Work–family conflict/family–work conflict, job stress, burnout and intention to leave in the hotel industry in Quebec (Canada): moderating role of need for family friendly practices as “resource passageways”

Sari Mansour & Diane-Gabrielle Tremblay

To cite this article: Sari Mansour & Diane-Gabrielle Tremblay (2016): Work–family conflict/family–work conflict, job stress, burnout and intention to leave in the hotel industry in Quebec (Canada): moderating role of need for family friendly practices as “resource passageways”, The International Journal of Human Resource Management, DOI: 10.1080/09585192.2016.1239216

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2016.1239216

Published online: 28 Oct 2016.

Submit your article to this journal

Article views: 278

View related articles

View Crossmark data
Work–family conflict/family–work conflict, job stress, burnout and intention to leave in the hotel industry in Quebec (Canada): moderating role of need for family friendly practices as “resource passageways”

Sari Mansour\textsuperscript{a,c} and Diane-Gabrielle Tremblay\textsuperscript{b,c}

\textsuperscript{a}TÉLUQ-Université du Québec, Montréal, Canada; \textsuperscript{b}Business School, TÉLUQ-Université du Québec, Montreal, Canada; \textsuperscript{c}CURA (Community-University Research Alliance) on Work-life Articulation over the Lifecourse, Montreal, QC, Canada

\textbf{ABSTRACT}
This study examines how the need for family friendly practices contribute in increasing the effects of work–family conflict (WFC) and family–work conflict (FWC) on job stress, burnout, and intention to leave in the hotel industry in Quebec (258 staff). The essential results indicate that the perception of a need for childcare moderates the relationship between FWC, job stress, and burnout. Also, employees wanting to have a compressed workweek and part time measures are exposed to more stress related to WFC/FWC. Finally, the four measures can constitute resources passageways in order to reduce the work-family interference, job stress, burnout and therefore the intention to leave. Theoretically, he results extend this line of theorizing by highlighting the importance of subjective needs for family friendly policies, as ‘resource caravan passageways’ in the work–family interface and job outcome processes. The perception of a desire or need for these measures offers a new understanding of these practices. Practically, identifying who is more sensitive to family friendly measures would enable organizations or employers to allocate supportive resources more adequately by targeting those employees who are most in need of such practices.

\textbf{Introduction}

The hotel industry is characterized by a high level of stress because of difficult working conditions (Kim, Shin, & Umbreit, 2007; Sharma, Verma, Verma, & Malhotra, 2010), and stress at work is a major issue in the hospitality industry (Hsieh & Eggers, 2011). Indeed, long and irregular working hours, low pay, excessive workload (Karatepe, 2008; Karatepe & Aleshinloye, 2009; Mansour, 2012), and the difficulty in reconciling work and family life (Namasivayam & Zhao, 2007;
Yavas, Babakus, & Karatepe, 2008) are some illustrations of stressful working conditions. In Québec (as in other Canadian provinces), the hospitality industry is subject to provincial minimum labor laws (minimum 2 weeks holidays, normal workweek and overtime pay over 40 h, etc.), and if the workers are unionized they may have slightly better conditions (D’amours & Bilodeau, 2015), but it is a sector with generally difficult conditions. Industrial relations in Canada are similar to the US, in the sense that they are based on the establishment’s collective agreement (if one exists) and so there is a certain diversity of conditions (D’amours & Bilodeau, 2015); unionization is ensured if a majority of workers have voted for one union (50% + 1), but it is not very common in hotels, which explains the difficult working conditions in most hotels.

Recently, Kim (2008) has revealed the importance of stress in the hospitality industry by showing that it produces burnout (O’Neill & Davis, 2011), and leads employees to consider leaving their work (Sharma et al., 2010; Tsaur & Tang, 2012), which makes the subject all the more important to firms in the industry. In Québec as elsewhere, the issue of stress in relation to work–family conflict (WFC) is all the more important since the hospitality industry is 59% female. Also, the hospitality industry is important for many countries, including Canada, where it counts 103,400 workers in 2269 establishments, Québec counting 37,561 workers (in 2012), for 11% of the tourism industry. As elsewhere, it is a growing industry, as jobs have increased 16% in Québec from 2004 to 2014, while hours of work increased 17% over the same period, to 62 million hours. In Canada, the tourism, hospitality, and restaurant sector is the second largest after retail trade, with 1.66 million workers and for Québec, it is the fifth export sector with 10.6 billion $ in total income (CQRHT, 2015).

Researchers have been increasingly interested in work–family conflict (WFC) over the past several decades (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006), largely because WFC negatively influences the well-being of individuals and organizations. Indeed, earlier studies show that WFC affects organizational commitment, stress at work, service recovery performance, turnover intention, job satisfaction, and exhaustion (Armour, 2002; Karatepe, 2010; Karatepe & Baddar, 2006; Karatepe & Sokmen, 2006; Namasivayam & Mount, 2004; Namasivayam & Zhao, 2007). Furthermore, the increase in research is ‘due in large part to the increasing representation of dual-earner partners and single parents in the workforce’ (Greenhaus & Allen, 2011, p. 65). The interest in the WFC area continues to increase (Greenhaus & Allen, 2011) and extends more and more to the analysis of specific professions or sectors.

To decrease the incidence of these harmful outcomes and to support employees in fulfilling their professional and family roles, organizations need to assume their social responsibilities. Many authors suggest they should opt for family friendly practices, which some may also refer to as ‘best practices’. These practices include ‘flexible scheduling, compressed work weeks, family leave (e.g. marriage leave and compassionate leave), job sharing, employee assistance programs, and days off’
While scholars are increasingly interested in work and family policies, their impact on job stress is unclear (Chiang et al., 2010), and surprisingly few studies have analyzed the role of these policies in decreasing WFC and in supporting balance between work and family (Frone, 2003). It is thus important to pursue research on family friendly programs to understand their impact, and eventually increase their implementation in the workplace (Bilal, Zia-ur-Rehman, & Raza, 2010). Similarly, the role of organizational initiatives in promoting balance between work and family requires future research (Greenhaus & Allen, 2011).

**Conceptual clarification**

**WFC and family–work conflict (FWC)**

In this research, family responsibilities refer to family ties that go beyond children, to include also individuals or couples who have responsibilities for their own aging or elderly parents or their spouse, or even siblings or relatives. In most research today, both descendants and ascendants are considered to be part of the family responsibilities involved when one speaks of WFC or FWC.

In this study, all working employees were included; this study did not exclude singles from the analysis, as has been the case in most studies in this field (see Goh, Ilies, & Wilson, 2015). The decision to include employees living in couples with or without children as well as singles is justified by the fact that:

‘even single, childless and widowed employees often have family and social commitments to their parents, siblings or relatives. These individuals may even have greater expectations and demands placed on them because they do not have a ‘formal family unit with kin’. (Fiksenbaum, 2014, p. 659)

Work/family conflict is ‘a form of inter-role conflict in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect’ (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985, p. 76). WFC is conceptualized from two perspectives: work-to family, where demands in the work sphere affect performance in the family sphere, and family-to-work, where family difficulties affect performance in the work sphere (Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992; Netemeyer, Boles, & McMurrian, 1996).

Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) indicate that the conflict between work and non-work roles appears when the roles are unbalanced at work and in life. These authors have conceptualized WFC as being based on three sources of conflict, namely, time-based, strain-based, and behavior-based conflicts. A time-based conflict happens when ‘time devoted to one role makes it difficult to fulfill requirements of another role’. Strain-based conflict is observed when ‘strain from one role makes it difficult to fulfill requirements of another role’. Finally, behavior-based conflict happens when specific ‘behaviors required in one role make it difficult to fulfill requirements of another role’ (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985, p. 78). Netemeyer
et al. (1996) have distinguished WFC and FWC. WFC refers to ‘a form of interrole conflict in which the general demands of, time devoted to, and strain created by the job interfere with performing family-related responsibilities’ (Netemeyer et al., 1996, p. 401). FWC refers to ‘a form of interrole conflict in which the general demands of, time devoted to, and strain created by the family interfere with performing work-related responsibilities’ (Netemeyer et al., 1996, p. 401). In this study, the definition of these authors for WFC and FWC was retained.

