

The Relationship between Work Motivation, Burnout and Intention to Leave for the Top Level Managers of Garment Industry (A Case Study of Indian Garment Industry)

Dr. Seema Qureshi

Assistant Prof. Department of Business administration

Dar al Uloom University, Riyadh- Saudi-Arabia

Email: seemaqureshi2003@yahoo.co.in

Doi:10.5296/ijhrs.v3i4.4609

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijhrs.v3i4.4609>

Abstract:

Managers play an important role in organizations. They are the persons who formulate and implement policies, plans etc in the organization. Managers are the first to be contacted for suggestions with regard to overall information about the organization. Taking into consideration the importance of managers in the organization and a critical review of literature which revealed that the study on work motivation, burnout and intention to leave has not been conducted so far on the top level managers of garment industry of Delhi and NCR, the researcher found a gap to be filled by conducting investigation on this sample for the variables in question. So the sample of the present study consists of top level managers of garment industry of Delhi and NCR.

Thus, a convenient sampling method was used for drawing the sample from 60 garment export houses of Delhi and 40 of NCR.

This paper gives a deep insight of work motivation, burnout and intention to leave for the top level managers of the garment industry of Delhi/NCR. In this paper we have checked the relationship of all dimensions of work motivation with the dimensions of burnout and intention to leave and have observed that all dimensions of work motivation have some more or less relationship with each dimension of burnout but neither of the dimensions of work motivation or total work motivation have any relationship with intention to leave. So even if top level managers leave their current job they don't leave because of lack of work motivation.

Keywords: Work Motivation, Burnout, Intention to leave

INTRODUCTION

Work Motivation perhaps is single most important factor that concerns each and every executive today. The word “motivation” comes from Latin word “movere” meaning to move. Motivation is inner bearing passion caused by needs, wants and desire which propels an employee to exert his physical and mental energy to achieve desired objectives.

Industry frequently offers the employee’s external incentives such as pay, and reprimands, these, however, are less successful than incentives which motivate people internally. External motivation stimulated by pay, praise or punishment is supportive only if it is internalized. Internal motivation is that which starts from ego, needs of the person.

In Garment industry employers uses. visual aids - charts of production, first pass yield, orders filled, etc. as a great motivator and quality is also used as a factor in promotions or grade changes - from operator to senior operator if you use job grade.

Management provides many stimuli to motivate people at work. Several motives may be operating at once. When a motive is present in person it will become active when there is some appealing reason. Management’s problem is to induce employees to express their motives in productive work and to prevent frustration resulting from blocked expression of these motives. So it is very important for management to know that what motivates its employees because when employees have high work motivation, there will be high job satisfaction as a result of which there will be up to mark performance, less stress and less turnover.

The topic of burnout began to gain attention in the mid (1970s) with a book by Freudenberger (1974). He originally defined ‘burnout’ as “the extinction of motivation or incentive, especially where one's devotion to a cause or relationship fails to produce the desired results .As a clinician, he reported a number of cases studies burnout, particularly in the human services professions; his focus was on the psychodynamics of the problem. He defined burnout as a state of physical and emotional depletion resulting from conditions of work (Freudenberger and North, 1985). Burnout is a process that occurs when workers perceive a discrepancy between their work input and the output they had expected from work. According to Maslach (1993), burnout is a multidimensional construct of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment that can occur among individuals who work extensively with others under considerable time pressures. Furthermore, burnout is particularly relevant to individuals when working with people in emotionally charged situations. Much of the researches conducted on burnout have been done with the proposed definition of burnout put forth by Maslach (1993) and her colleagues. Ultimately Maslach (1993) proposed that there are three specific symptoms of burnout. *Emotional exhaustion* is that feeling of being "used up" and unable to face another day. That feeling prompts individuals to emotionally and cognitively distance themselves from their work as a way to cope. *Depersonalization* is characterized by a negative shift in response to person’s problems. In other words, one begins to expect the worst from the person or begins to treat him as a "case" or a "number," distancing oneself from him. *Reduced sense of personal accomplishment* is characterized by a negative shift in response toward oneself and the work that one does as a result of pressures on the job. Reduced personal accomplishment

or a sense of reduced professional efficacy leads to an overall sense of ineffectiveness. Experiencing any one of these three symptoms is manageable to some extent; however, when individuals begin to exhibit all three symptoms, they have reached burnout.

