



## Lodging Managers' Perceptions of Work and Personal Life: Balanced or Imbalanced?

Yu-Chin Hsieh , Sheryl F. Kline & Thomas E. Pearson

To cite this article: Yu-Chin Hsieh , Sheryl F. Kline & Thomas E. Pearson (2008) Lodging Managers' Perceptions of Work and Personal Life: Balanced or Imbalanced?, International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration, 9:1, 18-35, DOI: [10.1080/15256480801910442](https://doi.org/10.1080/15256480801910442)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15256480801910442>



Published online: 11 Oct 2008.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 435



View related articles [↗](#)



Citing articles: 1 View citing articles [↗](#)

# Lodging Managers' Perceptions of Work and Personal Life: Balanced or Imbalanced?

Yu-Chin Hsieh  
Sheryl F. Kline  
Thomas E. Pearson

**ABSTRACT.** This study serves two main purposes: (1) to assess lodging managers' perceptions of difficulties and success in balancing their personal and work lives, and (2) to investigate if lodging managers' work interferes with or is enhanced by their personal lives, or vice versa. The results indicate that most lodging managers believe that they have struck a satisfactory balance between their work and personal lives. This study identifies the respective bidirectional effects of the interaction between work and personal life. Personal life boundaries are more permeable to work demands than work boundaries are to personal life demands.

**KEYWORDS.** Work, personal life, balance, lodging manager

---

Yu-Chin Hsieh, PhD, is Assistant Professor, Department of Recreation, Tourism, and Hospitality Management at University of North Carolina Greensboro.

Sheryl F. Kline, PhD, is Association Professor, School of Hotel, Restaurant, & Tourism Management at University of South Carolina.

Thomas E. Pearson, PhD, is Professor, Department of Hospitality and Tourism Management at Purdue University.

Address correspondence to: Yu-Chin Hsieh, Department of Recreation, Tourism, and Hospitality Management at University of North Carolina Greensboro, 420 E HHP Building, P.O. Box 26170, Greensboro, NC 27402-6170 (E-mail: y\_hsieh@uncg.edu).

International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration, Vol. 9(1) 2008

Available online at <http://ijhta.haworthpress.com>

© 2008 by The Haworth Press, Inc. All rights reserved.

doi:10.1080/15256480801910442

The hospitality industry operates at a 24/7 business pace, and expects its managers to provide products and services to consumers around the clock, every day of the year. By the end of each working day, many managers have little energy or patience left for their family members or extramural activities (Cannon, 1998; Sarabakhsh, Carson, & Lindgren, 1989). This situation offers a challenge to managers who wish to advance in their careers and to be involved in family activities at the same time. Some managers choose to leave their jobs or abandon the industry completely (Berta, 2002). For instance, Marriott International experienced difficulties recruiting talented people in early 2000, and noticed that some of its best managers quit their jobs because they wanted to spend more time with their families (Munck, 2001). A survey titled "Trends in Hospitality 2004," conducted by CareerBuilder.com, indicated that about one-third of more than 285 hospitality workers were dissatisfied with their work and life balance (CareerBuilder, 2004).

In addition to the long working hours inherent in the hospitality industry, social and demographic changes have had a significant impact on the industry. One of the changes is that people have started to value their personal lives more than their work. Cascio and Young (2005) reported on the results of a 2002 survey by the Society for Human Resource Management, in which 70% of the respondents indicated that they would rather spend time with their families than at work, compared to 54% in 2000. Even memories of the terrorist attack of September 11, 2001 have provoked Americans to rethink the meaning of work in their lives, and their priorities in work and non-work activities. The changes in the prioritization of work and personal life have forced companies to pay attention to their work/life policies in order to attract and retain a viable workforce.

According to a report from the U.S. Department of Labor (2003), today's workforce now includes more dual-earner couples who also shoulder responsibilities for the care of children or elderly dependents. The report also says there are more dual-professional couples, in which both members have careers, rather than just jobs. The number of people juggling the increasingly complex demands of the workplace and home is rising.

Changes in social values pose another new challenge to the hospitality industry. The 2002 National Study of the Changing Workforce by the Families and Work Institute reported that younger workers are far more family-centered than their predecessors. The study found that the Baby Boomer generation tends to be more work-centric than other generations. Generation Xers and Generation Yers tend to place the same priority on their jobs as they do on their families, and are thus more family-centric

than the Baby Boomers (Bond, Thompson, Galinsky, & Protta, 2002). Many younger generation employees now occupy managerial positions in the hospitality industry, and in line with the family-centric trend of this younger generation of lodging managers, they may be more concerned about their lives outside of the workplace.