**Job stress**

There are two basic approaches of stress at work. The transactional approach emphasizes the interaction between the individual and the work environment in the process of stress development. This approach includes Lazarus and Folkman’s model (1984) and Siegrist’s model (1996). The interactionist approach considers stress as the result of an interaction or a dynamic relationship between individuals and their environment (Karasek, 1979). Karasek’s model (1979) and the person-environment fit model of French, Caplan, and Harrison (1982) are used in this approach.

Another approach has focused on the factors that enable individuals to deal with the demands of work situations: the theory of conservation of resources (COR) of Hobfoll (1989) and the model of job demands-resources (Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, & Schaufeli, 2001). Hobfoll defines psychological stress as ‘a reaction to the environment that leads to (a) the threat of loss of resources, (b) the net loss of resources, or (c) a lack of resource gain following a significant investment of resources’ (Hobfoll, 1989, p. 516).

Moreover, recently, Hobfoll (2011, 2012) proposed an extension of his theory by putting forward the concept of ‘resource caravan passageways’, which refers to the ‘the environmental conditions that support, foster, enrich, and protect the resources of individuals, sections or segments of workers, and organizations in total, or that detract, undermine, obstruct, or impoverish people’s or group’s resource reservoirs’ (Hobfoll, 2011, p. 29). For example, the laws on the paternity or maternity leave are the main channels of ‘resources passageways’ to employees to have more resources such as spend time with the child. Thus, it is not always a choice of individuals to have resources or not, but rather it depends on the resource passageways available in their environment (Doane, Schumm, & Hobfoll, 2012).

**Burnout**

Burnout is the result of a long experience of stress or permanent organizational factors that lead to repetitive stress and deplete the resources of individuals (Maslach & Schaufeli, 1993; Schaufeli, Maslach, & Marek, 1993; Truchot, 2004). It was first recognized among women and men working in the care professions and is now linked to many jobs and professions (Burke, Koyuncu, & Fiksenbaum,
For Halbesleben (2008), burnout refers to ‘a psychological weakness caused by a state of chronic and uncontrolled stress resulting in fatigue and frustration, especially among employees’. According to Maslach and his colleagues (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996; Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001), burnout is a process in which the individual first suffers from erosion of emotional resources that gradually lead to disengagement from the tasks assigned. It thus introduces a phase of cynic depersonalization, which leads to an absence of fulfillment at work (Lee & Ashforth, 1996; Maslach & Jackson, 1981). The MBI (Maslach Burnout Inventory) scale consists of three dimensions: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment. Emotional exhaustion refers to a weakening of physical, psychological, and emotional resources of individuals in dealing with work demands that exceed their adaptive capacity to work (Halbesleben & Bowler, 2007; Lee & Ashforth, 1996). Depersonalization, also called cynicism or disengagement, is the response to emotional exhaustion (Halbesleben & Buckley, 2004). Personal accomplishment refers to individuals’ fruitful achievement, skills, and sufficiency at work (Maslach & Jackson, 1986). This study takes into account only the two first dimensions. The personal accomplishment dimension of MBI was also deleted in other research as its items do not have a good reliability and the relations between this factor and others are fragile and unbalanced (Babakus, Yavas, & Ashill, 2009; Maslach & Leiter 2008).

Intention to leave

Mobley (1982, p. 68) defines turnover as ‘the cessation of membership in an organization by an individual who received monetary compensation from the organization’. Turnover intention can be defined as the employee’s intention to quit his or her current job. High employee turnover has considerable effects on employees’ performance in the hospitality sector (Aksu, 2004), and turnover among managers is even more preoccupying (Lee & Shin, 2005). Previous research has shown that intention to leave can lead to workers’ effective departure from the firm (Griffeth et al., 2000; Porter & Steers, 1973). It can be modeled according to the Theory of Reasoned Action (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975), which postulates that ‘some action on the part of the employee is likely to follow self-expressed intention’ (Jourdain & Chênevert, 2010, p. 710). Moreover, intention to leave a job is an emotional reaction toward work (Price & Mueller, 1981). Intention to leave is defined as an employee’s plan for intention to quit the present job and look forward to finding another job in the near future (Purani & Sahadev, 2007).

Family friendly practices

Family friendly practices refer to flexible work arrangements, dependent care assistance and referral services, family leaves, and other resources, such as employee assistance programs (Frone, 2003). Flexible work arrangements refer
to the possibility of changing one’s working hours from week to week, or day to day, usually within a period of time where workers have to be present, for example, flexibility to come to work between 7 and 10 am and leave between 4 and 7 pm; a compressed work week refers to the usual number of hours per week (35 or 40 usually) which are done in a shorter week, usually 4 days instead of 5 (Tremblay, 2012a). As for referral services, this is when an employer presents a reference list of services for dependent care and other family needs (without paying for them); family leaves can be additional days off for family reasons, and these can be paid or unpaid; finally, employee assistance programs are support programs, often access to a certain number of hours of lawyers’, accountants’ or psychological services (Tremblay, 2012a, 2012b). Childcare is also considered an important family friendly practice. In Québec, there is an important public network of childcare, subsidized by the state, so firms do not always need to offer this. However in sectors that work 24 h a day, this is a challenge as childcare is usually offered from 7 am to 6 pm (Tremblay, 2012a), so not available for many workers in hotels who work on evenings or during the night.

**The present study**

This research contributes to the literature by addressing a number of limitations identified within previous studies. Firstly, few studies have examined family friendly policies using both directions of the conflict, that is, WFC and FWC, within the same study. This is very important especially because WFC, which refers to the conflict and spillover of work toward family, and FWC, which is related to the spillover from family to work, are two distinct concepts, the direction of the effect being the opposite. This is also important because researchers sometimes use the term WFC for different constructs such as non-directional conflict, work–family balance, and work–family interference (Allen et al., 2013). This is central since some family friendly practices may be more useful than others in terms of decreasing or averting WFC and/or FWC, and in turn, job stress, burnout, and intention to leave. This study thus contributes to the knowledge in this field.

Secondly, as noted by Shockley and Allen (2007), research has explored the impacts of flexible work arrangements on WFC, but in their meta-analysis, Allen et al. (2013, p. 346) indicate that ‘despite the recent attention and emphasis given to flexible work arrangements, empirical studies examining their relationship with WFC have produced inconsistent results. According to Shockley and Allen (2007), more research is needed on the impact of flexible work arrangements on outcomes, such as individual well-being.

While Byron (2005), in her meta-analysis, presents an effect size of –.30 between flexibility and WFC and of –.17 for FWC, Mesmer-Magnus and Viswesvaran (2006) state non-significant effect sizes of –.01 with WFC and .04 with FWC. These differences and inconsistencies in results ‘suggest a great deal of variation in the relationship between flexible work arrangements and WFC, bringing into
question the effectiveness of family–work arrangements in terms of alleviating conflicts between work and family’ (Allen et al., 2013, p. 347). Thus, more research on the relationship between these practices and WFC and FWC is needed for a better understanding of the relations (Allen et al., 2013). This research fills this gap.

Thirdly, there is little evidence on the effect of flexible working hours on work pressure (Russell, O’Connell, & McGinnity, 2009). As there is even less evidence regarding the effects of other practices (childcare, information services, voluntary compressed workweek, part-time work) on job stress and burnout; this study fills this gap. Furthermore, the majority of studies on family friendly practices have studied their direct effects on WFC or FWC, stress, burnout, and intention to leave. A major contribution of this study is that it adopts a new approach by studying the moderating role of the perceived need for these practices on the links between, on the one hand, the WFC/FWC, job stress and burnout, and on the other hand, between job stress, burnout and intention to leave.

Fourthly, although it presents many constraints in work, the hospitality industry has not been studied much. Indeed, most research has concentrated on top management and professional groups, while more vulnerable workers and industries have not been studied much and these are the ones who suffer most from WFC or FWC.

