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ABSTRACT

This paper examines perceptions of organizational politics as a mediator of the effects of negative sensitivity and positive sensitivity on burnout. In this research the data were collected by questionnaires from full-time frontline workers of three-, four-, and five-star hotels in Tehran city of Iran. The measures were also subjected to confirmatory factor analysis using LISREL 8.80 for further psychometric evaluation. According to data achieved from frontline hotel workers in Iran, results show that the effects of negative sensitivity on weaknees and disengagement, through perceptions of organizational politics, are powerful than positive sensitivity.
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Introduction

Burnout exacerbates depression (Shani and Pizam, 2009), increases healthcare costs and leads to substantial loss of workdays each year (Gabriel and Liimatainen, 2000). As a type of work-related strains , burnout goes to such undesirable results as reduced job performance; job dissatisfaction, moving of time spent on work-related activities to non-work activities, lower organizational obligation, and increased absenteeism (Deery, 2008; Shani and Pizam, 2009). Consequently burnout is infectious and crosses over from one individual to another and expansions across the organization (Bakker et al., 2007). Burnout can happen among workers in all kinds of jobs including frontline service workers in the hospitality industry (Chalkiti and Sigala, 2010; Kim et al., 2007) where pressures on organizations to reduce staff and growth visitor expectations continue to rise. Because of their boundary-spanning roles, frontline workers differ from other workers in an organization. Frontline workers represent their organization to customers intensify the image of the organization, and improve the organization’s legitimacy through support (Bettencourt and Brown, 2003). They provide information about customers’ needs, requests, expectations as well as improvements in service delivery (Bettencourt and Brown, 2003; Rust et al., 1996). Frontline workers also play important role in the delivery of quality services to visitors, returning aggrieved visitors to a state of satisfaction after a service failure (Yavas et al., 2004) and significantly contribute to customer retention (Alexandrov et al., 2007). However, today, among other factors, rises verbal offensive by visitors, increasing job demands, and the pressures of achieving work-life balance (Karatepe et al., 2009; Kim, 2008; Shani and Pizam, 2009) interject additional doses of daily stress to the already stressful work environments of frontline hotel workers. Such developments increase worker job burnout and make it unavoidable and extensive. Therefore, it becomes importance to further understand the antecedents of burnout among frontline hotel workers and manage worker burnout effectively. Therefore in this research, we develop and test a burnout model which examines the role of perceptions of organizational politics on the relationships between negative and positive sensitivity and burnout. We use frontline hotel workers in Iran as our environment. Our investigation is related and significant. First, the superiority of the research on the antecedents of burnout focuses on organizational variables (job autonomy, role stress) in predicting burnout (Halbesleben and Buckley, 2004; Kim et al., 2007) and largely ignores character variables such as sensitivity. Sensitivity or "the dispositional inclination to experience certain effective states extra
time” Thoresen et al. (2003), show clearly itself in terms of two independent types of sensitivity, negative sensitivity and positive sensitivity. In other words, negative sensitivity and positive sensitivity is not facing points on a continuum (Croppanzano et al., 1993). Negative sensitivity is the dispositional inclination to experience a variety of negative mood states (Watson and Clark, 1984). It reflects an individual’s inclination to experience discomfort across time and circumstances and show clearly itself in negative self-concept and negative emotional states such as “anger, scorn, guilt, self-dissatisfaction, a sense of refusal, and to some extent, unhappiness” (Watson and Clark, 1984). In contrast, positive sensitivity is the dispositional inclination to experience enjoyable obligation with the environment. In this investigate; we focus on both forms of sensitivity for two reasons. On one hand, Alarcon et al.’s (2009) meta-analytic investigates shows that negative and positive sensitivity have powerful relationships with burnout than other character variables such as proactive character, optimism, and center self-evaluations. On the other hand, the research which examines the role of sensitivity on burnout mainly scores on negative sensitivity (Thoresen et al. 2003). Overlooking positive sensitivity in earlier studies is a deficiency considering the current movement towards positive psychology/positive organizational behavior (Schaufeli and Bakker, 2004). Positive psychology focuses on human strengths, maximum functioning, and positive experiences at work rather than weaknesses and malfunctioning (Mauno et al., 2007; Schaufeli et al., 2002). Positive organizational behavior, which is an extension of positive psychology, support and promotes the study and application of positively oriented human resource strengths and psychological functions to improve performance in today’s workplace (Luthans, 2002). Positive sensitivity increases intuition and creativity, expands the handle of attention, starts happiness (Barsade and Gibson, 2007), relieves burnout (Hobfoll, 1989), and reduces absenteeism (Barsade and Gibson, 2007; Karatepe and Uludag, 2008a). Hence, hospitality organizations need workers with positive sensitivity to possibly mitigate the negative effects of burnout and achieve valued organizational goals and/or avoid undesirable results. Second, organizational politics whereby “organizational members attempt either directly or indirectly to effect other members by means not sanctioned by conventional standard operating procedures or unconventional norms (Witt et al., 2000, p. 342). In fact, recent reviews and empirical studies show that favoritism, unfair practices, unfair rewards and encouragement are prevailing in hospitality-related job environments (Kusluvan et al., 2010; Wan, 2010). Employees working in politically charged work environments where unfair outcomes, procedures, and favoritism are widespread are susceptible to work-related strain (Perrewé et al., 1991; Ross, 2005). Employees working in a political manner charged work environments where unfair results, procedures, and favoritism are extensive are susceptible to work-related strain (Ross, 2005). In spite of its impact on burnout, empirical research examining the relationships between perceptions of organizational politics and burnout is just enough (Huang et al., 2003). More consequentially, empirical research has largely neglected the possible relationships between dispositional variables and perceptions of organizational politics. Adams et al. (2008) investigated the effects of negative and positive sensitivity, self-efficacy, and fairness sensitivity on organizational politics. Thus, according to our knowledge; this is the first investigate which tests the relationships among dispositional variables, organizational politics, and burnout via data achieved from frontline hotel workers in an Iran. Besides adding to the inventory of knowledge and serving as a frame of reference for future research, the findings of our research may also prove useful from a managerial perspective as well.

