

WORKLOAD ISSUES AND TRENDS: DEMOGRAPHIC INFLUENCES

Aaliya Abdoolla*, Patsy Govender*

* School of Management, Information Technology & Governance, Faculty of Management Studies, University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa

Abstract

This study aims to assess the demographic influences on work intensification (work-family conflict, work flexibility, managerial/supervisory support, child/elderly care and employee wellness) of office-based employees in a public sector organization. A survey method was adopted for this quantitative study, and a sample of 100 employees was drawn utilizing the simple random sampling technique. The differing responses and findings reveal significant differences with each demographic factor (age, marital status, race, education qualifications, position in organization, length of service and number of children) and at least one construct of work intensification. The study utilizes a self-developed questionnaire which was pilot-tested; and the validity and reliability was determined. An interesting finding in the study is that the volume of workload emerged with significant differences with five of the demographic variables. Based on the results of the study, the recommendations provide practical implications and a useful guide for managers who work with a diverse workforce with the goal of enhancing productivity and performance on an ongoing basis. The article culminates with a discussion of recommendations and conclusion.

Keywords: Work Intensification, Demographic Variables, Employees

1. INTRODUCTION

With the growing dynamics of the work environment and the prevalence of continuous change, organizations are managing modernity which impinges on employees' working lives (Green, 2006). Organizations are forced to formulate new strategies for global sustenance and productivity and hence compelling the need to leverage human talent to maximize optimal performance. Employees are faced with increased demands and pressures to work independently, to work at a faster speed (Naswall, Hellgren, & Sverke, 2008), work long hours and multi-task (Rowh, 2006). The implications of these changes raises concern over personal development and health and well-being, and also for employees to work beyond their capabilities. Research studies have continuously focused on the occurrence of work intensification in labour intensive work environments, whereas this study addresses the effects of work intensification in a public sector office-based environment.

Work intensification is a worker challenge in the twenty-first century (Burchell, Lapido, & Wilkinson, 2002). Work intensity and overwork are critical factors as workplaces need to adhere to the dictates of globalization (Smith, 2006). Work intensity is not well-developed and research in this field is not underlined by an overarching theory (Burke, Koyuncu, Fiksenbaum, & Acar, 2009). Limited research prevails on the sources of work intensification due to the scarcity of usable

measures of work effort over time (Green, 2004). Work intensification can be conceptualized with the rate of physical or mental input that is expended to perform one's work during the working day (Green, 2001). Work intensity is the extent of effort change in the jobs that employees held five years prior to their current jobs (Green, 2004). With work intensification, each worker has a greater workload and a shorter rest period, whereas with labour intensification workers increase their overall effort in a given shift (Lu, 2009). Brown (2012) examined the sustained extensive work intensification on three levels, that is, working for 41- 47 hours, 48-55 hours and 56 plus hours on an average per week over a two year period. This representative sample consisted of employees consisting of the Generation X and Baby Boomers generational groups. The aim was to interpret whether generational differences in work attitudes influenced employee reactions to sustained extensive work intensification (Brown, 2012). Both generations responded negatively towards sustained hours of work and that sustained extensive work intensification lowered employee perceptions about job satisfaction and work-life balance.

The study taps into the work intensification constructs of organizational and technological change, work intensity and ergonomic factors, work-related stress and psychological factors, volume of workload and job insecurity. The study aims to assess the demographic influences on work intensification in a public sector organization.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Organizational change

The continuous changes with downsizing, reengineering, labour intensification and new technologies (Kazi & Indermun, 2013) and, the improvement of quality goods forces employers to pressurize their employees (Green, 2006). As a result, organizations seek to employ systems to benefit from optimization (Shah, Jaffari, Aziz, Ejaz, Ul-Haq & Raza, 2011), considering that high performance work teams aim to enhance employee involvement and performance (Shah et al., 2011). Today's radically transformed workforce is vastly diverse, highly global, virtual and empowered (Tucker, Kao & Verma, 2005). They are experiencing decentralization with more responsibility, greater independence and self-direction (Naswall et al. 2008), and hence, a more demanding work situation prevails. Organizations that keep abreast of changes and transform change into opportunity will flourish in securing conditions for development and maintaining a competitive advantage (Bula & Ziebicki, 2011). Manager's pressures are to protect the existing markets and identify new markets through innovative expansion strategies (Green, 2006).

2.2. Technological change

The advancements in technologies have redefined workplaces (Tucker et al., 2005), has made communication instantaneously global (Zofi, 2012) as the digital landscape enables effective communication via the digital social media, such as, Facebook and Twitter (Waller & Ragsdell, 2012). Technology, the hidden hand of work intensification (Lowe, 2006) has opened avenues for how, where and when people work. The new level of intensity in business operations is due to commerce-enabling technology coupled with global commerce (Porter & Kakabadse, 2006), which makes communication and business transactions possible in a matter of seconds (Porter & Kakabadse, 2006).

2.3. Work intensity and ergonomic factors

Working hard relates to time component (number of hours worked), and intensity component (intensity of effort exerted during the time worked) (Burke et al. 2010). An increase in work pressure stems from the time balance between work and non-work activities (work-life balance) and the effort intensity at work (Green, 2006). Managerial control strategies that contribute to work intensification (Beynan, Grimshaw, Rubery & Ward, 2002 cited in Burchielli, Pearson, & Thanacoody, 2006) includes the customers' dominance, the redesign of job tasks and the implementation of technologies to increase work pace and performance quality (Beynan et al., 2002 cited in Burchielli et al., 2006).