All these definitions embrace the essence of burnout, with the first stressing the part that exhaustion plays in it, and the second stressing the sense of disillusionment that is at its core.

The concept of intention to leave has been described by various research scholars in their own styles. Intention to leave refers to an individual's perceived probability of staying or leaving an employing organization (Cotton & Tuttle, 1986). Tett and Meyer (1993), on the other hand, referred to turnover intentions as a conscious and deliberate willfulness to leave the organization.

Lack of work motivation and turnover among employees may be major contributors to intention to leave. Moreover, turnover is often the result of what happens to managers after they become burned-out. Turnover is both a cause, and an effect of burnout. One of the main financial benefits of turnover is that it provides an opportunity to reset salaries. As employees at the high end of the pay structure leave, cost savings are typically seen when a company brings in a replacement at a lower rate, or promotes from within and lowers the rate for that employee's replacement. Some employee turnover positively benefits organizations. This happens whenever a poor performer is replaced by a more effective employee, and can happen when a senior retirement allows the promotion or acquisition of welcome 'fresh blood'

Literature Review

The present investigator has made an attempt to come out with a brief review of studies done on work motivation, burnout and intention to leave. Many theoretical and empirical studies tried to analyze relationship of these variables separately or in conjunction with each other on different samples with different modeling approaches. Most of the available literature on work motivation, burnout and intention to leave is of recent origin. The survey relates to the period from 1950's to 2009.

There is no dearth of researches on work motivation. Many scholars have worked on this variable and have come up with different observation and conclusions. It has been observed that intrinsic as well as extrinsic factors contribute to work motivation, in which money also plays an important role. Similarly internal communication impacts work motivation of employees in an organization. Burnout is also a complex problem which all employees at all levels face within an organization. Almost one-fifth of managers experience high levels of burnout in organizations and the reason being for burnout are usually the organizational factors that contribute to employees frustration with their work situation. Intention to leave mainly crops up due to low work motivation and high burnout. It has found by researchers that employees usually intend to leave when they are emotionally exhausted, have lower levels of intrinsic job satisfaction and are dissatisfied with their salary and promotion opportunities. One of the key findings from the review of literature shows that consistent employee recognition is rated very highly among employees as a factor influencing retention. This is consistent with industry research, which also identifies recognition as a key factor in retaining top-performing workers. These important findings, coupled with the human

resources department's strategic goals, generated actions to increase employee recognition. Similarly individual characteristics reflecting demographic and work factors, contextual variables reflecting individual stature and adjustment to the work environment also play an important role in employee's intention to leave the organization.

The researches which have been done till date on work motivation, burnout and intention to leave variables are presented as follows under their respective headings.

WORK MOTIVATION

Tiglao (1990) surveyed 150 frontline workers, 43 of their immediate supervisors and 50 clients of 11 government agencies. It was found that both intrinsic as well as extrinsic factors served as important motivating factors. Employee satisfaction with recognition rewards, type of work, personal sense of achievement, physical setting, style of supervisor, and relationship with co-workers were positively associated with productivity. Akintoye (2000) asserts that money remains the most significant motivational strategy. As far back as 1911, Frederick W. Taylor and his scientific management associate described money as the most important factor in motivating the industrial workers to achieve greater productivity. Taylor advocated the establishment of incentive wage systems as a means of stimulating workers to higher performance, commitment, and eventually satisfaction. Money possesses significant motivating power in as much as it symbolizes intangible goals like security, power, prestige, and a feeling of accomplishment and success. Winter (2000) identified positive and negative sources of work motivation. It was found that when roles are clear, job tasks are challenging and supervisors exhibit a supportive leadership style, the work environment is motivating and when there is role overload, low participation and poor rewards and recognition practices the work environment is de-motivating and henceforth low work motivation. Lindner (1998) conducted a research to describe the importance of certain factors in motivating employees at the Piketon Research and Extension Center and Enterprise Center. Specifically, the study sought to determine the ranked importance of ten motivating factors. The final ranked order of these factors was: 1) interesting work, 2) good wages, 3) full appreciation of work done, 4) job security, 5) good working conditions, 6) promotions and growth in the organization, 7) feelings of being in on things, 8) personal loyalty to employees, 9) tactful discipline, 10) sympathetic help with personal problems. Saiyadain (1979) presented a list of 213 managers and asked them to rank order in terms of their importance to workers. Their rankings were: achievement-7, salary-1, working-condition-2, supervision-10, rules=6, responsibility-9, relationship with others -8, fringe benefits-5, recognition-4, job security-3, where 1 indicates the highest rank and 10 is the lowest rank. The managerial personnel ranked salary as 1, indicating that this was the top most variable in the minds of workers while their own value to money was just the opposite.

