

Work-Life Integration in Women's Lives: A Qualitative Study

Solmaz. Bulut¹, Mehdi. Rostami^{2, 3*}, Sefa. Bulut⁴, Baidi. Bukhori⁵, Seyed Hadi. Seyed Alitabar², Zarmin Tariq⁶
Zohreh. Zadhan²

¹ MS, LPC, BHWC, Department of Counseling and Recovery Services of Oklahoma, Tulsa, OK, USA

² Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada

³ Rehabilitation Department, York Rehab Clinic, Toronto, Canada

⁴ Department of Counseling Psychology & Head of the Counseling Center, Ibn Haldun University, Istanbul, Turkey

⁵ Dean of the Faculty of Psychology and Health, Universitas Islam Negeri Walisongo Semarang, Indonesia

⁶ Knowledge and Research Support Service, University of Management and Technology (UMT), Lahore, Pakistan

* Corresponding author email address: mehdirostami@kmanresce.ca

Editor

Telma Catarina Almeida¹
Universidade Lusófona - Centro
Universitário do Porto, Hei-Lab:
Digital Human-
Environment Interaction Labs, 4000-
098 Porto, Portugal
telma.c.almeida@gmail.com

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Olga. Coelho¹
CICPSI, Faculdade de Psicologia, Universidade de Lisboa, Alameda da
Universidade, 1649-013 Lisboa, Portugal. Email: ocoelho@edu.ulisboa.pt
Reviewer 2: Catalina Ifrim¹
Egas Moniz School of Health and Science, Instituto Universitário Egas Moniz
(IUEM), 2829-511 Caparica, Portugal. catalina.ifrim@gmail.com

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The study prides itself on purposive sampling for diversity, yet the document does not sufficiently detail the criteria used for participant selection, especially concerning cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds. Expanding on how these factors were considered in the sampling process would strengthen the study's inclusivity and relevance to a broader audience.

The findings highlight the importance of support networks, but the analysis could benefit from deeper exploration into how different types of support (e.g., familial vs. professional) uniquely impact work-life integration. Further dissecting these subcategories could reveal nuanced insights into the interplay between various forms of support and work-life balance.

The study mentions several key themes and subthemes, such as workplace flexibility and personal well-being, without clear operational definitions. Providing specific criteria or indicators for these concepts could enhance the clarity and replicability of the research.

The age distribution of participants suggests an opportunity for comparative analysis. Exploring how work-life integration strategies and challenges vary across different life stages could add depth to the findings and offer more tailored recommendations.

To enrich the grounded theory analysis, incorporating and discussing negative cases or outliers—participants whose experiences contrast with the main themes—would strengthen the theory's robustness and provide a more comprehensive view of work-life integration.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

While the study mentions employing grounded theory, it could benefit from a more detailed explanation of how this methodological framework guided the data collection and analysis processes. Specifically, describing how theoretical saturation was achieved and providing examples of the iterative process between data collection and analysis could enhance the methodological rigor.

Given the increasing prevalence of remote work, a focused analysis on how this shift affects work-life integration, particularly in relation to workplace flexibility and work-life conflict, could make the study more timely and relevant.

While the study captures a range of experiences, it could benefit from a more detailed examination of how cultural attitudes towards gender roles influence work-life integration. This would provide a richer contextual backdrop for the findings.

Introducing a method to quantify the prevalence or intensity of themes (e.g., through a thematic saturation grid) could provide additional insight into the relative importance or commonality of the identified themes and subthemes.

The diverse employment sectors of participants are mentioned, yet the analysis does not deeply explore sector-specific challenges and strategies. Tailoring findings and recommendations to specific sectors could enhance the study's practical implications.

Given the significance of remote work and online communities in the findings, a more comprehensive discussion on how technology facilitates or hinders work-life integration would be valuable. This could include both the benefits and challenges associated with digital connectivity.

While flexible work arrangements are highlighted as beneficial, further discussion on potential downsides or challenges (e.g., blurring work-life boundaries) could provide a more balanced view and inform more nuanced policy recommendations.

The discussion could be strengthened by explicitly connecting the findings to existing theoretical frameworks on work-life balance, gender roles, and organizational behavior. This would situate the study within the broader academic discourse and enhance its theoretical contribution.

The conclusion offers general suggestions for future research, but specifying particular areas where gaps still exist (e.g., longitudinal impacts of policy changes on work-life integration, cross-cultural comparisons) would guide subsequent inquiries and highlight the study's contribution to ongoing scholarly debates.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.