With these factors at play, the balance between work and personal life has become a critical issue within the hospitality industry. It is important for the industry to understand the lodging managers' views on the balance between work and personal life, and to provide resources and support to help them achieve greater satisfaction in life while they address the responsibilities and opportunities of their careers. Educators and human resource professionals are often charged with leading the effort to create a more productive workforce. Understanding employee perceptions about their work/life balance complements the work of educators and human resource professionals, because these professionals then can then develop responsive policies and programs to achieve desired goals and attitudes among employers and employees. The purpose of this study was to assess US lodging managers' perceptions of difficulties and success in balancing their personal and work lives, and to investigate whether lodging managers' work interferes with, or is enhanced by their personal lives, and whether their personal lives interfere with, or are enhanced by their work.

## ***LITERATURE REVIEW***

### ***Work and Family Conflict***

Studies on balancing work and personal life arose from studies on work and family conflict (Burke & Greenglass, 1987; Burden & Googins; 1987, Hunsaker, 1983; Kanter, 1977; Near, Rice & Hunt, 1980). It was assumed that work and family were two separate, incompatible and competing roles that individuals attempt to fulfill (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). *Work and family conflict* has been defined as "a form of inter-role conflict in which the role pressure from the work and family domain are mutually incompatible in some respects." (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985, p. 77). Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) proposed three types of conflict: time-based, strain-based, and behavior-based. *Time-based conflict* occurs when time demanded by family competes with work activities. Greenhaus, Bedeian, and Mossholder's (1987) study of job performance and family well-being indicated that time commitment to work was positively correlated

with work/family conflict. Judge, Boudreau, and Bretz (1994) found that the number of hours worked per week was one of the strongest influences upon work/family conflict. *Strain-based conflict* occurs when stress from one domain spills over into another. Thus, irritability, fatigue, and depression experienced in one role may make it difficult to participate effectively in or enjoy the other role. *Behavior-based conflict* occurs when patterns of behavior appropriate to each domain are incompatible, and the person does not make the necessary adjustments. For example, a caring compassionate mother may have to be strict in the workplace.

In addition to the three types of conflict, Fisher (2001) incorporated the *theory of conservation of resources* and suggested including *energy* as the fourth source of inter-role conflict. According to the conservation of resources theory, stress is a reaction to an environment in which one is threatened by a potential loss in resources. One experiences an actual resource loss, or one fails to gain expected resources. Often times, as resources become scarce, individuals change their situations to safeguard them (Hobfoll, 1988;1989). The conservation of resources theory suggests that inter-role conflict leads to stress because resources are lost in the process of juggling between work and family roles. When employees believe that their work interferes with their personal lives, they eliminate this drain on their resources by leaving the organization.

### ***Consequences of Work and Family Conflict***

While conflict is a normal part of life, an increase in the level of work and family conflict has been linked to negative consequences, both for work and non-work domains. Family-to-work conflict was found to be positively correlated with job stress and depression, although work-to-family conflict did not predict either depression or family distress (Grandey & Cropanzano, 1999). Kossek and Ozeki's 1998 meta-analysis reported that work and family outcomes are correlated with job satisfaction and life satisfaction. Allen, Herst, Bruck, & Sutton (2000) reported that higher levels of conflict are associated with decreased job satisfaction, career satisfaction, organizational commitment, and job performance, as well as increased absenteeism and turnover intention. Work and family conflict was found to be significantly related to non-work related outcomes, such as dissatisfaction with marriage, life, leisure, and family. Some stress-related outcomes, such as general psychological strain, somatic and

physical complaints, depression, substance abuse, burnout, work-related stress, and family-related stress also were significantly associated with work and family conflict (Adams, King, & King, 1996; Allen, Herst, Bruck, & Sutton, 2000; Boles & Babin, 1996; Burke, 1988; Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Netemeyer, Boles, & McMurrian, 1996).

Namasivayam and Mount's (2004) study of 555 hotel employees from seven hotels owned and operated by the same South Texas company found that work-to-family conflict issues were related to lower job satisfaction, and family-to-work conflict issues were related to a higher job satisfaction.