Fifthly, previous research has examined the use or access to family friendly policies and has noted their effects in decreasing WFC. However, this study is based on the perception of workers concerning their need for these practices in the organization, as this can have an impact on their sense of WFC or FWC. From the point of view of employees, this could help us understand the necessity and usefulness of the implementation of certain measures in the organization and help to clarify what practices are more necessary and beneficial than others. For example, on-site childcare is more useful for couples with children, daycare for the elderly more useful for those who have aging parents, etc. Halpern (2005) has previously examined the effect of the need for flexible working time policies and the number of these policies which, in turn, affect job stress; however, in her study, she asked for the number of children <18 years old, age of youngest and need to care for an older adult (>65 years old) to determine the need for measures in the workplace. She showed that having children under 18 or caring for seniors over 65 does not per se determine the need for a particular measure. In our opinion, it is the judgment of an employee that determines the need, depending on his or her particular situation. Thus, this research gave employees the opportunity to express directly their need for a particular measure.

**Theoretical framework**

Several theoretical frameworks have dealt with WFC; these include role theory, spillover, and compensation or segmentation theories. For role theory (Kahn et al., 1964), the multiple roles to which the individual is exposed lead to role stress that
in turn leads to strain. Spillover theory (Staines, 1980) postulates that attitudes and behaviors can be transferred from working life to family life (such as if employees feel satisfied with their work, they will also be satisfied with their lives outside of work) and vice versa. In contrast to spillover theory, the compensation model (Staines, 1980) posits that the relationship between work and family is inverse and negative and that employees, who are unsatisfied at work, can possibly devote more time and energy to their families to offset the lack of benefits in their jobs. This situation leads to an imbalance between the two domains. The segmentation model is based on the assumption that the areas of work and family are not related because people are able to detach their roles (Lambert, 1990). More recently, Grandey and Cropanzano (1999) suggested that Hobfoll’s COR theory might provide a fruitful theoretical framework for understanding the conflict between work and family. Hobfoll’s (1989) COR theory provides a global theory to understand the nature of stress at the individual level, in the professional as well as in the non-professional context. Hobfoll proposes a motivational model to explain behavior in the context of stressors or in the absence of stressors. Based on the idea that individuals try to build and protect their resources, Hobfoll emphasizes the role of resources to cope with stressful events. Hobfoll (1998, p. 81) explains the spiral of loss of resources stating that ‘those who lack resources are not only vulnerable to the loss of resources, but the initial loss results in future losses’. He also states that ‘those with a lot of resources are more likely to win new resources and initial gains lead to future gains’ (Hobfoll, 1998, p. 82), in what he calls the spiral of gain of resources. Most stress theories only look at one role at a time (e.g. Karasek, 1979), but Hobfoll considers simultaneously the professional and private domains (Grandey & Cropanzano, 1999; Halbesleben et al., 2009). The Job Demands-Resource model (Demerouti et al., 2001) highlights that high job demands deplete employees’ resources and therefore lead to health problems. In contrast, high job resources increase employees’ engagement and extra-role performance. While this model is similar to the COR theory, it does not consider family related resources and demands (Barnett et al., 2012). Thus, the COR theory has been chosen to explain work and family roles.

According to the COR theory, the interface between work and family can cause either a loss of family resources related to a low emotional support of family, leading to a WFC, or a resource gain due to a strong emotional support from the family, resulting in an enrichment of roles. The family can thus constitute a resource (increase of the ‘resource pool’), or a stress (depletion of the ‘resource pool’) (Mansour & Commeiras, 2015). Researchers have applied the COR theory to explain the WFC and/or the FWC, many studying specific professions or sectors. For example, Gao et al. (2013) examined the moderating effect of emotional intelligence on the relationship between WFC and job satisfaction in a sample of 212 Chinese high school teachers. Another study was conducted by Jiang et al. (2015) with a sample of 2763 doctors and nurses from 140 hospitals in China to test how workload and emotion-rule dissonance are associated with WFC. Goh
et al. (2015) applied the COR theory to study the mediating role of WFC on the relationship between daily workload and life satisfaction in a sample of 135 married, full-time employees of a state university in Singapore. Mansour and Commeiras (2015) investigated the mediating role of WFC between workload and job stress with a sample of 648 hotel employees in France and confirmed the usefulness of the COR theory.

Based on the theory of COR, developed by Hobfoll (1989, 1998, 2011, 2012), as illustrated in Figure 1, this research aims to analyze the moderating role of the need for family friendly policies on the effects of WFC and FWC on job stress, burnout, and intention to leave; this is an original contribution of the paper. More precisely, drawing on the theory of ‘resource caravan passageways’ (Hobfoll, 2011, 2012), this study suggests that the relationships between WFC/FWC, job stress, burnout, and an individual’s intention to leave the organization may be better understood by considering the moderating role of individuals’ need for family friendly policies. The latter can be defined as the extent to which individuals’ desire or need to feel that the organization or supervisors care for their well-being at work and in family by implementing some family friendly policies, which can help them to better balance work and family. These family friendly practices could play the role of ‘resource caravan passageways’ that foster and enrich the resources available to individuals to cope with stressful events (Hobfoll, 2011, 2012). This study analyzes the need for four policies: on-site childcare, information services, voluntary compressed workweek, and part-time work. Each of these measures can act as ‘resource passageways’ to reduce the effects of WFC and FWC on job stress, burnout, and intention to leave. If these or some of these practices are not available at work and if employees, who are affected by WFC/FWC, need to have them at work, this group of employees may thus experience more stress and/or

Figure 1. Conceptual model.
burnout due to WFC/FWC. This could lead to an increase in the intention to leave the organization.

**Hypotheses**

Based on Hobfoll’s (1989) COR theory, as employees in the hospitality industry face difficult and stressful working conditions (Kim et al., 2007; Sharma et al., 2010), they tend to lose precious resources (energy, time, emotions). Consequently, according to Hobfoll’s principle of the ‘spiral of loss of resources’, they have fewer resources and face difficulties in managing their professional and family responsibilities, resulting in WFC (Mansour & Commeiras, 2015) or in FWC. Gorgievski and Hobfoll (2008) also explain this spiral by the fact that the loss of resources can produce negative emotions, which lead to a deterioration of mental and physical health. As concerns the amount of resources available, the COR theory postulates that an individual who has limited resources may be more vulnerable to subsequent losses and that an initial loss can lead to future losses (Hobfoll, 2001). The WFC and/or FWC can therefore create a new potential loss of resources, which induces stress and burnout (Karatepe, Sokmen, Yavas, & Babakus, 2010). Stress or burnout can use up much of the mental and physical resources of individuals. Employees try to minimize the loss and to maintain their meager resources by selecting defensive strategies, including disengagement at work, which may lead to increase the intention to leave the organization. Research in Kenyan hotels found that working conditions and job stress are sources of turnover (Kuria, Alice, & Wanderi, 2012). As reported by Knani and Fournier (2013), burnout has negative impacts such as reduced job satisfaction, poor performance, and high intention to leave (Halbesleben & Buckley, 2004; Hogan & McKnight, 2007).

The objective of each family friendly policy is not primarily to decrease work/family conflict (time or role conflicts) per se, ‘but rather to increase job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behaviors, etc. However, the availability and use of these practices should support workers’ efforts to balance work and family’ (Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2006, p. 557). Research indicates that organizational support in terms of family friendly practices reduces WFC (Anderson, Coffey, & Byerly, 2002; Hammer, Allen, & Grigsby, 1997; Kossek, Lautsch, & Eaton, 2006; Russell, O’Connell, & McGinnity, 2009).

Family friendly policies such as flextime, telecommuting, and work arrangements allow employees to cope with their workloads, without impacting on their family life (Greenhaus & Allen, 2011; Kossek et al., 2006; Russell et al., 2009). Likewise, ‘employed parents are likely to experience WFC in greater frequency and intensity if child care is unavailable or unsatisfactory’ (Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2006, p. 557).

However, using a meta-analytic approach based on 38 studies, Mesmer-Magnus and Viswesvaran (2006) find a minor negative association between flexibility and a global measure of WFC (–.12). However, they show no link between flexibility
and WFC and FWC measured separately (–.01 for WFC and .04 for FWC). On the contrary, Selvarajan, Cloninger, and Singh (2013) indicate that organizations with flexible working arrangements can reduce workers’ conflict between their work demands and their family responsibilities. It is thus important to further test these links.