BURNOUT

Brenda & Rowlinson (2009) investigated and compared the experience of job burnout among 249 construction engineers working within consulting and contracting organizations in Hong Kong. The most widely recognized model of burnout, comprising emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and diminished professional efficacy was found to be valid. The sample in this

study scored highest in all three dimensions of burnout among nine other occupations in national samples, with engineers working within contracting organizations reporting higher levels of burnout than their fellow engineers working within consulting organizations. The results of the study also showed that burnout attributed largely to stressors associated with job conditions and working environments. In particular, qualitative overload and lack of promotion prospects were found to be the major predictors of job burnout among engineers working within consulting organizations; whereas long working hours, role conflict, role ambiguity, and lack of job security accounted mostly for the burnout among engineers within contracting organizations. Farahbakhsh (2009) conducted a study to investigate the level of job burnout to recognize sources and coping strategies of top managers in Lorestan province's organizations. Number of 245 general managers, chiefs and deputy managers of governmental organizations in the province and towns were randomly selected by the cluster-sampling technique. The results indicated that 11 percent of participants were emotionally exhausted moderately. In addition, 22.3 and 6.9 percent of participants were depersonalized moderately and highly respectively. Moreover, 14.7 and 4.5 percent of participants had lack of personal accomplishment moderately and highly respectively.

INTENTION TO LEAVE

Harrington (2001) examined the predictors of potential for job turnover, including job satisfaction and burn out for a national, stratified random sample of Air Force Family Advocacy Program (FAP) workers. Respondents were more likely to intend to leave if they were emotionally exhausted, had lower levels of intrinsic job satisfaction, and were dissatisfied with their salary and promotion opportunities. O'Reilly (1996) found that firm used to pay the chief executive officer 50 percent more than the industry norm and paid the general managers 50 percent below the industry norm. At the company, Reilly found, turnover among the general managers was 18 percent higher than at firms whose chief executive officers were equitably paid. Jacob (1994) conducted a research on the relationship between the burnout of female school teachers and its effect on their intentions to leave their jobs. Based on a comparative analysis of three measures of burnout, showed that physical and mental burnout components were significant in explaining workers' intention to leave, while emotional burnout was not.

Hassan (2000) developed a study in which a causal diagram addressing the predictors of work satisfaction, burnout and turnover among professional social workers was done. A random sample of 218 social workers completed self-administered surveys. The results indicated that higher satisfaction, lower burnout, and lower turnover were a function of higher collegial relationship, greater supervision, adequate working conditions, greater opportunities for promotion, and ethnicity.

METHODOLOGY

The main purpose of this research is to find out the relationship among work motivation, burnout and intention to leave for top level managers in garment industry in Delhi/NCR.

In the light of review of literature, the present investigator was of the opinion that no such study has been found on the sample of top level managers in garment industry so formulated

following null hypothesis:

Ho1: Work motivation as well as its each dimension will not have any significant relationship with burnout and its dimensions for the top level managers of the garment industry.

Ho2: Work motivation as well as its each dimension will not have any significant relationship with intention to leave for the top level managers of the garment industry.

After several visits made to these garment houses, data was collected. Out of 100 questionnaires distributed, the present investigator got only 66 questionnaires back because it was very difficult to get information from top level managers because of their busy schedules. Some questionnaires were not responded completely so only 55 questionnaires were included for the purpose of analysis. Thus the sample size comprises of 55 (N=55).