### ***Work and Family Interaction***

Frone et al. (1992) further expanded research in work and family conflict by empirically demonstrating that the work and family interface is bidirectional, meaning that work interferes with family, and family interferes with work. Conflict can originate in the workplace and subsequently interfere with personal life (represented hereafter as WIF), and conflict can originate in personal life and interfere with work (represented hereafter as PIW). The Spillover Theory has been used widely to explain the relationships between work and family. This theory denotes the extent to which participation in one domain (e.g., work) impacts participation in another domain (e.g., family). The spillover model proposed that what occurs at work corresponds to what occurs in life outside of work (Staines, 1980). It suggests that what happens at work "spills over" and affects non-work life, and also that personal life events can spill over and affect work.

It is worth pointing out that spillover has been conceptualized both positively and negatively (Grzywacz, Almeida, & McDonald, 2002). Positive spillover refers to enhancement that results from one domain affecting another domain; for example, happiness at work would lead to happiness at home. Negative spillover refers to conflict or interference that results from one domain affecting another; for example, when work is boring or monotonous, workers may become 'lazy', which in turn may lead to their unwillingness to do things at home or with family members (Zedeck, 1992). Unlike previous studies on work and personal life, which focused only on negative spillover (interference), this study also investigated the effect of positive spillover (enhancement) between the work and personal life domains.

Based on a review of the literature on work and family conflict, six hypotheses are proposed:

**Hypothesis 1:** With a career in the lodging industry, the majority of managers will find it is difficult to maintain a balance between work and personal life.

**Hypothesis 2:** Given the characteristics of the managerial job, the majority of lodging managers will feel unsuccessful balancing work and personal life.

**Hypothesis 3:** Managers' work interferes with personal life more than it enriches personal life (WIP > WEP).

**Hypothesis 4:** The managerial job in the lodging industry interferes with personal life more than personal life interferes with work (WIP > PIW).

**Hypothesis 5:** Lodging managers' personal life interferes with work more than it enhances their work (PIW > PEW).

**Hypothesis 6:** The managerial job in the lodging industry enhances personal life more than personal life enhances work (WEP > PEW).

## ***METHODOLOGY***

Data for this study were collected at 83 hotels managed by a US hotel management company. This company was chosen because it has properties spread across the continental United States. These hotels range from 50 to 615 rooms, representing different types of lodging operations: business hotels, convention hotels, airport hotels, resort hotels, and residence hotels. The hotels carry the names of Marriott (including Courtyard, Fairfield Inn, Residence Inn), Holiday Inn, Hampton Inn, Sleep Inn, and Radisson, and offer economy to luxury levels of service. In addition, this hotel management company was very interested in issues pertaining to the balance of work and personal life and was willing to assist with data collection.

Between November 2003 and December 2003, surveys were distributed to all 535 managers at the 83 properties via the company's internal

mail system. These managers held the job titles of General Manager, Resident Manager, Front-office Manager, Reservations Manager, Controller, Executive Housekeeper, Engineer, Sales (Marketing) Director, Senior Sales Manager, Sales and Marketing Manager, Catering Manager, Security Manager, Personnel Manager, Food and Beverage Manager, Executive Chef, Sous Chef, Banquet Chef, Executive Steward, and Restaurant Manager. An on-line survey website was developed so that managers could respond to the survey at their own convenience.

### ***Measurement of Perceived Balance***

Managers' perceptions of the balance between work and personal life were measured by two items: "How easy or difficult is it for you to balance the demands of your work and your personal life?" based on a scale from 1 = very difficult to 5 = very easy; and "All in all, how successful do you feel in balancing your work and personal life?" based on a scale from 1 = very unsuccessful to 5 = very successful. To obtain as unbiased an answer as possible concerning work and personal life balance issues, these two questions were placed first on the questionnaire before the other questions could impact the respondents' answers. A short note appealed to the respondents to answer the questions honestly, and it is an assumption of this research that they did so.

### ***Measurement of Interaction between Work and Personal Life***

Questions measuring work and personal life interaction were derived from Work Family Tension Measurement scale recommended by the Virtual Think Tank Panel formed in 2000 (MacDermid, Barnett, Crosby, Greenhuas, Koblenz, Marks, Perry-Jenkins, Voydanoff, Wethington, & Sabbatini-Bunch, 2000). This panel consisted of distinguished researchers in the field of work and family studies. All questions were drawn from previous work and family conflict research. The interaction between work and personal life was captured by four dimensions: work's interference with personal life (WIP), work enhancement of personal life (WEP), personal life interference with work (PIW), and personal life enhancement of work (PEW). A pilot study was conducted on five hospitality major graduate students with at least three years of work experience in the industry. Minor modifications to the wording of several items were made, so that the questions would fit into the broader view of the balance of work and personal life in the current study. Respondents were asked to indicate, on five-point Likert scales, how often they experienced each work personal



life phenomenon (1 = does not apply, 2 = rarely, 3 = sometimes, 4 = often, 5 = most of the time).