Empirical investigations and the manifestation of work intensification are related to the dimensions of time and effort (Burchielli et al., 2006). Work intensity impacts on employee well-being at the individual level which includes their families, co-workers, the organization and society. At the

organizational level, work intensity disrupts the efficient functioning of business and threatens the organization's financial viability, and the issues of stress, burnout and turnover are acknowledged (Burke et al., 2010). Work intensification includes employee stress, reduced job satisfaction, and workplace injuries (Brown, 2012), affecting employee health and employee motivation (Burchell et al., 2002). Work intensity has productivity gains for the organization and, the internal drive to maximize satisfaction can influence work intensity (Burke et al., 2010). Working intensely shows positive outcome, for example, high work engagement in a rewarding work environment that is conducive to personal effort that benefits the employee and employer (Burke et al., 2010). On the contrary, a non-rewarding work environment can produce negative outcomes such as, stress (Burke et al., 2010).

Ergonomics optimizes the interaction between individuals' and their total working environment (Pile, 2001) including peoples' working conditions (their work system) regarding safety, well-being and performance (Down, 2001). Office workers environment need to support their emotional well-being and their physical activity (May et al., 2004). The office environment has its physical challenges (Rowh, 2006), and office workers are exposed to risks through repetitive motion and the extended hours spent sitting in the same position (Rowh, 2006). Inappropriate lighting or positioning of computer equipment contributes to undesirable postures, including eye fatigue (Down, 2001). Technology and office automation have changed the types of jobs, duration of sitting, performance of repetitive tasks and the work habits of employees, leading to work discomfort and work-related injuries (Alnaser & Wughalter, 2009), including the risk of developing work-related musculoskeletal disorders (WMSD's) (Pile, 2001).

Some manufacturers of office chairs promote dynamic sitting by introducing structural elements to the chairs (Dainoff, 2007). Computer workers tasks are monotonous and involve low and static muscle loads due to low physical demands (Dainoff, 2007) and, work-related musculoskeletal disorders (neck and shoulder region) are common to computer workers (Dainoff, 2007). Today's organizations are searching for ways to create office workspaces, specifically for knowledge workers, that facilitate the reduction of psychological and physical stress and improve individual and group performance (Dainoff, 2007). This is attributed to the concerns associated with the incidence of computer-related and work-related musculoskeletal discomfort (WMSD) (Dainoff, 2007). Ergonomic chairs accommodate the different heights and sizes of users' through adjustable features and moving parts (Alnaser & Wughalte, 2009). Older workers can be accommodated through better workstation design (May, Reed, Schwoerer & Potter, 2004). Ergonomics is an integrated business tool as opposed to a reactive safety strategy (Pile, 2001).

2.4. Work-related stress and psychological factors

Higher performance expectations and working under pressure is stress-inducing, and the assessment of work-related stress highlights the enablers and

effects of stress. Productive workplaces are highly complex, engage in risk-taking innovation that are stressful; considering the high workloads, pressure, unpredictability and insufficient control that accompany it (Walinga & Rowe, 2013). Stressors are linked to the content and circumstances of work and the individuals characteristics, resources and the social environment (Baba, Jamal & Tourigny, 1998 cited in Pasca & Wagner, 2011). Job-related stress has consequences for the work situation (van Zyl, van Eeden & Rothmann, 2013), and the causes relate to the conditions of the labour market, the personal career, employability, the relation to life outside work, and personal interests, amongst others (Allvin, Aronsson, Hagström, Johansson, & Lundberg, 2011) and, work overload, overwork and job insecurity which has implications for employees and the organization (Walinga & Rowe, 2013).

The victims of job-related stress have a reduced quality of work life and job satisfaction (van Zyl et al., 2013) and the severity imposes physical and psychological strain and negative behavioural consequences (Rothmann, 2008). Overwhelming stress leads to higher rates of absenteeism and/or high labour turnover (Waller & Ragsdell, 2012). This view concurs with van Zyl et al., (2013) who cites decreased productivity, changes in work attitudes, low morale and increased absenteeism, as the symptoms of stressed employees. Psychological well-being includes emotional and cognitive states, such as, the mental health, work and life satisfaction and individual's happiness (Burchell et al., 2002). Deteriorating psychological well-being is associated with anxiety and depression, sleep disturbances and dissatisfaction with oneself and one's environment (Burchell et al., 2002). Work intensification is theorized according to a stressor-stress-strain framework, whereby the intensification of work is conceptualized as the stressor (source of stress), which can lead to the experience of stress, resulting in psychological, behavioural or physiological strain (Burchell et al., 2002).

2.5. Volume of Workload

Working harder and faster is affected by employees' work demands which affects employees time and resources to conduct their job (Burchell et al., 2002). Workload can be physical (quantitative or objective) and perceptual (qualitative or subjective) (Sue Ling, Chang & Lien Yin, 2012). The complexity of qualitative workload is having too much to do, in too little time, at too high a pace, with too few resources; whereas quantitative workload is the amount of work the employee has to perform (Burchell et al., 2002).

