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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background

Phuket is the biggest island in Thailand, located in Andaman Sea adjacent to southern Thailand. Proportionally, 70% of the island is covered by forest. The west coast has several sandy beaches, while on the east coast beaches are muddy. Phuket has the second highest income per capita of any province in Thailand outside of Bangkok, the capital. Tourism has been a dominate factor in Phuket’s economy for the past two decades. Each year, over 3 million visitors arrive to enjoy Phuket’s natural resources. The hotel industry is the most significant industry that plays a major role in Phuket’s economy and labor market. It is the Thai people who create this industry, as it is said that the hospitality industry is a labor intensive human industry. Adler (1991) suggested that the effective use of human capital, not physical capital, is likely to be the most important determinant of organizational performance (Fey, 2005). Therefore, it is extremely important that hotel firms understand how to motivate their employees (human capital) to work to their fullest potential. Especially, when the Thai people are the comparative advantage of the Thai hotel industry, as they are friendly and hospitable (Glanzberg, 1993), however, Thai people are dynamic, and emotional. Many researchers also suggested that people from different nationalities or cultures are likely to be motivated by different factors (Boyacigiller & Adler, 1991; Fisher & Yuan, 1998; Hofstede, 1980; McCleland, 1961).
Moreover, there are many studies that have indicated that the employees and managers in the hospitality industry often experience higher levels of work stress than workers in other service fields (Sarabakhsh, Carson and Lindgren, 1989; and Vallen, 1993). Therefore, it is very challenging for the hotel industry to maintain high staff morale and motivation in order to provide quality service especially with the frontline employees who have been working for a long time.

The presence of frontline employees is of extreme importance to deliver quality service (Hartline and Ferrell, 1996), in fact they remain underpaid, under trained, and overworked (Karatepe and Sokmen, 2006). Thus, they are inclined to show signs of emotional exhaustion (Ledgerwood, Crotts & Everett, 1998). Emotional exhaustion is one of the critical constructs in explaining the attitudes and behaviour of frontline employees in high-stress work environments (Babakus, Cravens, Johnston, & Moncrief, 1999; Boles & Babin, 1996).

How can we motivate people to work and how can we maintain employee motivation, especially in the high-stress work environment? These questions are always in the hotel managers’ mind. Considerable research has been conducted into the relationship between people and their work dating back to the early years of the twentieth century. Theoretical and practical work on motivation has developed over the century together with the industrial production developments (Smith, 1999). “Motivation refers to a dynamic, internal state resulting from the independent and joint influences of personal and situational factors-- an individual mental state affected by the continuous interplay of personal, social, and organizational factors” (Nicholson, N. (Ed.), Schuler, R. and Van de Ven, A.H., 1995). From this definition, it can be concluded that job satisfaction, job performance, intension to leave and organizational commitment are integral parts of the “personal, social and organizational factors” influencing the worker’s internal state (motivation). Lee-Ross (2005) also supported that there is a significant link between motivation in the work place and practical organizational-based outcome such as productivity, commitment, job satisfaction, intent to stay and burnout.
For the purpose of this study, job satisfaction, job performance, intention to leave and organizational commitment together are considered as job outcomes. There has been substantial effort investigated in trying to understand the factors and processes that influence employee job outcomes. This study has a strong focus on the effects of emotional exhaustion and work motivation of the frontline employees’ job outcomes. A model of the relationship among emotional exhaustion, motivations and frontline employees’ job outcomes was developed. The study tested the model for the Phuket hotel industry. Due to their roles, hotel frontline employees (e.g., front office, food and beverage and housekeeping employees) have frequent contact with customers and are expected to deal with a variety of customers’ needs and expectations. Especially, in the hospitality industry where the production of complicated services involves numerous employees, and where each customer often has several encounters with and interacts with several of employees rather than just one individual employee. Each of the encounters has a potential for a decisive influence on the overall satisfaction and loyalty of the customer and the behaviour of every frontline employee will be vital for service quality and customer satisfaction and retention. Therefore, the need for this research is emphasized by the characteristics of frontline employees due to their roles and responsibilities in the hotel (Karatepe & Uludag, 2007).

**Problem Statement**

Motivation to work and emotional exhaustion are important factors for employee productivity. The main management problem in hotels are caused by emotional exhaustion and unmotivated employees, especially the employees who have worked for a longer period of time. Furthermore, the hotel industry is top of the list for a high rate of labor turnover. Therefore, understanding employees’ motivations for work and emotional exhaustion is challenging for managers in order to maintain high quality employees within the organization and also continuing to provide excellent service for the customers.
The main objective of this study is to examine the effects of emotional exhaustion and work motivation on services workers’ responses to their job outcomes. In particular four job outcomes will be included: (1) organizational commitment, (2) job satisfaction, (3) perceived job performance, and (4) intentions to leave.

**Research Questions**

In this research, the emotional exhaustion and employee motivation will be studied. More specifically we will focus on job outcomes, and then the research questions are:

1. How do the emotional exhaustion and motivation relate to job outcomes?
2. How does the emotional exhaustion affect job outcomes of hotel frontline employee?
3. How does the motivation affect job outcomes of hotel frontline employee?
4. What are the prior motivating factors to work for hotel frontline employee in Phuket?

**Objectives of the Study**

1. To study the relationship of emotional exhaustion, and motivation on frontline employees’ job outcomes.

2. To identify the prior motivating factor for work of hotel frontline employee in Phuket

**Research Model and Hypotheses**

This study will apply need theory, goal theory, feedback theory and equity theory (among the most popular motivation theories) in a complementary manner to formulate the hypotheses about which factors motivate frontline employee in the hotel industry. It examines the impact of work motivation and emotional exhaustion on job outcomes.
Figure 1 shows the conceptual framework for the study. It illustrates the effects of emotional exhaustion, and motivation on frontline employees’ affective outcomes (job satisfaction, affective organizational commitment, job performance, and turnover intention).

Figure 1: Research model

**Relationships of emotional exhaustion and work motivation on employee’s job outcomes**

It has been demonstrated that employee motivation and emotional exhaustion influence job outcomes such as job satisfaction, job performance, organizational commitment and intention to leave (Brewer, 1994; Miller, 2002; Lee & Ashforth, 1996; and Eby et al., 1999). The following hypotheses are therefore proposed:

**H1.** Emotional exhaustion is negatively related to job satisfaction among frontline employees.

**H2.** Emotional exhaustion is negatively related to affective organizational commitment among frontline employees.

**H3.** Motivation is positively related to job satisfaction among frontline employees.
H4. Motivation is positively related to organizational commitment among front line employee.

H5. Job satisfaction is positively related to job performance among frontline employees

H6. Organizational commitment is positively related to job performance among frontline employees

H7. Job performance is negatively related to turnover intensity among frontline employees
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Olsen (1996) described that the hotel industry as representing the largest employment sector in the world’s largest industries. The hotel industry continues to remain to be a labour-intensive industry, and a key to its competitive performance has been the successful motivation of its staff. Bitner, Boom & Mohr (1994) found that dealing with problem customers is one of the most unpleasant events for restaurant, hotel, and airline employees. Moreover, there are many reasons why young, talented hospitality employees leave the industry, for example, long working hours including nights and weekends, low pay, stress from demanding duties, and supervisors (Pavesic and Brymer, 1990). Numerous literatures sources indicate that there are a number of problems in the hotel industry, such as, limited training and development opportunities, inadequate pay, low job security, and excessive turnover (Cheng & Brown, 1998; Deery & Shaw 1999; Pizam & Thornburg, 2000). Also, there are problems relating to (undesirable) unsocial work hours, and workloads in hotel industry (Karatepe & Sokmen, 2006; Rowley & Purcell, 2001). Consequently, frontline employees in hotels tend to be vulnerable to emotional exhaustion (Ledgerwood, Crotts, & Everett, 1998), which is one of the components leading to employee burnout.
Emotional Exhaustion

Job burnout has been considered as a type of stress, which is one dimensional (Cordes and Daugherty, 1993). In contrast, Maslach and Jackson (1981), who developed the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI), which is the most widely known instrument used to measure burnout (Maslach et al., 2001), claimed that burnout is a multi-dimensional construct that consists of three distinct components: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and diminished personal accomplishment. They defined burnout as “a syndrome of emotional exhaustion and cynicism that occurs frequently among individuals who do ‘people-work’ of some kind” (Masland & Jackson, 1981: 99). Originally, job burnout research focused on human service jobs because Maslach and Jackson (1981, 1986) assumed that job burnout occurs only in the human services environment. It has been recognized as an occupational hazard for various people-oriented professions such as social service and education (Maslach, 1976; Maslach & Goldberg, 1998). Job burnout studies then were conducted on people working in human services and education (Cordes & Daugherty, 1993). Vallen (1993) studied about organizational climate and burnout, and consequently found a strong relationship between burnout among hospitality industry employees and identifiable organizational characteristics. In particular, hospitality organizations that generate employee distrust, demonstrate a close control over the employees, and do not encourage teamwork, were found to produce significantly more burnout among workers.

Many researchers have agreed that emotional exhaustion is the first stage of the ‘burnout syndrome’ (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993; Gaines & Jermier, 1983). Emotional exhaustion refers to a lack of energy and a feeling that one’s emotional resources are used up because of excessive psychological demands (Maslach, 1993). Also Gaines and Jermier (1983), who stated that emotional exhaustion is related to reduction of emotional resources, and involves feelings of fatigue, being ‘used up,’ and frustration.
Babukus et al. (1999) found that frontline employees who lacked emotional energy were less satisfied with their jobs. If the success of the hospitality firms relies on employees who are capable of performing their jobs under stress, emotional exhaustion is likely to exert damaging effects on frontline hotel employees’ affective job outcomes such as job satisfaction, affective organizational commitment, job performance and intention to leave. Studies usually found a negative relationship between burnout and work satisfaction, and both experiences are strongly determined by organizational structures and processes (Burish, 2002; Kalliath & Morris, 2002, Stechmiller & Yarandi, 1993; Thomsen, Soares, Nolan, Dallender & Arnetz, 1999). Therefore, burnout, particularly emotional exhaustion, was also strongly related to job dissatisfaction (Kalliath & Morrish, 2002). Also conservation of resources (COR) theory suggests that employees become dissatisfied with their jobs, display lower affective commitment to the organization, and have higher intentions to leave the organization, when they are emotionally exhausted (Lee & Ashforth, 1996).

Motivation

Motivation research was conducted during the first 50 years of the 20th century. For the first two decades, the study of workplace motivation was largely emphasized on money. In the third decade, attitude surveys conducted by industry-organizational psychologists (I/O) and revealed that it took a lot more than money to make people happy, for example, job security, recognition, and job status (Latham & Ernst, 2006). The psychological test supported that job satisfaction predicts job performance. Moreover, the research showed that people can be happy for non-job performance reasons, e.g., happy with co-workers, fringe benefits, physical work condition (Latham & Ernst, 2006).

Motivation can be viewed in two parts: intrinsic and extrinsic (Sujan, 1986; Tyagi, 1982). Intrinsic motivation comes internally from the desire to do a job well. Extrinsic
motivation is defined as externally mediated rewards such as pay and promotion (Tyagi, 1985). Paulin, Ferguson and Bergeron (2006) found that when jobs and workplace conditions are intrinsically motivating, supportive and equitable, they create overall job satisfaction, affective commitment and organizational citizenship behaviour. Past studies of Dubinsky and Harty (1986), and Tyagi (1985) suggested employees may value both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and both can influence job performance and self-efficacy. However, not all studies have found a significant relationship between motivation and performance (Hampton et al., 1986).

Following Klein (1989: 150, cited in Fey, 2005: 349), motivation is defined as “the set of psychological processes that cause the initiation, direction, intensity and persistence of behaviour.” While Locke and Latham (2004: 388) stated that “motivation refers to internal factors that impel action and external factors that can act as inducements to action.” There are many well-known motivation theories such as Adam Equity’s Theory, Maslow’s needs hierarchy, Vroom’s expectancy theory, Skinner’s reinforcement theory, and Herzberg’s two factor theories.