The three statements were used to measure the interference of work on personal life (WIP). They were: (a) "Because of my job, I did not have enough time to participate in non-work activities I find relaxing and enjoyable" (Bond, Galinsky, & Swanberg, 1997; Bond, Thompson, Galinsky, and Protta, 2002); (b) "My job made it difficult to maintain the kind of relationships with my family and friends that I would have liked" (Stephens & Sommer, 1996); (c) "Because of my job, I didn't have the energy to do things with my family or other important people in my life" (Bond et al., 1997).

The interference of personal life on work (PIW) was measured by means of three questions. Question items included (a) "The schedule demands of my personal responsibilities kept me from getting work done on time at my job"(Bond et al., 1997); (b) "I was preoccupied with personal responsibilities while I was at work"; (Guttek, Searle, & Klepa, 1991) (c) "I was too tired to be effective at work because of personal responsibilities"(Guttek et al., 1991).

Five statements were used to measure the level at which work enhanced personal life (WEP). These statements were: (a)"My work schedule was sufficiently flexible to enable me to take care of personal responsibilities"; (b) "Having a good day on the job made me a better companion at home or to my friends"(Grzywacz & Marks, 1998); (c) "My job gave me energy to do things with my family or other important people in my life" (Bond et al., 1997); (d) "Skills I used on my job helped me deal with personal and practical issues at home"(Grzywacz & Marks, 1998); (e) "My colleagues gave me support that helped me face difficulties at home" (Bond et al., 1997).

Five statements were used to measure the levels at which personal life enhanced work (PEW). These questions were:(a) "My personal responsibilities allowed me enough time to do my job"; (b) "I was in a better mood at work because of my family or personal life"(Grzywacz & Marks, 1998); (c) "My family or personal life gave me the energy to do my job"(Bond et al., 1997); (d) "Skills I used at home helped me deal with personal and practical issues at work"(Stephens & Sommer, 1996); (e) "My family and friends gave me support that helped me face difficulties at work" (Bond et al., 1997).

The variables related to work interference with personal life (WIP), personal life interference with work (PIW), work enhancement of personal life (WEP), and personal life enhancement of work (PEW) were

determined by averaging their respective items and scoring the answers, so that a high score indicated higher levels of each type of interference or enhancement. Internal consistency reliability estimates obtained in the present study were 0.87 for the WIP Scale; 0.58 for the WEP Scale; and 0.78 for the PIW Scale; 0.70 for the PEW Scale. Descriptive statistics and T-tests were conducted for data analysis. Hypotheses were accepted or rejected based upon p values less than 0.05.

## **RESULTS**

With 295 questionnaires returned, the response rate was 55%, which is consistent with most general population surveys. Of these respondents, approximately half were males (49.6%) and half females (50.4%). Approximately 54% of the respondents were married, and 46% were single. This data constitutes good representation of respondents in terms of gender and marital status. Their ages ranged from 21 years to 62 years, and the average age was 33. Approximately 46% of the respondents had at least a bachelor's degree, and 27% had some college. In the busy season, respondents worked an average of 58.8 hours per week, while in the low season, the average number of weekly hours dropped to 49.5. Compared to the 49 hours per week for men, and 43.5 hours per week for women reported by the 2002 National Study of the Changing Workforce (Bond, Thompson, Galinsky, & Protta, 2002), this sample worked longer hours than the national average in both the low and high seasons.

### ***Hypotheses Testing***

Descriptive statistics indicated that over half of the respondents (56%) reported that they felt it was difficult or very difficult for them to balance the demands of work and personal life. Only 20% reported that it was easy or very easy to balance work and personal life (See Table 1). Hence, Hypothesis 1 was supported.

With regard to Hypothesis 2, only 23% of respondents felt they either were unsuccessful or very unsuccessful in balancing work and personal life, whereas approximately 44% felt they were successful or very successful in balancing work and personal life (See Table 2). Hence, Hypothesis 2 was not supported.