The psychological stressors of having to work fast and hard, has a conflicting demand and the amount of physical labour used (usually measured by work hours) is perceptual workload (Sue Ling et al. 2012) and, workload is detrimental to quality of work life (QWL) as it affects employees' family life, job burnout, job stress, turnover intentions and mental stress (Sue Ling et al., 2012). Workload involves the intensity of job assignments and employees' stress levels are negatively affected, thus impacting on performance levels (Shah et al., 2011). Demanding jobs that lead to pressure and work overload is associated with stress and employees'

well-being (Burchell et al., 2002). From a challenging to an overtaxing workload and from secure to insecure employment induces stressful experiences and; high workload is negatively linked with job satisfaction (Burchell et al., 2002).

2.6. Job insecurity

Organizational changes relating to retrenchments, downsizing and mergers lead to job insecurity, including the fear about losing job-related dimensions, such as the opportunity for promotion (van Zyl et al., 2013). Insecurity is triggered by lay-offs, redundancies or dismissal, the loss of other employment conditions (Burchell et al., 2002). Employees feel insecure or threatened by job loss. A harsh reality of job insecurity is linked with economic loss. It affects peoples' psychological well-being, family stability and organizational efficiency and, lack of situational clarity makes a person feel less in control, resulting in feelings of helplessness (Burchell et al., 2002). High levels of job insecurity lowers employee morale and commitment (van Zyl et al., 2013). Poor working conditions are likely to be tolerated due to a lack/limitation of alternate employment (Burchell et al., 2002).

Considering that work intensification has been characterized as an important feature of the European labour markets during much of the 1990's (Burchell et al., 2002; Green, 2001); of recent, the profound growth in information technology has contributed to information overload and a faster pace of working (Sparks, Faragher & Cooper, 2001). Baby boomers are workaholics who live to work whereas Generation Xer's are slackers who work to live (Brown, 2012). This study assesses work intensification (organizational and technological change, work intensity and ergonomic factors, work-related stress and psychological factors, volume of workload and job insecurity) in relation to the demographic factors (age, gender, marital status, race, educational qualifications, position in organization, length of service and number of children) in a public sector organization.

3. AIM OF THE STUDY

The study aims to assess the influence of the demographic factors (age, marital status, race, education qualifications, position in organization, tenure and number of children) on work intensification in a public sector organization.

4. METHODOLOGY

4.1. Research Approach

A survey design was adopted for the study.

4.2. Respondents

The study targeted all office-level employees across three administrative clusters at a public sector organization, in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. The sample comprised of both male and female individuals of varying age, marital and race groups, with varying educational qualifications and years of service to reflect correct parameters of all in the

total population. This quantitative study comprised of a sample of 100 employees. A self developed questionnaire was utilized and a simple random sampling method was utilized. In terms of the composition, 15% were managers, 18% were supervisors, 65% were employees and 2% constituted nil responses. In terms of age, 13.0% were under 25 years of age, 39.0% were between 25-34 years, 31.0% were between 35-44 years, and 17.0% were 45 years and above. In terms of race 8.0% were Coloured employees, 11.0% were White, 24.0% were Indian and 57.0% were African. In addition, 13.0% of employees had a standard 8-10 qualification, 37.0% had a Diploma certificate, 18.0% had undergraduate degrees, 29.05 had post-graduate degrees, 2.0% had Post-graduate Diploma/Certificate and there were no responses from 1.0% of the employees. In addition, 43% were 0-5 years in the organization, 18.0% were 6.10 years, 18.0% were 11-15 years, 9.0% were 16-20 years and 11.0% were 21 years. In this organization, 28.0% had one child, 22.0% had two children, 12.0% had three children, 2.0% had four children and over and lastly 36.0% had no children. Furthermore, 15.0% were managers in this organization, 18.0% were supervisors, 65.0% were employees and 2.0% were nil responses. In addition, 56.0% were single in this organization, 35.0% were married, 6.0% were divorced and 3.0% were widowed. In this organization, 46.0% were male and 54.0% were female.

4.3. Measuring instrument

The data were collected utilizing a self-developed questionnaire consisting of two sections. Section A constitutes the demographic data which as measured using a nominal scale with pre-coded option categories. Section B comprised of 55 items relating to work intensification. Items were measured using a 5-point Likert scale constituting strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree and

strongly agree. The researcher ensured that pre-testing and pilot testing was conducted.

4.4. Measures

The reliability of the questionnaire was determined using Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha. The overall alpha coefficient was 0.616 indicating internal consistency and reliability. The validity of the questionnaire for Section B was assessed using Factor Analysis.

4.5. Administration of the measuring instrument

An employee of the organization was responsible for the administration and collection of the questionnaires.

4.6. Statistical analysis

Both, descriptive and inferential statistics were utilized for the analysis of the quantitative data. Inferential statistics included Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Variance (ANOVA).

5. RESULTS

Data was collected using a questionnaire consisting of Section A to include the demographic information age, marital status, race, educational qualifications, position in organization, length of service and number of children, using a nominal scale with pre-coded option categories and; Section B tapped into the key constructs of work intensification.

Hypothesis 1

There is a significant difference in the level of work intensification of employees varying in demographic profiles (age, gender, marital status, race, educational qualifications, position in organization, length of service and number of children), respectively (Table 1).