The aim of introducing work–family policies may also be to reduce job stress and encourage gender equality (Ramadoss & Lape, 2014). Indeed, feeling able to balance between work demands and family responsibilities may enhance psychological health and well-being (Greenhaus & Allen, 2011). Grzywacz, Carlson, and Shulkin (2008) provide evidence that workplace flexibility is only accessible for about 1 in 4 employees, but show that it decreases stress and burnout when it does exist. A growing literature reveals that workplace flexibility can effectively diminish work stress and depression and increase happiness of employees (Golden et al., 2013; Grzywacz, Casey, & Jones, 2007; Halpern, 2005). Schedule flexibility facilitates the management of life demands, and reduces WFC, which in turn, leads to fewer illnesses (Grzywacz & Tucker, 2008).

Very little research has been done on differences in health-related outcomes among employees participating in different types of formal flexible arrangements (Grzywacz et al., 2008) and results are not conclusive. Lapierre and Allen (2006) reveal that workers who had flextime did not have a better state of affective well-being than others. Halpern (2005) tested the link between the need for flexible working time policies and the number of these policies on work-related stress. Her study indicates that ‘employees who need flexible working time policies are not more likely to work for employers who offer them than employees who have less need for these policies’ (Halpern, 2005, p. 162). This indicates a mismatch in offer and demand for these policies. In addition, Halpern (2005, p. 162) found that ‘the greater number of flexible working time policies that employers offer predicts both higher employee commitment and lower work-related stress’.

Access to family friendly policies leads to higher organizational commitment and lower intention to quit the job (Grover & Crooker, 1995). Baughman, DiNardi, and Holtz-Eakin (2003) reveal that the presence of flexible sick leave and childcare assistance policies results in a reduction in turnover. Halpern (2005) notes that:

If workers have the option to work reduced hours or can take a family-related leave without losing their job, there should be less worker turnover and other tangible, though frequently overlooked benefits to the employer, such as increased loyalty to one’s employer. (Halpern, 2005, p.159)

According to COR theory (Hobfoll, 1989), individuals seek to build (acquisition) and protect (conservation) resources which bring them pleasure, success, and survival, while stress occurs when these resources are lost or threatened to be lost (Hobfoll, 2001). Moreover, the ability of individuals and families to build and maintain their ‘pool’ of resources (or conversely to lose their resources) is largely dependent on circumstances outside their control (Hobfoll & De Jong, 2013). In other words, an organization has a responsibility to protect its employees and to
offer them the adequate resources to improve their well-being at work and in the family. As reported by Fiksenbaum (2014, p. 667), ‘organizations should be motivated to develop strategies that decrease perceptions of WFC, which in turn would increase employees’ well-being’. Consistent with the COR theory and particularly the concept of ‘resource caravan passageways’ (Hobfoll, 2012), practices acting as ‘passageways’ should thus be established in organizations by senior management or employers, in order to reduce WFC and/or FWC and to decrease stress and burnout. For example, flextime can be considered as a passageway because it allows working parents to have more resources such as time and energy at home and also to have the support of family or partner. However, all practices are not beneficial or applicable to all employees and organizations should thus examine the fit between each practice and the employees’ needs. Research shows that employees vary in their level of need for each measure depending on their particular situation and/or experience in life. For example, the level of need for childcare varies depending on the age of children; also the number and age of children influences the need for various forms of work–family policies; finally gender can also influence this need as women usually have more work–family difficulties, and less frequently have a stay-at-home spouse (Tremblay, 2012b). Moreover, employees who need care for the elderly, and who do not have children, do not need the on-site childcare but would maybe prefer to work part time. These individuals still have WFC and/or FWC and can be stressed. However, the effect of WFC and/or FWC on stress and burnout will be more salient when it interacts with the need for such a measure. In other words, the positive effects of WFC and FWC on stress and burnout can be amplified for employees with a high need for such a measure, as they can judge the resources not provided by their organization as critical to fulfill their actual needs. This is also consistent with the work–family enrichment theory which postulates that resources obtained in one sphere are more likely to improve performance in another (work–family enrichment) when they respond to the actual needs perceived by an employee (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). For example, partner’s support at home can give an employee more energy to better achieve his tasks. Conversely, when resources, which are consistent with the actual needs perceived by an individual, are missing in one role, this can decrease performance in the other role. Low wages or less support from a supervisor can lead to more strain with family and maybe to less leisure with family. According to the spiral of loss of resources (Hobfoll, 1989), the initial loss of resource will lead to future losses. In other words, the loss spiral would be strongest for those respondents with the greatest need (i.e. individuals who need a measure in an organization with no family-friendly benefits) than for those respondents with no need for such a measure. Accordingly, WFC/FWC will be perceived as more important for employees who need family friendly practices and work for an organization that does not offer them. This will result in stronger positive effects on individual stress, burnout and in turn increase the intention of employees to leave the organization. Thus, the following hypotheses are formulated:
H1. The perception of a need for (H1.1. on-site childcare, H1.2. information service for reconciliation, H1.3. voluntary compressed workweek, H1.4. part-time work) has a moderating effect on the relationship between WFC and job stress; this relationship is stronger for those needing to use such a measure than others not wishing to do so.

H2. The perception of a need for (H2.1. on-site childcare, H2.2. information service for reconciliation, H2.3. voluntary compressed workweek, H2.4. part-time work) has a moderating effect on the relationship between WFC and burnout (Emotional exhaustion and Depersonalization); this relationship is stronger for those needing to use such a measure than others not wishing to do so.

H3. The perception of a need for (H3.1. on-site childcare, H3.2. information service for reconciliation, H3.3. voluntary compressed workweek, H3.4. part-time work) has a moderating effect on the relationship between FWC and job stress; this relationship is stronger for those needing to use such a measure than others not wishing to do so.

H4. The perception of a need for (H4.1. on-site childcare, H4.2. information service for reconciliation, H4.3. voluntary compressed workweek, H4.4. part-time work) has a moderating effect on the relationship between FWC and burnout (Emotional exhaustion and Depersonalization); this relationship is stronger for those needing to use such a measure than others not wishing to do so.

H5. The perception of a need for (H5.1. on-site childcare, H5.2. information service for reconciliation, H5.3. voluntary compressed workweek, H5.4. part-time work) has a moderating effect on the relationship between job stress and intention to leave; this relationship is stronger for those needing to use such a measure than others not wishing to do so.

H6. The perception of a need for (H6.1. on-site childcare, H6.2. information service for reconciliation, H6.3. voluntary compressed workweek, and H6.4. part-time work) has a moderating effect on the relationships between burnout (Emotional exhaustion and Depersonalization) and intention to leave; this relationship is stronger for those needing to use such a measure than others not wishing to do so.

Method

Sample

The study was conducted in the hospitality industry in the province of Quebec (Canada) in partnership with a tourism association. There was also a call for participants on the LinkedIn website. Table 1 presents sample characteristics. Key words such as hotel manager, supervisor, front office, chief of front office, housekeeper, concierge, butler, waiter/waitress, night receptionist, etc., were researched on LinkedIn. Then, an email was sent, including a letter stating the purpose of the research, and inviting people to complete the survey. In order for the sample
to be as representative as possible of the hospitality industry, persons working in
different types of hotels, independent, or franchised were contacted. It was difficult
to have a totally representative sample, as there is no list of all hotels by category,
but we have a diversity of responses, as wages and some working conditions may
vary depending on the type of hotel (chains vs. independent, and according to
size). Two hundred and fifty-eight responses were collected. The sample cons-
ists of 37.2% management personnel (96 respondents), 35.7% frontline staff (92
respondents), and 27.1% supervisors or intermediary jobs (70 respondents). Of
these 258 persons, 185 work in hotel chains and 73 in small hostels, motels or
independent hotels. It is of course not a perfectly representative sample, but it does
cover the diversity of situations in the hotel industry. It is representative from the
point of view of gender (57% in the sample, 59% in hotel industry), but presents
an overrepresentation of larger hotels (4 and 5*).