Table 3 presents the means and t-values. Comparing the interference and enhancement from work to personal life, managers tended to perceive more

TABLE 1. Ease of balancing work and personal life

Ease of balancing work and personal life levels	Frequency	%
1 = Very Difficult	20	7.6%
2 = Difficult	128	48.5%
3 = Neutral	64	24.2%
4 = Easy	47	17.8%
5 = Very Easy	5	1.9%

Note. N = 264. Mean = 2.58. Std. Deviation. = 0.932

TABLE 2. Success of balancing work and personal life

Levels	Frequency	%
1 = Very Unsuccessful	7	2.7%
2 = Unsuccessful	54	20.5%
3 = Neutral	87	33.0%
4 = Successful	101	38.3%
5 = Very Successful	15	5.7%

Note. N = 264, Mean = 3.24, Std. Deviation. = 0.931

TABLE 3. Means of variables and t-values

Hypothesis	Variable 1	Mean	Variable 2	Mean	t-value	p value
H3	WIP	3.06	WEP	2.91	1.913	p > .05
H4	WIP	3.06	PIW	1.91	22.311	p < .01
H5	PIW	1.91	PEW	3.53	-26.578	p < .01
H6	WEP	2.91	PEW	3.53	-10.726	p < .01

Note: N = 264

work interference with their personal life (Mean = 3.06, Std. Dev. = 0.88) than they perceived work enhancement of personal life (Mean = 2.91, Std. Dev. = 0.76); however, the difference between WIP and WEP did not achieve statistical significance (df = 263; t = 1.913, p = .057). Hence, Hypothesis 3 was not supported, so that WIP = WEP. Regarding the

interference between work and personal life, the results of the T-test indicated that managers perceived more interference of work on personal life (Mean = 3.06, Std Dev. = 0.88) than of personal life on work (Mean = 1.91, Std Dev. = 0.55);  $df = 263$ ,  $t = 22.311$ ,  $p = .000$ . Hence, Hypothesis 4 was supported (WIP > PIW). In terms of the spillover effect from personal life to work, managers' personal lives enhanced work (Mean = 3.53, Std Dev. = 0.92) more than their personal lives interfered with their work (Mean = 1.91, Std Dev. = 0.55);  $df = 263$ ,  $t = -26.578$ ,  $p = .000$ . Hence, Hypothesis 5 was not supported. Assessing the enhancement effects between work and personal life, managers' personal lives enhanced work more (Mean = 3.53, Std Dev. = 0.92) than work enhanced their personal lives (Mean = 2.91, Std Dev. = 0.76);  $df = 263$ ,  $t = -10.726$ ,  $p = .000$ . Hence, Hypothesis 6 was not supported.

## ***DISCUSSION***

### ***Perceptions of Work and Personal Life Balance***

The majority of respondents (56%) believed that it was difficult or very difficult for them to maintain a balance between their work and personal life. Yet, in general, respondents felt they were able to maintain such a balance, and only 23% of respondents reported that they were unsuccessful or very unsuccessful in balancing their work and personal lives; approximately 33% of respondents reported that they were neither successful nor unsuccessful at balancing work and personal life, and about 44% of respondents reported that they were successful in balancing their work and personal lives. One explanation for this somewhat contradictory finding is that some respondents may have accepted a certain degree of conflict between work and other aspects of their lives. In other words, perhaps some people did not achieve perfect balance, yet they still were reasonably satisfied with whatever level of balance they were able to achieve. The results suggest that, despite working long hours and the pressure inherent in the lodging industry, most lodging managers still can strike an acceptable balance between their work and personal lives.

### ***Interaction between Work and Personal Life***

This study identified the bidirectional effects of work and personal life. In addition to the conflict between work and personal life, it uncovered positive connections between the two. However, the strengths of the

interactions between work and personal life varied, both in terms of direction and effects. Enhancement of work by personal life was reported most frequently by the respondents, followed by work interference with personal life, followed by work enhancement of personal life. Participants were less likely to report that their personal lives interfered with their work; more than 90% of respondents reported that personal life rarely or never interfered with their work, and more than 80 % of respondents even stated that their personal lives improved the quality of their work either “sometimes” or “most of the time.” Even though more than 60% of the respondents claimed that work “sometimes” or “most of the time” interfered with their personal life, more than half of the respondents noted that work “sometimes” or “most of the time” enhanced their personal lives.