Thus, a convenient sampling method was used for drawing the sample from 60 garment export houses of Delhi and 40 of NCR.

The scale of Aggarwal (1988) was used to measure employees work motivation. This scale consists of 6 factors such as Organizational Orientation, Job Satisfaction, Work Group Relations, Monetary Incentives, Psychological Work Incentives and Dependence. This scale consists of 26 items and each item has 5 alternative answers, one of which is required to be checked, assigning a score of 5 to the most positive response and 1 to the extreme negative response. Among these 26 items, 5 items are related to Organizational Orientation, 4 items are related to Monetary Incentives, 3 items are related to Work Group Relations, 3 items are related to Job satisfaction, 7 items are related to Dependence and 4 items are related to Psychological Work Incentives. The reliability of this scale is .994 and the item validity was found beyond 1% level of confidence.

For tapping information on burnout the scale developed by Freudenberger (1974) was used. This scale consists of 17 items and has 4 response categories. However, present investigator has modified the scale to 5 points to get also average response, if any, from the sample. Response at "1" represents not being true about the respondent and response at "5" describes the respondent very well. This scale has 4 factors such as Mental, Emotional, Physical and Social. The Mental factor measures that whether an individual is remembering his appointments and deadlines. Emotional factor measures how happy, irritable and short tempered an individual feels with his/her surroundings. The Physical factor includes the physical health of an individual. The Social factor takes into consideration that to which extent an individual is in touch with his family and friends. The reliability and validity of scale are 0.95 and 0.973 respectively.

For collecting information on intention to leave, two questions were included, each of which consists of 5 justifications or reasons for responding Yes or No.

The data thus collected by using the above questionnaires were treated with the stepwise multiple regression analysis to find out relationship among the dimensions of Work Motivation and Burnout and Intention to leave for the top level managers of garment industry of Delhi and NCR. The data thus analyzed revealed the results which are interpreted and

discussed as follows:

RESULTS & INTERPRETATIONS

Top Level Managers:

The following Table -1 of analysis of variance contains sum of square values, mean square value and f- value. (Significance level is 5%). This table provides analysis of variance among the group and between the groups.

Table -1: Analysis of Variance.

Dependent Variable	Source	Sum of Square	Degree of Freedom	Mean Squares	F-Ratio	P-Value
Job-Satisfaction(JS)	<i>Regression</i>	43.397	3	14.466	15.621	0.000
	<i>Residual</i>	48.156	52	0.926		
Organizational Orientation(OO)	<i>Regression</i>	155.900	4	38.975	8.059	0.000
	<i>Residual</i>	246.654	51	4.836		
Psychological Work Incentive(PWI)	<i>Regression</i>	146.456	3	48.819	17.659	0.000
	<i>Residual</i>	143.758	52	2.765		
Material Incentive(MI)	<i>Regression</i>	114.740	3	38.247	16.119	0.000
	<i>Residual</i>	123.385	52	2.373		
Work Group Relation(WGR)	<i>Regression</i>	29.083	1	29.083	17.694	0.0000
	<i>Residual</i>	88.756	54	1.644		
Dependability(DEP)	<i>Regression</i>	57.825	2	28.913	6.965	0.002
	<i>Residual</i>	220.014	53	4.151		
Total Score Of Work Motivation (WT)	<i>Regression</i>	2446.534	4	611.634	8.565	0.000
	<i>Residual</i>	3642.019	51	71.412		

The above Table-1 warranted the investigator to do further analysis which resulted in the following Table -2 which depicts the summary output of stepwise regression analysis.