**Measures**

WFC (5 items) and FWC (5 items) were measured with the scales by Netemeyer,
Boles, and McMurrian (1996). The psychological stress measure (8 items) of
Lemyre and Tessier (2003), and the scale by Mobley (1982) were used to evalu-
ate intention to leave (3 items), both with the five point Likert-type scale (from
1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). For burnout, the Maslach Burnout
Inventory (MBI) scale (Maslach & Jackson, 1986; Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter,
1996) which has three subscales and 22 items was used. The first factor is emo-
tional exhaustion (9 items); the second is depersonalization (5 items). Here, a
seven-point Likert-type scale was applied: 0 = Never, 1 = A few times a year or
less, 2 = Once a month or less, 3 = A few times a month, 4 = Once a week, 5 = A
few times a week, and 6 = Every day.

**Data analysis**

As concerns possible bias, (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003) have
proposed four preventive methods to reduce the common method variance bias.
This includes: (1) adding reverse items in the survey, (2) randomly organizing
items, (3) concealing the purpose of the research, and (4) concealing the relation-
ship between questions. The survey was based on these principles. Confirmatory
factor analysis was led to check on dimensionality, convergent, and discriminant validity issues (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988) and the same was done for items of each scale for a stringent psychometric testing (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1996). The research hypotheses were tested using AMOS version 20 (Arbuckle, 2011). The effective sample size was 258. The results of confirmatory factor analysis are shown in Table 2. To verify the reliability and validity of the scales, the measurement model was assessed with all 258 responses and examined by Maximum likelihood.

Table 2. Assessment of the measurement model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>IR</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work–family conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) The demands of my work interfere with my home and family life.</td>
<td>WFC1</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) The amount of time my job takes up makes it difficult to fulfill family responsibilities.</td>
<td>WFC2</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Things I want to do at home do not get done because of the demands my job puts on me.</td>
<td>WFC3</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) My job produces strain that makes it difficult to fulfill family duties.</td>
<td>WFC4</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Due to work-related duties, I have to make changes to my plans for family activities</td>
<td>WFC5</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family-work conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) The demands of my family or spouse/partner interfere with work-related activities</td>
<td>FWC1</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) I have to put off doing things at work because of demands on my time at home</td>
<td>FWC2</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Things I want to do at work don’t get done because of the demands of my family or spouse/partner</td>
<td>FWC3</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) My home life interferes with my responsibilities at work such as getting to work on time, accomplishing daily tasks, and working overtime.</td>
<td>FWC4</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job stress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) I feel calm&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) I feel rushed; I do not seem to have enough time</td>
<td>JS3</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) I have physical aches and pains: sore back, headache, stiff neck, stomach ache</td>
<td>JS4</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) I feel preoccupied, tormented, or worried</td>
<td>JS5</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) I feel confused; my thoughts are muddled; I lack concentration; I cannot focus</td>
<td>JS6</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) I feel a great weight on my shoulders</td>
<td>JS7</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) I have difficulty controlling my reactions, emotions, moods, or gestures</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) I feel stressed</td>
<td>JS8</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout (EE)&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) I feel emotionally drained from my work</td>
<td>BUREE1</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) I feel used up at the end of the workday</td>
<td>BUREE2</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job</td>
<td>BUREE3</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Working with people all day is really a strain for me</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) I feel burned out from my work</td>
<td>BUREE5</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) I feel frustrated by my job</td>
<td>BUREE6</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout (DP)&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) I feel I treat some clients as if they were impersonal objects</td>
<td>BURDP1</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) I’ve become more callous toward people since I took this job</td>
<td>BURDP2</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) I worry that this job is hardening me emotionally</td>
<td>BURDP4</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) I don’t really care what happens to some clients</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to leave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) I think a lot about leaving this organization</td>
<td>INLEAV1</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) I am actively searching for an acceptable alternative to this organization</td>
<td>INLEAV2</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) When I can, I will leave the organization</td>
<td>INLEAV3</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: IR – item reliability; CR – composite reliability; AVE – average variance extracted.

<sup>a</sup>Item reversed.
<sup>b</sup>EE – emotional exhaustion.
<sup>c</sup>DP – depersonalization.
The preliminary results of the confirmatory factor analysis provided low model fit data. Therefore, according to the modification indices in AMOS, several items were deleted because of low standardized loadings (<.50), high standard residues or correlation measurement errors. Specifically, two items from job stress, one item from burnout (emotional exhaustion), and one item from burnout (depersonalization) were removed from further analysis. Also, covariance between measurement errors was added between WFC1 and WFC5. Item reliability was tested by a standardized loading factor between .63 and .96, indicating that the significance level (t > 1.96) is achieved. In the analysis of reliability (Table 2) of the dimensions, composite reliability surpassed .70 (range .76–.95), which indicates satisfactory internal consistency.

Additionally, in the examination of convergent validity, the average variance extracted (AVE) is used to estimate the average explained variance of measurements to scales; values above .5 mean a good convergent validity (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). In table 2, AVE of each scale exceeded .50 (range, .51–.85). Discriminant validity is also confirmed because the correlation between every pair of variables is less than AVE.

Table 3 shows the correlations between the constructs. The confirmatory analysis for the full measurement model indicates the model fits well with the data with $\chi^2$/DF = 1.844, $p < .001$; RMSEA = .057 and is less than .08 (Bollen, 1990); GFI = .87 and AGFI = .83 (Joreskog & Sorbom, 1993); NFI = .89 CFI = .94 (Bentler, 1990). The research model is thus internally valid.

### Structural model

All analyses were carried out with AMOS version 20 (Arbuckle, 2011) through Maximum likelihood estimation of parameters.

To test for any moderating effects, the multi-group approach is possible. AMOS uses the median values of the moderator variables to constrain all parameters to be equal between the subgroups (Madu & Kuei, 2012). ‘Only if this constrained model is significantly worse in terms of fit than the unconstrained model does it makes sense to test individual paths for equality across groups’ (Madu & Kuei, 2012, p. 235). The current study compared critical ratios for differences between parameters (Arbuckle, 2011) using parameter pairing to examine the differences.
in unstandardized coefficients for the model between each pairs of groups used for the measurement of family friendly policies. Respondents were then divided into three groups: those who need the measure or service and don’t have it, those who don’t need the measure or service, and don’t have it and those for whom the service exists and is used. The first two groups were compared for many reasons. Given the fact that the existence and use of these practices have already been the subject of study, this research wanted to bring a new perspective by examining the need for these practices. Moreover, given the scope of the analysis with many topics, it was quite difficult to compare all groups.

**Moderating effect of on-site childcare**

One hundred and forty-five respondents judged that is important to have a childcare service in the workplace to help employees to cope with WFC and/or FWC while 111 do not want this service.

As shown in Table 4, the results of analyses of subgroups for moderating effects indicate significant differences between the two groups (childcare desirable and childcare undesirable) in four cases. In the first case, the link between FWC and burnout (emotional exhaustion) is statistically and significantly different between the two groups ($Z = -3.595^{***}$). Second case: the link between FWC and burnout (depersonalization) ($Z = -3.093^{***}$). Third case, the relation between FWC and job stress ($Z = 1.739^*$). The perception of a need for childcare at work has a moderating effect on the relationship between FWC, job stress, and burnout (emotional exhaustion and depersonalization); this relationship is stronger for those needing to use this service ($\beta = .472$, $p < .001$ for job stress; $\beta = .943$, $p < .001$ for emotional exhaustion; $\beta = .773$, $p < .001$ for depersonalization) than for those not wishing to do so ($\beta = .157$, NS; $\beta = -.074$, NS; $\beta = .013$, NS, respectively). The hypotheses H3.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct relationships</th>
<th>Estimate childcare desirable (145)</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Estimate childcare undesirable (111)</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>z-score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BURNEE ← WFC</td>
<td>.815***</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.677***</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>−.662ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURNDP ← FWC</td>
<td>.943***</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>−.074ns</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>−3.595***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURNEE ← WFC</td>
<td>.773***</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.013ns</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>−3.093***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURNDP ← FWC</td>
<td>.745***</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.536***</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>−.906ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRESS ← WFC</td>
<td>.641***</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.555***</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>−.529ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRESS ← WFC</td>
<td>.472***</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.157ns</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>−1.739*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTELEAVE ← BURNDP</td>
<td>.454***</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.158ns</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>1.996***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTELEAVE ← BURNEE</td>
<td>.325***</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.352**</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.198ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTELEAVE ← STRESS</td>
<td>.247*</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.177ns</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>−.411ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2$ Group 1 $R^2$ Group 2
Burnout EE = .385 Burnout EE = .149
Burnout DP = .343 Burnout DP = .261
Job stress = .328 Job stress = .296
Intent to leave = .327 Intent to leave = .359

Note: $N = 258$ (unstandardized coefficients are reported).
*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001; ns= not significant.
and H4.1 are confirmed. Employees needing to have childcare at work are exposed to more FWC, causing more stress and burnout among them than those not wishing to have this service. On the contrary, hypotheses H1.1 and H2.1 are not confirmed. The effect of WFC on job stress and burnout is not moderated by on-site childcare.