The study found that positive spillover from personal life to work was more common than negative spillover. Negative spillover from work to personal life, however, was more prevalent than positive spillover. This finding suggests that work and personal life boundaries are asymmetrically permeable; in other words, personal life boundaries are more permeable to work demands than work boundaries are to personal life demands: work seems to interfere with personal life more than it enriches it. This has important implications for theorists concerned with the balance between work and personal life. People who allow work to consume disproportionate amounts of their energy and attention are frustrated in their pursuit to “have it all” (Eagle, Miles, Icenogle, 1997). Conversely, “personal life” seems to enhance work more than it interferes with work. This finding was supported by the respondents’ high PEW scores among the four work and personal life interactions. This finding also supports the findings of several previous studies (Frone et al., 1992; Hall, 1990; Wiley, 1987).

Similarly, it appears that personal life has a more beneficial impact on work life than work life has on personal life. Even though people today tend to pay more attention to personal life, work remains a priority. Work supports life, provides financial security, and sustains our families and ourselves (Ciulla, 2000). It also is a vehicle for the realization of our individual emotional, social and psychological aspirations (Allen, 1997). Devoting one’s life to work certainly has its rewards, so it should not be surprising that respondents tried not to let their personal lives interfere with their work. This finding was substantiated by higher WIP than PIW scores, and by higher PEW than PIW scores.

## ***SIGNIFICANCE AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY***

This study extends the body of knowledge regarding lodging managers' work and personal life balance. First, this study increased the knowledge base by offering new insight into managers' perceptions of the actual balance between their work and their personal life.

Second, this study extended previous studies by using work/life balance scale items that included the non-work domain more broadly rather than focusing primarily on the family domain. Specifically, the items used in the survey included the term "personal life," so that the respondents could interpret the item in the context of what was relevant to them. This more general wording provided a better assessment of the non-work content domain than did the term 'family', as not all employees have families.

Third, previous studies on work and family have focused on the negative aspects of their interaction; only one study has explored the relationship of both types of work-family facilitation to health outcomes (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000).

Fourth, many organizations have been developing programs without knowing how their employees struggle with work and personal life balance. This study provided an understanding of lodging managers' work/life balance by investigating the dynamics that are specific to work/personal life interfaces.

The results of the study have several implications to hotel companies that are interested in improving human capital by offering work/life balance programs. This study shows that many managers still maintain a satisfactory balance between work and personal life. However, a company cannot ignore the fact that the quality of an employee's personal life will affect their work to a certain degree, and vice versa. Most of all, companies should recognize that employees are human beings, not machines or robots. In addition to work roles, people have other roles to play in their lives. Non-work social roles play important functions in the lives of all individuals. These roles help to define who we are; they influence what we do and how we do it, and with whom we interact. The roles even influence how we think and feel about things. They structure our use of time, and determine our physical location (Ashforth, Kreiner, & Fugate, 2000; Clark, 2000). An imbalance between social roles may be an important stressor that can influence outcomes in affected life domains, including work, and can influence the overall health and well-being of individuals exposed to imbalance (Frone, 2003).

Strategies that may be employed by hotels to reduce work pressure and assist employees in managing the work/personal life interface include:

1. Assessing job assignments to avoid systematic work over load and burnout in the long run.
2. Restructuring the everyday work environment to allow employees the autonomy to accommodate their own work and personal life needs and give employees more choices about work arrangements and schedules so that they can adjust them to their own needs.
3. Promoting a supportive work/life balance company culture. Companies should recognize that employees are human beings, not machines or robots. In addition to work roles, employees have other roles to play in their lives. Hotel companies should promote a company culture that encourages employees to seek a balance between work and personal life. Managers who stay late or work overtime no longer are seen as super-achievers but as power time-managers. Policies and reward systems should be upgraded to support this work/personal life balance culture. For example, companies should reward results rather than “face time” on the job.
4. Promoting a social support system within the workplace so that co-workers can help each other when there is a problem occurring in an employee’s personal life.
5. Providing training programs in time-management and conflict-management to assist employee in coping with conflicts arising from work or personal life.
6. Establishing policies and benefits that reduce the impact of both on-the-job and personal stressors.