Table- 2: Stepwise Regression Analysis of Work Motivation Factors, Burnout Factors & Intention to leave in Top Level Managers:

Dependent Variable	Step No.	Variable Removed	Multiple R	Multiple R Square	Decrease in R Square
Job Satisfaction	0	Physical Burnout	0.703	0.494	
	1	Intention to Leave	0.697	0.486	0.008
	2	Social Burnout	0.680	0.474	0.012
Organizational Orientation	0	Emotional Burnout	0.622	0.387	
	1	Intention to Leave	0.622	0.387	0.002
Psychological Work Incentive	0	Physical Burnout	0.713	0.509	
	1	Total Burnout	0.713	0.508	0.001
	2	Intention to Leave	0.710	0.505	0.003
Material Incentive	0	Emotional Burnout	0.695	0.484	
	1	Intention to Leave	0.695	0.483	0.001
	2	Physical Burnout	0.694	0.482	0.001
WorkGroup Relations	0	Emotional Burnout	0.531	0.282	
	1	Intention to Leave	0.531	0.281	0.001
	2	Physical Burnout	0.507	0.257	0.023
	3	Total Burnout	0.497	0.247	0.010
Dependability	0	Physical Burnout	0.476	0.226	
	1	Social Burnout	0.475	0.226	0.003
	2	Intention to Leave	0.474	0.224	0.002
	3	Emotional Burnout	0.456	0.208	0.016
Total Score of Work Motivation	0	Total Burnout	0.634	0.402	
	1	Intention to leave	0.634	0.402	0.002

During backward multiple regression method in the first step when *Job Satisfaction factor* which is one of the dimensions of work motivation, is entered as dependent variable and all the burnout factors and intention to leave as independent variables, it has been observed from Table- 2 that in the initial step 0 physical burnout factor is removed and in step 1 & 2, intention to leave and social burnout factor are removed as they are not the best predictors of job satisfaction for the sample of top level managers. In the last step following Table -2a was observed:

Table-2a:

Regression Coefficients B = $(X'X)^{-1}X'Y$						
Effect	Coefficient	Standard Error	Std. Coefficient	Tolerance	t-value	p-value
CONSTANT	15.172	0.811	0.000		18.713	0.000
Emotional Burnout	-0.689	0.147	-1.419	0.110	-4.672	0.000
Mental Burnout	-0.776	0.169	-1.132	0.166	-4.590	0.000
Total Burnout	-0.336	0.090	-1.638	0.052	-3.729	0.000

The above Table -2a shows that emotional burnout, mental burnout and total burnout factor determined the job satisfaction level in the top level managers, so the following regression equation is framed from above table:

$$Y = 15.172 - 0.0689 x_1 - 0.776 x_2 - 0.336 x_3$$

Where Y is job satisfaction, 15.172 is constant or intercept, x_1 is the emotional and x_2 is mental burnout factor, x_3 is total burnout factor respectively. It is observed that job satisfaction increases as the amount of emotional, mental and total burnout factors decrease. With reference to Table no- 1 it can be interpreted that F- value 15.621 is highly significant as p value is less than 5% significance level. So the variance level within the group and between the groups is well within permitted limit.

Similarly when *Organizational Orientation* factor which is one of the dimensions of work motivation, is entered as dependent variable and all the burnout factors and intention to leave as independent variables, it has been observed from Table -2 that in the initial step 0 emotional burnout factor is removed and in step 1 intention to leave factor is removed as they are not the best predictors of organizational orientation. In the last step following Table -2b was observed:

Table-2b:

Regression Coefficients B = $(X'X)^{-1}X'Y$						
Effect	Coefficient	Standard Error	Std. Coefficient	Tolerance	t-Value	p-value
CONSTANT	21.063	1.856	0.000		11.348	0.000
Mental Burnout	-0.711	0.261	-0.495	0.364	-2.723	0.009
Physical Burnout	-1.224	0.337	-0.828	0.231	-3.630	0.001
Social Burnout	-1.437	0.498	-0.769	0.170	-2.887	0.006
Total Burnout	-0.479	0.183	-1.113	0.067	-2.623	0.011

The above Table -2b shows that only mental, physical, social and total burnout factor determined the organizational orientation in the top level managers, so the following regression equation is framed from above Table- 2b:

$$Y = 21.063 - 0.711 x_1 - 1.224 x_2 - 1.437 x_3 - 0.479 x_4$$

Where Y is organizational orientation, 21.063 is constant or intercept, x_1 is the mental, x_2 is physical, x_3 is social and x_4 is total burnout factor. It is observed that organizational

orientation increases as the amount of mental, physical, social and total burnout factor decreases. With reference to Table-1 it can be interpreted that F- value 8.059 is highly significant as p value is less than 5% significance level. So the variance level within the group and between the groups is within permitted limit.

