# CONTENTS

## INDEX

## EMPIRICAL STUDY OF PERCEIVED MOTIVATION AND BURNOUT IDENTIFICATION IN PREDICTING LEAKAGE AND TURNOVER INTENTION IN HOSPITALITY PERSPECTIVE: NCR, INDIA

**Nagendra Singh Nehra**

### ABSTRACT

The primary objective is to focus motivational and stress factor that most likely to cause employee to either reduce performance or change employers, even change industry segments in National Capital Region, India. The research design cover extensive literature review of available secondary data and a quantitative primary data collection tool; a survey questionnaire. The sample consisted of 112 randomly selected individuals currently holding managerial, executive and junior level position of 3, 4 and 5 star Hotels in NCR. We analyzed the data by using descriptive statistics, factor analysis, multiple regression and inferential statistics namely cross tabulations with Pearson Chi-Square test. Furthermore the finding reveals that motivational factors are likely to change as demographic changes and not be in static condition. However, the findings should provide indicative evidence and research are limited by the specificity of the geographic Context to NCR region.

**Keywords: Motivation, Stress, Hospitality services**

### Introduction

There is dearth of investigation into the life of employee working in hospitality industry currently working in NCR. Hence to investigate some major issues that effect organizational profitability ,to know motivational factor that effect the efficiency , profitability ; stress among hospitality industry employee and other factors that most likely to cause managers to either change employer or entirely the industry segment. The hospitality industry is highly labour intensive and moreover depends on human resources for its stability. Such needs in more demand for efficiently and effectively investment are made in order to optimum level of performance to resuscitate in dynamic global environment. However hospitality sector have an eye for detail on maintaining cost structure, while simultaneously providing quality service. As literature ( Gronroos,1996,1997,2000;Zeithaml   and   Bitner,2000)   to   focus   employee performance, as a means to gain competitive advantage.

- *Research Scholar, Bharathiar School Of Management & Entrepreneur Development

- Bharathiar University Coimbatore, State- TamilNadu.

- **2. Background Literature**

- **2.1. Motivation**

- Effective motivational strategies helps to improve productivity and achieving customer satisfaction. According to (Wiley, 1995, p.266), "which reveals that finding focus on what motivates people today may not motivate them tomorrow. She inform that in 1946 appreciation was major important motivational factor while in 1980 and 1986 interesting work is important motivational factor and in 1992 it changes to good wages (Wiley, 1995,p.267).

- However employee motivation and stress directly effect employee behavior and hence provide quality service to customer (Zeithaml and Bitner, 2000). The previous study reveals that major motivation contributors are nature of job; appreciation; and the need for achievement (Analoui, 2000).

- But practically motivation has more vast scenario than offering tangible rewards which are converts into cash. Further motivation is more complex , requires sound policy by framing in concern to whom the strategies are aimed and emerges to increases the productivity . However, in conclusion motivation are more complex dimensions which include intrinsic and extrinsic factors but employee motivation are not stable it changes from time to time. (Kovach, 1987).

- **2.2 Stress-Burnout**

- The hospitality industry is known for high pressure work with extensive hours working and seems to as "pressure- cooker" environment reveals of emotional and physical exhaustion ( lee and Ashforth ,1990,p.743) reveals as "emotional exhaustion , and develop a feeling of reduced personal accomplishment". Burnout are more common place and as an form of stress and it was first identified by (Bradley,1969). Furthermore (Freudenberger,1974) to express a state of physical and mental depletion results from conditions of work. However ,a research reveals that burnout was caused with increased mental demands (Garden,1989). ( Cordes and Dougherty,1993), experiencing various characteristics of burnout like failure to perform , loss of creativity , loss of commitment for work , estrangement from clients , co-workers , job and agency , chronic stress and the reflection of negative attitude towards self and others which accompany with uncomfortable physical emotional symptoms.

- However investigate reveals that works hours , actual working conditions , job classification , role overload, role ambiguity and role conflict contribute to the various level in hospitality industry. While on the other hand by coping with burn out there is need for more attention, care and supportive work environment rather than more focus of monetary point of view. Further management style is more important in job satisfaction and most widely it is examined that there is relationship between the organizational climate and burnout in fast food industry.

- **2.3 Turnover and Leakage**

- Further the literature reveals that management decision, policies and overall organizational climate may play a major impact on turnover and employee results in voluntary or involuntary exit from organization. Therefore management simultaneously bear training cost , sepration cost , replacement cost and management is unable to provide perceived customer quality . The managers will leave the industry segments which finally affects the goals and objectives of the industry. (Birdir, 2002), quoting (Meier,1991), cites the some of characteristics like odd hours , low pay , no breaks , public contact, simultaneous production and consumption and fluctuating demands , long hours working , staffing problem .On the other hand company culture play a major role in turnover. However financial constraint is not the major issue in labor turnover. The unique finding made by (Ulrich et al.,1991) reveal that customer satisfaction and labor turnover are correlated with each other.

