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ABSTRACT

This thesis examined the links between work conditions (long work hours, job demands, and permeable boundaries) and psychological well-being (positive affect, negative affect, and role overload) of hotel managers and their partners. Participants included 189 couples sampled from hotels across the United States. Gender was tested as a moderator to determine whether the associations differed for men and women. In support of the hypothesis, hotel managers with more job demands had higher negative affect and role overload, and higher permeable boundaries were linked to lower positive affect and higher role overload. Contrary to my hypothesis, long work hours were positively associated with positive affect. There was no evidence of crossover: There were no significant associations between hotel managers’ reports of work conditions and partner psychological well-being. Gender moderated the association between permeable boundaries and negative affect for hotel managers: For female hotel managers, greater permeability was linked to higher negative affect; in contrast, for male hotel managers, there was no significant association. Overall these findings can inform the hospitality industry regarding workplace practices that can be implemented to foster and protect employee well-being.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

As the U.S. workforce has had to face increasing job demands in the last few decades due to the economic downturn, employees across all industries have become more stressed, ultimately putting their health and well-being at increased risk (Matos & Galinsky, 2012). Employees are working longer hours often for less compensation, recognition, and job security (Rones, 1997; Williams, 2008). The proliferation of technology has led to increased permeable boundaries between work and employees’ lives at home (Seery et al. 2, 2008). With increased accessibility of employees by their organizations via mobile devices and email, as well as the ability to work from home, employees may feel that they are never truly “off the clock” when they come home (Bulger, 2007; Presser, 2005). To date, an abundance of research especially in industrial/organizational psychology and health psychology, has focused on the links between individual occupational conditions and psychological health, with more demanding work conditions linked to greater distress and poorer psychological well-being (e.g., burnout, exhaustion, depression, strain, and overload (Hecht, 2001; Westman, 2001; Coverman, 1989).

Three main work conditions that are linked to individual well-being are long work hours, job demands, and permeable boundaries. More information is known about long work hours and job demands and their associations to individual well-being than there is know about permeable boundaries, which this study aims to build upon. Long work hours are associated with exhaustion, fatigue, and burnout (Jacobs, 2009). Job demands, such as pace and frequent deadlines, have been linked to burnout, job dissatisfaction, and negative affect (Seery et al. 2, 2008). A small body of literature suggests job demands can benefit employees, too: Job demands have been
linked to increased feelings of autonomy, motivation, and enrichment (Seery et al., 2008). Advances in technology have increased accessibility to employees at home. Less known about the implications of permeable boundaries for individual well-being but this is an important avenue of research.

Not only can these extenuating job conditions strain the individual employee, they can also have ripple effects reaching employees’ families and partners (Bolger et al., 1989; Westman, 2001). With the rise of women in the workforce, research studying the connection between experiences at work and home has also increased. Research on the work-family interface has shown that work and family are not separate spheres, and research has increased in the past few decades investigating how an individual’s role at work can influence his/her own well-being as well as that of their partners (Westman, 2001). Job demands and work stress have also been linked to partner well-being outcomes including stress (Westman, 2001), role overload (Bakker, 2009), and lack of positive engagement (Neff et al., 2013). Less information is known about how permeable boundaries may influence partners’ well-being, a lacuna this study will address.

Long work hours, job demands, and permeable boundaries are characteristics of many U.S. jobs today, and are extremely relevant in the hospitality industry. According to the 2013 Current Population Survey, there were approximately 13.554 million employees in the hospitality and leisure industry, and 10.349 million in the accommodation and food industry (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2014). The hotel industry is susceptible to the effects of demanding job conditions because of its focus on 24-hour/7 days a week customer service. In addition, turnover rates are high in the hotel industry (Cleveland et al., 2007) and the resultant churn likely produces stress and strain for the remaining employees who must adapt. Many hotel managers must be able to be reached at all times of the day or night depending on the needs of their customers. Hotel managerial jobs are characterized by long and non-standard hours, job-specific requirements to relocate, and constant face-to-face engagement with customers (Mulvaney et al., 2007; Cleveland
et al., 2007). These work conditions can take a toll on their hotel managers’ well-being. They may report poorer physical and mental health (Mulvaney et al., 2007); These conditions could also have implications for their partners’ distress (Mulvaney et al., 2007) and role overload (Mulvaney et al., 2007). To date, research in the hospitality industry has focused primarily on determining the aspects of the job/industry that are stressful overall and their implications for the workplace (e.g., turnover rates and absenteeism). Limited hospitality research has examined the work-family interface and how hotel workers’ stress may have implications for their families (Mulvaney et al., 2007; Cleveland et al., 2007).