Fourth case, the link between burnout (depersonalization) and intention to leave ($Z = 1.996$). The need for childcare at work has a moderating effect on the relationship between burnout (depersonalization) and intention to leave; this relationship is stronger for those wishing to use this service ($\beta = .454, p < .001$) than those not wishing to do so ($\beta = .158$, NS). Hypothesis H6.1 is thus partially validated. Employees wishing to have childcare at work have higher intentions to leave the organization because of a burnout (depersonalization) than those not wishing to use such a service. On the contrary, hypothesis H5.1 is not verified. Childcare does not have a moderating effect on the relationship between job stress and intention to leave.

**Moderating effect of information services for work–family reconciliation**

The results indicate that 102 respondents consider that information services on how to balance work and family life are a necessary resource to assist employees to cope with WFC and/or FWC, while 40 do not want such services.

Table 5 reveals that three relationships in the model are different between the two groups. The link between FWC and burnout (depersonalization) is significantly different between those wishing to have information services in the workplace and others who do not want these services ($Z = 2.205^{**}$) and this link is stronger among the workers wishing to have this service ($\beta = .725, p < 0.01$) than the others ($\beta = .076$, NS). Thus, hypothesis H4.2 is partially validated. That is, employees indicating a need for this service have more depersonalization relative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct relationships</th>
<th>Estimate information services desirable (102)</th>
<th>$P$</th>
<th>Estimate information services undesirable (40)</th>
<th>$P$</th>
<th>$z$-score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BURNEE ← WFC</td>
<td>.756***</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.503*</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>−1.001ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURNDP ← WFC</td>
<td>.725**</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.076ns</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>−2.205**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURNEE ← FWC</td>
<td>.354**</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.128ns</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>−.905ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURNDP ← FWC</td>
<td>.709***</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.301ns</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>−1.511ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRESS ← WFC</td>
<td>.504***</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.243ns</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>−1.537ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRESS ← FWC</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.19ns</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>−.557ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTELEAVE ← BURNDP</td>
<td>.079ns</td>
<td>.363</td>
<td>.403ns</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>1.303ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTELEAVE ← BURNEE</td>
<td>.903***</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.344***</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>2.365**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTELEAVE ← STRESS</td>
<td>.405**</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>−.334ns</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>−2.298**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2$ Group 1: Burnout EE = .291, Burnout DP = .285, Job stress = .56, Intention to leave = .32

$R^2$ Group 2: Burnout EE = .11, Burnout DP = .221, Job stress = .232, Intention to leave = .63

Note: $N = 258$ (unstandardized coefficients are reported).

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$; ns = not significant.
to FWC than others. On the contrary, hypotheses H1.2, H2.2 and H3.2 are not verified. Information services do not moderate the effect of FWC on job stress and the effects of WFC on job stress and burnout.

Likewise, this measure does not have a moderating effect on the relationship between FWC and job stress. The results reveal that the relationship between emotional exhaustion and intention to leave is significantly different between the two groups ($Z = 2.365^{**}$) and this relationship is stronger among the first group (want this service) ($\beta = .903$, $p < .001$) than among the second group (do not want) ($\beta = .344$, $p < 0.001$), indicating that employees wanting this service think more about leaving the company because of a burnout. The same is found for the link between job stress and intention to leave ($Z = -2.298^{**}$). The results indicate that this relationship is greater among the first group (want this service); $\beta = .405$, $p < 0.001$) than among the second group (do not want) ($\beta = .334$, NS). Thus, hypothesis H5.2 is confirmed. Hypothesis H6.2 is partially validated. Employees wishing to have information services at work have higher intentions to leave the organization because of job stress and burnout (emotional exhaustion) than those not wishing to use such services.

**Moderating effect of voluntary compressed workweek**

As for the desire to have a voluntary compressed workweek, 154 respondents indicated this, while only 23 respondents do not want this option (the 4 day workweek was mentioned as an example of compressed workweek). As shown in table 6, six relationships are significantly different between the two groups.

The link between FWC and emotional exhaustion is significantly different between workers wanting to have a compressed workweek and workers not wanting to have one. Table 6 presents the results of the moderating effect of voluntary compressed workweek.

**Table 6.** Moderating effect of voluntary compressed workweek.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct relationships</th>
<th>Estimate desire for a voluntary compressed workweek (155)</th>
<th>$P$</th>
<th>Estimate no Desire for a voluntary compressed workweek (23)</th>
<th>$P$</th>
<th>$z$-score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BURNEE ← WFC</td>
<td>.615***</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.712*</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.301ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURNDP ← FWC</td>
<td>.516**</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.329ns</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>-.679ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURNEE ← FWC</td>
<td>.563***</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.166ns</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>-2.996***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURNDP ← FWC</td>
<td>.583***</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.838**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.72ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRESS ← WFC</td>
<td>.563***</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.11ns</td>
<td>.603</td>
<td>-1.977**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRESS ← FWC</td>
<td>.393***</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.015ns</td>
<td>.907</td>
<td>-2.36**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTELEAVE ← BURNDP</td>
<td>.227**</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.645*</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>-3.136***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTELEAVE ← BURNEE</td>
<td>.291***</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.021ns</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>3.246***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTELEAVE ← STRESS</td>
<td>.387***</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.375ns</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>-3.263***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2$ Group 1

- Burnout EE = .221
- Burnout DP = .259
- Job stress = .368
- Intention to leave = .359

$R^2$ Group 2

- Burnout EE = .629
- Burnout DP = .313
- Job stress = .015
- Intention to leave = .829

Note: $N = 258$ (unstandardized coefficients are reported).

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$; ns= not significant.
interested in this option \((Z = 2.996^{***})\); this relationship is stronger in the first group \((\beta = .563, p < .001; \beta = -.166, \text{NS})\). Hypothesis H4.3 is partially validated, indicating that employees in the first group have a stronger FWC and are more emotionally exhausted because of this conflict. It is similar for the links between WFC/FWC and job stress and the values of the Z test are significant \((Z = -1.977^{**}; Z = -2.36^{**}, \text{respectively})\). The effect of WFC/FWC on job stress is greater among the first group than the second \((\beta = .563, p < .001; \beta = .11, \text{NS for WFC and stress and } \beta = .393, p < .001; \beta = -.015, \text{NS for FWC and stress})\). Hypotheses H1.3 and H3.3 are confirmed, indicating that employees wanting to have a compressed workweek are exposed to more stress related to WFC/FWC. On the contrary, hypothesis H2.3 is not verified, indicating that a compressed workweek does not moderate the effect of WFC on burnout.

Furthermore, the relationships between depersonalization, emotional exhaustion, job stress, and intention to leave are all significantly different between the two groups \((Z = -3.136^{***}; Z = 3.246^{***}; Z = -3.263^{**})\) and are stronger in the first group \((\beta = .227, p < .01; \beta = .291, p < .001; \beta = .387, p < .001 \text{ for the group 1 and } \beta = -.645, \text{NS}; \beta = .021, \text{NS}; \beta = -.375, \text{NS for the group 2})\). Hypotheses H5.3 and H6.3 are validated. Like other practices, the compressed workweek is an option, which many would like to have in their workplace in order to reduce the work family interference, job stress, and burnout and therefore their intention to leave.

**Moderating effect of part-time work**

The interest for part-time work is mentioned by 96 respondents while 62 respondents do not see this as a solution. Table 7 shows seven relationships which are significantly different between the two groups.