- **3. Methodology**

- The main purpose of research is to investigate, for the first time in NCR , a number of issues that directly challenges hospitality industry professionals such as motivation , burnout , turnover and leakage.

- The question were formulated which reflecting the primary purpose as follows:-

- 3.1. Is there any gender difference between employees in regard to factors that motivate them in NCR region?

- 3.2. Which are most important motivation factor for NCR region hospitality employees?

- 3.3. What are the factors that leads to Occupational Stress in NCR region hospitality Industry?

- 3.4. Is there are difference between motivational differences at different level of hospitality working professionals?

- 3.5.What are major factors of stress that drive hospitality professionals to want to change employers, within distinct environment of NCR region?

- 3.6.What are the factors that are affected hospitality professionals to leave hospitality industry (leakage), and to divert into non hospitality professions?

- **. Method**

- The research design include both an extensive review of secondary data and a quantitative primary data collection tool; a questionnaire .Further more it is cost effective and easy of administration. The sample consist of 112 randomly selected individuals presently holding managerial, executive , trainee positions in 3 -,4-, 5- star hotels operated in NCR region in order to address our research questions.
- The questionnaire contained two sections:

- 4.1.Burnout;

- 4.2.Motivation;

- The first section of questionnaire consist of eighteen factors which are likelihood express work related factors that could drive employee causing turnover and leakage. The eighteen factors are excessive work load , treating undervalued , repetitive work environment , low pay and promotion , poor communication , lack of appropriate training , lack of control over work, physical violence abuse , lengthy working hours , high pressure work , widespread pushing and throwing object in production areas, some case deliberate burning with hot food and equipments , physical conditions , highly aggressive management style , poor fixtures and fitting of equipments , being shortage of staff , denying of providing same terms as promised .

- **Table 1 Demographic profile of the respondent**


- _____

-                                  **Frequency**                    **Valid**

**percentage**

- _____

- Sex

- Male                                          82                                          72.6

- Female                                     30                                          27.4

- Age

- 20-30                                        32                                          28.57

- 31-40                                        52                                          46.42

- 41-50                                        24                                          21.42

- Over 50                                     4                                            3.57

- Current employer

- Hotel – 5 Star                            47                                          41.96

- Hotel – 4 Star                            41                                          36.60

- Hotel – 3 Star                            24                                          21.42

- Managerial level

  Entry level – supervisory              15                                          13.39
- Mid-level                                    48                                          42.85
- Upper level                                49                                          43.75
- Note: n = 112

- _____
  _


- Further by utilizing the same eighteen factors respondents were asked to express cause behind to burnout which leads to "dropout" from hospitality industry and seek alternative employment in non hospitality professions.

- The second section of questionnaire, to twenty seven work related factors which are perceived role in motivation of employee. The factors are direct compensation , job security, challenging work environment , income plan- fixed income plan ,

6

internal environment , fringe benefits , open door policy , proper training and development cell , flexible working hours , overtime incentive policy is framed and implemented , transparent systematic performance management , systematic grievance system , clearly defined job description , framing quality circle , avoiding salary deduction system , welfare activity , heads attending problems immediately , offering same terms of employment as promised , women cell , ensure transportation in late hours , Joint committee meeting may be held , provision of profit sharing , issues shares to in house , tie up for training and development , minimum set standard for job in hospitality industry , systematic system for employment , a proper sub division of employee on basis of education and professional qualifications . Some factors have been previously used in related studies since the year 1946 (Kovach, 1987; Wiley, 1995).

- Using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) we analyzed the data by using descriptive statistics ,factor Analysis, multiple regression and inferential statistics namely cross tabulations with Pearson Chi-Square test . It enabled us to rigorously address the research questions .The questionnaire were pilot tested for reliability and validity by panel of experts and also by using (Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient) . The Kaiser-Meyer- Olkin measure of sampling adequacy and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity is also conducted for knowing the factor analysis appropriateness .

- 5. Findings

- The questionnaire were mail to 207 hospitality employee currently working in NCR in between of Feb to July 2013 .A total of 123 were completed and returned by the end of year . Of these , eleven survey were incomplete , and thus exclude from the study, reducing the number of usable survey to 112 and the overall response rate to 59.42 %. Table 1. display the demographic profile of the respondent in relation to different variables: sex , age, current employer and managerial experience. Joint Cronbach's coefficient alpha for work factors was 0.674.

- The findings challenge a past perception of NCR hospitality stakeholders who suggest that money is the top motivator among vary level of employee , gender , age group . When reviewing the findings concern to gender basis , According to findings of the research study there were significant statistical differences in motivational profile of male and female hospitality employees .

- Table 2 display that, for male hospitality professionals , defined job description is considered the most important work factor followed by over time policy , proper subdivision of employee on education , challenging work environment , fringe benefits , offering same terms as promise , flexible working hours , job security ,

direct compensation , set minimum standards for employment were the major important work factors for male employee. As on comparative reviewing the most important work factor for female is direct compensation, followed by transportation at late hours , welfare activity , restrict salary deduction system , women cell, increment policy , fringe benefits , open door policy , environment safety , offering same terms as possible .