Table 1. Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Variance (ANOVA): Difference in perceptions of Work Intensification based on biographical profile

Biographical Variables		Age	Marital Status	Race	Educational Qualification	Position in Organization	Length of Service	Number of Children
Overall Work Intensification	p	0.067	0.001*	0.012*	0.073	0.002*	0.001*	0.105
	x ²	7.171	16.529	11.040	8.577	12.350	18.570	7.648
Job Insecurity	p	0.012*	0.013*	0.888	0.185	0.003*	0.289	0.083
	x ²	10.918	10.727	0.638	6.194	11.783	4.979	8.241
Volume of Workload	p	0.009*	0.000*	0.379	0.060	0.016*	0.000*	0.022*
	x ²	11.581	18.881	3.083	9.025	8.230	22.341	11.493
Work-related Stress & Psychological Factors	p	0.241	0.284	0.003*	0.026*	0.228	0.000*	0.797
	x ²	4.196	3.795	14.131	11.038	2.957	22.130	1.666
Work Intensity & Ergonomic Factors	p	0.854	0.373	0.115	0.889	0.027*	0.290	0.867
	x ²	0.779	3.123	5.938	1.136	7.208	4.974	1.266
Technological Change	p	0.438	0.306	0.633	0.046*	0.997	0.540	0.499
	x ²	2.711	3.620	1.717	9.665	0.006	3.107	3.365
Organizational Change	p	0.792	0.108	0.104	0.350	0.284	0.040*	0.193
	x ²	1.040	6.068	6.167	4.441	2.519	10.038	6.088

Note: * $p < 0.05$

Table 1 indicates that employees varying in biographical profiles (age, gender, marital status, race, educational qualifications, position in organization, length of service and number of children) differ significantly in their perceptions of work intensification and its sub-dimensions, respectively. Table 1 indicates that there is a

significant difference in employee perceptions varying in age with regards to workload at the 1% level of significance and; including a significant difference in age and job insecurity at the 5% level of significance. To assess where the significant differences lie, the Kruskal-Wallis test was computed (Table 2).

Table 2. Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Variance (ANOVA): Mean Differences of the dimensions of Work Intensification between Age Groups

Sub-dimensions of Work Intensification	Age	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	P
Volume of Workload	Under 25	3.72	0.575	13	0.009*
	26-34	3.48	0.810	39	
	35-44	3.27	0.486	31	
	45& above	3.39	0.482	17	
Job Insecurity	Under 25	3.14	0.525	13	0.012*
	26-34	3.18	0.849	39	
	35-44	3.19	0.578	31	
	45& above	2.69	0.496	17	

Table 2 indicates that employees who were 35-44 years of age were the least convinced (Mean = 3.27) that the volume of work contributes to work intensification as compared to all other employees in this organization and mainly employees who were under 25 years of age who were the most convinced (Mean = 3.72) in this regard.

Furthermore, employees who were 45 years and above were the least convinced (Mean = 2.69) that job insecurity is evidently a contributing factor to work intensification in comparison to other age groups and, especially those who were 35-44 years of age who were the most convinced (Mean = 3.19), followed closely by the age group between 26-34 (Mean = 3.18) that job insecurity contributes to work intensification.

Table 1 indicates that there is a significant difference in employees' perceptions relating to marital status and workload at the 1% level of significance; and with marital status and job insecurity at the 5% level of significance. In order to assess where the significant differences lie, the Kruskal-Wallis test was computed (Table 3).

Table 3. Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

Sub-dimensions of Work Intensification	Marital Status	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	P
Volume of Workload	Single	3.60	0.640	56	0.000*
	Married	3.14	0.589	35	
	Divorced	3.37	0.674	6	
	Widowed	3.80	0.346	3	
Job Insecurity	Single	3.22	0.739	56	0.013*
	Married	2.99	0.613	35	
	Divorced	2.83	0.612	6	
	Widowed	2.47	0.503	3	

Table 3 indicates that married employees were the least convinced (Mean = 3.14) that the volume of workload adds to work intensification in comparison to widowed employees who were the most convinced (Mean = 3.80). Evidently, widowed employees were the least convinced (Mean = 2.47) that job insecurity adds to work intensification, whereas single employees were the most convinced (Mean = 3.72).

Table 1 indicates that there is a significant difference of employees varying in race with regards to work-related stress and psychological factors at the 1% level of significance. To assess exactly where the significant differences lie, the Kruskal-Wallis test was computed (Table 4).

Table 4. Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

Sub-Dimensions of Work Intensification	Race	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	P
Work-related Stress & Psychological Factors	Coloured	2.85	1.104	8	0.003*
	White	1.97	0.618	11	
	Indian	2.85	0.485	24	
	African	2.84	0.547	57	

Table 4 shows that only White employees in this organization were the least convinced (Mean = 1.97) that work-related stress and psychological factors contributes to work intensification, whereas Coloured and Indian employees were the most convinced (Mean = 2.85) otherwise, followed closely by African employees (Mean = 2.84).

Table 1 indicates that there is a significant difference in the perceptions of employees varying in educational qualifications with regards to technological change and work-related stress and psychological factors at the 5% level of significance. To assess exactly where the significant differences lie, the Kruskal-Wallis test was computed (Table 5).