Building upon existing research, this study first aims to replicate and build upon these findings with a sample of hotel managers from across the United States to examine the implications of specific job conditions—work hours, job demands, and permeable boundaries—and how they are directly linked to individual psychological well-being outcomes (i.e., positive and negative affect, role overload). The second aim of the study is to examine the extent to which these job conditions cross over and are associated with the same indicators of partners’ psychological well-being. The third aim for the study will investigate whether these associations differ by gender.

**Theoretical Frameworks**

Two theoretical frameworks – the Job Demands-Resource (JD-R) Model and the Spillover-Crossover Model, informed the present study.

*Job Demands-Resources Model (JDR Model).* The Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model focuses on whether workplace conditions are either “demands” or “resources” (Demerouti et al., 2001). In this model, job demands are defined as “physical, social, or organizational aspects of the job that require sustained physical or mental effort and are therefore associated with certain physiological and psychological costs” (Demerouti et al., 2001, p. 501). An example of a job demand would be a large workload or pressure to meet many deadlines in a short period of time.
Job demands are typically viewed as stressors in the JD-R model due to their external nature and the perception that they are out of the individual’s control (Demerouti, 2001). The other side of the JDR model is job resources, which are aspects of the job that can facilitate success in the workplace as well as reduce job demands (Demerouti et al., 2001), such as having an understanding and helpful supervisor. The combination of job demands and resources are proposed to explain individual burnout, exhaustion, and disengagement (Bakker & Verbeke, 2004; Demerouti et al., 2001). The current study focuses strictly on the job demands aspect of the JD-R model. It is important to understand what specific work conditions are important for well-being within an industry in order to make more specific recommendations for interventions or work redesign. Thus, the present study will investigate the link between work hours, job demands, and permeable boundaries and psychological well-being for managers within the hospitality industry.

*The Spillover-Crossover Model.* The Spillover-Crossover Model links two processes that connect work and family life – spillover and crossover (Bakker & Demerouti, 2012). Spillover is the transmission of well-being or behaviors within an *individual* from one domain in life to another, such as stress at work impairing an individual’s desire ability to fully engage with family (Bolger et al., 1989). The transmission of emotions from work to home is not deliberate (Westman, 2001) but the result of individuals trying to manage multiple roles (Marks, 1977). When a person has multiple roles to which to attend and not enough time to successfully perform them, emotions can spill over across roles (Hecht, 2001). These types of associations can be positive and facilitating in some situations, or negative in others for individuals (Westman, 2001). The model extends beyond the individual to partners. Crossover is the *dyadic* transmission of states of psychological well-being between two partners in a family (Westman, 2001). For example, a hotel manager is working extremely long hours at the hotel and therefore comes home feeling exhausted and burnt-out. The partner tries to talk the hotel manager and becomes upset
after detecting how tired and stressed the manager is. First, the transition of the long hours to feeling exhausted and burnt-out at home occurs within the individual (spillover), then the partner is exposed to those states of negative well-being and begins to feel elevated levels of exhaustion and burnout themselves (crossover) (Demerouti et al. 2, 2005). This model guides the current study for the investigation of how hotel managers’ work conditions may be linked to partner well-being.

*Work Conditions and Individual Well-Being*

Research has focused mostly on the relationship between work conditions and the individual’s own psychological well-being; much less research focuses on crossover (Bakker et al. 2, 2009). The focus of the following review is on the three job conditions examined in the present study, with particular attention to studies in the hospitality industry on individual experiences of well-being.