- Refer table 3 , are there any motivational differences between individuals working at various levels ? Research reveals that there are certain differences between entry, middle, upper level employee currently working in hospitality industry of NCR region. The descriptive statistics shows significant differences between the three level in the following nine factors: offering same terms as promise , proper subdivision of employee on education , overtime policy , fringe benefits , direct compensation , flexible working hours , welfare activity , permanent after probation period , challenging work environment .

- Further analysis of descriptive statistics ,the result shows a number of differences between the position levels but a defined job description are considered the most important motivator that are common in all levels refer

Table 2. Motivation work factor ranked by gender basis

| Work Factors | N | Male | | Female | | Ranking | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Standard Deviations | Means | Standard Deviations | Means | Male | Female |
| Defined job description | 112 | 0.41 | 4.79 | 0.61 | 2.8 | 1 | 14 |
| over time policy | 112 | 0.63 | 4.46 | 0.63 | 2.5 | 2 | 24 |
| proper subdivision of employee on eduction | 112 | 0.69 | 4.45 | 0.73 | 2.47 | 3 | 25 |
| challenging work environmrnt | 112 | 0.67 | 4.41 | 0.78 | 2.27 | 4 | 27 |
| Fringe Benefits | 112 | 0.65 | 4.4 | 0.87 | 4.27 | 5 | 7 |
| offering same terms as promise | 112 | 0.66 | 4.37 | 0.69 | 4.27 | 6 | 10 |
| Flexible working hours | 112 | 0.73 | 4.35 | 0.78 | 4.27 | 7 | 11 |
| Job Security | 112 | 0.8 | 4.34 | 0.68 | 2.43 | 8 | 26 |
| direct compensation | 112 | 0.72 | 4.34 | 0.63 | 4.53 | 9 | 1 |
| set minimum standards for employement | 112 | 0.81 | 4.3 | 0.61 | 2.8 | 10 | 15 |
| permanent after probabtion | 112 | 0.74 | 4.28 | 0.77 | 4.23 | 11 | 12 |
| welfare activity | 112 | 0.93 | 4.21 | 0.67 | 4.4 | 12 | 3 |
| transparent performance review | 112 | 0.89 | 4 | 0.68 | 2.53 | 13 | 22 |
| Training & development cell | 112 | 0.8 | 3.68 | 0.87 | 2.73 | 14 | 16 |
| Open door policy | 112 | 0.57 | 3.57 | 0.87 | 4.27 | 15 | 8 |
| tie up for training | 112 | 0.83 | 2.98 | 0.6 | 2.7 | 16 | 17 |
| restricts salary deduction system | 112 | 0.78 | 2.83 | 0.76 | 4.37 | 17 | 4 |
| issuing in house share system | 112 | 0.71 | 2.77 | 0.63 | 2.53 | 18 | 21 |
| frame quality circle | 112 | 0.74 | 2.73 | 0.56 | 3.6 | 19 | 13 |
| transportation at late hours | 112 | 0.81 | 2.71 | 0.63 | 4.5 | 20 | 2 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| profit sharing | 112 | 0.67 | 2.67 | 0.67 | 2.6 | 21 | 19 |
| enviroment safety , hygiene , sanitation | 112 | 0.6 | 2.63 | 0.91 | 4.27 | 22 | 9 |
| joint committee meetings | 112 | 0.73 | 2.61 | 0.73 | 2.5 | 23 | 23 |
| HOD solving attraction | 112 | 0.65 | 2.6 | 0.62 | 2.6 | 24 | 20 |
| Increment policy- Fixed Flexible | 112 | 0.65 | 2.57 | 0.6 | 4.3 | 25 | 6 |
| systematic grivance system | 112 | 0.61 | 2.46 | 0.56 | 2.63 | 26 | 18 |
| women cell | 112 | 0.79 | 2.43 | 0.7 | 4.3 | 27 | 5 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 112 | | | | | | |

N=112; Scale : 1= Least Important ; 3= No opinion ; 5= Most important
Motivational Factors ranked by Gender basis

- 

- In particular, for the over time policy variables difference exit between the entry level and collectively middle, upper level employee. For middle and upper level , over time policy are considered the most important motivator, may be because they reached a point of age where they settle down there social life and more to be
professional engagement , while on the other hand entry level are more social oriented and belong to age of 20 – 30 years old.