2. Research model

In Fig. 1, perceptions of organizational politics act as an incomplete mediator of the effects of negative and positive sensitivity, on weakness and disengagement, the two dimensions of burnout in the Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (OLBI) (Demerouti et al., 2001, 2003). We assert that negative sensitivity relative to the effect of positive sensitivity, use a powerful effect on weakness and disengagement through organizational politics perceptions. Evidence from the work suggests that organizational strength effects job policies and behaviors (Alexandrov et al., 2007; Van Breukelen et al., 2004) and is increasingly incorporated into stress-and related studies (Bradley, 2007; Karatepe, 2009). For instance, a recent investigate shows that workers with longer strength are more satisfied, obligated and relaxing with the psychological climate in their jobs and are less disposed to leave their jobs (Van Breukelen et al., 2004). However, it also seems that frontline workers develop some uncertainty about management and their jobs as a function of strength (Alexandrov et al., 2007). Therefore this research shows that
workers with longer strength demonstrate higher perceptions of organizational politics (Adams et al., 2008). In addition, according to Karatepe and Uludag (2008b), frontline hotel workers with longer strength face lower levels of burnout in their jobs. Therefore, in an effort to describe the relationships in our model, we incorporate organizational strength as a control variable.

2.1. Sensitivity, perceptions of organizational politics,

Watson and Clark (1984) claim that, individuals with high negative sensitivity often experience discomfort across circumstances, even in the absence of clear stress. Evidence shows that negative sensitivity slowly consume job satisfaction and organizational obligation, and increases absenteeism (Cropanzano et al., 1993; Thoresen et al., 2003). On the contrary, research shows that positive sensitivity increases creativity, increases job satisfaction and organizational obligation, lowers absenteeism (Amabile et al., 2005; Cropanzano et al., 1993). High positive sensitivity involves full concentration, excitement, high energy, excitement, enjoyable obligation and resolution (Cropanzano et al., 1993; Fogarty et al., 1999). Individuals high in positive sensitivity tend to perceive events and other individuals in a more positive manner (Iverson et al., 1998). Individuals with low positive sensitivity are more likely to experience perceptions of fatigue (Cropanzano et al., 1993; Watson et al., 1988). Both negative and positive sensitivity effect workers’ perceptions of organizational politics, which is not functioning properly side of organizational life (Hochwarter and Treadway, 2003) and a strongly source of stress (Treadway et al., 2005). Individuals with high negative sensitivity react more strongly to stressful circumstances (Watson and Clark, 1984). They are more tending to exalted levels of perceptions of organizational politics (Adams et al., 2008) whereas individuals high in positive sensitivity tend to have lower perceptions of organizational politics (Adams et al., 2008; Hochwarter and Treadway, 2003). Both negative and positive sensitivity also effect weakness and disengagement (Demerouti et al., 2001, 2003). Weakness refers to “a consequence of intensive physical effective and perceptive strain. Disengagement, in turn, is defined as “distancing oneself from one’s work, and experiencing negative attitudes toward the work object, work content, or one’s work in general” (Demerouti et al., 2001, p. 501). Iverson et al., (1998) Thoresen et al., (2003) in their finding shows that negative sensitivity increases burnout, while positive sensitivity reduces it. Research also shows that workers’ perceptions of organizational politics increase burnout (Advani et al., 2005; Huang et al., 2003). In our model, perceptions of organizational politics incompletely mediate the effects of negative and positive sensitivity on weakness and disengagement. We base our reasoning on the theoretical underpinnings of the perception mechanism