*Work hours.* The effect of work hours on individual well-being has been a topic of research for several decades because of the increase in work hours in many sectors, including the human service industries (Jacobs, 2009; Williams, 2008). Employees in the accommodation and food services sector of the hospitality industry worked an average of 41.9 hours on average per week in 2013 (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2014). Increased number of hours worked for individuals has been linked to increased negative well-being outcomes, specifically exhaustion, fatigue, and burnout (Jacobs, 2009). More specifically, in the hospitality industry the center of business is interaction with customers 24/7; work hours are long and erratic compared to a 9 am-5 pm/40 hour week job (Kim et al., 2007; Mulvaney et al., 2007) and may also include holiday and weekend hours (Cleveland et al., 2007). In a qualitative study of thirty three hotel managers, Cleveland and her colleagues (2007) found that inconsistent, long, and unpredictable hours was the most common stressor for hotel managers and was predictive of diminished performance at
work. Additionally, Cleveland and colleagues (2007) found that even though hours can be long, hotel managers were happy when they had flexibility in and control over selecting their hours.

*Job demands.* Aside from long work hours, managers in the hospitality industry face many job demands, including extensive face time with customers and employees (Mulvaney et al., 2007), high workload, and having to make multiple decisions quickly (Zohar, 1994). Job demands have been associated with a number of poor psychological well-being outcomes including exhaustion, burnout, depressive symptoms (Coverman, 1989), anxiety/tension (Kelly et al., 1981), increased perceived strain and distress (Pienaar & Willemse, 2008). Job demands have also been linked to disengagement at work (Demerouti et al., 2001), lower job performance and commitment (Zohar, 2004; Bruning & Snyder, 1982; Frost, 1983), absenteeism (Mulvaney et al., 2, 2007), job dissatisfaction (Zohar, 2004; Ivancevich, 1980; Moorhead, 1981), and decreased levels of satisfaction in the hospitality industry itself (Pienaar & Willemse, 2008). Further, role overload is linked to turnover within the industry (Kim et al., 2007) and therefore should be a concern of hospitality organizations if for no other reason than that the high cost of recruiting and training employees that accompanies high rates of turnover.

*Permeable boundaries.* With the advances and proliferation of technology in the last few decades, the boundary lines between work and family have become more blurred than ever before (Chesley, 2005). Role boundary permeability is the extent in which an individual can physically be in one role’s domain but behaviorally and psychologically active in another role (Ashforth et al., 2000; Chesley, 2005). An example of permeability would be an individual responding to work emails or calls while they are physically at home and technically off the clock (Kossek and Lautsch, 2012). Permeable boundaries have been linked to a number of negative outcomes, such as constant interruption (Bulger et al. 2007; Ventura, 1995), promotion of overwork (Bulger et al. 2007; Galinsky et al., 2001), increased individualism (Kossek and Lautsch, 2012), and distraction and lack of attention (Bulger et al. 2007) which affects quality of work or time at home. Another
important association to focus on is that permeable boundaries have been linked to increased isolation, which could be related to negative affect (Kraut et al., 1998; Sproul, 2000). Limited research suggests that increased technology can promote enough flexibility that it reduces conflict between work and family roles and individual well-being (Hill et al., 2001; Valcour & Hunter, 2005). The combination of lower flexibility and high permeability, however, appears to interfere with personal life outside of work (Bolger et al., 2007). Kossek and Lautsch (2012) suggest that effective boundary management between domains can aid in reduction of negative outcomes (e.g., lack of focus and interruption). Most research shows more negative than positive outcomes associated with permeable boundaries (Chesley, 2005).

Crossover: Managers’ Work Conditions and Partner Psychological Well-Being

In addition to examining the implications of managers’ work hours, job demands, and permeable boundaries for managers themselves, the present study also examines crossover – how managers’ work is associated with their partner’s well-being (Westman, 2001). Less attention has been paid to crossover processes in the past, particularly within the hospitality industry, and this study aims to delve deeper into which job conditions in particular are associated with the psychological well-being of partners.