- Table 3. Motivation work factors ranked by entry, middle, upper level employee

| Descriptive Statistics | N | Employee | | Employee | | Employee | | Entry | Middle | Upper |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Work Factors | | Std. Deviation | Mean | Std. Deviation | Mean | Std. Deviation | Mean | | Ranking | |
| Defined job description | 112 | 0.41 | 4.8 | 0.41 | 4.79 | 0.41 | 4.8 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| offering same terms as promise | 112 | 0.52 | 4.53 | 0.74 | 4.29 | 0.7 | 4.37 | 2 | 7 | 5 |
| proper subdivision of employee on eduction | 112 | 0.52 | 4.53 | 0.78 | 4.31 | 0.8 | 4.1 | 3 | 6 | 10 |
| over time policy | 112 | 0.52 | 4.53 | 0.71 | 4.4 | 0.51 | 4.51 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| Fringe Benefits | 112 | 0.64 | 4.47 | 0.73 | 4.35 | 0.65 | 4.45 | 5 | 4 | 3 |
| direct compensation | 112 | 0.74 | 4.4 | 0.73 | 4.38 | 0.72 | 4.35 | 6 | 3 | 6 |
| Flexible working hours | 112 | 0.51 | 4.4 | 0.73 | 4.35 | 0.63 | 4.35 | 7 | 5 | 7 |
| welfare activity | 112 | 0.88 | 4.27 | 1.01 | 4.21 | 0.81 | 4.39 | 8 | 8 | 4 |
| permanent after probabtion | 112 | 0.74 | 4.13 | 0.79 | 4.19 | 0.82 | 4.1 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| challenging work environmrnt | 112 | 0.8 | 4.07 | 0.59 | 2.77 | 0.7 | 2.73 | 10 | 22 | 22 |
| transparent performance review | 112 | 0.88 | 3.93 | 0.89 | 4.02 | 0.88 | 3.98 | 11 | 12 | 12 |
| Training & development cell | 112 | 0.74 | 3.6 | 0.8 | 3.71 | 0.64 | 3.63 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
| Open door policy | 112 | 0.63 | 3.4 | 0.58 | 3.48 | 0.57 | 3.37 | 13 | 15 | 15 |
| profit sharing | 112 | 0.8 | 3.27 | 0.68 | 2.92 | 0.6 | 2.88 | 14 | 19 | 21 |
| transportation at late hours | 112 | 0.88 | 3.07 | 0.76 | 3.02 | 0.73 | 2.96 | 15 | 18 | 19 |
| set minimum standards for employement | 112 | 0.65 | 3 | 0.87 | 4.13 | 0.78 | 4.12 | 16 | 10 | 8 |
| tie up for training | 112 | 0.76 | 3 | 0.75 | 3.33 | 0.67 | 3.12 | 17 | 16 | 16 |
| restricts salary deduction system | 112 | 0.83 | 2.87 | 0.81 | 2.83 | 0.79 | 2.96 | 18 | 20 | 18 |
| issuing in house share system | 112 | 0.7 | 2.73 | 0.67 | 3.02 | 0.67 | 2.88 | 19 | 17 | 20 |

| joint committee meetings | 112 | 0.62 | 2.67 | 0.82 | 2.81 | 0.58 | 2.57 | 20 | 21 | 24 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Job Security | 112 | 0.49 | 2.67 | 0.91 | 4.06 | 1.01 | 4.1 | 21 | 11 | 11 |
| HOD solving attraction | 112 | 0.72 | 2.67 | 0.64 | 2.6 | 0.69 | 2.67 | 22 | 25 | 23 |
| enviroment safety , hygiene , sanitation | 112 | 0.63 | 2.6 | 0.55 | 3.52 | 0.66 | 3.76 | 23 | 14 | 13 |
| Increment policy- Fixed Flexible | 112 | 0.74 | 2.6 | 0.68 | 2.52 | 0.71 | 2.53 | 24 | 27 | 26 |
| frame quality circle | 112 | 0.64 | 2.53 | 0.72 | 2.67 | 0.65 | 2.53 | 25 | 24 | 25 |
| systematic grivance system | 112 | 0.64 | 2.53 | 0.65 | 2.56 | 0.58 | 2.45 | 26 | 26 | 27 |
| women cell | 112 | 0.52 | 2.47 | 0.78 | 2.69 | 0.76 | 3 | 27 | 23 | 17 |

Valid N (listwise)          112
N=112; Scale : 1= Least Important ; 3= No opinion ; 5= Most important
Motivational Factors ranked by Entry , Middle , Upper level basis

- In addition, entry level employees view proper sub division of employee on education give more importance for them compared to middle and upper level

  employees. It is apparent that middle level employees would like to have direct compensation and fringe benefits since at this level of age more focus on growing

  and money saving aspects by employees. In contrast, upper level fringe benefits and welfare activity ranked higher for motivation factors.

- The issue of challenging work environment was the variable where significant differences existed between all three levels. Research findings revealed that for entry level employees , having offering same terms as promise , proper subdivision of employee on education , over time policy , fringe benefits , direct compensation flexible working hours are some of more important compared to their middle or upper level employees , while statistical differences also exits between middle and upper levels. Further issue of job security, environment safety, hygiene, sanitation, challenging work environment was the only variables where significant differences exited between three levels.

- The Kaiser-Meyer- Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was 0.854 and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity is also conducted for knowing the factor analysis appropriateness was 1430.814 as in Table 4.