**Table 7.** Moderating effect of part-time work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct relationships</th>
<th>Estimate part-time desirable (96)</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Estimate part-time undesirable (62)</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>z-score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BURNEE ← WFC</td>
<td>.946^{***}</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.417^{**}</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>−2.055^{**}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURNDP ← FWC</td>
<td>.641^{**}</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>−.619^{*}</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>−3.403^{***}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURNEE ← FWC</td>
<td>.561^{**}</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>−.422ns</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>−3.048^{***}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURNDP ← WFC</td>
<td>1.038^{***}</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.367^{*}</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>−2.319^{**}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRESS ← WFC</td>
<td>.728^{**}</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.302^{*}</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>−2.29^{**}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRESS ← FWC</td>
<td>.35^{**}</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>−.057ns</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td>−1.773^{*}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTELEAVE ← BURNDP</td>
<td>.068ns</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>.205ns</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.765ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTELEAVE ← BURNEE</td>
<td>.412^{**}</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.343^{*}</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>−.423ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTELEAVE ← STRESS</td>
<td>.371^{*}</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>−.129ns</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>−2.269^{**}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(R^2\) Group 1 = .373
\(R^2\) Group 2 = .251
Burnout EE = .394
Burnout DP = .298
Job stress = .131
Intention to leave = .406

Note: \(N = 258\) (unstandardized coefficients are reported).

*\(p < .05\); **\(p < .01\); ***\(p < .001\); \(\text{NS} = \text{not significant}\).
The relationship between WFC/FWC and emotional exhaustion is significantly different between employees wanting to use part-time work and workers finding part-time undesirable ($Z = -2.055^{**}$; $Z = -3.048^{***}$). These relationships are stronger in the first group ($\beta = .946, p < 0.001; \beta = .561, p < .001$) than in the second group ($\beta = .417, p < .01; \beta = -.422, \text{NS}$).

Similarly, the relationships between WFC/FWC and depersonalization are significantly different ($Z = -2.319^{***}; Z = -3.403^{**}$) and these links are stronger in the first group ($\beta = 1.038, p < .001; \beta = .641, p < .01$) than the second ($\beta = .364, p < .05; \beta = -.619, p < .05$). It is similar for the links between WFC/FWC and job stress, and the value of the $Z$ test is significant ($Z = -2.29^{**}; Z = -1.773^{*}$, respectively). The effect of WFC/FWC on job stress is greater in the first group ($\beta = .728, p < 0001; \beta = .35, p < 0.01$) than in the second ($\beta = .302, p < 0.01; \beta = -.057, \text{NS}$), meaning that employees who express a need for this measure are exposed to more stress related to WFC/FWC. Hypotheses H1.4, H2.4, H3.4, and H4.4 are all confirmed, indicating that employees in the first group have a stronger level of WFC/FWC and are more stressed, more emotionally exhausted and more depersonalized because of this conflict.

Furthermore, the relationship between job stress and intention to leave is significantly different between the two groups ($Z = -2.269^{**}$) and this link is stronger in the first group ($\beta = .371, p < .05$) than in the second ($\beta = -.129, \text{NS}$). Thus, hypothesis H5.4 is supported. Like other practices, part-time work appears to constitute an essential resource for some, in order to decrease the WFC/FWC, job stress and therefore the intention to leave. Hypothesis H6.4 is not validated. This measure does not have a moderating effect on the relationship between burnout and intention to leave.

**Discussion**

This study has examined the moderating effects of the need for family friendly policies on the relationships between WFC/FWC, job stress, burnout, and intention to leave. The need for each practice in the workplace has been measured, something which distinguishes this research from previous studies that have examined the use or the mere existence of these policies. Also, this is theoretically important given that earlier research has tested the direct effects, and not the moderating effects of these arrangements on balancing work and family, reducing stress and decreasing turnover. The results indicate that each of the measures tested in this study has a different impact. This study therefore provides an additional contribution to the literature by examining the effects of WFC/FWC on stress, burnout, and intention to leave at conditional levels of need for each of the four family friendly practices studied in this research. These results are very important because they support the concept of fit between the resources which organizations can offer to their employees at work and the employees’actual needs. This is reported by Fiksenbaum (2014, p. 668):
most studies examining the availability or utilization of different flexible work options typically assume a ‘more is better’ perspective. This perspective overlooks the concept of fit; an organization may offer a wide range of flexible work options, but if these options do not meet the needs of the workers, then they are ineffective.

Preliminary evidence was provided that the need for these policies is a critical individual factor that enables employees to determine which resources are a better match for their actual needs. The results demonstrate that when these needs are not met and interact with the effects of WFC and FWC, they are more likely to produce negative outcomes.

For on-site childcare, the need for this service has a moderating effect on the relationships between FWC, burnout (emotional exhaustion and depersonalization), and job stress. The results reveal that the workers needing this service, those with children of course, have a higher level of FWC, are more stressed, more emotionally exhausted and more disengaged at work in response to emotional exhaustion (Halbesleben & Buckley, 2004). In other words, employees who have children have more responsibilities at home; therefore they need childcare in the workplace to reduce their difficulties in reconciling work and family life. Mesmer-Magnus and Viswesvaran (2006, p. 557) note that ‘employed parents are likely to experience WFC in greater frequency and intensity if childcare is unavailable or unsatisfactory’. While there is a very good public system of low-cost childcare in Quebec, the schedules (7–6 pm usually) are unsatisfactory for many hospitality workers, who don’t have the typical 9–5 schedules. As women are usually more responsible for children, this can be more important for them, and more so for single mothers, although when couples are separated and the father has the child one week out of two (which is frequent in Québec), childcare can present challenges for men as well, especially in this industry with irregular schedules. The type of hotel can also play a role. For example, in a chain hotel, working conditions are usually better than in independent hotels and workers can have more resources, such as flextime. Also, the position can have an impact, as managers are more exposed to WFC due to a heavier workload (Mansour & Commeiras, 2015) and to longer working hours than the other workers or supervisors. Thus, childcare could be more important for them.

Regarding information services, the need for this measure moderates the relationship between FWC and depersonalization. In addition, it has a moderating effect on the relationships between emotional exhaustion, job stress and intention to leave. Employees needing information services to reduce the conflict between family and work are led to disengage from their work and think of leaving. The lack of knowledge on available resources is thus an issue, one which could actually be easily resolved in organizations by developing lists of tested resources (Tremblay, 2012a).

However, it is interesting to note that these practices have a moderating effect on the relationship of FWC on job stress and burnout, but not for the WFC. Therefore, such a measure might be more useful to reduce FWC. Shockley and
Allen (2007) found that policies such as work flexibility seem more helpful in decreasing WFC than FWC. Hence, this is a contribution of this research which examined the concept of WFC in both directions (WFC/FWC). Also, on-site childcare moderates the effect of depersonalization or disengagement on intention to leave while information services have an effect on the links between emotional exhaustion, job stress, and intention to leave. According to Hobfoll, disengagement is a coping strategy, allowing people to protect their own resources against stressful events. Resources such as childcare and information services could thus help employed parents to overcome the stress from the FWC before falling into a state of burnout, leading them to leave the organization, which would be very costly for their employer. The hospitality industry is indeed known for a high turnover rate, which translates into high costs for hiring and training of new workers, so these observations can be useful to the hospitality industry on an international level, not only in Canada.

Concerning the compressed workweek, the desire for this option has a moderating effect on six relationships. It moderates the link between, on the one hand, WFC, and on the other hand job stress and emotional exhaustion. It also has a moderating effect on the link between FWC and job stress. In the same vein, it moderates the effects of job stress, emotional exhaustion, and depersonalization on intention to leave. This is another interesting result. This practice makes it possible for workers having family obligations or children to have more free days for their family obligations. Also, this measure can help employees to reduce both WFC and FWC. Employers offering this practice could retain employees who are exposed to both types of conflict by providing employees the ‘resource passageways’ (Hobfoll, 2011) to protect their family life and their work. According to Hobfoll’s (1989, 1998) theory on the spiral of loss of resources, having access to such a resource (compressed workweek) could therefore improve well-being at work, strengthen commitment at work and provide a better performance and a better quality of service, the latter being crucial in a sector such as hospitality. Women, who usually have more family obligations, could need this measure more than men because it allows them to have more free days for caring for children. Again, this might be easier to offer in chain hotels than in independent hotels where the number of workers is more limited, and work arrangements thus more difficult.