Work hours. The association between work hours and partner’s psychological well-being is an important aspect to focus on, especially in the hospitality industry due to the long and erratic hours causing additional stress, burnout and exhaustion for an individual (Mulvaney et al., 2007). Stress from long work hours can cross over to the stress and emotions experienced by the partner when they are at home (Westman, 2001). Long work hours is the largest predictor of stress for hotel managers (Cleveland et al., 2007), and in crossover research individual stress is associated with many negative well-being outcomes for partners, including increased distress, dissatisfaction, and inability to cope (Westman, 2001).
Job demands. In the hospitality industry, management positions have demands that are not characteristic of other positions in the American workforce, including an emphasis on face time and 24/7 customer service (Mulvaney et al., 2007). Face time, high workload, and emotional labor due to demanding customers are linked to negative overall well-being for partners and increased stress, work-family conflict, and marital dissatisfaction (Bakker et al., 2009; Cleveland et al., 2007; Westman, 2001).

Permeable boundaries. Permeable boundaries play a large role in employees not being able to adapt accordingly to different role domains (Cleveland et al., 2007) because individuals are not devoting full attention to the task or domain at hand (Bulger et al, 2007; Ashforth et al., 2000). Increased email and computer use, phone time, telecommuting, and not being able to mentally detach from work can be associated with an increased number of marital disagreements as well as problems with children (Cleveland et al., 2007) The stress from lack of segmentation between roles could cross over to the partner’s experience of well-being (e.g., increased distress; (Cleveland et al., 2007; Chesley, 2005)). If individuals feel that they are unable to separate themselves from their work in can become overwhelming and stressful to the individual, which in turn can upset the partner. At this time there are no studies that examine the direct crossover association in regard to permeable boundaries, and my study aims to fill this gap.

Role of Gender

This study aims to examine how the associations between job conditions and individual and partner well-being differ by gender. Gender is an important aspect to focus on as well when examining individual job conditions on well-being and crossover because men and women have different role expectations. Still today many people hold the view that men are primarily responsible for breadwinning whereas women are responsible for the home. In the hospitality and leisure industry there are more women (6.918 million) than men (6.637 million) (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2014). The gender breakdown is important to focus on because it is not the
standard organizational demographic breakdown compared to other industries. More importantly, in these occupations there is a possibility that conditions may be harder for one group to deal with than the other.

There are mixed findings regarding whether men or women experience more work-related stress and poorer well-being (Hecht, 2001; Noor, 2004; Westman, 2001; Roxburgh, 1996). Men and women may experience job conditions differently; therefore the associations between demands and well-being may differ by gender. When there are significant gender differences, they tend to show that, compared to men, women are more susceptible to job stressors in general which can affect their overall well-being and distress (Roxburgh, 1996). Limited research has been conducted that explores gender differences in individual experiences of permeable boundaries linked to individual well-being outcomes, and this study aims to fill that gap.

Research conducted in relation to gender differences in crossover research has also been inconsistent and mixed (Neff et al., 2013, Westman, 2001; Barnett et al., 1995; Hammer et al., 1997; Westman & Etzion, 1995; Westman & Vinokur, 1998). Studies of crossover have primarily has focused on men in the workforce and how their job demands affect their female partners (Duxbury & Higgins, 1991; Westman, 2001). Research suggests that women are more susceptible to their partners’ stress than vice versa (Westman, 2001). Crossover research in relation to permeable boundaries has found no gender differences and partner well-being outcomes (Grandley et al., 2005; Eagle et al., 1997).

The Current Study

The current study will build on extant research to examine how three salient job conditions in today’s U.S. economy work hours, job demands, and permeable boundaries --are related to the psychological well-being of hotel managers and their partners. By examining specific job conditions that could lead to negative psychological well-being, interventions can be designed to specifically mitigate the detrimental effects of these work conditions. This study will
also focus on the importance of gender, and how certain job demands can affect men and women differently.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

I. To what extent are hotel managers’ work conditions -- work hours, job demands, and permeable boundaries -- related to their own psychological well-being (i.e., positive and negative affect, role overload)?
   • H1: Longer work hours, greater job demands, and more permeable boundaries will be related to lower positive affect and higher negative affect and role overload.