Similarly when *Psychological Work Incentive factor* which is one of the dimensions of work motivation, is entered as dependent variable and all the burnout factors and intention to leave as independent variables it has been observed from Table- 2 that in the initial step 0 physical burnout factor is removed and in step 1 & 2, total burnout and intention to leave factors are removed respectively as they are not the best predictors of psychological work incentive. In the last step following Table- 2c was observed:

Table- 2c:

Regression Coefficients $B = (X'X)^{-1}X'Y$						
Effect	Coefficient	Standard Error	Std. Coefficient	Tolerance	t-value	p-value
CONSTANT	23.022	1.398	0.000		16.470	0.000
Emotional Burnout	-0.382	0.125	-0.442	0.453	3.048	0.004
Mental Burnout	-0.904	0.146	-0.741	0.665	6.191	0.000
Social Burnout	-0.876	0.253	-0.552	0.374	3.458	0.001

The above Table- 2c shows that only mental, emotional and social burnout factors determined the psychological work incentive in the top level managers, so the following regression equation is framed from above table:

$$Y = 23.022 - 0.382 x_1 - 0.904 x_2 - 0.876 x_3$$

Where Y is psychological work incentive, 23.022 is constant or intercept, x_1 is the emotional burnout factor and x_2 is mental burnout factor and x_3 is social burnout factor. It is observed that psychological work incentive increases as the amount of mental, social and emotional burnout factor decreases. With reference to Table-1 it can be interpreted that F- value 17.655 is highly significant as p value is less than 5% significant level. So the variance level within the group and between the groups is within permitted limit.

Similarly when *Material Incentive factor* which is one of the dimensions of work motivation, is entered as dependent variable and all the burnout factors and intention to leave as independent variables, it has been observed from Table-2 that in the initial step 0 emotional burnout factor is removed and in step 1 and 2 intention to leave and physical burnout factor are removed as they are the only predictors not suited for material incentive factor. In the last step following Table -2d was observed:

Table -2d:

Regression Coefficients B = (X'X)⁻¹X'Y						
Effect	Coefficient	Standard Error	Std. Coefficient	Tolerance	t-value	p-value
CONSTANT	19.997	1.255	0.000		15.934	0.000
Mental Burnout	-0.516	0.180	-0.467	0.376	-2.871	0.006
Social Burnout	-0.543	0.246	-0.378	0.340	-2.207	0.032
Total Burnout	-0.170	0.075	-0.512	0.197	-2.274	0.027

The above Table- 2d shows that mental, social and total burnout factor determined the material incentive in the top level managers, so the following regression equation is framed from above table:

$$Y = 19.997 - 0.516 x_1 - 0.543 x_2 - 0.170 x_3$$

Where Y is material incentive, 19.997 is constant or intercept, x_1 is the mental, x_2 is social, x_3 is total burnout factor. It is observed that material incentive increases as the amount of mental burnout, social burnout and total burnout decreases. With reference to Table-1 it can be interpreted that F- value 16.119 is highly significant as p value is less than 5% significance level. So the variance level within the group and between the groups is within permitted limit. Similarly when *Work Group Relation* factor which is one of the dimensions of work motivation, is entered as dependent variable and all the burnout factors and intention to leave as independent variables, it has been observed from Table- 2 that in the initial step 0 emotional burnout factor is removed and in step 1, 2 and 3 intention to leave, physical and total burnout factor are removed respectively as they are not the best predictors of work group relation factor. In the last step following Table -2e was observed:

Table-2e:

Regression Coefficients B = (X'X)⁻¹X'Y						
Effect	Coefficient	Standard Error	Std. Coefficient	Tolerance	t-value	p-value
CONSTANT	13.242	0.492	0.000		26.939	0.000
Mental Burnout	-0.386	0.092	-0.497	0.110	-4.206	0.000
Social Burnout	-0.341	0.086	-0.439	0.121	-4.913	0.002

The above Table -2e shows that mental burnout factor and social burnout factor determined the work group relation factor in the top level managers, so the following regression equation is framed from above table:

$$Y = 13.242 - 0.386 x_1 - 0.341 x_2$$

Where Y is work group relation factor, 13.242 is constant or intercept, x_1 is the mental burnout factor and x_2 is social burnout factor. It is observed that work group relation increases as the amount of mental burnout and social burnout factor decreases. With reference to Table-1 it can be interpreted that F- value 17.694 is highly significant as p value is less than

5% significance level. So the variance level within the group and between the groups is within permitted limit.