**MOTIVATION**

| KMO and Bartlett's Test | | |
|---|---|---|
| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy. | | 0.854 |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity | Approx. C | 1430.814 |
| | df | 351 |
| | Sig. | 0 |

- Table 4. Kaiser-Meyer- Olkin measure for motivation
- Our investigations also attempted to find out whether hospitality employees of

collectively different age, gender and levels shared the same perception regarding the motivation work factors.

- Table 4.1. Model summary for motivation

**Model Summary**

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 0.879 | 0.772 | 0.754 | 0.35 |

**Predictors: (Constant), REGR factor score 8 for analysis   1 , REGR factor score  7 for analysis      1 , REGR factor score      6 for analysis      1 , REGR factor score      5 for analysis      1 , REGR factor score      4 for analysis      1 , REGR factor score      3 for analysis      1 , REGR factor score      2 for analysis      1 , REGR factor score      1 for analysis      1**
**Dependent Variable: Motivation**

- In using factor analysis the total variance explain under cumulative percentage is 68.358 and development of eight major components. Finally, in order to find out whether which component factor is significant, regression analysis were used. The results revealed a significant component factors where dependent variable is motivation and predictors involves from one to eight component.

- As model summary shows the R is 0.879 and adjusted R square 0.754 which tell that our model accounts for 75.4 % of variance in the component factor 1,2,3,4,5,6,7and 8. a very good model as per table 4.1.

- The table 4.3. reports on ANOVA , which assesses the overall significance of our model . As $p<0.05$ our model is significant. Finally the standardized beta coefficient give a measure of the contribution of each variable to the model. A large value indicates that a unit change in this predictor variables has a large effect on the criterion variable.

- Table 4.2. Major factor for motivation

**Coefficients**

| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| 1 | (Constant) | 4.366 | 0.033 | | 131.278 | 0 |
| | REGR factor score  1 for anlysis   1 | 7.75E-02 | 0.033 | 0.109 | 2.319 | 0.022 |
| | REGR factor score  2 for analysis   1 | -6.88E-02 | 0.033 | -0.097 | -2.059 | 0.042 |
| | REGR factor score  3 for analysis   1 | 5.95E-02 | 0.033 | 0.084 | 1.782 | 0.078 |
| | REGR factor score  4 for analysis   1 | -1.98E-02 | 0.033 | -0.028 | -0.593 | 0.554 |
| | REGR factor score  5 for analysis   1 | 0.121 | 0.033 | 0.17 | 3.62 | 0 |
| | REGR factor score  6 for analysis   1 | 0.112 | 0.033 | 0.158 | 3.353 | 0.001 |
| | REGR factor score  7 for analysis   1 | -7.72E-02 | 0.033 | -0.109 | -2.311 | 0.023 |
| | REGR factor score  8 for analysis   1 | 0.585 | 0.033 | 0.823 | 17.497 | 0 |

a    **Dependent Variable: Motivation**

- 

- The t and sig (p) values give a rough indication of the impact of each predictor variable. Findings shows a big absolute t value and small p value suggest that a predictor variable is having a large impact on the criterion. Investigation findings that $p<0.022$ for regression factor 1 ,$p<0.042$ for regression factor 2 ,$p<0.000$ for regression factor 5 , p $<0.001$ for regression factor 6 ,$p<0.023$ for regression factor 7, $p<0.000$ for regression factor 8 as refer table 4.2

**ANOVA**

| Model | | Sum of Squar | df | Mean Squar | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Regression | 43.231 | 8 | 5.404 | 43.62 | 0 |
| | Residual | 12.76 | 103 | 0.124 | | |
| | Total | 55.991 | 111 | | | |

**Predictors: (Constant), REGR factor score 8**
**for analysis 1 , REGR factor score 7 for**
**analysis  1 , REGR factor score  6 for**
**analysis  1 , REGR factor score  5 for**
**analysis  1 , REGR factor score  4 for**
**analysis  1 , REGR factor score  3 for**
**analysis  1 , REGR factor score  2 for**
**analysis  1 , REGR factor score  1 for**
**analysis  1**

**Dependent Variable: Motivation**

- Table 4.3. Significance for model

- In particular hospitality employees gave more importance to welfare activity ( Pearson Chi-Square =0.005; p <0.05 ) environment safety , hygiene , sanitation ( Pearson Chi-Square =0.015;p<0.05 ) Flexible working hours ( Pearson Chi-Square =0.009;p<0.05) direct compensation ( Pearson Chi-Square =0.005 ; p<0.05 ) Training and development cell ( Pearson Chi-Square =0.035; p<0.05 ).

- 5.2 Burnout

- Prior to analysis, we examined the reliability of work factors for stress. The joint Cronbach's coefficient alpha was 0.689. The table 6 reports , based on descriptive statistics work factors such as lengthy working hours is most important factors for stress of hospitality employee currently working in NCR region.

