

## WORK LIFE INTEGRATION AMONG EMPLOYEES OF AUTOMOBILE FIRMS IN CHENNAI

<sup>1</sup>U. Lakshmi Kanthan, <sup>2</sup>Dr. R. Ramesh Kumar

<sup>1</sup> Research Scholar, University of Madras

<sup>2</sup> Associate Professor, Tamilnadu Institute of Labour Studies, Chennai

Email: <sup>1</sup> kanthan0904@gmail.com   <sup>2</sup> drrameshkumar@yahoo.co.in

**Abstract:** Work is an integral part of life. Human beings acquisition to sustain balance and stability in life. But there is more to life than work: there is personal life, family life, and life within one's social network and culture too. From a systems psychology perspective, all domains of life are interrelated, naturally, but without an integrated life plan the interrelationships defining our system will gravitate toward chaos, fragmentation, and conflict. The objectives of this study are to analyse work life integration among employees of Automobile firms in Chennai, identify the constructs influencing work life integration among such employees, analyse the role of work life and family interface in highlighting work life integration and the role of family and work life interface in work life integration. This study has helped in bringing out important aspects of work life integration among employees which could be beneficially used by automobile firms in order to enhance work life integration thereby ensuring that there is a positive spill of employee attitude towards work into their personal lives thereby enriching both spheres of life.

**Key Words:** Work life integration, work domain variables, personal level variables, organisational level variables.

### 1. INTRODUCTION:

Work is an integral part of life. Human adaptation implies acquisition of the means to sustain life. But there is more to life than work: there is personal life, family life, and life within one's social network and culture too. From a systems psychology perspective, all domains of life are interrelated, naturally, but without an integrated life plan the interrelationships defining our system will gravitate toward chaos, fragmentation, and conflict. As work roles and tasks became increasingly specialized, more and more effort is needed to sustain growth and competitiveness in the new market economy. The challenge now is to prepare employees for a new culture of work, a culture defined by accelerating change which helps them balance work life and personal life.

### 2. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM:

People commonly report that they are working more hours than they would like. Overwork is particularly high among well-educated professionals and managers and this group is also most likely to experience work-family conflict. Reports of high levels of work stress and stress-related illness are commonplace and there is a perception that the workplace is becoming even more stressful. Constant availability of workers and zero fault work processes are increasingly considered necessary. Expectations are rising across every sector to which the automobile sector is no exception.

### 3. REVIEW OF LITERATURE:

It has been advocated by Greenhaus and Parasuraman (1999) that integration between work and personal life will take place when the positive attitude developed by an individual while being in a role spills over to the role played by the same individual. In other words the type of experience one has while performing in a particular role will serve as a resource which will go to enrich the other role played by the individual in his life. This philosophy of integration on account of spill over is also advocated by Kossek and Lambert (2005).

According to Edwards & Rothbard (2000) integration is considered to be the exact opposite of the theory of segmentation which believes in conscious and intentional separation of the two domain namely work and family spheres.

Kreiner (2006) believe that integration is in accordance with the P-E Fit theory, which has the conviction that level of integration at the work place depends to a great extent on an individual's personal preference. In other words it tends to increase up to that point at which it does not conflict with the individual's personal preference on account of which individuals may tend to negotiate work and family roles to his/her satisfaction.

Fletcher and Bailyn (2005) believe that by providing scope for relaxing the conflicting spheres of work life and family life, individuals would become more involved in both spheres which in turn would improve the quality of life in both spheres.

#### 4. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY:

- To analyse Work Life Integration among employees of Automobile firms in Chennai
- To identify the constructs influencing Work Life Integration among such employees.
- To analyze the role of Work Life and Family interface in highlighting Work Life Integration
- To analyse the role of Family and Work Life interface in Work Life Integration

#### 5. METHODOLOGY OF RESEARCH:

This study is empirical in nature. The tool used for the collection of primary data was a non-standardized questionnaire. The sampling technique was snow ball sampling and the sample size was limited to 125 respondents drawn from various managerial levels such as senior managers and junior managers employed with various Automobile firms in Chennai.

#### 6. ANALYSIS:

**Table 1 Friedman Test for Significant Difference among Mean Ranks of Work Domain related Variables influencing Work Life Integration**

Variables	Mean Rank	Chi-Square Value	P value
Working conditions	2.96	114.956	<0.001**
Responsibilities related to the job	2.03		
Psychological Involvement	2.55		
Job related demands	2.42		

Note: \*\* Denotes significant at 1% level

Since P value is less than 0.01, the null hypothesis is rejected at 1 percent level of significance. Hence concluded that there is significant difference among mean ranks of work domain related variables influencing work life integration. Based on mean rank working conditions (2.96) is most effective work domain variable influencing work life integration, followed by psychological involvement (2.55), job related demands (2.42) and responsibility related to the job (2.03). Thus it is obvious that working conditions has scored highest as it goes to make things more difficult for employees which in turn could lead to them having reduced time to spend with their family members.

