ້ນໄປຕາມເຫດຜົນ
	I work on changing the situation to get what I want.	ຂ້ອຍ ໄດ້ຊອກຫາທາງວິທີທາງ ເພື່ອແກ້ໄຂບັນຫາທີ່ເກີດຂຶ້ນ ໃຫ້ໄດ້ຕາມຕ້ອງການ
Seeking Support (ການຊອກຫາຄວາມຊ່ວຍເຫຼືອ)	I ask people who have had similar experiences what they did.	ຂ້ອຍ ໄດ້ຖາມຜູ້ມີປະສົບການທີ່ກ່ຽວຂ້ອງ ທີ່ເຄີຍເຮັດຜ່ານມາ
	I try to get advice from someone about what to do.	ຂ້ອຍ ໄດ້ຂໍຄຳແນະນຳ ຈາກຜູ້ໃດຜູ້ໜຶ່ງ ວ່າຄວນຈະເຮັດແນວໃດ
	I talk to someone to find out more about the situation.	ຂ້ອຍ ໄດ້ສົນທະນາກັບຜູ້ໃດຜູ້ໜຶ່ງ ເພື່ອຊອກຫາຂໍ້ມູນເພີ່ມເຕີມ ຕໍ່ບັນຫາດັ່ງກ່າວ
	I talk to someone who could do something concrete about the problem.	ຂ້ອຍ ໄດ້ສົນທະນາກັບຜູ້ໃດຜູ້ໜຶ່ງ ທີ່ມີຄວາມສາມາດແກ້ໄຂບາງຢ່າງ ຕໍ່ບັນຫາດັ່ງກ່າວ

Table 3: Result of Content Validity

Scale/item	Six Experts						Total	CVI value
	1	2	3	4	5	6		
WFE (9 items)	3.44	3.44	3.67	3.22	3.89	3.44	21.1	0.87
Problem-focused coping (7 items)	3.14	3.71	3	3.86	3.14	3.71	20.56	0.85
Total score (Sum of Expert scores) CVI value= $\frac{\text{Total score}}{\text{Maximum total of 24 scores}}$								

Source: Polit and Beck (2006). Content Validity Index (CVI)

Table 4: Results of Face Validity

Scale/item	Three Panels			Sum Value	Average Value	Five Respondents					Sum Value	Average Value
	1	2	3			1	2	3	4	5		
WFE (9 items)	3.2	3.3	3.33	9.9	3.3	3.33	3.67	3.44	3.33	3.33	17.1	3.42
Problem (7 items)	3.1	3.4	3.14	9.7	3.2	3.71	3.86	3.29	3.71	3.43	18	3.6
Sum of Value						Sum of Value						

Average value= $\frac{\text{Number of 3 panels}}{\text{Number of 3 panels}}$	Average value= $\frac{\text{Number of 5 Respondents}}{\text{Number of 5 Respondents}}$
--	--

Source: Lu (2007). Panels' face validity

Chart 1: Questionnaire Translation and Validation Process