and the Conservation of Resources (COR) theory. The perception mechanism, as a tangible approach to explaining why negative sensitivity relates to job stressors and strains, states that necessary reports of job stressors are valid indication of their perceptions (Spector et al., 2000) and suggest that individuals with high negative sensitivity “tend to perceive their jobs as having high levels of stressors which lead to high levels of job strains” (Spector et al., 2000). Oliver et al. (2010) provides strong support for the perceptions mechanism and clearly shows that the effects of negative sensitivity on psychological health are incompletely mediated by work stressors. Research shows that negative sensitivity increases burnout, while positive sensitivity and reduces it (Iverson et al., 1998; Thoresen et al., 2003). Research also shows that workers’ perceptions of organizational politics increase burnout (Advani et al., 2005; Huang et al., 2003). In our model, perceptions of organizational politics incompletely mediate the effects of negative and positive sensitivity on weakness and disengagement. We found our reasoning on the theoretical underpinnings of the perception mechanism and the Conservation of Resources (COR) theory. The perception mechanism, as a tangible approach to explaining why negative sensitivity relates to job stressor and strains, states that necessary reports of job stressors are valid indication of their perceptions (Spector et al., 2000) and states that individuals with high negative sensitivity “tend to perceive their jobs as having high levels of stressors which lead to high levels of job strains” (Spector et al., 2000). Oliver et al. (2010) provides strong support for the perceptions mechanism and clearly shows that the effects of negative sensitivity on psychological health are incompletely mediated by work stressors. The COR theory assumes that individuals seek to obtain, assert and protect three types of resources including individual characteristics, conditions, and energies (Hobfoll, 1989). According to the instructions of the COR theory, “people must empower resources in
order to protect against resource loss, recover from losses, and gain resources” (Hobfoll, 2001). Stress in the workplace happens when individuals (a) face threat of loss of resources, (b) lose their resources, and (c) empower resources and do not catch what they have predicted in return (Hobfoll, 2001). Individuals can use individual resources to handle with stress and one such individual resource is positive sensitivity. Thus, workers with positive sensitivity are able protecting themselves from the dark side of organizational politics. This is because under the principles of the COR theory, individual resources are important mechanisms in managing with strains (Hobfoll, 2001) and workers with individual resources (Positive sensitivity,) (Zellars et al. 2006) can avoid source exhausting and avoid burnout. Research indeed shows that positive sensitivity relieves burnout (Iverson et al., 1998; Thoresen et al., 2003). In our investigate we assert that the effect of negative sensitivity on burnout via organizational politics perceptions is higher than positive sensitivity. Empirically, Adam et al.’s (2008) shows that the impact of negative sensitivity on organizational politics perceptions is much higher than that of positive sensitivity. Thoresen et al. (2003) meta-analytic inquiry displays that the associations of negative sensitivity with emotional weakness and individualization are higher than that of positive sensitivity. Also research shows that positive sensitivity, effects job satisfaction more strongly than negative sensitivity, (Agho et al., 1992; Connolly and Viswesvaran, 2000). Such findings are consistent with the effect matching hypothesis which states that negative sensitivity predicts perceptions of unpleasant events and positive sensitivity and predicts perceptions of pleasant events (Valle et al., 2002). In other words, negative sensitivity is linked to negative consequences, while positive sensitivity is linked to positive consequences. Therefore, we suggest the following hypotheses:

H1. The indirect effect of negative sensitivity on weakness, through organizational politics perceptions, is powerful than the indirect effect of positive sensitivity

H2. The indirect effect of negative sensitivity on disengagement, through organizational politics perceptions, is powerful than the indirect effect of positive sensitivity

3. Method

3.1. Sample and procedure

In this research the data were collected by questionnaires from full-time frontline workers of three, four, and five-star hotels in Tehran city of Iran. These respondents were employed as front-desk agents, food and beverage servers, doorkeepers; visitor relations representatives, and had frequent face-to-face or voice-to-voice interactions with customers. According to the information we received from the Ministry of Culture and Tourism office, 5 five-star hotel, 14 four-star, and 19 three-star hotels were operating in the research location at the time of our investigate. These hotels had a total number of 2816 rooms. The managements of all these hotels were contacted to receive permission for data collection. The total number of frontline workers in these hotels was 665. The research team distributed the questionnaires to all these frontline workers. Each questionnaire included a cover letter promising complete anonymity and confidentiality to the respondent. Six hundred twenty questionnaires were returned for a response rate of 46.3%. This response rate is comparable to the response rate obtained in another study conducted among frontline hotel employees in the same locality (Yavas et al., 2008). Each questionnaire included a cover letter promising complete anonymity and confidentiality to the respondent. Five hundred ninety five (595) questionnaires were returned for a response rate of 82.3%. As shown in Table 1, about 51% of the respondents were between the ages of 18 and 25, 43% between 26 and 40, and the rest were older than 40. Approximately 58% of the respondents were male. Approximately 42% of the respondents had secondary and high school education, 28% had vocational school (two-year College) education, 20% had college degrees and the rest had graduate degrees. About 51% of the respondents had strengths of 1–5 years, 33% had strengths of 6–10 years and 4% over 10 years. The rest of the respondents (12%) had been with their hotels less than one year.

3.2. Measurement

Negative sensitivity and positive sensitivity was measured via three (3) items from Agho et al. (1992) which were employed to make operational in earlier studies (Karatepe and Magaji, 2008; Karatepe and Uludag, 2008a). Responses were recorded on seven point scales ranging from (7 = strongly agree) to (1 = strongly disagree). Higher scores reflected higher negative and positive sensitivity perceptions of organizational politics were measured using nine (9)
items from Kacmar and Ferris (1991). Sample items were ‘People in this hotel attempt to build themselves up by tearing others down’ and ‘Rewards come only to those who work hard in this hotel’. Responses to each item were extracted from on a seven-point scale ranging from (7 = strongly agree) to (1 = strongly disagree). The OLBI was used to make operational of the two dimensions of burnout (weakness and disengagement). Each dimension was measured using six (6) items from Demerouti et al. (2003). Responses to these items were centered on five-point scales ranging from (5= strongly agree) to (1 = strongly disagree). After canceling the positively worded scale items higher scores showed higher levels of weakness and dis-obligation. The control variable strength was measured using a five-point scale. The questionnaire was pretested with a pilot sample of 45 workers and no problems were discovered.