**Table 2 Friedman Test for Significant Difference Among Mean Ranks of Family Domain related Variables influencing Work Life Integration**

Family Domain Variables	Mean Rank	Chi-Square Value	P Value
Well-being of the individual	2.92	48.113	<0.001**
Size and composition of family	3.31		
Responsibilities related to family	2.72		
Moral support for spouse/children /parents	3.27		

Note: \*\* Denotes significant at 1% level

Since P value is less than 0.01, the null hypothesis is rejected at 1 percent level of significance. Hence concluded that there is significant difference among mean ranks of family domain related variables influencing work life integration. Based on mean rank size and composition of the family (3.31) is most effective family domain related variable influencing work life integration, followed by moral support for spouse/children/parents (3.27),well-being of the individual (2.92) and responsibilities related to family (2.72).

**Table 3 Friedman Test for Significant Difference Among Mean Ranks of Organisational Level related Variables influencing work life integration**

Organisational Level Variables	Mean Rank	Chi-Square Value	P value
Higher employee commitment	2.97	21.851	<0.001**
Improved employee productivity	2.04		
Reduced attrition level	2.56		

Note: \*\* Denotes significant at 1% level

Since P value is less than 0.01, the null hypothesis is rejected at 1 percent level of significance. Hence concluded that there is significant difference among mean ranks of organisational related variables influencing work life integration. Based on mean rank higher employee commitment among employees (2.97) is most effective organisational related variable influencing work life integration, followed by reduced attrition level (2.56) and improved employee commitment (2.04).

**Table 4 Friedman Test for Significant Difference Among Mean Ranks of Personal Level related Variables influencing work life integration**

Personal Level Variables	Mean Rank	Chi-Square Value	P value
Improved physical / psychological Health	1.90	11.890	<0.001**
Increased job satisfaction	1.93		
Improved family relations	2.11		

Note: \*\* Denotes significant at 1% level

Since P value is less than 0.01, the null hypothesis is rejected at 1 percent level of significance. Hence concluded that there is significant difference among mean ranks of organisational related variables influencing work life integration. Based on mean rank improved family relations (2.11) is most effective personal level related variable influencing work life integration, followed by increased job satisfaction (1.93) and improved physical/ psychological health (1.90).

**Table 5 Pearson Correlation Coefficient between Work Domain related Variables**

Work Domain related Variables	Working conditions	Responsibilities Related to the job	Psychological Involvement	Job related Demands
Working conditions	1	0.660**	0.652**	0.655**
Responsibilities related to the job		1	0.547**	0.410**
Psychological Involvement			1	0.481**
Job related demands				1

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The correlation coefficient between working conditions and responsibilities related to the job is 0.660, which indicate 66.0 percentage positive relationships between working conditions and responsibilities related to the job and is significant at 1% level.

The correlation coefficient between working conditions and psychological involvement is 0.652 which indicate 65.2 percentage positive relationships between working conditions and psychological Involvement and is significant at 1% level.

The correlation coefficient between working conditions and job related demands is 0.655, which indicate 65.5 percentage positive relationships between working conditions and job related demands and is significant at 1% level.

The correlation coefficient between responsibilities related to the job and psychological involvement is 0.547, which indicate 54.7 percentage positive relationships between responsibilities related to the job and psychological involvement and is significant at 1% level.

The correlation coefficient between responsibilities related to the job and job related demands is 0.410, which indicate 41.0 percentage positive relationships between responsibilities related to the job and job related demands and is significant at 1% level.

The correlation coefficient between psychological involvement and job related demands is 0.481, which indicate 48.1 percentage positive relationships between psychological involvement and job related demands and is significant at 1% level.

**Table 6 Pearson Correlation Coefficient between Family Domain related Variables**

<b>Family Domain Variables</b>	<b>Well-being of the individual</b>	<b>Size and composition of family</b>	<b>Responsibilities related to family</b>	<b>Moral support for spouse/children /parents</b>
Well-being of the individual	1	0.737**	0.690**	0.716**
Size and composition of family		1	0.613**	0.722**
Responsibilities related to family			1	0.572**
Moral support for spouse/children /parents				1

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The correlation coefficient between well-being of the individual and size and composition of family is 0.737, which indicate 73.7 percentage positive relationships between well-being of the individual and size and composition of family and is significant at 1% level.