II. To what extent do managers’ job conditions cross over to their partner’s well-being?
   • H2: Longer work hours, greater job demands, and more permeable boundaries will be related to lower positive affect and higher negative affect and role overload for the partner.

III. To what extent does the gender of the hotel manager moderate the association between the managers’ job conditions and their psychological well-being?
   • H3: The association between job conditions and psychological well-being will be weak for male managers but there will be a significantly stronger association for female managers.

IV. To what extent does the gender of the hotel manager’s partner moderate the crossover between the managers’ job conditions and their partner’s psychological well-being?
   • H4: When the male hotel managers’ have highly demanding work conditions, female partners will report less positive psychological well-being. This association will be weaker or not apparent for female hotel managers’ and their male partners.
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Method

Participants and Procedure:

The data collected and used for this study was part of the Hotel Work and Well-Being Project that aimed to investigate ways that hotel companies could improve workplace practices to increase employee and family well-being. The study collected from hotel executives, general managers, unit managers, and hourly hotel workers across the United States. Hotels were recruited in geographic clusters in locations in New York, Washington D.C., Maryland, Pennsylvania, California, Colorado, Missouri, Illinois, Georgia, Florida, and Kansas. In each location efforts were made to recruit participants from hotels in downtown areas, suburbs, airport locales, and, if relevant, resorts (Lawson et al., 2013).

For the current study, hotel managers were asked to complete telephone surveys conducted by survey research personnel. The initial sample for the Hotel Work and Well-Being Project included 586 hotel managers (298 males and 288 females) (Lawson et al., 2013). For the present study the sample was narrowed down to a sample of 189 managers who were married or cohabiting and whose partner also participated in a telephone interview (111 female managers and 79 male managers). Those hotel managers who reported being single were excluded from the sample. The hotel managers and partners received an incentive of $20 for participating in the telephone survey. On average, hotel managers and their partners were approximately 37 years old (see Table 1). The majority of hotel managers was Caucasian (71.43%) and had obtained a college degree or more (62.97%). Similarly, the majority of partners was also Caucasian (67.02%) with a college degree or higher (61.39%). Approximately 81 percent of the partners were employed (Lawson et al., 2013).

Measures
Hotel Manager Job Conditions

Work hours were assessed with a one-item question: “How many hours per week do you typically spend working (including over-time and hours you spend on work-related matters at home)?"

Job demands were measured by the job demands subscale by Karasek (1979), a 7-item subscale measuring time pressure and overload at work. An example item is, “There is excessive work in your job.” Participants used a 4-point scale (1 = Strongly disagree, 4 = Strongly agree) to respond. Responses were averaged so that higher numbers represented higher job demands. Cronbach’s alpha was $\alpha = .79$.

Permeable boundaries were measured by four items developed during a pilot study of work and family experiences of hotel workers to assess managers’ work availability even when at home (Ashforth, 2000). Responses to items, such as “You are never completely ‘off’ work” ranged on a 5-point scale (1 = Strongly disagree, 5= Strongly agree). Higher mean scores indicate that work permeated life off the job frequently. The reliability of the scale was high ($\alpha = .82$).

Hotel Manager and Partner Well-being

The well-being of the hotel managers and partners was assessed using the same scales.

Positive and negative affect were assessed by the Positive and Negative Affect Scales (PANAS) developed by Watson, Clark, and Tellegen (1988). Positive affect, or the extent to which an individual feels alert, active, or enthusiastic, was assessed with a 10-item scale about feelings in the past two weeks. The negative affect scale assessed how often ten aversive emotions (e.g., distressed, irritable, and disinterested) occurred in the past two weeks. Responses were answered on a 5-point scale (0 = Very Little or None of the Time, 4= Extremely). Scores were then summed separately for the positive and negative affects scales so that higher scores
represented more of the particular type of affect. The reliability for both scales in both managers and partners was high (range from .83 - .88).

Role overload was measured using a 13-item scale created by Reilly (1982). Responses to items such as “You have to do things that you don’t really have the time and energy for” were rated on a 5-point scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree). The mean was calculated so that higher scores mean higher role overload. The reliability of the scale was high for the hotel managers ($\alpha = .94$) and partners ($\alpha = .91$).