4. Results

The measures of all the perceptual investigate variables were subordinate to an investigative factor analysis with indirect rotation. The factors collectively accounted for 61% of the variance in items scores. The first factor explained only 26.8% of the variance, which is much less than the 50% benchmark used in Harman’s single-factor test to determine if common method variance is present (McFarlin and Sweeney, 1992). This result suggests that common method bias may not be a problem. All items loaded on their respective underlying factors where loadings ranged from .49 to .88 with an average of .67. Additionally, all the cross-loadings were less than .32. These results provide initial evidence that the measures show convergent and distinguish validity. Also the measures demonstrated acceptable levels of internal consistency reliability where coefficient alphas were .79 (negative sensitivity), .77 (positive sensitivity), .89 (perceptions of organizational politics), .79 (weakness) and .76 (disengagement). The measures were also subordinate to confirmatory factor analysis using LISREL 8.80 (Joreskog and Sorbom, 1996) for further psychometric evaluation. An initial seven factor measurement model including all 23 scale items, did not show a good fit to the data (x2 218 = 3262.3, RMSEA=.12, NFI=.62, CFI=.66, SRMR=.094). We then followed an incomplete collection approach to reduce the number of items (Bagozzi and Edwards, 1998; Bagozzi and Heatherton, 1994). The incomplete collection approach improves indicator reliabilities and model fit (Williams and O’Boyle, 2008). We randomly divided items growth perceptions of organizational politics, weakness and disengagement scales into two equal groups and then computed the average scores of each group to create two hybrid indicators for each construct. Since the positive and negative sensitivity scales included only three items each, they were not subjected to incomplete collection. We retested the seven factor measurement model using the incompletely accumulated measures. The results showed improvement as a result of incomplete collection of items (x242= 347.4, RMSEA=.11, NFI=.92, CFI=.93, SRMR=.069), but the model fit relatively unsatisfactory. Next, we added a method factor to the seven factor measurement model by allowing all items to load on the method factor in addition to loading on the unconnected to underlying constructs. The method factor was not permitted to correlate with any of the underlying constructs (Podsakoff et al., 2003). This measurement model with the method factor produced better results in terms of model fit (x230 = 140.4, RMSEA=.074, NFI=.95, CFI=.97, SRMR=.035). All items showed significant loadings (all t-values >2.0) and standardized loadings ranged from .51 to .86 on their respective underlying factors. The standardized item loadings on the method factor were relatively small (ranged from −.02 to .46). However, with the exception of two items in the negative sensitivity scale, item loadings on the method factor were all statistically significant. Hence, common method variance had to be incorporated clearly into our substantial model testing (hypothesis testing).

4.1. Results of model test and tests of hypotheses.

We conducted two separate path analyses to estimate the relationships characterized in our conceptual model and to test the research hypotheses. First, we used the estimated covariance matrix of the underlying latent constructs (including the single-item strength) resulting from a test of the measurement model which clearly included a method factor. This covariance matrix is free from measurement error and from any bias due to common method variance; hence it is purified (Allen et al., 2007; Jonsson, 1998). Second, we also conducted path analysis using the covariance matrix achieved from accumulate measures for each construct in the model by averaging scores across all items of a particular scale. These accumulate scores represent model constructs at a molar level of abstraction (Bagozzi and Heatherton, 1994), but they are not free from measurement error and common method variance. The correlations, means and standard
deviations of the accumulate variables are presented in Table 2.

As shown in Table 2, the mean scores of weakness and dis-obligation in our research were 2.30 and 2.60. We compared these averages to the mean scores achieved in other studies which used the OLBI to measure job burnout among workers in other professions.

Bakker et al. (2004) reported that the mean scores of weakness and disengagement among employees working in such jobs as industrial work, health care, trade, and construction were 2.09 and 2.16. Halbesleben and Demerouti (2005) in their finding reported that the mean scores of weakness and disengagement among working adults in telecommunications, manufacturing, and banking/financial services were 2.99 and 2.87 at Time I, and 2.78 and 2.99 at Time II. They also reported that the mean scores of weakness and disengagement among fire department employees were 3.29 and 2.96. In a other studies conducted with nurses, the mean scores of weakness and disengagement were found to be 2.24 and 2.29 (Bakker and Heuven, 2007). These findings suggest that frontline hotel workers in our study scored somewhat higher on the two components of burnout than workers in industrial work, health care and construction in Bakker et al. (2004) and nurses in Bakker and Heuven (2007) studies. However, they scored lower on weakness and disengagement than fire department and banking/financial services workers in Halbesleben and Demerouti (2005) study. The results of two separate path analyses, by using the covariance matrices described above as inputs to LISREL 8.80, are presented in Table 3. It should be noted that direct effects from both negative and positive sensitivity constructs to weakness and disengagement were permitted as part of testing our research model in Fig. 1, since they were statistically significant.