### ***LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY***

This study has several limitations. The sample was limited to hotel employees who held managerial positions within one hotel management company in the US, so its results cannot be extended globally to all employees. In addition, the respondents were all from one company, a circumstance that adds potential bias to the results. Moreover, the research relied exclusively on self-reported data. The respondents were asked to check off the statements that best reflected their feelings; however, many people are more concerned with giving an “appropriate” or “desirable” answer than a true answer (Cacioppo & Petty, 1981). Hence, it is possible

that the respondents were especially sensitive to questions that asked; “How successful are you in balancing work and personal life?” Such questions pertain to their self-identity, and they might have been reluctant to select a true answer even though the study was anonymous. The results also may not truly reflect the respondents’ real successes.

### ***FUTURE STUDIES***

Future studies can be designed to explore the findings uncovered in this study. The majority of respondents reported interference of work on their personal life and interference of their personal life on work; however, many also reported success in balancing the two. The study seems to indicate that some interference from work or personal life is tolerable and acceptable to most of these lodging managers. There are no data that establish a maximum tolerance level. Future research may explore the threshold between acceptable and unacceptable levels of conflict.

This study focuses on managerial employees in the lodging industry, while operational level employees make up 88 % of the lodging industry (US Department of Labor, 2003). It may be valuable to explore the perceptions of operational level employees for possible differences. To better understand managers’ perceptions of work and personal life balance, personal interviews and stakeholder analysis also are suggested for further, more detailed exploration of the issue.

### **REFERENCES**

- Adams, G. A., King, L. A., and King, D. W. (1996). Relationships of job and family involvement, family social support, and work-family conflict with job and life satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*(4), 411–420.
- Allen, S. (1997). What is work for? The right to work and the right to be idle. In R. K. Brown (Ed.), *The changing shape of work*. New York: St Martin’s Press.
- Allen, T. D., Herst, D. E. L., Bruck, C. S., and Sutton, M. (2000). Consequences associated with work-to-family conflict: a review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5*(2), 278–308.
- Ashforth, B. E., Kreiner, G. E., and Fugate, M. (2000). All in a day’s work: Boundaries and micro role transitions. *Academy of Management Review, 25*(3), 472–491.
- Berta, D. (2002). Chains give notice, say GM workweek too long. *Nation’s Restaurant News, 36*(36), 1 & 18.



- Boles, J. S., and Babin, B. J. (1996). On the front lines: Stress, conflict, and the customer service provider. *Journal of Business Research*, 37(1), 41–50.
- Bond, J. T., Galinsky, E., and Swanberg, J. E. (1997). *The 1997 National Study of the Changing Workforce*. New York: Families and Work Institute.
- Bond, J. T., Thompson, C., Galinsky, E., and Protta, D. (2002). *The National Study of the Changing Workforce*. New York: Families and Work Institute.
- Burden, D. S., and Googins, B. G. (1987). *Boston University: Balancing job and home life study: Managing work and family stress in corporations*. Center on Work and Family. Boston: Boston University.
- Burke, R. J. (1988). Some antecedents and consequences of work-family conflict. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 3(4), 287–302.
- Burke, R. J., and Greenglass, E. R. (1987). *Work and family*. Chichester, England: Wiley.
- Cacioppo, J. T., and Petty, R. E. (1981). Social psychological procedures for cognitive response assessment: The thought-listing technique. In T. V. Merluzzi, C. R., Glass, and M. Genest (Eds.), *Cognitive assessment* (pp. 309–342). New York: Guilford Press.
- Cannon, D. F. (1998). Better understanding the impact of work interferences on organizational commitment. *Marriage and Family Review*, 28 (1/2), 153–166.
- Careerbuilder (2004, February 6). Careerbuilder.com: turnover approaches 50-percent. *Hotel & Motel Management*, Retrieved April 18, 2006, from <http://www.hotelmotel.com/hotelmotel/article/articleDetail.jsp?id=84349>
- Cascio, W. F., and Young, C. E. (2005). Work-family balance: Does the market reward firms that respect it? In D. F. Halpem and S. E. Murphy (Eds.), *From Work-Family Balance to Work-Family Interaction* (pp. 49–63). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ciulla, J. B. (2000). *The working life: The promise and betrayal of modern work*. New York: Times Books.
- Clark, S. C. (2000). Work/family border theory: a new theory of work/family balance. *Human Relations*, 53(6), 747–770.
- Eagle, B. W., Miles, E. W., and Icenogle, M. L. (1997). Interrole conflicts and the permeability of work and family domains: are there gender differences? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 50(2), 168–184.
- Edwards, J. R., and Rothbard, N. P. (2000). Mechanisms linking work and family: Clarifying the relationship between work and family constructs. *Academy of Management Journal*, 25(1), 178–199.
- Fisher, G. G. (2001). *Work/personal life balance: a construct development study*. Unpublished Doctor of Philosophy, Bowling Green State University.
- Frone, M. R. (2003). Work-family balance. In J. C. Quick and L. E. Tetrick (Eds.), *Handbook of Occupational Health Psychology* (pp. 143–162). Washington, DC: American Psychology Association.
- Frone, M. R., Russell, M., and Cooper, M. L. (1992). Antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict: testing a model of the work-family interface. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77(1), 65–78.
- Grandey, A. A., and Cropanzano, R. (1999). The Conservation of resources model applied to work-family conflict and strain. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 54(2), 350–370.