Similarly when *Dependability factor* which is one of the dimensions of work motivation, is entered as dependent variable and all the burnout factors and intention to leave as independent variables, it has been observed from Table-2 that in the initial step 0 physical burnout factor is removed and in step 1, 2 and 3 social, intention to leave and emotional burnout factors are removed respectively as they are not the best predictors of dependability. In the last step following Table- 2f was observed:

Table-2f:

Regression Coefficients $B = (X'X)^{-1}X'Y$						
Effect	Coefficient	Standard	Std.	Tolerance	t-value	p-value
CONSTANT	21.034	1.658	0.000		12.686	0.000
Mental Burnout	-0.824	0.235	-0.690	0.385	-3.503	0.001
Total Burnout	-0.137	0.070	-0.384	0.385	-1.949	0.057

The above Table -2f shows that mental and total burnout factor determined the dependability factor in the top level managers, so the following regression equation is framed from above table:

$$Y = 21.034 - 0.824 x_1 - 0.137 x_2$$

Where Y is dependability, 21.034 is constant or intercept, x_1 is the mental and x_2 is total burnout factor. It is observed that dependability increases as the amount of mental burnout and total burnout factor decreases. With reference to Table-1 it can be interpreted that F-value 6.965 is highly significant as p value is less than 5% significance level. So the variance level within the group and between the groups is within permitted limit.

Finally when we combined the *score of all the Work Motivation* on the individual cases and total score as a new variable and entered this variable as dependent variable and all other burnout factors and intention to leave as the independent factors, then it has been observed from Table -2 that in the initial step 0 total burnout factor is removed and in step 1 intention to leave is removed as these two factors are not suited for total work motivation. In the last step following Table-2g was observed:

Table-2g:

Regression Coefficients $B = (X'X)^{-1}X'Y$						
Effect	Coefficient	Standard Error	Std. Coefficient	Tolerance	t-value	p-value
CONSTANT	114.674	7.132	0.000		16.079	0.000
Emotional Burnout	-1.323	0.702	-0.334	0.372	-1.884	0.065
Mental Burnout	-4.252	0.872	-0.761	0.482	-4.879	0.000
Physical Burnout	-1.272	0.832	-0.221	0.560	-1.529	0.133
Social Burnout	-2.448	1.354	-0.337	0.339	-1.809	0.076

The above Table -2g shows that emotional, mental, physical and social burnout factor determined the total work motivation factor as a whole in the top level managers, so the following regression equation is framed from above table:

$$Y = 114.674 - 1.323 x_1 - 4.252 x_2 - 1.272 x_3 - 2.448 x_4$$

Where Y is total work motivation, 114.674 is constant or intercept, x_1 is the emotional, x_2 is the mental, x_3 is the physical and x_4 is social burnout factor. It is observed that total work motivation increases as the amount of emotional burnout, mental, physical and social burnout factor decreases. With reference to Table-1 it can be interpreted that F- value 8.565 is highly significant as p value is less than 5% significant level. So the variance level within the group and between the groups is within permitted limit.

The above results clearly indicate that some dimensions of work motivation do have relationship with burnout and its dimensions but no relationship with intention to leave. So, the hypothesis Ho1 and Ho2, which states that 'Work motivation as well as it's each dimension will not have any significant relationship with burnout and it's dimensions for the top level managers', stands rejected and 'Work motivation as well as it's each dimension will not have any significant relationship with intention to leave for the top level managers', stand accepted.

Limitations of study:

The main limitation of this study is that, information could not be collected from large sample of top level managers because of their non availability and busy schedules.