Table 5. Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

Sub-dimensions of Work Intensification	Educational Qualifications	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	P
Technological Change	0	2.80		1	0.046*
	Standard 8-10	2.45	0.684	13	
	Diploma/Certificate	2.89	0.466	37	
	Under-graduate Degree	2.78	0.544	18	
	Post-graduate Degree	3.00	0.463	29	
	Post-graduate Diploma/Certificate	3.00	0.283	2	
Work-related Stress & Psychological Factors	0	3.50		1	0.026*
	Standard 8-10	2.24	0.516	13	
	Diploma/Certificate	2.80	0.497	37	
	Under-graduate Degree	2.69	0.869	18	
	Post-graduate Degree	2.92	0.626	29	
	Post-graduate Diploma/Certificate	2.58	1.061	2	

Table 5 indicates that employees with Standard 8-10 education were the least convinced (Mean = 2.45) that technological change contributes to work intensification than those with post-graduate degree and post-graduate diploma/certificates who were the most convinced (Mean = 3.00). In addition, those with diploma/certificate were more convinced (Mean = 2.89) than those with undergraduate degree (Mean = 2.78).

Table 1 indicates that there is a significant difference in the perceptions of employees varying in position with regard to work intensity and ergonomic factors and workload at the 5% level of significance and; with the perceptions of employees varying in position with regard to job insecurity at the 1% level of significance. To assess where the significant differences lie, the Kruskal-Wallis test was computed (Table 6).

Table 6. Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

Sub-dimensions of Work Intensification	Position in Organization	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	P
Work Intensity & Ergonomic Factors	0	3.60	0.566	2	0.027*
	Manager	3.11	0.609	15	
	Supervisor	3.67	0.658	18	
	Employee	3.60	0.674	65	
Volume of Workload	0	3.90	0.424	2	0.016*
	Manager	3.13	0.543	15	
	Supervisor	3.18	0.814	18	
	Employee	3.55	0.589	65	
Job Insecurity	0	3.20	0.283	2	0.003*
	Manager	2.68	0.439	15	
	Supervisor	3.00	0.669	18	
	Employee	3.22	0.728	65	

Managerial staff, as indicated in Table 6 were the least convinced (Mean = 3.11) that work intensity and ergonomic factors adds to the work intensification levels whereas supervisors strongly believed (Mean 3.67) otherwise. With volume of workload, managers were the least convinced that it is a contributing factor to work intensification in comparison to employees who were convinced (Mean = 3.55) otherwise. Furthermore, managers were the least convinced (Mean = 2.68) that job insecurity contributes to work intensification, in comparison to employees who were the most convinced (Mean = 3.22).

Table 1 indicates that there is a significant difference in the perceptions of employees varying in length of service with regards to organizational change at the 5% level of significance and; with employees varying in length of service with regards to work-related stress and psychological factors and workload at the 1% level of significance.

In order to assess exactly where the significant differences lie, the Kruskal-Wallis test was computed (Table 7).

Table 7. Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

Sub-dimensions of Work Intensification	Length of Service	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	p
Organizational Change	0	3.80	0	1	0.040*
	0-5 years	3.37	0.659	43	
	6-10 years	3.13	0.881	18	
	11-15 years	3.20	0.683	18	
	16-20 years	3.76	0.882	9	
	21 years & over	3.69	0.404	11	
Work-related Stress & Psychological Factors	0	3.33	0	1	0.000*
	0-5 years	3.08	0.479	43	
	6-10 years	2.59	0.717	18	
	11-15 years	2.45	0.628	18	
	16-20 years	2.17	0.640	9	
	21 years & over	2.61	0.579	11	
Volume of Workload	0	3.60	0	1	0.000*
	0-5 years	3.77	0.402	43	
	6-10 years	2.98	0.800	18	
	11-15 years	3.19	0.771	18	
	16-20 years	3.29	0.575	9	
	21 years & over	3.35	0.370	11	

Table 7 shows that employees who were 6-10 years in the organization were the least convinced (Mean = 3.13) that organizational change is an added factor to work intensification whereas the longer serving employees, that is, 16-20 years were the most convinced (Mean = 3.76). On the contrary, employees who served the organization for 16-20 years were the least convinced (Mean = 2.17) with work-related stress and psychological factors, whereas employees with the least number of years, that is, 0-5 were the most convinced (Mean = 3.08). In addition, employees with 6-10 were the least convinced (Mean = 2.98) that the volume of workload contributes to work intensification whereas those with a minimum number of years, that is, 0-5 years were the most convinced in (Mean = 3.77) in this regard.

Table 1 indicates that there is a significant difference in the perceptions of employees varying in number of children with regards to volume of workload at the 5% level of significance. To assess where the significant differences lie, the Kruskal-Wallis test was computed (Table 8).

Table 8. Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

Sub-dimensions of Work Intensification	Number of Children	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	P
Volume of Workload	No Children	3.48	0.755	36	0.022*
	One Child	3.49	0.707	28	
	Two Children	3.51	0.384	22	
	Three Children	2.98	0.471	12	
	Four Children or more	3.50	0.141	2	

Table 8 indicates that those employees with three children were the least convinced (Mean = 2.98) that the volume of workload adds to work intensification. On the other hand, employees with two children were the most convinced (Mean = 3.51) in this regard.

Hence, hypothesis 1 may be partially accepted.