Although, motivation has been studied from many perspectives, it can be classified into 4 main prospects including need-based (e.g., Alderfer, 1969; Maslow, 1954; McCleland, 1961), goal-setting (e.g. Locke & Latham, 1990; Tubbs, 1986), equity (e.g., Adams, 1976; Mowday, 1987), and feedback (e.g., Ashford, 1986; Bandura & Cervone, 1983; Talor, 1984). Scholars have pointed out that though the motivation field has many theories, most frequently scholars use only theory claiming it is universal and exclusive. Focusing on one theory may not be a good solution as most motivation theories do not contradict each other but in fact normally complement each other (Klein, 1989; Laudy & Becker, 1987).
Need theory

The first attempt to classify needs was done by Murray (1938 cited in Fey, 2005) who listed 20 needs that explained the behaviour of an individual in work situations. Later Abraham Maslow (1954) developed a clear-cut hierarchical categorizations of all needs that guided individual behaviour: (1) Physiological needs—need for food, water, air, cloth and shelter, (2) Safety needs—need to feel safe and secure from potential evils, (3) Social needs—need to feel accepted and loved, (4) Esteem needs—need to feel successful and admired by others, and (5) Self-actualization—the desire to become all that one is capable of becoming. The basic idea of Maslow’s work is that lower level needs must be satisfied before higher level needs become an important motivating factor. Maslow’s hierarchy of needs has been criticized by some researchers for being too finely divided making it difficult to distinguish between the different levels of needs. Thus many later researchers modified Maslow’s needs hierarchy such as Alderfer (1969) and McClelland (1961).

A number of other studies found Maslow’s needs hierarchy to be similar, although not identical, in different countries such as India (Jaggi, 1979), Peru (Stephens, Kedia, & Ezell, 1979), and in Middle East. Also, Hofstede (1980) convincingly argued that Maslow’s needs hierarchy was not universally applicable across cultures due to variations in national culture across countries. Further, some studies have provided evidence which rejects the universality of Maslow’s needs hierarchy across national cultures in different countries (Blunt and Jones, 1992; Kaungo and Mendonca, 1994; and Tayeb, 1988). However, Steers and Sanchez-Runde (2002) presented that while some progress has been made in testing need theories of motivation in international settings, significant problems still exist. For example, they noted that most of the extant research has focused on higher-order needs (e.g., achievement and self-actualization). Though, much of the world’s population, especially those people living in developing countries
are most likely to remain primarily concerned with trying to satisfy lower-level needs like safety and security.

**Equity theory**

In many cases, an individual’s work motivation is affected by how one perceives oneself to be treated by colleagues, superiors, and other people in the work environment. The major difference between equity theory and need theories such as those proposed by Alderfer (1969) and Maslow (1954), is that the latter explain work motivation by analyzing the situation of each person individually, while equity theory emphasizes relative situations within a group. Equity theory stresses that motivation is increased if the individual believes he receives fair treatment with respect to others. Additionally, the key important in equity theory is perception, not reality. A person will not become less motivated because he is treated unfairly, but because he believes he was treated unfairly.

Adams (1976) is the first scholar who developed equity theory and stated that individuals compare themselves continuously to their peers. This comparison is done by monitoring how employee input (education, effort, loyalty, etc.) to the employers is rewarded in the form of output (money, travel, vacation, career, etc.). If an individual believes that he is rewarded less compared to his amount of input than is the case for his peers, he will be unmotivated unless the inequity is resolved. There are several ways to resolve this inequity such as paying the person more, or having the person less work. It might be help employees to understand that they are comparing themselves to the wrong persons. In other words, it might be possible to logically explain why other persons deserve more pay. Additionally, perceived justice is associated with several organizational outcomes, such as performance and job satisfaction (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter & Ng, 2001). Employees can compare their rewards and
benefits with those of their competitors, which may significantly influence their job satisfaction (Kim, Leong & Lee, 2005).

There are many researchers, who support the fundamental principle of equity theory in a U.S. western setting, but there is little support for the fact that equity principle works universally in different cultures (Hofstede, 1980). In fact, results of studying equity theory are not always predicted in many countries such as Korea (Chung, Lee, & Jung, 1997) and Israel (Yuchtman, 1972). Additionally, Fay (2005) who studied the motivation across-culture between Swedish and Russian managers found that Swedish managers are highly motivated by perceived equity with their peers concerning the ratio of inputs they exert and outputs they receive. In contrast, equity appears to be less important for Russians who have been faced with much inequity in the past. Therefore, the generalization of equity theory has still been criticized (Husman, Hatfield, & Miles, 1987).

**Goal Theory and Feedback Theory**

During the 1980s, motivational theory focused on the importance of setting goals for employees (Locke & Latham, 1990). According to the goal-setting theory, individuals feel more motivated if they are presented with explicit goals, such as a sales target to reach. Much study supports that people perform at a higher level when they have specific and challenging goals with they had some role in developing (Lock & Latham, 1990). Similarly to other theory, the large numbers of studies are U.S.A.-based; little goal theory research has been done in the international context (Erez, 1986).

Goal and feedback can help clarify for an employee what he must do. The difference is feedback takes place during and after the behaviour has been taken place while goals are usually set before and activity is commenced. Feedback is information with the purpose of guiding the
individual in various situations. Feedback is given either by the task itself or by some other person such as a supervisor or a colleague (Lawler, 1973). A large number of studies (e.g., Asford, 1986; Bandura & Cervone, 1983; Taylor, 1984) have shown a positive correlation between feedback and work motivation. Feedback is also posited to affect motivation in Hackman and Oldham’s Job Characteristic Model (1980). Many studies found that the extent that feedback is effective varies across cultures (Early, Gibson, & Chen, 1999; and Early & Stubblebine, 1989). Moreover, Welsh et al. (1993) demonstrated that positive feedback (praise and recognition for good work) can lead to increased job performance among Russian factory workers.

Feedback is related to hierarchy and responsibility. The relatively high power distance implies that subordinates are likely to appreciate clear feedback that helps them to understand what is expected, whereas it is unlikely to be appreciated in a low power distance. In contrast, in flatter cultures, where responsibility is spread more equally with members, feedback does not play as important a role as in hierarchical top-down managed cultures, where subordinates attain legitimacy by means of approval from superiors. Goal-setting and feedback both fill the function of uncertainty reduction. People fearing ambiguity want frequent proof that their actions are legitimate. This can be attained either by receiving detailed goals or by receiving frequent detailed feedback (Fey, 2005).

Job Outcomes

Job outcomes consist of many components but mostly factors that are considered the significant elements include job satisfaction, job performance, organizational commitment and intention to leave.
Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction can be defined as a set of employee attitudes about their work (Paulin, Ferguson & Bergeron, 2006). It is extent to which workers feel positively or negatively about their job (Odom, Boy & Dunn, 1999). Job satisfaction indicates the employees’ general affective evaluation of their job. In the hospitality industry, job satisfaction assists to ensure that employees will treat customers with the greatest respect. Also, job satisfaction leads to good employee performance, which, in turn makes them less likely to leave (Arnett, Laverie & McLane, 2002). Jerome and Kleiner (1995) mentioned that the companies that exhibited high commitment to improving the employee’s job satisfaction, motivation, and morale may recognize long-term benefits of corporate success, loyalty, productivity, and employee retention. Kim, et al. (2005) also supported that implementing an effective internal marketing program should improve employee satisfaction, which creates customer satisfaction. However, implementing such a good internal program requires a strong commitment from management (Kotler, Bowen & Makens, 1999). The Job Description Index of job satisfaction includes the facets of: the work itself, supervision, pay, promotion and co-workers (Smith, 1992). Another study of Hom and Griffeth (1995) found the result from exit survey, which indicated pay is an important reason given by employees for leaving their jobs. This problem may be caused not just from the level of pay but the method in which it is distributed and communicated to employees (i.e., organizational justice).

Moreover, many studies found that job satisfaction has a positive association with organizational commitment (Fletcher & William, 1996; Yavas & Bodur, 1999; Brown & Peterson, 1994; Mathieu & Hamel, 1989; Reichers, 1985; Kim, et al., 2005; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Lok & Crawford, 2001, Lock & Latham, 1990) and job performance (Meyer, Paunonen, Gellatly, Goffin & Jackson, 1989; Babin & Boles, 1996; Birnbaum & Somers, 1993). Thus, employees who are satisfied with their jobs have greater organizational commitment than do
dissatisfied employees. Mobley (1977) supported that if employees are dissatisfied with their jobs, they are more likely to leave the organization for another position.

**Organizational Commitment**

Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979: 226) defined organizational commitment as “(a) a strong belief in, and acceptance of, the organization’s goals and values; (b) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; and (c) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization.” The three-component model of commitment comprises affective (want to), normative (ought to) and continuance (have to) commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Lee, Park and Yoo (1999) proposed that the organizational commitment is loyalty to the organization and mobilization of all employees in the development of its goals, purposes, and infrastructure. Organization commitment also can be defined as an attachment to or identification with the organization. Such attachment may be considered an emotional response, particularly when the individual believes strongly in the organization’s goals and values and/or demonstrates a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). The consequences of organizational commitment include retention, attendance, performance, and job productivity. Employees with a high commitment engage in behaviors that are consistent with organizational objectives and align themselves with organizational norms, guidelines and policy. They resist the temptation to engage in problem behaviors even in the face of disappointment, frustration, and emotional exhaustion. Highly committed employees demonstrate their attachment to the organization by following organizational guidelines and by avoiding behaviors that can bring harm to the organization or project a negative image of the company (Mulki, Jaramillo and Locander, 2006). Evidently, the employee who has high positive commitment to the organization may result in a low intention to leave. Both Davy, et al. (1991), and Williams and Hazer (1986) identified organizational commitment as a mediator between job satisfaction and intent to leave.
**Turnover Intention**

A person’s intention to leave the organization can be described as a psychological response to specific organizational conditions which fall along a continuum of organizational withdrawal behaviors ranging from day-dreaming to the physical act of quitting (Kraut, 1975). The hospitality industry has been characterized as having excessive levels of both absenteeism and turnover. In the hospitality industry, there is some evidence to suggest that turnover (voluntary and involuntary) vary by the size and type of the establishment. Voluntary turnover was defined as “voluntary resignation by an employee” (Pizam & Thornburg, 2000). Woods, Heck and Sciarini (1998) found that larger properties had lower turnover rates than smaller properties, and that upscale hotels had lower turnover rates than economy hotels. According to the Human Resource Management, HRM opinions, Pizam and Thornburg (2000) found that the most important factors affecting hotel voluntary turnover rates were pay and benefits, satisfaction with the job as a whole, relationship with co-workers and whether pre-employment expectations were met. Moderately important factors included tenure, job performance, internal motivation, job stress, and job status (hourly vs. salary employees). Age was also rated as a moderately important contributor to turnover. Thus, it is valuable for the organization to understand employee’s intention to leave and intrinsic motivational factor in order to reduce turnover rate. Several researches showed that organizational commitment is negatively related to intention to leave (Ingram & Kuen, 1990; Sager, 1990). It means low levels of organizational commitment will lead to willingness to search for another job, intention to leave. Table 1 presents the summary of literature reviews about motivation, emotional exhaustion, and job outcomes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Parsons E. & Broadbridge A.  | 2006 | Job motivation and satisfaction: unpacking the key factors for charity shop managers | - 22 in-depth interviews followed by a UK wide survey of 826 charity shop managers.  
- Descriptive statistic was used | - The managers show low levels of satisfaction with factors such as pay, job status and working conditions.  
- The managers’ dissatisfaction is improved by the fulfillment gained from interpersonal relationships with other staff members and knowledge that their efforts are benefiting a charitable cause. |
| Fey, F. C.                   | 2005 | Opening the black box of motivation: A cross-cultural comparison of Sweden and Russia | - The questionnaires were randomly selected sent to 275 Russian firms and 225 Swedish-owned firms, which had at least 20 employees.  
- The companies were asked to select one middle manager either in sales or manufacturing to complete the questionnaire. | - Russian managers are best motivated by salary level and provision of bonus. While Swedish managers are better motivated by having a pleasant working environment.  
- Swedish managers are also highly motivated by perceived equity with their peers concerning the ration of inputs they exert and outputs they receive. In contrast, equity appears to be less important for Russians who have been faced with much inequity in the past.  
- This study did not provide support for goal-setting theory. However, it shows that several motivation theories can be used to complement each other.  
- The results of this study support for the fact that |
Sharpley R., Forster G.  
2003  
The implications of hotel employee attitudes for the development of quality tourism: the case of Cyprus  

- A total of 40 accommodation providers across four resorts were initially selected for participation in the survey.  
- 20 self-completion questionnaires were supplied to each establishment along with covering letter requesting the manager to distribute as many questionnaires as possible amongst appropriate staff envelopes were provided to maintain anonymity and to encourage honest responses.  
- A period of 2 weeks was allowed for between distribution and collection of questionnaires.  