- Table 5. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure for stress

**STRESS**

**KMO and Bartlett's Test**

| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy. | | 0.624 |
|---|---|---|
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity | Approx. C | 285.813 |
| | df | 351 |
| | Sig. | 0 |

- The Kaiser-Meyer- Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was 0.624 and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity is also conducted for knowing the factor analysis appropriateness was 285.813. While using factor analysis the total variance explain under cumulative percentage is 63.673 and development of six major components.

- Table 5.1. Model summary for stress factors

**Model Summary**

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 0.953 | 0.908 | 0.902 | 0.27 |

| Predictors: (Constant), REGR factor score 6 for analysis   1 , REGR factor score   5 for analysis      1 , REGR factor score 4 for analysis      1 , REGR factor score 3 for analysis 1 , REGR factor score 2 for analysis   1 , REGR factor score  1 for analysis     1 |
| Dependent Variable: Stress |

- In order to answer research question we are using regression analysis. The results revealed a significant component factors where dependent variable is stress and predictors involves from one to six component. As model summary shows the R is 0.953 and adjusted R square 0.902 which tell that our model accounts for 90.2 % of variance in the component factor 1,2,3,4,5 and 6. a very excellent model. The table 5.2. reports on ANOVA , which assesses the overall significance of our model .

- Investigation findings that $p<0.000$ for regression factor 3 , $p<0.011$ for regression factor 4 . The Standardized Beta Coefficient for regression factor 3 is 0.949 and for regression factor 4 is 0.077 , respective value of t for both regression factors are 31.983 ( factor 3 ) and 2.598 ( Factor 4 ) as refer table 5.3. The regression factor which are significant for model are as work load , high pressure work, poor pay promotion , denying terms of employment , physical violence abuse.

- Table 5.2. Significance for model

**ANOVA**

| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Regression | 74.165 | 6 | 12.361 | 171.9 | 0 |
| | Residual | 7.549 | 105 | 7.19E-02 | | |
| | Total | 81.714 | 111 | | | |

Predictors: (Constant), REGR factor score 6 for analysis     1 , REGR factor score      5 for analysis      1 , REGR factor score 4 for analysis           1 , REGR factor score 3 for analysis  1 , REGR factor score 2 for analysis     1 , REGR factor score      1 for analysis      1
Dependent Variable: Stress

In particular hospitality employees gave more importance in concern to stress factors are high pressure work ( Pearson Chi-Square =0.000; $p <0.05$ ) physical violence abuse( Pearson Chi-Square =0.000;$p<0.05$ ) Supervisor treatment ( Pearson Chi- Square =0.000;$p<0.05$) poor equipments fixtures ( Pearson Chi-Square =0.002 ; $p<0.05$ ). In particular, work load becomes a much more

important factor for stress in hospitality employee in concern to NCR region. In contrast, one new factor for stress emerges out as are poor equipment and fixture.

- Table 5.3. major factors for stress

**Coefficients**

| Model | | Unstandardized Coef | | Standa | t | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| | 1(Constant) | 4.357 | 0.025 | | 171.973 | 0 |
| | REGR factor score 1 for analysis   1 | 5.24E-03 | 0.025 | 0.006 | 0.206 | 0.837 |
| | REGR factor score 2 for analysis   1 | -2.80E-03 | 0.025 | -0.003 | -0.11 | 0.913 |
| | REGR factor score 3 for analysis   1 | 0.814 | 0.025 | 0.949 | 31.983 | 0 |
| | REGR factor score 4 for analysis   1 | 6.61E-02 | 0.025 | 0.077 | 2.598 | 0.011 |
| | REGR factor score 5 for analysis   1 | -2.82E-02 | 0.025 | -0.033 | -1.109 | 0.27 |
| | REGR factor score 6 for analysis   1 | -1.99E-02 | 0.025 | -0.023 | -0.782 | 0.436 |

a        Dependent Variable: Stress

- Table 6.Stress work related factors ranked by employee

**Descriptive Statistics**

| Work Factors | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| lengthy working hours | 112 | 4 | 5 | 4.79 | 0.41 |
| Physical violence abuse | 112 | 3 | 5 | 4.66 | 0.56 |
| working condition | 112 | 3 | 5 | 4.59 | 0.51 |
| high pressure work | 112 | 3 | 5 | 4.54 | 0.55 |
| Supervisor treatment | 112 | 2 | 5 | 4.46 | 0.8 |
| Poor Pay promotion | 112 | 2 | 5 | 4.45 | 0.8 |
| Treatment undervalue | 112 | 3 | 5 | 4.41 | 0.73 |
| work load | 112 | 2 | 5 | 4.36 | 0.86 |
| shortage of staff | 112 | 3 | 5 | 4.28 | 0.82 |
| Wide pushing throwing objects | 112 | 3 | 6 | 4.19 | 0.65 |
| burning with food and equipments | 112 | 2 | 5 | 4.17 | 0.76 |
| denying terms of employement | 112 | 2 | 5 | 3.6 | 1.06 |
| poor equipments fixtures | 112 | 2 | 5 | 3.4 | 0.88 |
| Poor commuinaction | 112 | 1 | 5 | 3.37 | 1.45 |
| lack of control over job | 112 | 2 | 4 | 3.12 | 0.67 |
| repetitive work | 112 | 2 | 5 | 2.86 | 0.7 |
| aggressive mgmt style | 112 | 2 | 4 | 2.85 | 0.67 |
| Training Lacking | 112 | 1 | 5 | 2.61 | 0.88 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 112 | | | | |