6. DISCUSSION

In this study, a significant difference was noted amongst employees varying in age regarding the volume of work at the 1% level of significance and; with age and job insecurity at the 5% level of significance. In line with this, Bos, Donders, Schouteten, and van der Gulden (2013) assert that in relation to work, employees of different ages will vary in terms of their work duties, work position, work ability and possibly in health; and mature employees in complex exhausting jobs will need recovery.

A significant difference exists in employees' perceptions varying in marital status with regards to volume of workload at the 1% level of significance and; with marital status and job insecurity at the 5% level of significance. Families of workaholics, high levels of distress exist and due to a spillover-crossover effect, negative outcomes are created, including strained marital relationships (Matuska, 2010). There are people who feel torn between work and family as job expectations and parenting

standards have become more demanding (Moen, 2003 cited in Tade & Aderinto).

It was noted that there was a significant difference of employees varying in race with regards to work-related stress and psychological factors at the 1% level of significance was noted. In this organisation, only one race group (White employees) felt differently in comparison to the majority of the race groups with regard to the impact that work-related stress and psychological factors has on work intensification.

Furthermore, perceptions differed with employees varying in educational qualifications with regards to technological change and; with educational qualifications and work-related stress and psychological factors at the 5% level of significance. Hence, the higher the qualification the more convinced employees are that technological change contributes to work intensification. A close view of Seibt, Spitzer, Blank and Scheuch (2008) is that higher education has a positive effect on the maintenance of good work ability in occupations with psychological stress.

A significant difference is revealed in the perceptions of employees varying in position in this organization with regard to work intensity and ergonomic factors and, with volume of workload at the 5% level of significance; and with position and job insecurity at the 1% level of significance. In their study, Burke *et al.* (2009) found that with Turkish manufacturing managers, males and those at higher organizational levels reported higher work intensity and higher hours worked and; there was greater job satisfaction and work engagement from managers who encountered higher levels of work intensity yet reported were reduced levels of psychological well-being. A way forward for managers is to attend training courses to familiarize and understand ergonomics and, provide effective advice to employees. Periodic consultation with safety committee members would be an added advantage. Managers need to have a spreadsheet to know how long it takes to complete a task. There has been debate about the causes of work intensification and this call for research to improve our understanding of its sources (Green, 2004).

There is also a significant difference with employees varying in position in this organization with regard to job insecurity at the 1% level of significance. Managers in this organization need to be on the same side as employees and provide support and; they need to take cognizance of the economic downturn and stakeholders views but also take precautionary measures as job insecurity compels workers to work intensely. Job insecurity emerges when job tenures are very short and very long in a current position and they place less importance on job features (Erlinghagen, 2007 cited in Dachapalli & Parumasur, 2012).

With length of service a significant difference was noted with regards to organizational change at the 5% level of significance. A significant difference surfaced with length of service and work-related stress and psychological factors and, with length of service and volume of workload at the 1% level of significance. Employees with the least number of years in the organization were the most convinced that both work-related stress and psychological factors and, volume of workload are contribute to

work intensification. As tenure grows there are long-term investments as gaining specific skills or engaging in development programmes could be at risk due to change initiatives (Kunze, Boehm, & Bruch (2010).

Lastly, a significant difference noted was with employees' perceptions varying in number of children with regards to volume of workload at the 5% level of significance. Psychosomatic strain is related to psychosocial job demands, social support including, job hazards, home responsibilities and having younger and older children (Hall, 1992 cited in Matthews & Power, 2002).

7. RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

The study investigated the demographic influences selected for the study on workplace factors, that is, work intensification in a public sector organization. Firstly, a theoretical review of work intensification was outlined. To explain the effects of work intensification the study embarked on addressing the demographic factors.

Based on the findings, managers need to take note of all the demographic factors and each construct of work intensification. The responses to employee perceptions vary considerably. Furthermore, internal pressures and intensifying factors and working conditions, working conditions, technological changes, stress factors and volume of workload must be addressed periodically. Evidently, significant differences surfaced with each demographic variable and at least with one sub-dimension of work intensification. The volume of workload emerged with significant differences with five of the demographic variables; followed by work related stress and psychological factors and three demographic variables and; job insecurity and three demographic variables. On the contrary, each of the variables of organizational behaviour; technological change and; work intensity and ergonomic factors surfaced with significant difference with one demographic factor in the study. Furthermore, from an organizational perspective, focus must be on both short-term and long-term cost factors.

Clearly, a better quality of life with reduced levels of intense work would be the ideal scenario for employees to be productive and engaging. New avenues for research with a larger sample size or a comparative analysis with other public sector organizations may yield a different set of results.