- The majority of employees work in hotels for the money rather than because of a commitment to the (service) nature of the job; as discussed shortly, this implication is supported by the other cited attractions of the work.  
- The majority of employees are satisfied with the wages they earn and that they would not work harder if they were paid more, an attitude that suggests that remuneration alone would not be an effective means of motivating staff.  
- The trade unions should, in future, direct their efforts to improving work conditions such as hours and shift patterns, rather than on wage increase and, secondly, it is intrinsic rewards such as a sense of achievement or feeling valued by the organization, that management should seek to increase to encourage desired behavior.  
- The pressure of work, unsocial hours and shift patterns and the belief that they have to work harder now than in the past emerged as significant problems or dislikes.  
- The employees felt part of a team whilst a ‘friendly atmosphere’ and ‘team spirit’ were dominant job ‘likes’. Thus, teamwork or a sense of belonging upon is strategies for reducing staff turnover.  
- The more support and more listening and responding to staff problems on the part of
| Hong J., Yang S., Wang L., Chiou E., Sun F. and Huang T. | 1995 | Impact of employee benefits on work motivation and productivity | - Questionnaires were sent to 133 excellent welfare corporation samples, which were 30 copies for managers and 60 for employees.  
- The questionnaire consisted of 27 employee benefit programs: foreign travel subsidies; entertainment equipment and activities; transportation facilities; opportunity for further education/training; subsidies for further education/training; counseling measures; day-care service; maternity and paternity leave; group and dependent insurance; various loans; dividends; year-end bonuses; savings subsidies; traditional and emergency subsidies; pensions; vocational  
- Implementation of employee benefit programs affects employees’ performance.  
- Employee benefit programs have greater impact on work-motivation than on productivity  
- Monetary benefit programs are most highly valued by both executives and workers.  
- There is a cognitive gap between management and worker on the importance of employee benefit programs.  
- Private-corporation employees have greater employee benefit demands than their public corporation counterparts.  
- Female and male employees have different benefits demands.  
- Single employees perceive more employee benefit impact on job performance than married ones. |
| Karatepe M. & Uludag O. | Conflict, exhaustion, and Motivation: A Study of frontline employees in Northern Cyprus hotels | disease and damage compensations; child-education benefits; individual annual vacations, national holidays, paid leave; discounted goods supply; dormitories and housing benefits; food/drink equipment and meal subsidies; barbering/hairdressing and laundry service; medical equipment and subsidies; free commuting vehicles; commuter subsidies; flexible working time; part-time working. | - Employees with different education levels perceive different employee benefit impact.  
- Employees with different positions perceive different employee benefit impacts.  
- Employee benefit programs have greater influence on job performance of younger employees. |

- 872 Questionnaires were sent to Turkish frontline employees in 3-5-star hotels in Northern Cyprus  
- Factor analysis was applied to analyze the factors in the research model.  
- The hypothesized relationships were tested with LISREL 8.30 using path analysis  
- Frontline employees who had difficulty in spending time with their family/social commitments as a result of their job-related responsibilities were susceptible to elevated levels of emotional exhaustion.  
- The intrinsically motivated employees displayed low levels of emotional exhaustion. So the frontline employees who really cared about their work and had feelings of competence in fulfilling job-related tasks experienced less emotional exhaustion.  
- Work-family conflict and emotional exhaustion are two constructs that have significant adverse effects on job satisfaction in the high-stress work environment. |
- Emotional exhaustion was found to have a significant negative relationship with affective organizational commitment, whereas work-family conflict did not.

- The effect of intrinsic motivation on affective organizational commitment appeared to be greater than its effect on job satisfaction.

- Job satisfaction was found to have a significant positive association with affective organizational commitment.

- The antecedents of intention to leave are increased emotional exhaustion, decreased job satisfaction, and low levels of affective organizational commitment.

- The emotional exhaustion has a strong positive impact on intention to leave. The frontline employees think about leaving the organization when they are emotionally exhausted.

- The frontline employees who had low level of job satisfaction and affective commitment to the organization think about leaving the organization.

- Work-family conflict was not found to have a significant positive relationship with intention to leave.

Kim H., Shin K., 2007 Hotel job burnout: The role of 1001 surveys were distributed. - Personality attributes explain significant proportions of three job burnout factors. The most noteworthy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Umbreit W.</td>
<td>personality characteristics</td>
<td>- The IPIP (International Personality Item Pool; Goldberg, 2001) was used to evaluate subjects’ five personality dimensions. - The MBI-GS instrument developed by Schaufeli et al. (1996) was used to evaluate employees’ job burnout in hotels.</td>
<td>finding is the predictability of the agreeableness trait as well as extroversion in hotel employees’ job burnout. - Empowered employees with more autonomy are less likely to experience job stress (exhaustion, treat customers more personally (lack of cynicism) and feel proud of their job (professional efficacy).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim W., Leong J., &amp; Lee Y.</td>
<td>Effect of service orientation on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and intention of leaving in a casual dining chain restaurant</td>
<td>- 450 questionnaires were distributed to international chain restaurant in Seoul, Korea - Factor analysis and structural equations modeling were utilized.</td>
<td>- The customer focus of employees was negatively associated with employee’s job satisfaction, but positively associated with their organizational commitment. - Organizational support was positively associated with job satisfaction. - Job satisfaction was positively associated with organizational commitment, but negatively associated with employees’ intention of leaving. - Organizational commitment was negatively associated with intention to of leaving.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luthams F., Zhu W. &amp; Avolio B.</td>
<td>The impact of efficacy on work attitudes across cultures</td>
<td>- 888 questionnaires were responded, 753 from the U.S., and 135 from southeast Asia (Indonesia, Malaysia and</td>
<td>- General efficacy had a significant positive relationship with organizational commitment and significant negative relationship with intention to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand) - One-way ANOVA analysis and regression analysis were applied.</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>The job satisfaction mediated the relationship between general efficacy and organizational commitment and intention to quit in the US. Sample. The relationship between general efficacy and organizational commitment was stronger in the U.S. than in the three combined countries sampled in Southeast Asia.</td>
<td>Piko, B. 2006, Burnout, role conflict, job satisfaction and psychosocial health among Hungarian health care staff: A questionnaire survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 450 questionnaires were distributed to health care staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Emotional exhaustion and depersonalization scores were higher than personal accomplishment as compared to Canadian, Norwegian or US sample. Burnout, particularly emotional exhaustion was found to be strongly related to job dissatisfaction. Job satisfaction was a negative predictor of each type of burnout subscale; role conflict was a factor contributing positively to emotional exhaustion and depersonalization scores.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Descriptive statistics, correlation and multiple regression analyses were computed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mostly HRMs would/could not compute the magnitude of their absenteeism and voluntary turnover rates in their properties. In their opinions, the factors that affect employee absenteeism were mostly work-related rather than demographic. The factors that affect employee voluntary turnover</td>
<td>Pizam, A. &amp; Thornburg, S. 2000, Absenteeism and voluntary turnover in Central Florida hotels: a pilot study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Ross F. G.             | 1997 | Career stress responses among hospitality employees                   | - The 400 questionnaire were distributed to Australian hospitality employees.  
- Factor analysis was employed.  
- The career anchor job autonomy was the most powerful predictor of the clearer work role stress response, and the sole predictor of the better communication stress response.  
- Better communication emerged as the most prominent of the stress responses among this sample. |
| Ross L. D.             | 2005 | Perceived job characteristics and internal work motivation: An exploratory cross-cultural analysis of the motivational antecedents of hotel workers in Mauritius and Australia | - 125 Survey questionnaires were distributed to three five-star hotels.  
- Using Hackman and Oldham’s job Diagnostic Survey  
- The t-test analysis was used and Mann-Whitney U tests were also conducted.  
- While Hackman and Oldham’s model is not wholly appropriate outside a Western culture, it provides a reasonable basis for future research and could be adapted by incorporating previously unaccounted-for non-western culture variables. |
| Sharpley R. & Forster G. | 2003 | The implications of hotel employee attitudes for the development of quality tourism: the case of Cyprus | - Questionnaires were sent to hotel employees in the four major coastal resorts in Cyprus  
- Descriptive statistic was used  
- The majority of employees work in hotels for the money rather than because of a commitment to the job.  
- The majority of employees are satisfied with the wages they earn and that they would not work harder if they were paid more, an attitude that suggests that remuneration alone would not be an effective means of |
- The primary source of job satisfaction for a majority of employees was meeting people.
- A notable dislike of the job was problem guests or dealing with unhappy customers.


- The 386 questionnaire were distributed to the participants in service organizations both hospitality and non-hospitality industries.
  - The measurement was assessed through the application of confirmatory factor analysis, while the predictive character of the proposed path models was assessed using path analysis.
- The measure of job satisfaction, intent to quit, a life satisfaction demonstrated acceptable construct validity within the service context sampled, while the measures of organizational support and commitment received mixed support due to problems with measurement error and item specification.
- Perceived organizational support strongly and significantly influenced job satisfaction and organizational commitment.
- Job satisfaction had a unidirectional impact upon life satisfaction.
- Job satisfaction displayed a limited predictive impact on organizational commitment
- Intent to quit was influenced by both job satisfaction and organizational commitment.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

Sample

A sample of frontline hotel employees in Phuket included both independent hotels and chain hotel property members. The study focused on three departments: front office, housekeeping, and food and beverage. They were chosen because these employees have frequent contact with customers (Rust et al., 1996), are over worked (Singh, 2000), and experience higher levels of emotional exhaustion as compared to other employees in service organizations (Cordes and Dougherty, 1993).

Sampling Approach

Since there is no hotel star rating system in the Thai hotel industry, the hotels in Phuket were selected from the room rate under the assumption that the higher hotel room rate, implied a higher service quality was provided. The selected hotels should have a minimum room rate for a standard room of 3,500 Baht per room per night (approx. US$100 per room) during the low tourist season (May-October). Each participating hotel was asked to distribute two questionnaires to their employees, who worked in front office department (receptionist, and reservationist) and to the wait staff, e.g., waiter/waitress in the food and beverage department, and one questionnaire to guest room attendant in the housekeeping department.
Both full-time and part-time employees were included in this study. The hotel employees in each department were selected by the convenient sampling process. It was found that there were 112 hotels had a room rates that met the US$ 100 per room night and selected according to the standard criteria.

**Survey Procedure**

The data was collected with the survey questionnaires. The hotel manager or human resource director of the targeted hotels were contacted; they were briefed as to the purpose of the study, the data collection process, and solicited their participation in the survey process and ask their permission to engage their employees in the data collection process. A detailed explanation on the questionnaire was provided, and all participants were assured of the confidentiality and anonymity of their responses. All hotels agreed to distribute questionnaires themselves and agreed to follow the researcher’s criteria. The convenience sampling method was used by the hotels. The questionnaires package was distributed to 500 front line employees in 100 participating hotels. The package included a survey questionnaire, a letter communicating the study’s purpose and confidentiality of individual responses, and a sealing return envelope for each questionnaire. Two weeks after the questionnaire packages were distributed, a gentle reminder phone call was instigated to the human resource department to make an appointment to collect the responded questionnaires.

**Questionnaire Development**

The questionnaire was originally prepared in English, and then translated into Thai by using the back-translation method (reverse translation) to confirm its accuracy (McGorry, 2000). To ensure the content validity of the survey questionnaire, both a pre-test and a pilot test were conducted. After translation, the pre-test was conducted with ten academic faculties in the field of hospitality, food service, and human resource management. They were asked to rate the
appropriateness of the items of each scale and the statements. The purpose of the pre-test was to check the content validity of the questionnaire wording and misunderstanding of the original meaning. Several Thai words were amended to make the statements clearer and to explicitly measure only one thing at a time. After correction, the survey instrument was tested with other pilot samples of 20 frontline employees to further ensure the validity of the instrument. According to Hair et al. (1998) validity is the extent to which a scale or set of measures accurately represents the concept of the interest. All statement items and measurement scale were accepted by the respondents.

The questionnaire consisted of 3 parts. Part one was rating the emotional exhaustion, job motivation and four job outcomes: question no.1 - 8 were related to emotional exhaustion, question no. 9 – 23 were related to work motivation, question no. 24 – 32 were related to job satisfaction, question no. 33 – 39 were related to the intentions to leave, question no. 40 – 44 were related to organizational commitment, and question no. 45 – 50 were related to perceived job performance. All of the answers for the questions in part one were responses to the objective one: to study the relationship of emotional exhaustion, and motivation on frontline employees’ job outcomes and also test the seven hypotheses. Part two was ranking the top-five relative to the importance of 15 motivating factors for work, and the last part was about demography. The result from ranking motivating factor in part two was expected to answer the objective two: to identify the prior motivating factor for work of hotel frontline employees in Phuket.