Background Characteristics

Models testing associations between work conditions and individual well-being included gender of the hotel manager (0 = female, 1 = male), whether their partner was employed (0 = unemployed, 1 = employed), and managers’ age in years. Crossover models included partner gender (0 = female, 1 = male), whether partner was employed, and partner’s age in years.
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Results

*Descriptive Analysis Results*

Table 2 shows the means, standard deviations, and bivariate correlations among the key study variables and demographic variables. The results of the bivariate correlations showed that there were significant associations between some of the key study variables and demographic variables. Table 2 shows that manager age was significantly correlated with all three indicators of managers’ psychological well-being (positive affect, negative affect, role overload), as well as partner positive affect. As hotel managers get older they report experiencing more positive affect, lower negative affect, and less role overload, and their partners’ reports of have higher positive affect. Household income and positive affect were significantly correlated: As the marital dyad’s combined income is larger, the manager reports experiencing more positive affect Managers who have been in the hotel industry longer reported experiencing increased positive affect. Years married or with partner and positive affect were significantly correlated. The longer the dyad had been together, the higher positive affect managers reported. Manager income was significantly correlated with partner positive affect, and also with spousal role overload: When the partner earned a higher salary they reported more positive affect as well as an increased level of role overload. Finally, partner age was correlated with manager role overload, and partners’ own positive affect: When partners were older they reported higher positive affect and the managers reported higher levels of role overload. Managers’ work hours, job demands, and permeable boundaries were also significantly correlated with well-being for the hotel manager. Managers’ work hours were also correlated with partner reports of well-being. Work hours were positively associated with partners feeling of role overload. When the manager worked more hours per week they reported an increased level of role overload.
Substantive Analysis Results

Job Conditions and Individual Well-Being. To test the first set of hypotheses, I ran three separate OLS regression models predicting each psychological well-being indicator (i.e., positive affect, negative affect, and role overload) from the three work conditions (work hours, job demands, permeable boundaries). Each model included the same covariates (i.e., hotel manager age, hotel manager gender, and spousal employment); the covariates were selected as the control variables because they were significantly associated with the outcome variables in the bivariate correlations. The only covariate that was significantly associated with the outcome variables was hotel manager age. All three of the specified work condition variables were associated with at least one of the outcome variables.

Positive affect. Hotel managers’ work hours were positively associated with their positive affect ($\beta = .19$, $p < .05$): When hotel managers worked more hours, they felt more positive affect (see Table 3). On the other hand, there was a negative association between permeable boundaries and positive affect ($\beta = -.20$, $p < .05$): The more managers perceived there were permeable boundaries between work and family, the lower their positive affect. Job demands were not significantly associated with managers’ positive affect.

Negative affect. There was a significant positive relationship between hotel managers’ job demands and their reported negative affect ($\beta = .24$, $p < .01$). As hotel managers perceived more job demands they experienced more negative affect. Work hours and permeable boundaries were not significantly associated with manager’s negative affect.

Role overload. There was a significant positive relationship between hotel managers’ job demands and their reported feelings of role overload: As hotel managers’ job demands increased, their feelings of role overload also increased ($\beta = .68$, $p < .01$). There was also a significant positive association between hotel managers’ permeable boundaries and reported feelings of role overload: As hotel managers experienced more permeable boundaries, they experienced increased
feelings of role overload ($\beta = .23, p < .01$). There were no significant findings with regard to work hours and hotel managers’ feelings of role overload.

**Crossover to Partner Well-Being**

To test the second set of hypotheses, I ran three separate regression models predicting each well-being indicator for partners’ psychological well-being (i.e., spousal positive affect, negative affect, and role overload). Each model included the same covariates (i.e., partner age, partner gender, and employment) and the three work conditions (hours worked, job demands, and permeable boundaries). For all three crossover models, there were no significant findings for work hours, job demands, or permeable boundaries (see Table 4).