As shown in Table 3, the model fits the data very well under both input conditions (with covariance input free from measurement error and common method variance: x24 = 1.40, p = .52, RMSEA=. .00, NFI =1.00, CFI=1.00, SRMR=.008; with covariance input achieved from accumulate scale scores: x24 = 4.08, p = .15, RMSEA=. 043, NFI=.99, CFI=1.00, SRMR=.018). The results from the purified covariance input show that the model explains 24% of the variance in perceptions of organizational politics, 39% in weakness, and 69% in disengagement, while the corresponding results founded on the covariance matrix of accumulates scores are 18%, 24%, and 40%, respectively. The path coefficients and t-values in Table 3 indicate that the results from the two covariance inputs are comparable in terms of statistical significance. The only exception is the direct effect of positive sensitivity on weakness, which is not significant under covariance input from accumulate scale scores (y= -.01, t = -.12). Both sets of results indicate that negative sensitivity has a significant positive effect on perceptions of organizational politics, weakness and disengagement, while positive sensitivity use significant negative effects. In addition, organizational politics significantly increase frontline workers’ weakness and disengagement. H1 and H2 predict that negative sensitivity use a powerful effect, relative to the effect of positive sensitivity, on weakness and disengagement through perceptions of organizational politics.

The results in Table 3 show that indirect effects (mediated by perceptions of organizational politics) of both negative sensitivity and positive sensitivity on weakness and dis-obligation are statistically significant. Consistent with H1, the perfect strength of the indirect effect of negative sensitivity on weakness under both covariance input conditions (.14 and .09) is much higher than the perfect indirect effect of positive sensitivity (−.06 under both covariance input conditions). In fact, in perfect terms, the indirect effect of negative sensitivity on weakness is more than twice the perfect size of indirect effect exerted by positive sensitivity (.14 versus −.06) under the covariance input free form measurement and method errors. These results provide support for H1. Consistent with H2, the perfect strength of the indirect effect of negative sensitivity on disengagement under both covariance input conditions (.29 and .16) is much higher than the indirect effect of positive sensitivity (−.11 and −.10). The perfect indirect effect of negative sensitivity on weakness is again more than twice the perfect size of indirect effect exerted by positive sensitivity (.29 versus −.11) under the covariance input free form measurement and method errors. These results communally provide support for H2. The comparative results founded on the two covariance input conditions show that the use of the covariance matrix free of measurement and method effect provides more explanatory power as shown by the larger portion of explained variance in the dependent variables in Table 3. Finally, strength has a significant negative effect only on perceptions of
organizational politics under both covariance input conditions (γ = -0.07, t = -1.91 and γ = -0.08, t = -2.04 respectively). That is, those workers with longer strength with an organization perceive less organizational politics relative to those with shorter strength. This may, on one hand, reflect Van Breukelen et al.’s (2004) observation that, with strength, workers perceive more relaxing with the psychological climate in their jobs and, on the other hand, suggests that with the passage of time, workers increasingly accept organizational politics as a reality of organizational life and get adapted to it. The investigate results are graphically presented in Figs. 2 and 3.