Measurement

The questions in part one was formulated in a five (5)-point Liker-scale format ranging from ‘5’ = ‘strongly agree’ to ‘1’ = ‘strongly disagree.’ Each of the constructs presented in Figure.1 were operationalized using scales derived from the relevant literature.
**Emotional exhaustion**

The emotional exhaustion was operationalized using eight (8) items from the Mashlach Burnout Inventory (Maslach and Jackson, 1981): (1) I feel emotionally drained from my work, (2) I feel used up at the end of the workday, (3) I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job, (4) Working with people all day is really a strain for me, (5) I feel burned out from my work, (6) I feel frustrated by my job, (7) I feel I am working too hard on my job, and (8) I feel like I am at the end of my rope.

**Motivation**

The motivation attributes were measured by using fifteen items adapted from Fey (2005): (1) hotel recognition: Hotel recognition means a lot to me, (2) job itself: My job is valued to me, (3) personal development: Personal development opportunity in this hotel is important factors in keeping me, (4) job autonomy: I like to work here because I can schedule my own work and to make job-related decisions with a minimum supervision, (5) social interaction: Contacting with people is the most favorite part of my job, (6) pay: I do not work for money, (7) skill utilization: I like this job because my skills and capabilities are utilized, (8) job security: Job security is important to me, (9) pleasant co-workers: The quality of relationship with colleagues is not important for me, (10) physical working conditions: I work here because of good physical working condition, (11) supervision: Visibility with upper management is important to me, (12) fringe benefits: The incentive bonus is important factor to improve my performance, (13) equity at work: I am often treated unfairly at work, (14) goals: I prefer my boss who sets clear goals for me, and (15) feedback: I like all comments on the quality of my work.

Additionally, 15 items of motivating factor were requested to rank top 5 according to how important they are (“1” is the most important and “5” is the least important): (1) Equity in work, (2) Work feedback, (3) Goal for work, (4) Physical working condition, (5) Relationship

**Job outcomes**

In line with Harris and Mossholder (1996), *job satisfaction* was measured by using nine items, adapted from the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (Cammann et al., 1983 cited in Øgaard, 2006): (1) All in all I am satisfied with my job, (2) I would recommend a good friend to apply for work in this hotel, (3) I am happy with the pay I have got, (4) I do not like my job because I have a few chances to utilize my skills, (5) The worse thing in my job is supervisor, (6) I am happy with my colleagues, (7) Physical working condition here is only reason that makes me want quit this job, (8) I work here because of good benefits, (9) I love this hotel because everyone is treated equally.

**The intentions to leave** the organization was measured with seven items, adapted from Boshoff and Allen (2000): (1) I often think about leaving this hotel, (2) It would not take much to make me leave this hotel, (3) I will probably be looking for another job soon, (4) I always search for the available job in other place, (5) I do not care my absent record, (6) I do not see my future in this hotel, and (7) I think I am over qualified for this job.

**Organizational commitment** was measured using the short form of the Organizational commitment questionnaires (Mowday et al., 1979), which measured affective or attitudinal commitment. The complete organizational commitment scale of these authors had consisted of affective and behavioral commitment items (Bettencourt and Brown, 2003). Thus, only five items from the original scale were used because this study assessed only affective organizational commitment: (1) My values and those of the hotels’ are similar, (2) I really care about my future in this hotel, (3) I am proud to tell others that I work for this hotel, (4) I am willing to put in a
great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help the hotel to be successful, (5)
For me, this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work.

**Perceived Job performance** was measured with six items adapted from Sigh et al. (1996) where each employee was asked to evaluate himself or herself in comparison to co-workers and to hotel industry employees in general: (1) Compare to other employees in the hotel industry, I do a good job, (2) Compared to other employees in this hotel I do an excellent job, (3) I have got lesser warning compare to my colleagues, (4) I gets more compliment from supervisor than everyone in my department, (5) I always gets compliment from the guests, and (6) I often get the employee of the month award.

**Demographic profile**

Demographic variables included age, gender, education, organizational tenure, marital status and the number of children. Age, education and organizational tenure were measured using a five (5)-point Likert scales. The number of children was measured using a four (4)-point Likert scale. Gender and marital status were coded as a binary variable (0 = male, and 1 = female; 0 = single/divorced/ widowed, and 1 = married).

**Data analysis**

Descriptive statistics such as means, standard deviations and percentages were examined to determine information about the hotel frontline employee demographic profile.

To test the hypotheses, confirmatory factor analysis and structural equations modeling were utilized. First, a confirmatory factor analysis was applied to derive the underlying factors of the eight emotional exhaustion attributes, 15 motivations attributes, nine job satisfactions attributes, seven intensions to leave attributes, five organizational commitment attributes, and six perceived job performance attributes. Lastly, structural equations modeling was employed to
determine the cause-effect relationships between three dimensions of emotional exhaustion, motivation, and job outcomes (job satisfaction, intentions to leave, organizational commitment, job performance). Table 2 indicates the exogenous and endogenous constructs defined in the path diagram.

**Table 2: Endogenous and Exogenous Constructs Defined in the Path Diagram**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Endogenous constructs</th>
<th>Exogenous constructs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>η 1 Job satisfaction</td>
<td>ξ 1 Emotional exhaustion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>η 2 Organizational commitment</td>
<td>ξ 2 Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>η 3 Job performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>η 4 Turnover intention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mentioned in the previous chapter, this study includes the following 7 hypotheses:

H1. Emotional exhaustion (EX) is negatively related to job satisfaction (SA) among frontline employees.

H2. Emotional exhaustion (EX) is negatively related to affective organizational commitment (OC) among frontline employees.

H3. Motivation (MO) is positively related to job satisfaction (SA) among frontline employees.

H4. Motivation (MO) is positively related to organizational commitment (OC) among frontline employee.

H5. Job satisfaction (SA) is positively related to job performance (JP) among frontline employees
H6. Organizational commitment (OC) is positively related to job performance (JP) among frontline employees

H7. Job performance (JP) is negatively related to turnover intension (TI) among frontline employees

Table 3 summarized the variable used in the structural modeling approach in this study.

Table 3: Summary of Scale Items Used In This Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct/Indicator name</th>
<th>Scale Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotional Exhaustion (EX)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX1:</td>
<td>I feel emotionally drained from my work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX2:</td>
<td>I feel used up at the end of the workday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX3:</td>
<td>I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX4:</td>
<td>Working with people all day is really a strain for me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX5:</td>
<td>I feel burned out from my work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX6:</td>
<td>I feel frustrated by my job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX7:</td>
<td>I feel I am working too hard on my job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX8:</td>
<td>I feel like I am at the end of my rope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation (MO)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO1:</td>
<td>hotel recognition: Hotel recognition means a lot to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO2:</td>
<td>job itself: My job is valued to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO3:</td>
<td>personal development: Personal development opportunity in this hotel is important factors in keeping me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO4:</td>
<td>job autonomy: I like to work here because I can schedule my own work and to make job-related decisions with a minimum supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO5:</td>
<td>social interaction: Contacting with people is the most favorite part of my job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO6:</td>
<td>pay: I do not work for money</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MO7: skill utilization: I like this job because my skills and capabilities are utilized
MO8: job security: Job security is important to me
MO9: pleasant co-workers: The quality of relationship with colleagues is not important for me
MO10: physical working conditions: I work here because of good physical working condition
MO11: supervision: Visibility with upper management is important to me
MO12: fringe benefits: The incentive bonus is important factor to improve my performance
MO13: equity at work: I am often treated unfairly at work
MO14: goals: I prefer my boss who sets clear goals for me
MO15: feedback: I like all comments on the quality of my work

Job satisfaction (SA)
SA1: All in all I am satisfied with my job
SA2: I would recommend a good friend to apply for work in this hotel,
SA3: I am happy with the pay I have got
SA4: I do not like my job because I have a few chances to utilize my skills
SA5: The worse thing in my job is supervisor
SA6: I am happy with my colleagues
SA7: Physical working condition here is only reason that makes me want to quit this job
SA8: I work here because of good benefits
SA9: I love this hotel because everyone is treated equally
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Organizational commitment (OC)

| OC1: | My values and those of the hotels’ are similar |
| OC2: | I really care about my future in this hotel |
| OC3: | I am proud to tell others that I work for this hotel |
| OC4: | I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help the hotel to be successful |
| OC5: | For me, this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work |

Perceived Job performance (JP)

| JP1: | Compare to other employees in the hotel industry, I do a good job |
| JP2: | Compared to other employees in this hotel I do an excellent job |
| JP3: | I have got lesser warning compare to my colleagues |
| JP4: | I get more compliments from supervisor than everyone in my department |
| JP5: | I always gets compliment from the guests |
| JP6: | I often get the employee of the month award |

Turnover intention (TI)

| TI1: | I often think about leaving this hotel |
| TI2: | It would not take much to make me leave this hotel |
| TI3: | I will probably be looking for another job soon |
| TI4: | I always search for the available job in other place |
| TI5: | I do not care my absent record |
| TI6: | I do not see my future in this hotel |
| TI7: | I think I am over qualified for this job |
Figure 2: Path Diagram for The Proposed Model

Notes: EX1 - EX8 = Observed measure associated with exogenous latent variable (Emotional Exhaustion)
MO1 - MO15 = Observed measure associated with exogenous latent variable (Motivation)
SA1 - SA9 = Observed measure associated with endogenous latent variable (Job Satisfaction)
OC1 - OC5 = Observed measure associated with endogenous latent variable (Organizational Commitment)
JP1 - JP6 = Observed measure associated with endogenous latent variable (Job Performance)
TI1 - TI7 = Observed measure associated with endogenous latent variable (Turnover Intention)
η 1 - η 2 = Exogenous latent variable
η 3 - η 4 = Endogenous latent variable
CHAPTER IV

FINDING

This chapter presents the results of data analysis and hypothesis testing. First, the descriptive statistics are reported from the respondent’s demographic profiles. Second, confirmatory factor analysis and reliability tests examine the underlying dimensions of emotional exhaustion, motivation, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, perceived job performance, and turnover intention. Third, structural equation model (SEM) was adopted to answer research questions related to the proposed model and the effects of the two dimensions (emotional exhaustion and motivation) on job outcomes (job satisfaction, organizational commitment, perceived job performance and turnover intention).

Respondent Profiles

Respondent Demographic Profiles

Table 4 provides a demographic profile of the frontline hotel employees who participated in this survey. Among 460 respondents, 317 respondents (68.9%) were female and 143 respondents (31.1%) were male. The majority of respondents were between 21 to 30 years old (69.3%), and only 5.2% of respondents were over 40 years old. More than half of respondents had a collage/university degree (56.5%) and approximately one-third (38.7%) of respondents graduated from schools at the secondary and vocational level. About 64.1% were single/divorced/widowed and 35.9% were married. Also 65.4% of respondents do not have children, while 33.7% had 1 to 3 children.
About 40.7% of respondents worked in the front office department, followed by the respondents who worked in the food and beverage department (33%) and 26.3% worked in the housekeeping department. The majority of the respondents (66.1%) had a household income between US$303.06-US$909.09 per month, followed by an income under US$303.03 per month (20%), of the household had income levels between US$909.12 to US$1,515.15 (8.7%) and less than (5.2%) of the household earned more than US$1,515.18 per month (currency exchange rate is 33 Thai baht = US$1). About 43.3% of respondents had worked in their current job for 1 to 3 years, followed by others who worked in their current job for less than 1 year (29.6%), others worked from 4 to 6 year (13.9%), while others worked for 10 years and more (8.3%), and the last group worked from 7 to 9 years (5%). Approximately half (53.1%) of respondents had been working in hospitality industry for 4 years and more, and the less 46.9% worked in the hospitality industry up to 3 years.

Table 4: Demographic characteristics of respondents (n=460)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>68.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 20 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 years old</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>69.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 years old</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 years old</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50 years old</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational school</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collage/university</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIABLE</td>
<td>FREQUENCY</td>
<td>PERCENTAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single/divorced/widowed</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of children</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front office</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and beverage</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housekeeping</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of time in current job</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years and more</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of time in hospital industry</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 years</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years and more</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household income (per month)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10,000 baht ($303.03)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001-30,000 baht ($303.06-$909.09)</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>66.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,001-50,000 baht ($909.12-$1515.15)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,001-100,000 baht ($1515.18-$3030.30)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 100,000 baht ($3030.30)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Applicability of the Theory of Emotional Exhaustion and Motivation Model

The main objective of this study was to empirically test the emotional exhaustion and motivation in predicting the job outcome (job satisfaction, organizational commitment, perceived job performance and turnover intention). Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) was applied in order to test the seven hypotheses that were based on a comprehensive review of the literature.