REFERENCES

1. Allvin, M., Aronsson, G., Hagström, T., Johansson, G., & Lundberg, U. (2011). *Work Without Boundaries: Psychological Perspectives on the New Working Life*. United Kingdom: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
2. Alnaser, M. Z., & Wughalter, E. H. (2009). Effect of chair design on ratings of discomfort. *Work*, Vol.34, Issue.2, pp. 223-234. doi: 10.3233/WOR-2009-0919.
3. Ashkenazy, P. (2004). Shorter Work Time, Hours Flexibility, and Labor Intensification. *Eastern Economic Journal*, Vol.30, Issue. 4, pp. 603-614.
4. Bos, J. T., Donders, N. M., Schouteten, R. J., & van der Gulden, J. J. (2013). Age as a moderator in the relationship between work-related characteristics,

- job dissatisfaction and need for recovery. *Ergonomics*, Vol. 56, Issue.6, pp. 992-1005. doi:10.1080/00140139.2013.789553.
5. Bula, P., & Ziebecki, B. (2011). Organizational Flexibility as a Challenge of Contemporary Management. *Determinants and Methods of Measurement*. *Act Commerce*, Vol.11, Issue.1, pp. 171-180. doi:10.4102/ac.v11i1.159.
 6. Brown, M. (2012). Responses to work intensification: does generation matter?. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol.23, Issue. 17, pp. 3578-3595. doi: 10.1080/09585192.2011.654348.
 7. Burchielli, R., Pearson, P., & Thanacoody, P. R. (2006). Exploring work intensification in teaching: A research agenda. *New Zealand Journal of Employment Relations (Online)*, Vol.31, Issue.2, pp. 71-81. Retrieved April 28, 2014 from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/233250067?accountid=11921>.
 8. Burchell, B., Lapido, D., & Wilkinson, F. (Eds). (2002). *Job Insecurity and Work Intensification*. London: Routledge
 9. Burke, R. J., Singh, P., & Fiksenbaum, L. (2010). Work intensity: potential antecedents and consequences. *Personnel Review*, Vol.39, Issue.3, pp. 347-360. doi: 10.1108/00483481011030539.
 10. Burke, R. J. (2009). Working to Live or Living to Work: Should Individuals and Organizations Care?, *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol.84, Issue.2, pp.167-172. doi: 10.1007/s10551-008-9703-6.
 11. Dachapalli, L. P., & Parumasur, S. B. (2012). Employee susceptibility to experiencing job insecurity. *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences*, Vol.15, Issue.1, p. 31.
 12. Dainoff, M. J. (Ed.). (2007). *Ergonomics and health aspects of work with computer: International conference, EHAWC 2007, held as part of HCI International 2007, Beijing, China, July 22-27: Proceedings*. Germany: Springer.
 13. Down, R. (2001). Getting the best out of the Ergonomics approach. *The Safety & Health Practitioner*, Vol.19, Issue.2, pp. 34-37. Retrieved April 29, 2014 from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/201006766?accountid=11921>.
 14. Green, F. (2004a). Why has work effort become more intense? *Industrial Relations*, Vol.43, Issue.4, pp. 709-741. doi:10.1111/j.0019-8676.2004.00359.x.
 15. Green, F. (2001). It's Been a Hard Day's Night: The Concentration and Intensification of Work in Late Twentieth-Century Britain. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol. 39, Issue.1, pp. 53-80.
 16. Green, F. (2006). *Demanding Work: The Paradox of Job Quality in the Affluent Economy*, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
 17. Iverson, R. D., & Zatzick, C. D. (2011). The Effects of Downsizing on Labor Productivity: The Value of Showing Consideration for Employees' Morale and Welfare in High-Performance Work Systems. *Human Resource Management*, Vol.50, Issue.1, pp. 29-44. doi:10.1002/hrm.20407.
 18. Kazi, T. B., & Indermun, V. (2013). The Impact of Globalisation, Mergers, Acquisitions, Reengineering and Downsizing, on Individuals and Organisations in South Africa. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, Vol.5, Issue.6, pp. 681-698. Retrieved April 15, 2014 from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1466273679?accountid=11921>.
 19. Kim, F., & Brian H, K. (2004). New development concerning the effect of work overload on employees. *Management Research News*, Vol.27, Issue. (4/5), pp. 9-16.
 20. Kinder, A., Hughes, R., & Cooper, C. L. (Eds.). (2008). *Employee Well-Being Support: A Workplace Resource*. England: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
 21. Kunze, F., Boehm, S., & Bruch, H. (2010). Age, Resistance to Change, and Job Performance: Testing for a Common Stereotype. *Academy Of Management Annual Meeting Proceedings*, 1-6. doi:10.5465/AMBPP.2010.54495229.
 22. Lowe, G. (2006). *Under Pressure Implications of Work-life Balance and Job Stress Human Solutions Report 2006*. Retrieved February 26, 2013, from <http://www.grahamlowe.ca/documents/182/Under%20Pressure%2010-06.pdf>
 23. Lu, J. L. (2009). Effect of Work Intensification and Work Extensification on Women's Health in the Globalised Labour Market. *Journal of International Women's Studies*, Vol.10, Issue.4, pp. 111-126. Retrieved July 10, 2013, from <http://vc.bridgew.edu/jiws/vol10/iss4/8/>
 24. Matthews, S., & Power, C. (2002). Socio-economic gradients in psychological distress: A focus on women, social roles and work-home characteristics. *Social Science & Medicine*, Vol.54, Issue.5, pp. 799-810. doi:10.1016/S0277-9536(01)00110-1
 25. Matuska, K. M. (2010). Workaholism, life balance, and well-being: A comparative analysis. *Journal Of Occupational Science*, Vol.17, Issue.2, pp. 104-111. doi:10.1080/14427591.2010.9686681.
 26. May, D. R., Reed, K., Schwoerer, C. E. & Potter, P. (2004). *Ergonomic Office Design and Aging: A Quasi-Experimental Field Study of Employee Reactions to an Ergonomics Intervention Program*, *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, Vol.9, Issue.2, pp. 123-135.
 27. Naswall, K., Hellgren, J., & Sverke, M. (Eds.). (2008). *The Individual in the Changing Working Life*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
 28. Pasca, R., & Wagner, S. L. (2011). Occupational Stress in the Multicultural Workplace. *Journal of Immigrant Minority Health*, Vol.13, Issue.4, pp. 697-705. doi:10.1007/s10903-011-9457-6
 29. Pile, K. W. (2001). Approaching ergonomics in the new millennium. *Pulp & Paper*, Vol.75, Issue.9, p. 25.
 30. Porter, G., & Kakabadse, N. K. (2006). HRM perspectives on addiction to technology and work. *Journal of Management Development*, Vol.25, Issue.6, pp. 535-560. doi:10.1108/02621710610670119.
 31. Rothmann, S. (2008). Job satisfaction, occupational stress, burnout and work engagement as components of work-related wellbeing: empirical research. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, Vol.34, Issue.3, pp. 11-16. Retrieved April 23, 2013 from <http://reference.sabinet>.
 32. Rowh, M. (2006). Everything you wanted to know about ergonomics but were in too much pain to ask. *Officesolutions*, Vol.23, Issue.6, pp. 26-28.
 33. Shah, S. S. H., Jaffari, A. R., Aziz, J., Ejaz, W., Ul-Haq, I., & Raza, S. N. (2011). Workload and performance of employees. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, Vol.3, Issue.5, pp. 256-267. Retrieved April 10, 2014 from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/904423968?accountid=11921>.
 34. Seibt, R., Spitzer, S., Blank, M. & Scheuch, K. (2009). Predictors of work ability in occupations with psychological stress. *Journal of Public Health*, Volume 17, Issue 1, pp 9-18.
 35. Shah, S. S. H., Jaffari, A. R., Aziz, J., Ejaz, W., Ul-Haq, I., & Raza, S. N. (2011). Workload and performance of employees. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*,