N=112; Scale : 1= Least Important ; 3= No opinion ; 5= Most important

Stress Factors ranked by Employees

- **6. Discussion and implications**

- Motivational factors such as welfare activity; environment safety ; Flexible working hours; Training and development cell ; precede direct compensation .However , our findings affirm earlier research which reveals that motivational factors changes as demographic change (Weaver, 1988; Wiley, 1995), as was illustrated by our data which implied that job security becomes an Important motivator for the over 30s, 40s and whereas challenging work environment are one of important factor for 20s rather not for 30s ,40s. Interestingly, according to the findings of the research study, there are number of significant statistical differences in the motivational profile of male and female hospitality managers as job security; challenging work environment; transportation at late hours; women cell. Further the top ten motivational factors reveals that defined job description specify the core responsibility and duties, which result in improved performance and hence increase appreciation along with recognition in his work. Furthermore hospitality industry have a long and lengthy working hours as over time policy will be more considered motivation factors. However fringe benefits; flexible working hours; job security; are also be an important factor for motivation in concern to hospitality employees in NCR region.

- Regarding the burnout related research , our findings indicate that hospitality employees experience burnout the top five factors are lengthy working hours ;physical violence abuse ; working conditions ; high pressure work ; supervisor treatment . In addition, our data did not indicate any variations of burnout among gender basis. In contrast a suggestive model may be develop by using working hours be flexible and to be arranged in break shifts , in addition over time policy factor be considered in framing model.

- 6.2 Limitations

- However , the findings should provide indicative evidence , even there will be arising of factors for developing new models . The research are limited by the specificity of the geographic Context to NCR region .

- References
- Anastasios , P.C.,2007. Human resource challenges confronting the cyprus hospitality industry. EuroMed Journal of Business 2 (2),135-153.

- Amarjit S. Gill,Neil Mathur.,2007. Improving employee dedication and pro-social behavior.International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management 19 (4),328-334.

15

- Annmarie Nicely, Radesh Palakurthi ,A. Denise Gooden.,2011. Behaviors linked to high levels of hotel manager work-related learning. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management 23(6),764-783.

- Blumberg , D.F., 1994. Strategies for improving field service operations productivity and quality. The Service Industries Journal 14(2),262-77.

- Chapman, R.L. , Soosay, C. and Kandampully , J., 2002. Innovation in logistics services and the new business model: a conceptual framework.Manage Service Quality 12(6)630-650.

- Chase, R.B., 1978. Where does the customer fit in a service operation?. Harvard Business Review 137-42.

- Ceridwyn King., 2010. One size doesn't fit all Tourism and hospitality employees' response to internal brand management. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management 22 (4),517-534.

- Frances Devine , Tom Baum , Niamh Hearns , Adrian Devine.,2007. Managing cultural diversity: opportunities and challenges for Northern Ireland hoteliers.International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management 19 (2),120-132 .

- Faulkner,B. and Patiar,A., 1997. Workplace induced stress among operational staff in hotel industry. International Journal of Hospitality Management 16, 99-117.

- Gummesson,E., 1996. Relationship marketing and imaginary organization: a synthesis. European Journal of Marketing 30(2),31-44.

- Glenn F Ross., 1995. Work Stress and personality measures among hospitality industry employee. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management 7(61), 9-13.

- Giri Jogaratnam , Polly Buchanan.,2004. Balancing the demands of school and work: stress and employed hospitality students. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management 16(4), 237-245.

- Haiyan Kong ,Catherine Cheung and Hanqin Qiu Zhang.,2010. Career management systems:what are China's state-owned hotels practising?.International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management 22(4),467-482.

- Heskett,J.L.,1986. Managing in the Service Economy, Harvard Business Review,pp.82-91.

- Jay Kandampully.,2006. The new customer-centred business model for the hospitality industry. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management 18(3),173-187.

- John C. Crotts, Robert C. Ford, Vincent C.S. Heung and E.W.T. Ngai., 2009. Organizational alignment and hospitality firm performance. International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research 3(1), 3-12.

- Jose´ Varela Gonza´lez , Teresa Garcı´a Garazo., 2006. Structural relationships between organizational service orientation, contact employee job satisfaction and citizenship behavior. International Journal of Service Industry Management 17(1), 3-50.

- Krone,C. Tabacchi,M.and Faber ,B.,1998. Manager burnout. Cornell Quarterly 30, 58-63.