In chapter II, the literature review discussed the theoretical foundation for the interrelationships among the latent constructs in the proposed model. In this model, emotional exhaustion is posited to negatively affect job satisfaction, and organizational commitment, while motivation is posited to positively affect job satisfaction, and organizational commitment.

Measurement Items

Descriptive statistics for the measurement items of the latent constructs were assessed. Table 5 presents the mean value, the standard deviation of each measurement item, and the correlations for each construct.

Measurement Model

The LISREL program was used to explore the relationships among the constructs within the structural model. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was used to assess the adequacy of the measurement model (i.e., to confirm the structure of constructs) (Hair et al., 2006). Overall model fit shows the degree to which the specified indicators represent the hypothesized constructs. The following are the overall model fit measures. 1) Chi-square ($\chi^2$) test and absolute fit measures include the goodness-of-fit-index (GFI). These indices directly assess how well a model reproduces the sample data. 2) Incremental fit measures include the Norm Fit Index (NFI) and the Comparative Fit Index (CFI). These indices measure the proportionate improvement in fit by comparing a target model with a more restricted, nested baseline model. Finally, 3)
parsimonious fit measures include the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA). The parsimonious indices are non-independent of both absolute fit measures and incremental fit measures because some of the absolute for and incremental fit indices have already adjusted their formulas for the degrees of freedom.
Table 5: Correlation, Mean and Standard Deviation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>36</th>
<th>37</th>
<th>38</th>
<th>39</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>41</th>
<th>42</th>
<th>43</th>
<th>44</th>
<th>45</th>
<th>46</th>
<th>47</th>
<th>48</th>
<th>49</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>51</th>
<th>52</th>
<th>53</th>
<th>54</th>
<th>55</th>
<th>56</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All correlations are significant at the 0.05 level.*
The results of the confirmatory factor analysis indicated a moderate fit of the six-factor model to the data on the basis of a number of fit statistics: Chi-square ($\chi^2$), the goodness-of-fit index (GFI), the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), the Norm Fit Index (NFI) and the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA). As shown in Table 6, the magnitudes of the standardized loadings ranged from 0.33 to 0.80, and all $t$ values (ranging from 6.57 to 19.50) were significant. Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black (1998) recommend that factor loadings greater than 0.30 are minimum level, loadings of 0.40 are considered more important, and loadings of 0.50 or greater are considered practically significant.

After deleted the indicators having less than 0.30 of coefficient alpha, and this theoretical model was evaluated and revised until a theoretically meaningful as well as statistically acceptable model was achieved. A total of 18 indicators for exogenous variables (8 from emotional exhaustion and 10 from motivation) and 24 indicators of endogenous variables (8 from job satisfaction, 4 from organizational commitment, 5 from job performance and 7 from turnover intention) were used in the measurement model.

The measurement model was assessed with respect to the composite construct reliability (CCR) to evaluate the loadings for each observed indicator. Fornell and Lacker (1981) have suggested that the CCR values should be greater than 0.6. According to the diagnostic indices (Table 6) the measurement model demonstrates a fairly good fit in that all of its model-fit indices surpassed common acceptance levels. This suggests that the structural model represents a good fit. Thus, the path coefficients of the structural model can be examined.
Table 6: Results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Standardized Loading</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>CCR&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotional Exhaustion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX1: I feel emotionally drained from my work</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX2: I feel used up at the end of the workday</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>17.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX3: I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>15.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX4: Working with people all day is really a strain for me</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>12.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX5: I feel burned out from my work</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>12.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX6: I feel frustrated by my job</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>15.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX7: I feel I am working too hard on my job</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>15.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX8: I feel like I am at the end of my rope</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>13.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: χ² = 21.37, d.f. = 14, p-value = 0.09, GFI = 0.99, RMSEA = 0.03, CFI = 1.00, NFI = 0.99
<sup>a</sup> The item was deleted after reliability test.  
<sup>b</sup> CCR: Composite construct reliability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Standardized Loading</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>CCR&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO1: HOTEL RECOGNITION: Hotel recognition means a lot to me</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO2: JOB ITSELF: My job is valued to me</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>13.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO3: PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT: Personal development opportunity in this hotel is important factors in keeping me</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>10.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO4&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;: JOB AUTONOMY: I like to work here because I can schedule my own work and to make job-related decisions with a minimum supervision</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO5: SOCIAL INTERACTION: Contacting with people is the most favorite part of my job</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>11.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO6&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;: PAY: I do not work for money</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO7: SKILL UTILIZATION: I like this job because my skills and capabilities are utilized</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>15.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO8: JOB SECURITY: Job security is important to me</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>15.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO9&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;: PLEASANT CO-WORKERS: The quality of relationship with</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
colleagues is not important for me

**MO10: PHYSICAL WORKING CONDITIONS:** I work here because of good physical working condition

**MO11: SUPERVISION:** “Visibility with upper management is important to me

**MO12**: FRINGE BENEFITS: The incentive bonus is important factor to improve my performance

**MO13**: EQUITY AT WORK: I am often treated unfairly at work

**MO14: GOALS:** I prefer my boss who sets clear goals for me

**MO15: FEEDBACK:** I like all comments on the quality of my work

Note: $\chi^2 = 34.14$, d.f. = 26, p-value = 0.13, GFI = 0.99, RMSEA = 0.02, CFI = 0.99, NFI = 0.98

*a. The item was deleted after reliability test.*

*b. CCR: Composite construct reliability.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Standardized Loading</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>CCR*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA1: All in all I am satisfied with my job</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>13.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA2: I would recommend a good friend to apply for work in this hotel</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>14.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA3: I am happy with the pay I have got</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>11.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA4: I do not like my job because I have a few chances to utilize my skills</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA5: The worse thing in my job is supervisor</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA6*: I am happy with my colleagues</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA7: Physical working condition here is only reason that makes me want to quit this job</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA8: I work here because of good benefits</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA9: I love this hotel because everyone is treated equally</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>12.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\chi^2 = 16.64$, d.f. = 13, p-value = 0.22, GFI = 0.99, RMSEA = 0.03, CFI = 1.00, NFI = 0.99

*a. The item was deleted after reliability test.*

*b. CCR: Composite construct reliability.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Standardized Loading</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>CCR&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational commitment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;: My values and those of the hotels’ are similar</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC2: I really care about my future in this hotel</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>13.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC3: I am proud to tell others that I work for this hotel</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>16.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC4: I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>15.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>normally expected in order to help the hotel to be successful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC5: For me, this is the best of all possible organizations</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>17.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for which to work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: χ² = 0.46, d.f. = 1, p-value = 0.50, GFI = 1.0, RMSEA = 0.00, CFI = 1.00, NFI = 1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. The item was deleted after reliability test.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. CCR: Composite construct reliability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP1: Compare to other employees in the hotel industry,</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>10.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do a good job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP2: Compared to other employees in this hotel I do an excellent job</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>14.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP3: I have got lesser warning compare to my colleagues</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>12.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP4: I get more compliments from supervisor than everyone</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>15.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in my department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP5: I always gets compliment from the guests</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>9.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP6&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;: I often get the employee of the month award</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: χ² = 5.36, d.f. = 3, P-Value = 0.15, GFI= 1.00, RMSEA = 0.04, CFI = 1.00, NFI = 0.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. The item was deleted after reliability test.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. CCR: Composite construct reliability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Standardized Loading</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>CCR&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Turnover intention</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI1: I often think about leaving this hotel</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI 2: It would not take much to make me leave this hotel</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>16.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI 3: I will probably be looking for another job soon</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>17.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI 4: I always search for the available job in other place</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>16.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI 5: I do not care my absent record</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>9.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI 6: I do not see my future in this hotel</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>14.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI 7: I think I am over qualified for this job</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>10.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\chi^2 = 6.34$, d.f. = 8, P-Value = 0.61, RMSEA = 0.00, GFI = 1.00, CFI = 1.00, NFI = 1.00

<sup>b</sup> CCR: Composite construct reliability.

Furthermore, Table 7 presents the final scale of correlation, mean and standard deviations of the constructs. It shows that emotional exhaustion and motivation were significantly correlated to job satisfaction and organization commitment.

**Table 7: Final Scale Correlation Estimates, Constructs Means, and Standard Deviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Motivation</td>
<td>-0.25** 1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Job satisfaction</td>
<td>-0.49** 0.48** 1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Organizational commitment</td>
<td>-0.34** 0.53** 0.59** 1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Job performance</td>
<td>-0.74 0.12** -0.07 0.18** 1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Turnover Intention</td>
<td>-0.45** 0.32 -0.68** -0.45** 0.28** 1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
### Structural Equation Model

Overall model fit was examined prior to examining the path coefficients in the structural model. Following Hair et al. (2006), the diagnostic indices evaluated in this study were the norm chi-square ($\chi^2$/degree of freedom), the goodness-of-fit index (GFI), the adjusted goodness-of-fit index (AGFI), and the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA). A structural model was used to test the relationships shown in table 8. The parameters of the structural model were estimated with the maximum likelihood (ML) method using covariance matrix (Diamantopoulos and Siguaw, 2000). Result shows that the key fit index, RMSEA = 0.05, was acceptable range, suggesting a good fit (Diamantopoulos and Siguaw, 2000). The acceptable level of fitness was also confirmed by other indices ($\chi^2 = 1726.70$, d.f. = 778, P-VALUE = 0.00, GFI = 0.85, CFI = 0.96, NFI = 0.93, AGFI = 0.82). Even though an examination of the standardized path coefficients among variables showed that the p-value was not significant, but all other fit indices indicated an acceptable level. Therefore, structure equation modeling revealed a fairly good level of fit ($\chi^2 = 1726.70$, d.f. = 778, P-VALUE = 0.00, RMSEA 0.05, GFI = 0.85, CFI = 0.96, NFI = 0.93, AGFI = 0.82).

The hypothesized structural causal model was tested by structural equation modeling (SEM), which included a test of the overall model as well as individual tests of relationships among the latent constructs. As presented in Figure 3, the results offered support for the relationship among emotional exhaustion, motivation, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, perceived job performance and turnover intention at a significant level of 0.05. Consequently, job satisfaction is negatively affected by emotional exhaustion, as indicated by the completely standardized coefficient of -0.23 and a t-value of -5.11. While, job satisfaction was found to be positively influenced by motivation, as indicated by the completely standardized coefficient = 0.77 and t-value = 13.47. Also, organizational commitment is negatively affected by emotional exhaustion, as indicated by the completely standardized coefficient of -0.14 and t-value = -2.87. And it is positively affected by motivation (completely standardized coefficient = 0.72 and t-value = 11.47). Interestingly, perceived job performance was found to be negatively influenced by job satisfaction (completely standardized coefficient = -0.27 and t-value = -3.02), which was conversely proposed in order to test. However,
another relationship that perceived job performance is positively affected by organizational commitment, indicated by the completely standardized coefficient score of 0.36 and a t-value of 3.88. Finally, the turnover intension was unexpected found to be positively influenced by job performance, (completely standardized coefficient of -0.15 and t-value of 2.64), which was also conversely proposed in order to test.

Table 8 shows the results of the model estimation with parameter estimates of the hypothesized paths, standard path coefficient, t-values, and goodness of fit indices for the model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesized relationship</th>
<th>Proposed model</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standardized path coefficient</td>
<td>Result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(t-value)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1: Emotional exhaustion → job satisfaction</td>
<td>-0.23 (-5.11)*</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2. Emotional exhaustion → organizational commitment</td>
<td>-0.14 (-2.87)*</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3. Motivation → job satisfaction</td>
<td>0.77 (13.47)*</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4. Motivation → organizational commitment</td>
<td>0.72 (11.47)*</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5. Job satisfaction → job performance</td>
<td>-0.27 (-3.02)</td>
<td>Not support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6. Organizational commitment → job performance</td>
<td>0.36 (3.88)*</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7. Job performance → turnover intentions</td>
<td>0.15 (2.64)*</td>
<td>Not support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: χ² = 1726.70, d.f. = 778, P-VALUE = 0.00, GFI = 0.85, RMSEA = 0.05, CFI = 0.96, NFI = 0.93, AGFI = 0.82
*p < 0.05.

The set of hypothesis H1- H4 addresses the relationship among emotional exhaustion, motivation, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. H1 and H2 predict that emotional exhaustion has a positive impact on job satisfaction and organizational commitment. For job satisfaction, this prediction suggests a negative coefficient (γ₁₁ = -0.23, p<0.05), as well as path coefficient for organizational commitment is negative and significant (γ₂₁ = -0.14, p<0.05)

Hypotheses, H3 and H4, suggest that motivation affect on job satisfaction and organizational commitment. For both job satisfaction and organizational commitment, results
are consistent with this prediction as evidence by positive path estimate ($\gamma_{12} = 0.77$, p<0.05) and ($\gamma_{22} = 0.72$, p<0.05).