**Gender as a Moderator**

Regression was used to analyze gender as for a moderator in the association between job conditions and individual and partner well-being. There was only one significant interaction with gender; the association between permeable boundaries and negative affect was moderated by gender ($t (9) = 4.28, p < .0001$). Follow-up simple slopes tests revealed that for women, when their husbands experienced greater permeable boundaries due to their hotel work, they had more negative affect ($t (9) = 3.472, p < .001$); however, there was no association for men ($t (9) = -0.926, ns$). This interaction is depicted in Figure 1.

When examining the crossover relationship between work conditions and partner well-being, there was no significant interaction by gender.
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Discussion

Employees are more stressed than ever and industrial psychologists need to understand how work conditions have implications for individual well-being as well as ripple effects beyond the workplace (Matos & Galinsky, 2012). There are over 13 million employees in the hospitality industry (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2014) which makes it a very important industry to study. Industrial psychologists and social scientists that investigate the hospitality industry have aimed to identify how hotel companies can reduce or buffer the demanding workplace conditions to protect employees and their family’s health and well-being.

Two models framed the current study -- the JD-R model and the Spillover-Crossover model. Many of the study’s hypotheses were supported by the current analysis as well as the models behind them, at least for hotel managers themselves. The results of the present analyses indicate that for the hotel manager all three work conditions -- long work hours, job demands, and feelings of permeable boundaries-- were linked to their own psychological well-being. As hypothesized, the study found that hotel managers who reported high job demands also felt more negative affect and role overload. Also as predicted, as the hotel managers experienced more permeable boundaries they felt less positive affect and increased feelings of role overload. These findings are consistent with past research from the JD-R model that has indicated there are links between increased job demands and negative well-being outcomes for individuals (Demerouti, 2001).

One main finding that contradicted the study’s hypothesis was that hotel managers who worked more hours reported increased feelings of positive affect in their overall well-being. Some research that supports this finding is that when individuals go into the hospitality industry they have a general understanding of the long hours expected of them, therefore perhaps their
perception of long work hours is understood and embraced (Cleveland et al., 2007). Another possible explanation with the long and irregular hours, the hotel managers also get more flexibility over their hours (Cleveland et al., 2007). A sense of control of work hours can contribute to their increased feelings of positive affect. Another explanation to this finding could be that the hotel manager may find their job rewarding. Even though past research supports the idea that long work hours are often linked to negative well-being for individuals, it can create more opportunities for positive well-being. People that view their work favorably may give their work their all, resulting in more time spent at work, reinforcing their experienced positive affect.

The JD-R model supports this finding that when individuals feel increased autonomy, flexibility, and control in the workplace it enhances their performance and overall well-being (Bakker et al., 2005). Future research can build on this idea that more time in a favorable position could ultimately be linked to increased experiences of positive affect for employees.

An additional finding in this study was the moderating effect of gender on the relationship between the hotel manager’s report of permeable boundaries and its association with negative affect. In the initial analysis, there were no significant associations between permeable boundaries and individual reports of negative affect for the hotel manager. However, the interaction term with gender indicated that for females hotel managers, the more permeable boundaries experienced was associated with increased feelings of negative affect. For men there was no significant interaction. One possible explanation of this interaction is that women may feel guided by more traditional roles related to work and family. They could experience an increased sense of dissonance because they want to keep the two domains separate and fulfill the duties that they are engaging in at the moment without distractions and interruptions. Even though findings are mixed, some studies that examine gender differences have shown that women experience more inter-role conflict (Grandley et al., 2005; Eagle et al., 1997), and are more susceptible to stress than men (Roxburgh, 1996). When roles are competing for time and
attention, women may feel more stress, anxiety, and ultimately negative affect. According to the boundary theory the only way to lessen the effects of increased permeability are flexibility and control (Bulger et al., 2007; Kossek & Lautsch, 2012). Women may feel that they lack control over their hours or job demands, therefore linking to more negative affect (Pugliesi, 1999). Increasing schedule control that allows employees to manage and separate both roles may be beneficial to employee (especially women’s) well-being and, in turn, their job performance.