The correlation coefficient between well-being of the individual and responsibilities related to family is 0.690, which indicate 69.0 percentage positive relationships between well-being of the individual and responsibilities related to family and is significant at 1% level.

The correlation coefficient between well-being of the individual and moral support for spouse/children /parents is .716, which indicate 71.6 percentage positive relationships between well-being of the individual and moral support for spouse/children /parents and is significant at 1% level.

The correlation coefficient between size and composition of family and responsibilities related to family is 0.613, which indicate 61.3 percentage positive relationships between size and composition of family and responsibilities related to family and is significant at 1% level.

The correlation coefficient between size and composition of family and moral support for spouse/children /parents is 0.722, which indicate 72.2 percentage positive relationships between size and composition of family and moral support for spouse/children /parents and is significant at 1% level.

The correlation coefficient between responsibilities related to family and moral support for spouse/children /parents is .572, which indicate 57.2 percentage positive relationships between responsibilities related to family and moral support for spouse/children /parents and is significant at 1% level.

## **7. FINDING AND CONCLUSION:**

The findings of this study are as summarized below:

- There is significant difference among mean ranks of work domain related variables influencing work life integration with working conditions being the most dominant work domain related variable influencing work life integration among employees of automobile firms in Chennai.
- There is significant difference among mean ranks of family domain variables influencing work life integration with size and composition of family being the most dominant family domain related variable influencing work life integration.
- There is significant difference among mean ranks of organisational related variables influencing work life integration with higher employee commitment being the most beneficial aspect to organisational related variable influencing work life integration.

- There is significant difference among mean ranks of organisational variables influencing work life integration with improved family relations being the most dominant aspect of personal level variable influencing work life integration.
- The correlation coefficient between the various work domain related variables shows that the correlation coefficient between working conditions and responsibilities related to job is the highest (66.0%) /
- The correlation coefficient between the various family domain related variables shows that the correlation coefficient is the highest between well-being of the individual and size and composition of family (73.7%).

This study has helped in bringing out important aspects of work life integration among employees which could be beneficially used by automobile firms in order to enhance work life integration thereby ensuring that there is a positive spill of employee attitude towards work into their personal lives thereby enriching both spheres of life.

## **REFERENCES:**

1. Edwards, J. R., & Rothbard, N. P. (2000). Mechanisms linking work and family: Clarifying the relationship between work and family constructs. *The Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 178-199.
2. Ellen Ernst Kossek and Susan J. Lambert. Lawrence (2005) , *Work and Life Integration: Organizational, Cultural, and Individual Perspectives* edited by Mahwah, NJ and London, 2005, xxviii + 570 pp., ISBN 0 8058 4616 6, \$42.50, paper.
3. Fletcher, J. K., & Bailyn, L. (2005). The Equity Imperative: Redesigning Work for Work-Family Integration. In E. E. Kossek & S. J. Lambert (Eds.), *LEA's organization and management series. Work and life integration: Organizational, cultural, and individual perspectives* (pp. 171-189). Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
4. Greenhaus, J. H., & Parasuraman, S. (1999). Research on work, family, and gender: Current status and future direction. In G. N. Powel (Ed.), *Handbook of gender and work* (pp. 391–412). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
5. Julian Xie, Hongyu Ma, Zhiqing E. Zhou and Hanying Tang, Work-related use of information and communication technologies after hours (W\_ICTs) and emotional exhaustion: A mediated moderation model, *Computers in Human Behavior*, 10.1016/j.chb.2017.10.023, **79**, (94-104), (2018).
6. Kreiner, G. E. (2006). Consequences of work-home segmentation or integration: A person-environment fit perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27: 485–507.
7. Mireia Las Heras, Yasin Rofcanin, P. Matthijs Bal and Jakob Stollberger, How do flexibility i-deals relate to work performance? Exploring the roles of family performance and organizational context, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, **38**, 8, (1280-1294), (2017)
8. Natasha Slutskaya, Rachel Morgan, Ruth Simpson and Alex Simpson, Does Necessity Shield Work? The Struggles of Butchers and Waste Management Workers for Recognition, Stigmas, Work and Organizations, 10.1057/978-1-137-56476-4\_7, (123-142), (2017).
9. Rajasekar, D and Premkumar, R (2017) A Study on Motivation Level of Employees in Automobile Industry, International Journal of Mechanical Engineering and Technology 8(12), 2017, pp. 744–749.
10. Rajasekar, D, Krishna Sudheer A and Raghunadha Reddy, P, (2017), A Study on Employee Empowerment in Indian Corporate Sector. International Journal of Civil Engineering and Technology, 8(11), 2017, pp. 268–277.