- Greenhaus, J. H., and Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *The Academy of Management Review*, 10(1), 76–88.
- Greenhaus, J. H., Bedeian A. G. and Mossholder, K. W. (1987). Work experiences, Job performance, and feelings of personal and family well-being. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 31(2), 200–215.
- Grzywacz, J. G., and Marks, N. (2000). Reconceptualizing the work-family interface: An ecological perspective on the correlates of positive and negative spillover between work and family. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(1), 111–126.
- Grzywacz, J. G., and Marks, N. F. (1998). *Family, work, work-family spillover and alcohol abuse during midlife*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin.
- Grzywacz, J. G., Almeida, D. M., and McDonald, D. A. (2002). Work-family spillover and daily reports of work and family stress in the adult labor force. *Family Relations*, 51(1), 28–36.
- Gutek, B. A., Searle, S., and Klepa, L. (1991). Rational versus gender role expectations for work-family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(4), 560–568.
- Hall, D. T. (1990). Promoting work and family balance: an organization-change approach. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18(3), 5–18.
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1988). *The Ecology of Stress*. New York: Hemisphere.
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44(3), 513–524.
- Hunsaker, J. (1983). Work and family life must be integrated. *Personnel Administrator*, 28(4), 87–91.
- Judge, T. A., Boudreau, J. W., and Bretz, R. D. (1994). Job and life attitudes of male executives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(5), 767–782.
- Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Work and family in the United States: A critical review and agenda for research and policy*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Kossek, E. E., and Ozeki, C. (1998). Work-family conflict, policies, and the job-life satisfaction relationship: A review and directions for future organizational behavior-human resources research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(2), 139–149.
- MacDermid, S. M., Barnett, R., Crosby, F., Greenhaus, J., Koblenz, M., Marks, S., Perry-Jenkins, M., Voydanoff, P., Wethington, E., and Sabbatini-Bunch, L. (2000). The measurement of work and personal life tension: recommendations of a virtual think tank. Retrieved January 20, 2005, from [http://www.bc.edu/bc\\_org/avp/csom/cwf/thinktanks/worklife\\_tension\\_vtt.pdf](http://www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/csom/cwf/thinktanks/worklife_tension_vtt.pdf).
- Munck, B. (2001). Changing a culture of face time. *Harvard Business Review*, 79 (10), 125.
- Namasivayam, K., and Mount, D. (2004). The relationship of work-family conflict and family-work conflict to job satisfaction. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, 28(2), 242–250.
- Near, J. P. Rice, R. W., and Hunt, R. G. (1980). The relationship between work and non-work domains: A review of empirical research. *Academy of Management Review*, 5(3), 415–429.
- Netemeyer, R. G., Boles, J. S., and McMurrian, R. (1996). Development and validation of work-family conflict and family-work conflict scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(4), 400–410.
- Sarabakhsh, M., Carson D. and Lindgren E. (1989). The personal cost of hospitality management. *Cornell Hotel & Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 30(1), 72–76.

- Staines, G. L. (1980). Spillover versus compensation: A review of the literature on the relationship between work and non-work. *Human Relations*, 33(2), 111–129.
- Stephens, G. K., and Sommer, S. M. (1996). The measurement of work to family conflict. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 56(3), 475–486.
- U.S. Department of Labor. (2003). *National employment, hours, and earnings*: Bureau of Labor Statistics.
- Wiley, D. L. (1987). The relationship between work/non-work role conflict and job related outcomes: Some unanticipated findings. *Journal of Management*, 13(3), 467–472.
- Zedeck, S. (1992). *Work, family and organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.