Finally, the desire for part-time work also has moderating effects in seven cases. It moderates the effects of WFC/FWC on job stress, emotional exhaustion, and depersonalization. It has a moderating effect on the relationship between job stress and intention to leave. In all cases, the relationships are stronger among employees indicating the need for such practices than for employees not desiring part-time work. This practice is also important to reduce the WFC or FWC. As for the compressed workweek, this practice could be a ‘passageway’ according to Hobfoll (2011, 2012), allowing to enrich, protect or even gain new resources (better family life, better well-being and thus better performance). On the contrary,
the absence of these policies could ‘undermine, obstruct, or impoverish people’s or group’s resource reservoirs’ (Hobfoll, 2011, p.129).

**Conclusion**

These results have both practical and theoretical implications. Theoretically, this research enables us to deepen the knowledge on the relationship between work–family interface and family friendly practices and their effects on workplace outcomes. Also, it provides a more comprehensive analysis of the process behind the effects of family friendly policies. The conclusions provide additional support for distinguishing between WFC and FWC in modeling the work–family interface. In addition, this research can enrich the international HRM literature. Indeed, while the hospitality industry is quite similar in terms of constraints and organizations internationally, it seems that FWC is higher in more collectivistic vs. more individualistic cultures (Allen, French, Dumani, & Shockley, 2015). Another interesting implication concerns the construct of fit between each measure and employees’ needs. While earlier studies have examined the availability and/or the use of family friendly policies, as reported by Fiksenbaum (2014, p. 668), ‘most studies on family friendly policies examined a listing of benefits rather than analyzing specific measures; such an approach provides little insight into specific practices which may be beneficial for reducing WFC. This study examined a new measure of these practices. This can be useful to develop and build better theories concerning the links between family friendly practices and work and family conflict. As reported by Allen et al. (2013, p. 348), ‘if we know that flextime is more strongly related to both work-family interface and family-work interface than is flexplace, we can develop more nuanced theories concerning the flexible work arrangements – WFC relationship that capture these differences’. The results extend this line of theorizing by highlighting the importance of subjective needs for family friendly policies in the work–family interface and job outcome processes. The perception of a desire or need for these measures offers a new understanding of these practices, and particularly of their impact on other dimensions such as stress, burnout, and intention to leave the firm. This is an important issue because employees are the only ones who can evaluate their need for certain measures, and this unsatisfied desire appears to have important impacts on the elements mentioned above. Also, ‘if workers fear negative impacts if they use flexible benefits, like flextime, perhaps they are unlikely to use them. If workers are not using these benefits, the benefits cannot reduce work/family conflict’ (Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2006, p. 568). Thus, this research extends this line of theorizing about the conditions and processes by which employees can experience greater WFC/FWC and stress, burnout and intention to leave.

Moreover, the present study contributes to the knowledge on the influence of the need for four family friendly policies not only on WFC and FWC, but also on job stress, burnout, and intention to leave. Very few studies were conducted in this
field and to our knowledge, none in the hospitality sector. Along the same lines, the use of Hobfoll’s COR theory (Hobfoll, 1989, 2011, 2012) to understand the moderating role of the need for these practices as ‘resource caravan passageways’ contributes to the advancement of knowledge in this area. The findings provide a support to this theory and particularly to the notion of ‘resource caravan passageways’ (Hobfoll, 2011, 2012) which is not much examined in the literature (Halbesleben, Neveu, Paustian-Underdahl, & Westman, 2014). Likewise, these results suggest that subgroups of employees should be considered when examining the effects of these practices on workplace outcomes. As reported by Matthews, Mills, Trout, and English (2014, p. 178) ‘testing results at an omnibus level may underestimate the true impact of any such intervention or experience on a particular subset of employees’. Finally, this study focused on a wide range of participants who face WFC, including singles, and not only married employees with or without children. This was ignored by previous studies, which further expands the basis for generalization of the findings.

Managerial implications

From a practical perspective, identifying who is more sensitive to family friendly measures would enable organizations or employers to allocate supportive resources more adequately by targeting those employees who are most in need of such practices. Also, all measures are not suitable for both WFC and FWC. In their meta-analysis, Allen et al. (2013) take into account the effects of only flextime and flexplace on WFC and FWC. This research studies the effects of different family friendly practices on WFC, FWC, job stress, burnout, and intention to leave. This could also help practitioners both in the hospitality industry and elsewhere to develop and to implement the best practices to balance work and family, reduce job stress, and decrease burnout. As a consequence, this could strengthen commitment of employees and reduce their intention to leave, helping to reduce turnover and costs in the hospitality industry across the globe. Indeed, policies such as on-site childcare and information services appear more helpful in reducing FWC than WFC. Others such as compressed workweek and part-time work are useful for both, WFC and FWC. In the same vein, these last measures have stronger effects in the model than the childcare and information services. Also, the usefulness of these measures depends on other factors. For example, childcare could be more useful for women than for men, for managers more than for office staff, who may have more regular hours. Compressed workweek could be more important and easier to implement for frontline staff than for managers, and may be more readily available in chain hotels than independent hotels. Part time could appear more interesting for frontline staff and be possible in independent hotels. Therefore, the study of the need for this or that measure is very important to determine the best practice for each group and type of hotel. The results of this research should alert employers in the hospitality industry on the
risks of not responding to the demand for family friendly measures. This should be considered a component of an organization’s plan for implementing strategic human resources practices (Bloom, Kretschmer, & Van Reenen, 2011). The results reveal that employees wishing to benefit from these policies are exposed to a high level of conflict in both directions (WFC and FWC); this produces a high level of stress at work. When employees are exposed to long-term stress, they experience emotional exhaustion, which causes disengagement at work. According to the results of this study, disengagement leads employees to think about leaving the organization; this can be very expensive for employers. While the hospitality industry has important constraints in terms of schedules and hours of work, it would surely be interesting for managers and employers to consider working time arrangements and other forms of support to alleviate the WFC, given the possible gains indicated by this research.

Therefore, the implications of this study are that that managers should try to identify, through formal and informal interviews or periodic surveys, which workers are most in need of family friendly policies and which measure is better for them, instead of implementing one specific type of benefit or program, as suggested by previous research. Such a targeted approach could help to decrease the costs associated with these benefits while increasing their efficiency and responding to the employees’ needs. This could be useful especially in those organizations that have labor shortages, and that need to attract and retain the best staff. Indeed, this research shows that workers aspiring to benefit from certain family friendly measures have more risks of higher stress, burnout, and of ultimately leaving the organization. As the replacement and training of workers is always very costly, and the quality of service is diminished with high turnover, employers should find an interest in developing family friendly measures in their hotels. This could also compensate, at least partly, for the difficult working conditions and low wages often found in this sector, which make it less attractive. Finally, employees’ perception of the need for measures could help employers to choose the best practices that could help their employees to balance work and family and have a better level of well-being at work.

**Limitations**

There are several limitations related to the current research and these constitute possible avenues for future research. First, the quantitative methods employed in this research may not have exposed fully all the opinions of workers on some issues. Future research with in-depth interviews could cover this gap. Also, future research should test the model of research in other sectors for external validation, and this would also be interesting to do with other countries, to see if different cultural values have an impact. Additionally, several demographic variables may also play a role in this model such as gender, marital status, number of children, work of the spouse, and the job category (management, supervision and service).
These will be analyzed in future research, as these variables can surely differentiate groups. Another limit is related to the generalizability of the results of this research due to conducting the survey in Canada/Québec. Future research could be done in other countries to reach a better understanding of the different situations. Finally, it could be interesting to construct a measurement scale on the basis of an in-depth qualitative study to measure the impact of family friendly practices; this would allow for a better understanding and better test of these practices in a given context. Finally, only those employees who need or do not need family friendly practices and work for an organization that does not offer them were examined. It could be interesting to compare these two groups with employees who need or do not need family friendly practices but work for an organization that offers them. Similarly, the comparison with the use of these practices would add value to the study.
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