5. Discussion

In this research we developed a job burnout model and investigated the role of perceptions of organizational politics on the relationships between negative and positive sensitivity and burnout. In the process, we tested two hypotheses. Thus, our research not only provides additional perceptions in connection to perceptions of organizational politics as an incomplete mediator in the relationships between dispositional variables and burnout when tested among frontline hotel workers, but also shows that the indirect effects of negative sensitivity on weakness and disengagement, through organizational politics perceptions, are powerful than the indirect effects of positive sensitivity. In addition, our research provides significant methodological perceptions concerning the effects of measurement error and common method variance. In this research, when common method variance and measurement error were controlled, the results provided better explanation of the relationships as shown by the larger portion of variance explained in the dependent variables and less biased estimates of the hypothesized path coefficients. Our results show that workers high in negative sensitivity have the inclination to perceive the work environment more political and such perceptions, in turn, lead to more weakness and disengagement. As explained by Schwarz (2000), effect plays a critical role in guiding one’s perceptive procedures and behaviors. Such a systematic focus on details consumes one’s psychological and physical resources and directly leads to weakness and disengagement from work. Hence, negative sensitivity affects weakness and disengagement directly and indirectly through perceptions of organizational politics. Our findings demonstrate that workers high in positive sensitivity be tend to have lower perceptions of organizational politics, which, in turn, lead to less weakness and disengagement. Positive sensitivity also effects weakness and disengagement directly in addition to the interfere role of perceptions of organizational politics. Because of their general inclination to experience frequent positive moods, workers high in positive sensitivity are not frightened of or threatened by the work environment. Workers with high positive effect occupied with less detailed estimation of environmental cues and less effortful information processing (George and Zhou, 2007). This inclination leads to lower perceptions of organizational politics which, in turn, results in lower levels of weakness and disengagement. Also workers high in positive sensitivity do not have to consume as much psychological and physical resources to handle with organizational politics and consequently experience lower weakness and disengagement. These explanations are consistent with the positive effect perspective advanced by Fredrickson and Losada (2005). Our findings also indicate that the indirect effects of negative sensitivity on weakness and disengagement via perceptions of organizational politics are powerful than the indirect effects of positive sensitivity. These results are identical with the effect matching hypothesis which states that negative sensitivity, predicts perceptions of unpleasant events better and positive sensitivity predicts perceptions of pleasant events (Valle et al., 2002). Therefore our results support to the work of Valle and Perréwe (2000), who investigated perceptions of organizational politics as a mediator of the effects of character variables on such results as job satisfaction and job anxiety. They also inclination reinforce Adams et al.’s (2008) findings, which have suggested that negative sensitivity serves as an preceding of perceptions of organizational politics, while positive sensitivity, best serves as a moderator in the perceptions of organizational politics- results relationship. The findings of our research bring to mind some indirect suggestions and offer normative guidelines that can be used in managing frontline worker burnout. Perhaps, the primary indirect suggestion of our research is that management must take final steps to plan new policies and/or revise the existent policies to create a work environment where politics is minimized. In a clear work environment, sharing information with frontline workers about policies and standards raise the spirit of trust and partnership between management and workers and raise spirit. To reinforce a team spirit, hotels need to design bonus systems to reward increased productivity resulting from teamwork. Encouraging a team spirit and
improvement workers’ participation in decisions involving them can lessen perceptions of organizational politics. If workers can be trained in coping skills and teach how to implement these activities, they would be less likely to be embedded by burnout. Despite good purpose of management, not every frontline hotel worker would be able to handle with burnout. Therefore, managers should give earlier to applicants high in positive sensitivity during selection and hiring, since they can handle with organizational politics and disengagement. Similarly, during the selection and hiring process, applicants high in negative sensitivity, should be avoided as much as possible, since negative sensitivity increase stressors and strains, and such prospective workers are more likely to be affected the detrimental effects of organizational politics and burnout. Besides recruiting applicants high in positive sensitivity management must also plan proactive strategies to keep workers high in positive sensitivity in the organization. It should be remembered that workers describe positive sensitivity can help create not only a positive work environment but may serve as role models to their colleagues and generate a demonstration effect among existing workers with negative sensitivity. In this context, the selection and maintenance of workers who have the required individual traits (i.e., positive sensitivity) cannot be excessively emphasized as such workers would be more receptive to and appreciative of various forms of support provided by their organization. Our research has limitations for further research. First, the relationships assumed in our model were tested via cross-sectional data. This does not permit causal inferences. Future studies should activate longitudinal data to be able to draw causal inferences. Second, in future studies, possible mediating roles of different forms of stressors should be examined to determine if they act as incomplete mediators in the relationships between dispositional variables and burnout. Finally, it should be mentioned that our paper deals with perceptions of organizational politics and its negative aspects. Politics, in any social group including an organization, is unavoidable and there can be both negative and positive aspects of political behavior in organizations (Gotsis and Kortezı, 2010). In other words, some organizations are characterized with high organizational politics, while others with low organizational politics. That is, organizational politics is not just a matter of workers ‘subjective perceptions (Gotsis and Kortezı, 2010). Given the number of hotels that participated in the research, there may be organizational politics variations among hotels not only in terms of worker perceptions but objective measures as well.
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Fig. 1 research model