Conclusion

As it is evident from the Table-2a, the multiple regression analysis of the variables—work motivation, burnout and intention to leave for the top level managers, indicates that emotional burnout, mental burnout and total burnout factors emerged as the significant predictors for job satisfaction dimension of work motivation.

For organization orientation dimension of work motivation, mental burnout, social burnout, physical burnout and total burnout emerged as the significant predictors for the top level managers (Table-2b).

For psychological work incentives—as evident from the Table-2c emotional, mental and social burnout dimensions came out to be the predictors for top level managers.

When we refer Table-2d, we will find that the analysis has revealed that mental burnout, social and total burnout has been found out to be the predictor of material incentives for top level, managers.

Social burnout and mental burnout dimension emerged as the common predictor of work group relations for the top level managers (Table-2e).

When we look at the Table-2f, we find that mental and total burnout factors of burnout emerged as the common predictors of dependability dimension of work motivation for the top level managers.

It is evident from the Table-2g that mental burnout, emotional burnout, physical burnout and social burnout emerged as important predictors of total work motivation for top level managers.

Looking at the above findings it becomes pertinent to mention that if these dimensions of burnout which affect total work motivation and its various dimensions are taken care while redesigning the job, the work motivation of the top level managers in garment industry of Delhi/NCR would be enhanced. Further the step-wise multiple regression analysis depicted that intention to leave did not emerged as best predictor for any of the dimensions of work motivation or total work motivation ,as such the findings revealed that top level managers don't leave their current jobs due to lack of work motivation.

References:

1. Akintoye, I.R. (2000). The place of financial management in personnel psychology. A Paper Presented as Part of Personnel Psychology Guest Lecture Series. Department of Guidance and Counseling, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.
2. Agarwal,K.G.(1978). Self Role and Stratus: Stratification Theory of Work Motivation, New Delhi: Sterling.
3. Agarwal,K.G.(1978). Work satisfaction and mental health, Indian Educational Review, Vol.14, pp.22-29.
4. Brenda; & Rowlinson .S. (2009). Job Burnout among Construction Engineers Working within Consulting and Contracting Organizations. Journal of Mgmt, Vol.25, Issue 3, pp. 122-130.
5. Cotton,J.L; and Tuttle,J.M.(1986).Employee Turnover: A Meta-Analysis and Review with Implications for Research,Academy of Management Review,Vol.11(1),pp.55-70.
6. Farahbakhsh.S. (2009). A Study of Job Burnout, Sources and Coping Strategies in Top Managers of Governmental Organizations in Province of Lorestan, Iran. Australia .Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences, Vol.3 (4).
7. Freudenberger, H.J. (1974). Staff burnout. Journal of Social Issues, Vol.30 (1), pp.159-165.
8. Harrington,D. (2001). Predictors of Intentions to Leave a Job in a Military Setting. Journal of Administration in Social work, Vol.25 (3), pp.1 – 16.
9. Hassan, S. AB. (2000).Work satisfaction, burnout, and turnover among social workers in Israel: a causal diagram. International Journal of Social Welfare, Vol. 9(3), pp. 191 – 200.

10. Jacob.W (1994). Measuring Workers' Burnout and Intention to leave. *Journal of International Manpower*, Vol.15 (1), pp 4 – 14.
11. Lindner, J.R. (1998). Understanding Employee Motivation. *Journal of Extension*, Vol.36 (3).
12. Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 397-422.
13. O'Reilly; & Wade, J.B. (1996). Social Capital at the Top: Effects of Social Similarity and Status on CEO Compensation. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol.39 (6), pp.1568-1593.
14. Saiyadain M.S. (1999), *Human Resource Management*. New Delhi: Tata McGraw – Hill publishing company.
15. Tett, R. P. & Meyer, J.P. (1993). Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, Turnover Intention and Turnover: Path Analyses Based on Meta-Analytic Findings. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 46, pp.259-293.
16. Tiglao, T.A. (1990). Work motivation and productivity of government workers, *Philippine Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol.81 (5), pp.575-586.
17. Winter, R. (2000). The Academic Work Environment in Australian Universities". *Journal of Higher Education R&D*, Vol. 21(3).