The set of hypotheses H5 through H7 shows the relationship between job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention. An unexpected finding occurred, H5 has a negative but significant effect on job performance ($\beta_{31} = -0.27$, p<0.05). H6 suggests that organizational commitment significantly affect job performance. Results are consistent with this prediction as evidenced by a positive path estimate ($\beta_{32} = 0.36$, p<0.05). Finally, as unanticipated, the results of H7 are ambiguous. It predicts a positive and significant relationship between job performance and turnover intention ($\beta_{43} = 0.15$, p<0.05).

Table 9 shows the result of ranking the importance of motivation factors. It presents the top five motivation factors of hotel frontline employees in Phuket, namely, pay, job security, present co-worker, physical working condition, and hotel recognition, respectively. Additionally, the highest percentage of first important motivation factor was pay (38.89%), while the highest percentage of the second important motivation was benefits (39.60%). The top third important motivation was job autonomy (30.56%); and the highest percent of the fourth important motivation was social interaction (30.19%). Finally, the highest percent of the fifth important motivation was feedback (42.55%).
Figure 3: Final Model of Emotional Exhaustion, Motivation and Job Outcomes
Table 9: The Ranking of Motivation Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation attribute</th>
<th>1st importance</th>
<th>2nd importance</th>
<th>3rd importance</th>
<th>4th importance</th>
<th>5th importance</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>11.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>12.77</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>27.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>11.70</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>26.60</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>15.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical working condition</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>12.24</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>17.01</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>19.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>23.17</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>26.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant co-workers</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>13.77</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>16.17</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>20.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>105.00</td>
<td>38.89</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>24.07</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>15.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>39.60</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>17.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job itself</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>35.71</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>21.43</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>19.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training/Development</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>12.20</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>12.20</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>26.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion/advancement</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>12.32</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>28.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel recognition</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>19.44</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job autonomy</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>19.44</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>30.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>73.00</td>
<td>30.54</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>15.90</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>15.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Interaction</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>18.87</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>18.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Ranking the top five important motivation factors from 15 motivation attributes, N=460
CHAPTER V

This chapter presents the summary, discussion of the findings, theoretical implications of the hypotheses tested, the practical implications, and recommendations. Also the limitations of the study and suggestions for future research are presented.

The main purpose of this study was to examine the motivation and emotional exhaustion effect on job outcomes: job satisfaction, organizational commitment, perceived job performance and turnover intention, among hotel frontline employees in Phuket. The study also prioritize motivation factor among hotel frontline employees and examines their demographic background. The major findings reported in Chapter 4.

Discussion

The findings of this study are consistent with previous work showing that frontline employees who lacked emotional energy were less satisfied with their job (Babakus et.al, 1999), as well as many studies found the negative relationship between burnout and work satisfaction (Burish, 2002; Kalliath & Morris, 2002; Stechmiller &Yarandi, 1993; Thomsen, Soares, Nolan, Dallender & Arnetz, 1999). Similarly, reports in motivation demonstrate a positive association between job satisfaction and organizational commitment.
However, four notable findings were presented in this study. Firstly, the confirmatory factor analysis disclosed that the motivation constructs are largely reduced in the number of reliable (five constructs are deducted: Pay, Fringe Benefits, Job Autonomy, Pleasant Co-Workers and Equity at Work). In contrast, the total priority ranking result showed that “Pay” was the highest percentage in the first important motivation factor, “Fringe Benefits” was the highest percentage in the second important motivation factor, “Job Autonomy” was the highest percentages in the third important motivation factor, and “Present Co-Worker” was the highest percentages in the fifth important factor of work motivation. A possible cause for the discrepancy in the measurement result could be that the items were perceived differently by these particular sample respondents and provide an incomplete assessment of their perceptions using those items. Also a single investigation may not be sufficient to support those claims at this time. It is valuable to explore these possibilities in future research to effectively measure hotel frontline employees’ responses to their work motivation priority. This suggests that employees may react differently to attitudinal measurement. Nonetheless, the study should focus upon expanding the measurement of these constructs while carefully matching the development of new items specifically toward hotel operating employee in order to ensure an accurate and consistent assessment hotel frontline employees’ attitudes and perception their duties and work. According to the dynamic, emotional fluctuation of human beings, and the differentiation of society and environment, many researchers reported that people from different national cultures are likely to be motivated by different factors (Boyacigiller & Adler, 1991; Fisher & Yuan, 1998; Hofstede, 1980; McCleland, 1961).

One remarkable deducted construct from the confirmatory factor analysis of motivation is “Equity at Work”, and it was ranked within the fifth lowest important factors among 15 work motivation factors. This is consistent with previous work presenting that the equity theory are not always predicted in many countries, which is different from US setting (Hofstede, 1980; Chung, Lee, & Jung, 1997; and Yuchtman, 1972). Therefore, the generalization of equity theory has still
been criticized (Husman, Hatfield & Miles, 1987). The results supported the extent that equity theory is transportable across national culture (Fey, 2005). Hence, the results demonstrated that several motivation theories can be used to complement each other. Implementation of single motivation theory does not provide ultimate efficiency in human resource management.

Secondly, the notion of emotional exhaustion has a negative effect on both job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Thus Hypothesis 1 and 2 are supported (H1. Emotional exhaustion is negatively related to job satisfaction among frontline employees, H2. Emotional exhaustion is negatively related to affective organizational commitment among frontline employees). These findings are consistent with the previous research that emotional exhaustion is one of the critical constructs in explaining the attitudes and behavior of frontline employees in high-stress work environments (Babakus, Cravens, Johnston, & Moncrief, 1999; Boles & Babin, 1996, Kalliath and Morris, 2002). Likewise, the concept of motivation has a positive effect on both job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Thus Hypothesis 3 and 4 are supported (H3: Motivation is positively related to job satisfaction among frontline employees, H4: Motivation is positively related to organizational commitment among frontline employees). This study supports the previous research that there is a significant link between motivation in the workplace and job outcomes such as organizational commitment, and job satisfaction (Lee-Ross, 2005).

Thirdly, the element of job satisfaction tends to erode perceived job performance. Although this finding is contrary to the general perception of the impact of job satisfaction on employee perceived job performance, it is nonetheless important. In the real situation of the hotel industry, the employees who attempt to provide excellent job performance may experience less job satisfaction because of low compensation, inadequate fringe benefits, conflict with coworker and supervisor, and long working hours (Karatepe and Sokmen, 2006). Although the negative impact is not a desirable condition, the hotel remains responsible for providing a positive and continuous employee orientation program that encourage the employees to attempt to develop
their skills and attain a level of job satisfaction. In the view of this rationale, Hypothesis 5 is not supported with a positive sign to the original model. (H5: Job satisfaction is positively related to job performance among hotel frontline employees). However, the job performance was improved by organizational commitment. Thus Hypothesis 6 is supported (Organizational commitment is positively related to job performance among hotel frontline employees).

Lastly, the investigation unexpectedly found that the greater the perceived job performance of hotel frontline employee, the higher the turnover intention among them. Therefore, the Hypothesis 7 is not supported (H7: Job performance is negatively related to turnover intention among frontline employees). It is widely accepted that the hotel industry has a high labor turnover. The unanticipated positive relationship between perceived job performance and turnover intention is not an unusual condition. It may be presented as the high performance employees will have a better chance to get a new job in other hotels, especially, when they have low job satisfaction in the current hotel.

In addition, the issue of the two hypotheses which were not supported with the original model (H5: job satisfaction is positively related to job performance among hotel frontline employees and H7: job performance is negatively related to turnover intention among frontline employees) could be affected by the demographic factors. Considering the majority of the respondents who were between 21 years old to 30 years old (69.3%), had a college/university degree (56.5%) and had been working in their current job for 1-3 years (43.3%), they represented the Generation Y stereotype.

The Generation Y, also known as the Millennial, was born during the period from 1982 through 2002, has been described differently from any other generation before. The Generation Y segment is one of the most diverse demographic groups. They were coddled by their parents and nurtured with a strong sense of entitlement. The specific changes both in behavioral patterns and expectations, certain conducts and attitudes that change incredibly. The Generation Y individual has been told that they are special, they are privileged and they are truly the pride and
joy of their parents. So they seem to have a stronger sense of self-confidence and self-esteem (Esptien, 2006). They want to be engaged in a positive work experience that offers much more than a chance to earn for living. They want attention from their bosses, they desire a workplace with clear rules and chance to do work that will offer some benefit to society. Nonetheless, they are unbelievably gifted at building and maintaining a network among individual. As children, the generation Y person participated in team sports, play in groups and participate in other group activities. They value teamwork and seek the input and affirmation of others. They are loyal, committed in team and they want to be included and involved. So the sense of teamwork value is strong. While they have been protected and directed since early childhood, so they have had a structured life. They may have difficulties if they encounter situations that are less structured and ambiguous.

The generation Y individual arrives at work with a new attitude. They are young, energetic, determined, and smart. Even though they want to work but they do not want work to be their entire goal in life, as they seek a balance between work, family and leisure. Unlike the baby boomers which tend to put a high priority on career, today’s youngest workers are more interested in making their jobs accommodate, or complement their family and personal lives. They want jobs with flexibility, telecommunicating options and the ability to work part-time or leave the workforce temporarily when their children’s needs are apparent. There is a high value placed on self-fulfillment. They are much less likely to respond to the traditional command and control type of management, which is still popular in much of today’s workforce. Perhaps they may subscribe more to the participate form of management. The Generation Y person does not expect to stay in a job or even a career for a life time. They have tremendous self-confidence as they believe in their own self-worth and strive to change the work environment of the companies that they work for. They are most confident in their professional competencies and have ability to find another job that is better suited to their skills (Esptien, 2006). They would likely rotate from one job to the next and they may show a lack of loyalty by stating that they would renge on
a job offer by their commitment to accept another position if a better offer came along during that time (Alsop, 2008). The biggest difference for employers may be that the Generation Y individual is looking for work with much more meaning and significance than the prior generation. The Generation Y individual needs to understand what the organization stands for and what their role in bringing about organizational efficiency is. They are much less likely to be focused on their next step in terms of career progression, and are more likely to care about making a meaningful contribution in their workplace (Hershatter, 2006).

The Millennial individual desires attention and guidance from their employers. They want to know how they are doing on a daily and weekly basis. The research shows that they need special treatment and close contact with their supervisor and positive feedback regards their job performance. The Generation Y person values feedback which might be from handwritten notes or cards, non-monetary rewards, and formal recognition for the job well done by their supervisors. They want someone who will empower them, the desire to have a mentor and guardian to equip them with the best practice towards accomplishing a task. Although they have high expectations about what their employers should provide them, there is a general feeling that company should not expect much loyalty from them in return. If a job does not prove fulfilling, they will seek a more enriching, meaningful position. In some cases, these individuals have been known to leave the job during the first month. Indeed, many employers say it is retention that worries them most about the Generation Y worker (Alsob, 2008). When comparing the other previous generation, they expect a higher rate of pay, a more flexible work schedule, a promotion within a year, and more vacation or personal time. Since their desires are so different, thus the millennial person does not respond well to the many rules and regulations. They want a workplace where they can belong, which is stress free and social, a family friendly workplace and which values a trade of generating profits, showing friendliness to the environment, and showing concern, and compassion for the people in the work group. These individuals are comfortable in
a casual workplace community, they use ‘team’ in their language, they develop fun traditions, and need to be regularly told that they are valued and supported. Therefore, the smart company should try to adjust their recruiting tactic and their work environment to meet this group’s very different needs.

**Conclusion and Recommendation**

The purpose of this study was to examine the impact of emotional exhaustion and motivation on job outcomes of hotel frontline employees. It can be concluded that job outcomes (job satisfaction, organizational commitment, perceived job performance and turnover intention) of hotel frontline employee have casual relationships with motivation and emotional exhaustion. Both emotional exhaustion and motivation have a significant influence on job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Moreover, even though job satisfaction does not always lead to higher employees’ perceived job performance, the organizational commitment is still favorable affecting it.

For the top five of motivation factors of hotel frontline employees in Phuket, the study found that pay is the most value for hotel frontline employees, and job security, present co-workers, physical working condition and hotel recognition is ranked respectively. This finding suggests that it would be worthwhile for hotel managers to make a greater concern of motivation and emotional exhaustion factors, in order to enhance job outcomes of hotel frontline employees. Additionally, the present study suggests that using multiple motivation theories which are better than focusing on one theory because the national culture plays an important role in determining the conditions for motivating people.