- Kandampully,J.,2002. Innovation as the core competency of a service organization : the role technology,knowledge and networks. European Journal of Innovation Management 5(1), 18-26.

- Kangis,P. , Zhang,Y., 2000. Service quality and customer retention in financial services. Journal of Financial Services Marketing, 4(4), 306-18.

- Kasavana,ML. and Knutson,B.J.,2000. Investing in customer equity :using technology to build your frequent diner programs. Journal of Hospitality and Leisure Marketing 7(1),63-74.

- Kong Hai-yan, Tom Baum.,2006. Skills and work in the hospitality sector ,the case of hotel front office employees in China. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management 18(6), 509-518.

- Marcia Taylor ,Dori Finley., 2010. Acculturation, assimilation,and retention of international workers in resorts. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management 22 (5), 681-692.

- Morgan, R., Katsikeas,C. and Appiah-Adu,K., 1998. Market orientation and organizational learning capabilities. Journal of Marketing Management 14, 353-381.

- Nykiel,R.A., 2001. Technology, convenience and consumption. Journal of Hospitality and Leisure Marketing 7(4), 79-84.

- Po-Ju Chen , Youngsoo Choi. , 2008. Generational differences in work values: a study of hospitality management. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management 20 (6), 595-615.

- Paul Barron., 2008. Education and talent management : implications for the hospitality industry . International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management 20 (7), 730-742.

- Parasuraman,A., Grewal D., 2000. The impact of technology on the quality – value-loyalty chan: a research agenda. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science 28(1), 168-74.

- Prahalad C.K., 1993. The role of core competence in the corporation. Research Technology Management 36(6), 40-7.

- Prahalad C.K., Hamel,G., 1990. The core competence of the operation. Harvard Business Review 68,79-91.

- R Murray - Gibbons , C. Gibbons., 2007. Occupational stress in the Chef profession. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management 19(1), 32-42.

- Ronald J. Burke , Mustafa Koyuncu , Lisa Fiksenbaum., 2008. Work experiences, satisfactions and psychological well-being of female and male managers in the hospitality sector in Turkey. Equal Opportunities International 27(6), 505-518.

- Ross,G., 1995. Work stress and personality measures among hospitality industry employees. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management 9(6), 9-13.

- Ross, G., 1997. Career stress responses among hospitality employees. Annals of Tourism Research 24(1), 45-51.

- Rotter,J.B.,1996. Generalised expectations for internal control versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs 80 (1), 184-215.

- Rowley ,G. and Purcell, K., 2001. As cooks go , she went :is labour  churn inevitable?. Hospitality Management 20, 163-85.

- Richard Nicholls., 2011. Customer-to-customer interaction (CCI): a cross-cultural perspective. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management 23(2), 209-223.

- Sandra Watson., 2008. Where are we now? A review of management development issues in the hospitality and tourism sector Implications for talent management. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management 20(7), 758-780.

- Sandra Naipaul and Youcheng Wang., 2009. Entrepreneurship and leadership in hospitality Insights and implications for hospitality and tourism education – Mr Harris Rosen in conversation with Drs Sandra Naipaul and Youcheng Wang. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management 21(6), 639-658.

- Sasser,W.E.,1976. Match supply and demand in services industries. Harvard Business Review, 133-41.

- Sivadas ,E. and Baker –Prewitt,J.L., 2000. An examination of the relationship between service quality , customer satisfaction and store loyalty . International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management. 28(2), 73-82.

- Slater ,S.F. , 1997. Developing a customer value based theory of the firm. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science 25(2), 162-7.

- Slater,S.F.and Narver,J.C., 1995. Market orientation , customer value, and superior performance. Business Horizons 37, 22-8.

- Slater,S.F. and Narver,J.C., 1995. Market orientation and the learning organization. Journal of Marketing 59, 63-74.

- Sonia Bharwani and Neetu Butt ., 2012. Challenges for the global hospitality industry: an HR perspective. Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes 4(2), 150-162.

- Terje Sla°tten and Mehmet Mehmetoglu., 2011. Antecedents and effects of engaged frontline employees A study from the hospitality industry. Managing Service Quality 21(1), 88-107.

- Tracy Harkison, Jill Poulston , Jung-Hee Ginny Kim., 2011. Hospitality graduates and managers: the big divide. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management 23(3), 377-392.

- Veronica Velo , Cristina Mittaz., 2006. Breaking into emerging international hotel markets Skills needed to face this challenge and ways to develop them in hospitality management students. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management 18(6), 496-508.

- Vargo,S.L. , Lush,R.F., 2004. The four service marketing myths: remnants of a goods – based, manufacturing model. Journal of Service Research 6(4), 324-35.

- Vallen,G.K., 1993. Organisational climate and burnout. Cornell HRA Quarterly 34(1), 54-60.

- Zohar,D., 1994. Analysis of Job stress profile in the hotel industry. International Journal of Hospitality Management 13(3), 219-31.