Fig. 2. Model parameter estimates (path coefficients) based on covariance matrix input free of measurement and method effects. Note: The indirect effect of negative sensitivity on weakness and disengagement via perceptions of organizational politics is -.14 and .29. The indirect impact of positive sensitivity on weakness and disengagement through perceptions of organizational politics is -.06 and -.11. All direct connecting are significant at the .05 level.
The indirect effects are significant further the .05 level. Model fit statistics are as follows: $\chi^2 = 1.38$ (p = .50), RMSEA = .00, NFI = 1.00, CFI = 1.00, SRMR = .016.
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**Fig. 3.** Model parameter estimates (path coefficients) based on covariance matrix input from accumulate scale scores.

Table 1: Demographic breakdown of the sample (n = 595).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-40</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-60</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary and high school</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational school</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Sensitivity (NA)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Sensitivity (PA)</td>
<td>−.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perceptions of organizational politics (POPS)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weakness (WEA)</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>−.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disengagement (DISE)</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>−.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational strength</td>
<td>−13</td>
<td>−.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Composite scores for each construct were calculated by averaging respective item scores. The scores for NA, PA, and POPS ranged from 1 to 5, while the scores for WEA and DISE ranged from 1 to 4. Higher scores indicated higher NA, PA, POPS, WEA, and DISE. Strength was recorded using a four-point scale, ranging from 1 (less than a year) to 4 (more than 10 years). Correlations $|r| > .11$ are significant at the .05 level.
Table 3  research model and hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated effects</th>
<th>Results based on covariance matrix input free of measurement and method effects</th>
<th>Results based on covariance matrix input from accumulate scale scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standardized estimate</td>
<td>t-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA→POPS</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>10.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA→POPS</td>
<td>−.13</td>
<td>−4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA→WEA</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>8.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA→WEA</td>
<td>−.10</td>
<td>−3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA→DISE</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA→DISE</td>
<td>−.14</td>
<td>−6.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POPS→WEA</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>10.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POPS→DISE</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>28.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H1: Indirect effect (mediated by UOPS) of:

| NA on WEA | .12 | 7.29 | .07 | 5.55 |
| PA on WEA | −.06 | −3.80 | −.05 | −4.39 |

H2: Indirect effect (mediated by POPS) of:

| NA on DISE | .27 | 9.82 | .13 | 7.43 |
| PA on DISE | −.13 | −4.05 | −.11 | −5.25 |

Model fit statistics:

\[ x^2 = 4.14 (p = .50), RMSEA = .00, \]
\[ x^2 = 4.12 (p = .15), RMSEA = .043, \]
\[ NFI = 1.00, CFI = 1.00, SRMR = .007 \]
\[ NFI = .99, CFI = 1.00, SRMR = .018 \]

R^2 for: POPS=.24, WEA=.39, DISE=.69

Note: RMSEA=root mean square error of approximation; NFI=normed fit index; CFI= comparative fit index; SRMR= standardized root mean square residua. a NA= negative Sensitivity, PA= positive Sensitivity, POPS= perceptions of organizational politics, WEA = weakness, DISE = disengagement.

The control variable strength had a significant negative impact on only POP S under both covariance input conditions (y = −.07, t = −1.91 and y = −.08, t = −2.04 respectively). With the exception of PA→WEA under covariance input from aggregate scores, all direct connecting are significant at the .05 level. In addition, the indirect effects of NA and PA on WEA and DISE are significant further the .05 level.