**Managerial implications**

The empirical results of this study provide trustworthy evidence that the proposed structural equation model designed to consider the influence of emotional exhaustion and
motivation on job outcomes (job satisfaction, organizational commitment, perceived job performance and turnover intention) is acceptable. The major findings of this study have significant managerial implications for Phukets’ hotel industry. First, the confirmatory factor analysis revealed that even if each construct retains its original characteristics, the motivation constructs are largely reduced in the number of reliable and appropriate items that can be used to measure these constructs. Additionally, it is hard to determine solid measurement indicators for its constructs. Even though these findings result from a single, empirical investigation, frontline employees in three departments (front office, housekeeping and food and beverage department), hotel managers and practitioners should be aware that there is a need to have further studies to develop more effective measurement scales to assess such constructs. This suggests that since hotel frontline employees may be differently motivated and react differently in different time, consistent measurement scales and constructs should be explored and refined.

This study indicated that the human resource managers or head of departments should give attention to emotional exhaustion and motivation factors in order to maintain job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The hotel manager or human resource manager should concern with the work and social life balance of hotel frontline employees in order to avoid emotional exhaustion or job burnout because naturally the hotel job is hard and has high emotional contact between the employee and the guest. The frontline hotel employees should have enough relaxation; flexible work schedule might be good option. In addition, the hotel manager should think about fostering a good working environment, friendly atmosphere and comfort zone at workplace. Naturally, Thai people do not totally separate the work and play concept opposed to the western value. Thai people originally come from an agricultural culture or background, which always combined work and play and they have never had emotional exhaustion problem. Thus if the hotel manager can create a friendly working environment and fun work, the hard work of a hotel job will not be a problem for Thai frontline employees. The emotional exhaustion might be eliminated automatically.
Additionally, Thai society faces the same situation as other parts of the world about the Generation Y workforce, over self-confidence, high work performance, and low organizational commitment. The hotel manager who realizes the generation stereotype differences among their employee, especially the Generation Y, should focus special attention on their work and social values. The coaching and mentoring process, frequency feedback method, and flexibility in work schedules should be highly concerned and emphasized. The Millennial individuals have high potential, as they have been trained in a variety of skills because of their upbringing from their parents. If the hotel understands and knows how to extract those potentials, the hotel operation will get tremendous benefits. The hotel manager or supervisor should learn and practice good communication skills, and exhibit participative management tendencies, as the process of traditional autocratic command and control type of management does not work with the Millennials. They value frequent feedback and clear instructions from their supervisor. Regular dialogue with frontline hotel employee is highly recommended. In return, the organization will have strong teamwork when the Millennials feel their involvement has been recognized and valued.

For the motivation factor, as pay and benefit are the highest priority of motivation factor, following by job autonomy, social interaction and feedback, human resource managers in Phuket, Thailand should not pay attention to only the adequate “pay and benefits” for their employees but, also on the equity of pay and benefits both the internal equity and especially the external equity of pay and benefit. The internal equity of pay may affect job satisfaction at the beginning while the external equity of pay might cause the turnover intention. The hotel frontline employees might be easy to change the job to competitor hotels if their pay and benefits is higher. In fact, hotel job in Phuket, Thailand, provides higher income and better benefits than other jobs.

Beside pay equity, job autonomy, job enrichment, responsibility and feedback are also vital motivation factors. Autonomy is viewed as a necessary component of employee empowerment. Delegation of authority is an alternative solution for hospitality work stress
(Zohar, 1994 and Ross, 1997). In hotels, many service encounters require immediate action from frontline personnel to fulfill customers’ needs. Autonomy seems to reduce hotel employees’ emotional exhaustion by allowing them to make their own decisions so that they can respond to guests’ desires more efficiently and effectively.

Phuket’s work environment is unique compared to other provinces in Thailand. Generally there is a stronger sense of international value than other provinces as there are many international companies and tourists over the past decades. The Thai workers who have worked in Phuket for several years value the western managerial process. Several concepts of western management such as empowerment, job autonomy, goal and feedback setting, which work in western perceptions, also work in Phuket’s environment. Therefore, the hotel supervisor or hotel manager especially the front office, food and beverage and housekeeping department, should concern more about employee empowerment. The hotel frontline employees will be motivated to work more if they have authority to make decision on their work, especially problem solving and handling guest’s complaint, are assure with close coaching from their supervisor.

Generally, languages such as English are not a major problem of the hotel frontline employees in Phuket but the real problem is the communication skills. Listening skills of the Thai hotel frontline employees need to be highly concerned of the hotel managers especially when dealing with problem guests. Sometimes the hotel guests do not want the solution or recommendation of their problems or complaints, but understanding from someone will help to relieve their emotional temperament. Therefore, the improvement of the listening skills of hotel workers is highly recommended. Training in communication skills, especially non-violent communication is necessary for hotel frontline employees, not only verbal communication but the non-verbal communication skill is also important. The feeling of care, empathy, and friendliness could be presented along with eye contact and the tone of voice. The manner to communicate hospitality from the hotel frontline employee to the hotel guest is a vital process and needs to be trained.
Moreover, the hotel manager nowadays should understand the trends and personal changes of the hotel employee’s demographic in Thailand due to the increasing number of hotel management programs in colleges and universities. The current hotel employee has more knowledge and confidence to work compared to the previous generation of hotel employees who are normally not graduated in the hotel management field. They will be satisfied with implementing their capability and knowledge. Participative management style is a good alternative for hotel manager in order to motivate frontline employees and sustain competitive advantage.

The unique measurements and discriminant validity of emotional exhaustion, motivation, job satisfaction and organizational commitment have been confirmed. Thus it can be said that the two concepts are distinct and independent from each other. It also can suggest that an integrated and/or simultaneous approach for measuring frontline employee job satisfaction and organizational commitment are desirable with the items of “emotional exhaustion” and “motivation”. Finally, this study supports the idea that the general theory of emotional exhaustion, and motivation can apply to hotel frontline employees. Thus, human resource managers in the hotel industry can increase the productivity of hotel frontline employee’s job outcomes by considering this information in their decision-making.

The findings of testing of the proposed model have implications for the success of human resource management. In order to improve job satisfaction with hotel frontline employees, department heads, supervisor and human resource managers must consider emotional exhaustion and motivation. Because job satisfaction has been shown to directly impact employee service quality (Yoon et al., 2001), motivation and emotional exhaustion may therefore play an important role in overall service delivery. Furthermore, job satisfaction may lead to higher levels of customer satisfaction (Heskett et al., 1994).

In addition, the organizational commitment is another factor which has high influence from emotional exhaustion and motivation. Therefore, the appropriate motivation approach and
emotional exhaustion avoidance should be implemented to hotel frontline employees in order to enhance organizational competitiveness. These indicate that emotional exhaustion and motivation affect job satisfaction and organizational commitment, which includes recommending the organization to others. Also the hotel managers should consider the role of organizational commitment and its positive relationship to perceived job performance. Moreover, hotel managers should not overlook frontline employees who demonstrate high performance, especially the young and talented employees who have been describe as the Generation Y. They have different desires relative to work motivation and job satisfaction.

Another implication for practice to support the Generation Y needs is enhanced through employing mentors in the workplace since younger and less experienced employees are confronted with emotional exhaustion. Mentors could help such employees relieve their emotional exhaustion by listening to their problems and their expectations from the management of the hotel and providing support and guidance (Hershatter, 2006 and Lee & Akhtar, 2007). Those mentors could arrange for specific meetings with frontline employees to explore their difficulties and provide solutions. Those mentors could also hold regular meetings with frontline employees (perhaps on a monthly basis) to discuss problematic cases and to devise effective solutions whereby both the organization and the employee will benefit.

Moreover, the frontline employees should be trained continuously to learn how to cope with problems that stem from emotional exhaustion. This is significant because effective and continuous training programs in the hospitality industry are not abundant. Therefore, managers should foster social support emanating from both supervisors and coworkers in the workplace during these training programs and train their frontline employees in the areas of compliant handling procedures and genuine customer care. The training programs would also consist of potential empowerment practices frontline employees would use to deal with customers’ complaints. Beside, the managers should pay more attention to the employee’s recognition and make them feel part of the team.
Limitation and suggestion for future research

There are several issues associated with this study’s limitation that should be discussed to provide a guide for future research. First, the study’s model was tested in a specific setting—Phuket, in Thailand, Southeast Asia region. The generalizability of the model is suggested, with the reproduction of this study in other settings that have different hotel employee level. This can provide opportunities to evaluate the extent and direction of motivation and emotional exhaustion as hotel employees relate degrees of job outcomes. An application of the model to other settings will help produce reliable indicators and further validate the constructs, as well as producing a more powerful and stable model.

Secondly, as the economy is a desirable characteristic of most research investigations, the simplified models presented in this study may be excluding some important antecedents and consequences of the variables measured in this study. Future studies are needed to extend the other important antecedents of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and perceived job performance. For example, the environment of service industry is complex and influenced by multiple factors (Bowen et al., 1989; Schnieder and Bowen, 1993; Schneider et al., 1992). Therefore the factors such as job identity, conflict among co-workers and supervisors, feelings of belonging and esteem may exert an influence upon hotel employee’s perceptions of motivation, emotional exhaustion, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, perceived job performance and turnover intention. Sharpley & Forster (2003) suggested that teamwork or a sense of belonging upon is the strategies for reducing staff turnover as well as intrinsic rewards such as empowerment and supporting, listening and responding to staff problems on the part of management would enable employee to work more effectively. Future investigations should consider the impact of additional variables not measure in this analysis. Additionally, the external factors such as political problem and economic crisis in particular geographic areas of data collection period can play major roles in turnover intention of employees. Future research
might need to investigate those external environments which might affect on the employees job outcomes.

Moreover, future research may address the complex issue of employee demographic and casual relationship between demographic information and emotional exhaustion, motivation, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, perceived job performance and turnover intention. Each employee might have different levels of satisfaction and commitment, depending on the difference of age, gender, education level, marital status, tenure and household income. The longer the employee’s tenure with a company the better able the employee is to service customers because of a superior service from employees (Reichheld, 1993; Hope & Mühlemann, 1998). In addition, Mulki et al. (2006) found that emotional exhaustion had negative relationship with age and total job experience. It suggested that as employees gain job experience, they began to accept that they might not always have satisfactory solutions to all problems and that doing their best within constraints is the emotional intelligent course of action. As such, future research is needed to investigate those statements. Also, future research needs further study on the direct effect of emotional exhaustion and motivation on job performance and turnover intention.

Thirdly, a distinction was not drawn in this study among part-time and full-time workers. The service industries rely heavily upon part-time workers. Therefore, it is possible that employee attitudes such as motivation, emotional exhaustion, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, perceived job performance and turnover intention may vary as a function of workers’ employment status. The future research may benefit from additional empirical work in this area and should further explore the distinction between part-time and full-time workers when examining hotel frontline employees’ attitudes.

Fourthly, this research used a cross-sectional design to examine the proposed research issue. It is possible that the different relationship between emotional exhaustion, motivation, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, perceived job performance, and turnover intention may have existed at times not observed in this study. The evidence showed different results when
comparing the cross-sectional data to the longitudinal data over a five-year time frame (Judge and Watanabe, 1993). Therefore, longitudinal designs are needed for verifying the casual relationship among the study variables to any claims of generalization. Fifthly, the hotel managers did not permit the researcher to directly contact their frontline employees for data collection. Instead, they distribute the questionnaires to a broad range of employees in frontline service jobs in their hotels. Thus, such a data collection practice might have created a potential selection bias.

Finally, the use of subjective scales and self-reporting methods to assess attitudes and behaviors, which can enlarge the correlation between constructs due to common method bias, especially the “perceive job performance” construct. Considering the majority of the respondent which is in the generation Y who has been described as the over self-confidence generation. The bias might be a critical problem and it might be the cause of unanticipated result of causal effect between job satisfaction and perceived performance; and perceived job performance and turnover intension. Therefore, in future studies using multiple sources of data would minimize such a potential problem.

It is hoped that the results from this study will stimulate future research into the hotel environment in particular, and the hospitality sector in general, both in the context of Thailand and other countries. The influence of emotional exhaustion and motivation of employees are worth investigating, especially in the present day which not only has the higher pressures of the workplace and higher demand of customers than in the past but also the varieties of the workforce generation’s desire are currently different from the past. These factors are the challenges within hotel management in the future.
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General Manager and Human Resource Director:

Dear Sir or Madam:

We had sent you an earlier survey related to Emotional exhaustion, Motivation and Job Outcomes: A Study of Hotel Frontline Employee in Phuket. If you had completed the original survey, we thank you for your input. Please take a few minutes to complete the enclosed survey if you did not do it earlier. We appreciate your time and insight in this matter.