- Vol.3, Issue.5, pp. 256-267. Retrieved April 10, 2014 from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/904423968?accountid=11921>.
36. Smith, B. (2006). Outsourcing and digitized work spaces: Some implications of the intersections of globalization, development, and work practices. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, Vol.49, Issue.7, 596-607. doi:10.1598/JAAL.49.7.5.
37. Sparks, K., Faragher, B., & Cooper, C. L. (2001). Well-being and occupational health in the 21st century workplace, *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, Issue. 74, pp. 489-509.
38. Stranks, J. (2005). *Stress at Work: Management and Prevention*. Oxford, UK: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.
39. Subramanyam, M., Muralidhara, P., & Pooja, M. (2013). Mental Workload and Cognitive Fatigue: A Study. *IUP Journal Of Management Research*, Vol.12, Issue.2, pp. 29-39.
40. Sue Ling, L., Chang, J., & Lien Yin, H. (2012). Does Effect of Workload on Quality of Work Life Vary With Generations?. *Asia Pacific Management Review*, Vol.17, Issue.4, pp. 437-451. doi:10.6126/APMR.2012.17.4.06.
41. Smithson, J., & Lewis, S. (2000). Is job security changing the psychological contract? *Personnel Review*, Vol.29, Issue.6, pp. 680-702. Retrieved April 15, 2013 from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/214802495?accountid=11921>.
42. Tade, O., & Aderinto, A.A. (2011). Socio-Demographic Predictors of Domestic Outsourcing among Working Women in Ibadan, Nigeria, *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 8, Issue.4, pp. 198-204.
43. Tucker, E., Kao, T., & Verma, N. (2005). Next-Generation Talent Management: Insights On How Workforce Trends Are Changing The Face Of Talent Management. *Business Credit*, Vol.106, Issue.7, pp. 20-27.
44. Van Wyk, M., & Pienaar, J. (2008). Towards a research agenda for job insecurity in South Africa. *Southern African Business Review*, Vol.12, Issue 2, pp. 49-86. Retrieved June 11, 2013 from http://reference.sabinet.co.za/webx/access/electronic_journals/sabr/sabr_v12_n2_a3.pdf.
45. Walinga, J., & Rowe, W. (2013). Transforming stress in complex work environments: Exploring the capabilities of middle managers in the public sector. *International Journal of Workplace Health Management*, Vol.6, Issue.1, pp. 66-88. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/17538351311312420>.
46. Waller, A. D., & Ragsdell, G. (2012). The impact of e-mail on work-life balance. *Aslib Proceedings: New Information Perspectives*, 64(2), 154-177. doi: 10.1108/00012531211 215178.
47. van Zyl, L., van Eeden, C., & Rothmann, S. (2013). Job insecurity and the emotional and behavioural consequences thereof. *South African Journal Of Business Management*, Vol.44, Issue.1, pp. 75-86.
48. Waller, A. D., & Ragsdell, G. (2012). The impact of e-mail on work-life balance. *Aslib Proceedings: New Information Perspectives*, Vol.64, Issue.2, pp. 154-177. doi:10.1108/00012531211 215178
49. Zofi, Y. (2012). *A Manager's Guide to Virtual Teams*. New York: American Management Association (AMA).