There were no significant associations between hotel managers’ work conditions and their partner’s reports of overall well-being. We were hoping to build upon the mixed findings that past research has found when it comes to linking one partners’ work conditions to the other partner’s reports of well-being. It may be important to examine how the couples interact to determine how hotel managers’ stress may cross over. Also, because managers are working long hours, there may be little opportunity for crossover. Future studies should explore what conditions can be stressful and are more likely to cross over to partners and under what conditions crossover is more likely to occur.

The strengths of this study include that it focused on a sample of hotel managers across the US as well as their partners. The study did not rely on a single source of reports. Another strength was that this study replicated expanded upon past research examining hotel managers’ work conditions for individual well-being (Lawson et al., 2013), and analyzing crossover effects. Another strength is the industry-specific analysis, which can provide hotel employers information relevant to their industry rather than trying to use results generalized across occupations.

The current study has its limitations. The first limitation is that the study design is cross-sectional and therefore causal relationships between job conditions and individual and partner well-being cannot be tested. Future research should conduct longitudinal investigations linking hotel managers’ job conditions and individual and partner well-being to try to determine causal
ordering. Alternatively, one could run an experiment with random assignment to intervention conditions. For example, an intervention could involve trying to decrease work.

The most important finding regarding this study is that in order to protect and foster the well-being of hotel managers, hotel management and human resources should focus on strenuous job conditions, such as long work hours, job demands, and permeable boundaries. Being aware of the job conditions and the negative implications they can have on well-being, hotel management can tailor workplace practices that promote flexibility and control that can aid in promoting positive feelings of well-being while simultaneously reducing negative well-being (Cleveland et al., 2007). The hospitality industry could lose talent if they do not acknowledge the associations between the grueling job conditions and their relation to individual well-being. Also, if the hotel industry wants to continue to recruit and retain women they should pay attention to permeability between work and family roles because these findings suggest it is particularly salient this group of hotel managers. Hotel industries can use these findings to combat and lessen the stressful and demanding work conditions indicated in this study and apply them to their workplace practices to promote individual well-being outcomes for their employees.


APPENDIX A

Table 1

Background characteristics of hotel managers and their partners (N = 189)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hotel Managers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Partners</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M / %</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Min - Max</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M / %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>37.19</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>22 - 61</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>37.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>41.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>189</td>
<td>58.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>71.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>189</td>
<td>67.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College education or more</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>62.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>189</td>
<td>61.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual gross income</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>65,536</td>
<td>27,330</td>
<td>24,000 – 200,000</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>42,526.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>189</td>
<td>80.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel industry tenure (yrs)</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>12.99</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>0.50 – 35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>0.08 – 42.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have children</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>58.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>189</td>
<td>56.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX B

**Table 2**

*Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations among Key Study Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hotel Manager</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Age (years)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Female</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work hours</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Job demands</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.24**</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Perm. boundaries</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Positive affect</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Negative affect</td>
<td>-0.14*</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.15*</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Role overload</td>
<td>-0.15*</td>
<td>-0.16*</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.79**</td>
<td>0.49**</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partner</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Age (years)</td>
<td>0.82**</td>
<td>-0.17*</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.14*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Female</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-1.00**</td>
<td>-0.19**</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>-0.19**</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Employed</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.19**</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Positive affect</td>
<td>0.18*</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.24**</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Negative affect</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.16*</td>
<td>-0.20**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Role overload</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
<td>37.19</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>56.70</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>26.09</td>
<td>8.01</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>37.17</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>27.52</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SD</strong></td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>7.84</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>α</strong></td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01.*
Table 3

Regression Analysis Linking Job Demands with Individual Well-Being (N = 182)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Manager Positive Affect</th>
<th>Manager Negative Affect</th>
<th>Manager Role Overload</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse employed</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work hours/week</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job demands</td>
<td>-0.87</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permeable boundaries</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>-0.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*p < .05. **p < .01.

Note: The sample size for the role overload model is 184.
## APPENDIX D

### Table 4

*Regression Analysis Linking Job Demands with Partner Well-Being (N = 183)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Partner Positive Affect</th>
<th>Partner Negative Affect</th>
<th>Partner Role Overload</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner employed</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work hours/week</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job demands</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permeable boundaries</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* The sample size for the partner positive affect model is 184.

*p < .05. **p < .01.*
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