Motivation to work and the level of emotional exhaustion are important factors for employee productivity. Mostly, management’s problem in the hotel is caused by emotional exhaustion and unmotivated employees, especially the seasoned employees who work for a long time. In addition, the hotel industry is on the top of the list for the high rates of labour (employee) turnover experienced by the lodging industry. Therefore, understanding the employees’ motivation to work and determining their level of emotional exhaustion is challenging for managers. In order to maintain qualified employees within the organization, the manager must be sensitive to their emotional needs by enable them to provide excellent service to their customers.

The purpose of this study is to examine the effects of emotional exhaustion and work motivation on frontline services workers’ and how their work performance levels influences their job outcomes. In particular, the four job outcomes are: (1) organizational commitment, (2) job satisfaction, (3) perceived job performance, and (4) intentions to leave. We appreciate your participation in this study.

Would you be kind enough to complete the enclosed survey and return it in the enclosed sealing envelope. Please take about twenty minutes to complete the survey, which asks you to rate your perceived importance of each of the motivation, emotional exhaustion, and job outcomes attributes. The information from this survey will be kept strictly confidential, at no time will your name, or your company’s name be associated with the results. Please return this questionnaire soon, please, by 15 December 2008. Participation in this study is voluntary and you may stop at any time without penalty. Thank you for your valuable time and insights that will provide needed information to the lodging and hospitality industry. For information on subjects’ rights, contact: Dr. Sheila Kennison, IRB Chair, Oklahoma State University, 219 Cordell North, Stillwater, OK 74078, 405-744-3377 or irb@okstate.edu.

Sincerely yours,

Saiphon Yoonlaie, Lecturer
E-mail: pryn@phuket.psu.ac.th
T: 076-276868

ENCLOSURE: (4)
เรียน ผู้จัดการส่วนบุคคล

เรื่อง ขอเก็บข้อมูล

ดิฉันทางสารสารสนเทศ บริษัท อาคารย้อย และการบริการและการท่องเที่ยว มหาวิทยาลัยสุวรรณภูมิ วิทยาเขตภูเก็ต ขอความช่วยเหลือในการเก็บข้อมูลเพื่อใช้ในการที่จะทางการหรือระดับการวิจัย หรือพิจารณา เพื่อเตรียมความพร้อมสำหรับการพัฒนา แรงจูงใจ และผลการปฏิบัติงาน สำหรับศึกษาพนักงานระดับปฏิบัติการของโรงแรมในภูเก็ต (The Emotional Exhaustion, Motivation and Job Outcome: A Study of Hotel Front Line Employees in Phuket)

ในการสัมภาษณ์เรื่องข้อมูลข้างต้น ทางฝ่ายบริการหน้าโรงแรมในโรงแรมของท่านจำนวน 5 คน คือพนักงานห้องดับบั้น (receptionist) 1 คน พนักงานห้องน้ำของห้องพัก (reservationist) 1 คน พนักงานห้องอาหารของห้องพัก (room attendant) 1 คน และพนักงานบริการในห้องอาหาร (waiter/waitress) 2 คน โดยวิธีการสุ่มเลือก เรื่องข้อมูลที่ได้จากการสัมภาษณ์จะเป็นความลับและนำมาใช้เพื่อการวิจัยทางวิชาการเท่านั้น หากเกิดเหตุการณ์ข้อมูลส่งเสริม กรุณาติดต่อสอบถามได้ตามที่อุทิศสั่งการ

จึงเรียนมาเพื่อขอความอนุเคราะห์ในการเก็บข้อมูลดังกล่าวด้วย จะเป็นพระคุณยิ่ง

(ลายมือ บรรณาธิการ)

อาคารย้อย

ENGL(4) Q.2

Letter to HRM (THAI)

89 Moo 1, Wichit Songkram Road, Amphur Kathu, Phuket 83120, Thailand Tel. 66 7627 6200 Fax. 66 7627 6203
E-mail: pory@phuket.psu.ac.th
โทรศัพท์: 089-400-5226
30 October 2008

To whom it may concern:

My name is Ms. Saiphon Yuanlaie, lecturer from Prince of Songkla University, Phuket Campus. I am now a registered student of Oklahoma State University, USA, reading for Ph.D. in Hospitality and Tourism Administration.

Currently, I am in the process of writing up my dissertation in the topic “The emotional exhaustion, motivation and job outcome: a study of hotel frontline employee in Phuket”. Therefore, I need to interview your 5 employees: 1 receptionist, 1 reservationist, 1 room attendants and 2 waiters/waitresses. I would be most grateful for any assistance you could provide me to interview your staffs with survey questionnaire. I wish to confirm that all information supplied will be classified and used for academic purpose only.

If any further information is required, please contact me at the undernoted address.

Yours faithfully,

Saiphon Yuanlaie
Lecturer

E-mail: pryo@phuket.psu.ac.th
Mobile: 089-400-5226

---

Okl. State Univ.
IRB

Approved: 1/28/10
Expires: 1/27/12

---

89 Moo 1, Wichit Songkram Road, Amphur Kathu, Phuket 83120, Thailand Tel: 66 7627 6200 Fax: 66 7627 6203
Participant Information Sheet

Project Title: THE EXHAUSTION, MOTIVATION AND JOB OUTCOMES: A STUDY OF HOTEL FRONTLINE EMPLOYEES IN PHUKET

Investigator(s): Saiphon Yualaie Ms. / Lecturer

Purpose: The purpose of this study is to help the hotel understand the motivation and emotional exhaustion factor of frontline employee in order to make improvements in their job outcome. Therefore, the main objective is to examine the effects of emotional exhaustion and work motivation on services workers’ responses to their job outcomes. In particular four job outcomes will be included: (1) organizational commitment, (2) job satisfaction, (3) perceived job performance and (4) intentions to leave.

Procedures: A survey should take approximately 20 minutes to complete has been included with this letter. Please complete the survey and return it in the sealing envelope that has been provided. The survey has some questions about your education, marital status, and number of child. Also the organizational tenure, your emotional exhaustion and motivation factor, your experiences with job satisfaction, organizational commitment, job performance and turnover intention will be included.

Risks of Participation: There are no known risks associated with this project.

Benefits: It is expected that the hotel manager and human resource manager will learn valuable information from you that will help them improve hotel services by understanding the employee emotional exhaustion and motivation factor to maintain qualified employees within the organization. This should benefit you and your work life, as the managers are sensitive to your emotional needs and enable them to provide excellent service to their customers.

Confidentiality: All information will be anonymous as no names or identification numbers will be recorded on the survey. The surveys will be destroyed in March 2009 or after the responses have been entered into a computer. No names or identification numbers will be recorded in the data file. All results will be reported as aggregated data and no individual responses will be reported. The OSU IRB has the authority to inspect consent records and data files to assure compliance with approved procedures.

Contacts: If you have any questions about the research or your rights as a participant in this study, please feel free to contact Ms Saiphon Yualaie from Prince of Songkla University at Phone no. 076-276868 /email: pyrm@phuket.psu.ac.th. If you have questions about your rights as a research volunteer, you may contact Dr. Sheila Kernison, IRB Chair, 219 Cordell North, Stillwater, OK 74078, 405-744-3377 or irb@okstate.edu.

Participant Rights: Your participation in this project is appreciated and completely voluntary. You may choose not to participate at any time without any penalty or problem. Returning your completed survey in the envelope provided indicates your willingness to participate in this study.

Enclosure 1c.
Questionnaire

The Exhaustion, Motivation and Job Outcomes: A Study of Hotel Front Line Employees in Phuket

This questionnaire is designed for studying the emotional exhaustion, motivation for work, and job outcomes of the front line employees in hotels. The data collected is for the academic research as part of Ph.D. dissertation. The information received from this questionnaire is confidential and will be used for the academic purposes only. Thank you for your kind cooperation.

Part I. Emotional Exhaustion, Work Motivation and Job Outcome

Please indicate the level of agreement of each statement that relevant to you: ‘5’ = ‘strongly agree’ to ‘1’ = ‘strongly disagree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I feel emotionally drained from my work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel used up at the end of the workday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and have</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to face another day on the job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I feel burned out from my work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I feel frustrated by my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I feel I am working too hard on my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I feel like I am at the end of my rope</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Hotel recognition means a lot to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. My job is valued to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Personal development opportunity in this hotel is important factors in keeping me</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>☻</td>
<td>☻</td>
<td>☺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I like to work here because I can schedule my own work and to make job-related decisions with a minimum supervision</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>☻</td>
<td>☻</td>
<td>☺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Contacting with people is the most favorite part of my job</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>☻</td>
<td>☻</td>
<td>☺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I do not work for money</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>☻</td>
<td>☻</td>
<td>☺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I like this job because my skills and capabilities are utilized</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>☻</td>
<td>☻</td>
<td>☺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Job security is important to me</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>☻</td>
<td>☻</td>
<td>☺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The quality of relationship with colleagues is not important for me</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>☻</td>
<td>☻</td>
<td>☺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I work here because of good physical working condition</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>☻</td>
<td>☻</td>
<td>☺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Visibility with upper management is important to me</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>☻</td>
<td>☻</td>
<td>☺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The incentive bonus is important factor to improve my performance</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>☻</td>
<td>☻</td>
<td>☺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I am often treated unfairly at work</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>☻</td>
<td>☻</td>
<td>☺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I prefer my boss who sets clear goals for me</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>☻</td>
<td>☻</td>
<td>☺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I like all comments on the quality of my work</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>☻</td>
<td>☻</td>
<td>☺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. All in all I am satisfied with my job</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>☻</td>
<td>☻</td>
<td>☺</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
25. I would recommend a good friend to apply for work in this hotel

26. I am happy with the pay I have got

27. I do not like my job because I have a few chances to utilize my skills

28. The worse thing in my job is supervisor

29. I am happy with my colleagues

30. Physical working condition here is only reason that makes me want to quit this job

31. I work here because of good benefits

32. I love this hotel because everyone is treated equally

33. I often think about leaving this hotel

34. It would not take much to make me leave this hotel

35. I will probably be looking for another job soon.

36. I always search for the available job in other place

37. I do not care my absent record

38. I do not see my future in this hotel

39. I think I am over qualified for this job

40. My values and those of the hotels’ are similar

41. I really care about the future of this hotel

42. I am proud to tell others that I work for this hotel
43. I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that 😊😊😊😊😊.

normally expected in order to help the hotel to be successful

44. For me, this is the best of all possible organizations for 😊😊😊😊😊.

which to work

45. Compare to other employees in the hotel industry, 😊😊😊😊😊.

I do a good job

46. Compared to other employees in this hotel I do 😊😊😊😊😊.

an excellent job

47. I have got lesser warning compare to my colleagues 😊😊😊😊😊.

48. I get more compliments from supervisor than 😊😊😊😊😊.

everyone in my department

49. I always gets compliment from the guests 😊😊😊😊😊.

50. I often get the employee of the month award 😊😊😊😊😊.
Part II. Motivation ranking

Please rank the top five important factors to motivate you to work in this hotel: “1” is the most important and “5” is the least important.

........ Equity in work place

........ Work feedback

........ Goal for work

........ Physical working condition

........ Relationship with superior

........ Relationship with colleague

........ Pay/salary

........ Fringe benefits

........ Job itself

........ Training/skill development

........ Promotion/advancement

........ Hotel recognition

........ Job autonomy

........ Job security

........ Social interaction

Part III. Demography

1. Age

- ○ less than 20 years
- ○ 21 – 30 years
- ○ 31 – 40 years
- ○ 41 – 50 years
- ○ 51 and more
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2. Gender
   ○ male ○ female

3. Education
   ○ No degree/ never attend to school ○ Primary school
   ○ High school ○ Vocational school
   ○ College/ University

4. Marital status
   ○ Single/ divorced/ widowed ○ Married

5. Number of children
   ○ None ○ 1-3 ○ 4-5
   ○ More than 5

6. Household income (per month)
   ○ Less than 10,000 Baht ○ 10,001 – 30,000 Baht
   ○ 30,001 – 50,000 Baht ○ 50,001 – 100,000
   ○ More than 100,000 Baht

7. Length of time in current job
   ○ less than 1 year ○ 1-3 years ○ 4-6 years
   ○ 7-9 years ○ 10 years and more
8. Length of time in hotel industry

- less than 1 year
- 1-3 years
- 4-6 years
- 7-9 years
- 10 years and more

9. Department

- Front office
- Housekeeping
- Food and Beverage

😊 Thank you very much for your cooperation 😊
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