



STATUS OF HOUSEKEEPING DEPARTMENT IN SELECTED HOTELS IN LEYTE

Bryan Prime O. Sustal^{*}, MS-HRM

Received: 05 January 2026

Accepted: 07 January 2026

Published: 09 January 2026

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18197577>

Article ID: GPH-IJBM-2026-2207

Abstract

This study assessed the status and challenges of housekeeping departments in selected hotels in Leyte, Philippines, as evaluated by their managers. Using a descriptive survey design, data were collected from 15 housekeeping managers regarding staff performance, tools and equipment, training and development, and recognition practices. Results indicate that the overall status of housekeeping departments was Highly Adequate ($M = 3.54$), with Housekeeping Staff scoring highest ($M = 3.75$) in teamwork, professionalism, safety awareness, and guest satisfaction. Tools and Equipment ($M = 3.56$) were generally sufficient and well-maintained, while Training and Development ($M = 3.52$) reflected adequate orientation, ethical training, and skill enhancement, although the use of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for performance monitoring was limited. Staff Recognition and Appreciation scored lowest ($M = 3.35$), highlighting the need for more structured incentive programs. Key challenges identified included maintaining operational efficiency, insufficient tools, high turnover, and limited management support. Statistical analysis revealed that respondent profiles, including age, civil status, and years of service, had no significant relationship with the assessed status of the departments, except for gender, which influenced perceptions of staff performance. The findings suggest that while housekeeping operations are generally effective, targeted improvements in performance monitoring, recognition systems, and management support could enhance staff motivation, service quality, and operational efficiency.

Keywords: *Housekeeping Department, Hotel Management, Staff Performance, Training and Development, Tools and Equipment, Staff Recognition.*

* Corresponding Author Email: sustal.b21@gmail.com

I. INTRODUCTION

The housekeeping department is a core operational unit in the hospitality industry, as it is primarily responsible for maintaining cleanliness, safety, orderliness, and aesthetic standards within hotel premises. Its performance directly influences guest satisfaction, hotel reputation, and repeat patronage, making it a critical determinant of service quality and operational success (Jones, 2008). Despite its importance, housekeeping remains one of the least examined functional areas in hotel management research, particularly in provincial and regional settings such as Leyte, Philippines.

In recent years, the Province of Leyte has experienced gradual growth in tourism and hospitality, driven by infrastructure development, improved inter-island connectivity, and regional tourism promotions. Cities such as Tacloban and Ormoc have emerged as commercial and travel hubs in Eastern Visayas, leading to an increase in hotel establishments catering to both business and leisure travelers. This growth has intensified the demand for high-quality housekeeping services, as hotels are expected to maintain strict standards of cleanliness, hygiene, and service efficiency. However, many hotels in provincial areas continue to face challenges related to staffing shortages, limited training opportunities, outdated tools and equipment, and inconsistent recognition and motivation systems for housekeeping staff.

This study is anchored on three major theories that explain housekeeping performance from operational, leadership, and motivational perspectives. The 5S Housekeeping Theory of Kaizen emphasizes workplace organization, cleanliness, standardization, and discipline as foundations of efficiency and quality service. This framework is particularly relevant to hotel housekeeping operations, where systematic organization and consistency are essential. The Contingency Model of Leadership by Fiedler (1960) supports the idea that leadership effectiveness in housekeeping depends on how well a manager's leadership style fits situational demands such as task structure, staff experience, and organizational control. Meanwhile, Vroom's Expectancy Theory (1964) explains how employee motivation is shaped by the perceived relationship between effort, performance, and rewards—an important consideration in labor-intensive departments like housekeeping, where recognition and incentives influence job satisfaction and productivity.

Empirical studies further support these theoretical foundations. Dizon (2019) found that targeted training significantly improves housekeeping staff competence and reduces turnover, while Reyes (2017) emphasized that recognition and motivation enhance service quality and employee commitment. Santos (2020) highlighted that inadequate tools and equipment negatively affect housekeeping efficiency in provincial hotels in Leyte, while Saito (2025) and Andrews (2013) emphasized the role of technology, ergonomics, and modern equipment in improving housekeeping performance and staff well-being. These studies collectively suggest that effective housekeeping operations require a holistic approach integrating organization, leadership, motivation, training, and resource support.

The researcher's professional experience in hotel operations, particularly in housekeeping, combined with current involvement as a Hospitality Management educator,

provides both practical and academic perspectives in examining housekeeping practices. Preliminary observations and engagement with hotel stakeholders in Leyte indicate varying levels of housekeeping effectiveness, with some hotels demonstrating strong operational systems and others struggling with high turnover, limited training, and inconsistent service protocols. These conditions highlight the need for a systematic assessment of the status of housekeeping departments in selected hotels in the province.

Objective of the Study

The primary objective of this study is to determine the status of the housekeeping department in selected hotels in the Province of Leyte as assessed by housekeeping managers, and to use the findings as a basis for proposing an action plan to enhance housekeeping operations.

Specifically, this study aims to:

1. Describe the profile of the respondents in terms of age, gender, civil status, and years of service in the establishment.
2. Determine the status of the housekeeping department in selected hotels as assessed by the respondents in terms of housekeeping staff, tools and equipment, training and development; and staff recognition and appreciation.
3. Identify the challenges encountered by housekeeping managers in the operation of the housekeeping department.
4. Examine the significant relationship between the profile of the respondents and the status of the housekeeping department in selected hotels.

Methodology

This study employed a descriptive-correlational research design to determine the status of the housekeeping department in selected hotels in the Province of Leyte as assessed by housekeeping managers. The study was conducted in selected hotels located in Tacloban City, Ormoc City, and Palompon, Leyte, representing key hospitality areas in the province.

The respondents consisted of fifteen (15) housekeeping managers, one from each selected hotel, chosen through purposive sampling due to their direct responsibility for overseeing housekeeping operations. Respondents were described in terms of age, gender, civil status, and years of service.

Data were gathered using a researcher-made checklist survey questionnaire composed of three parts: respondents' profile, status of the housekeeping department (housekeeping staff, tools and equipment, training and development, and staff recognition and appreciation), and challenges encountered. A four-point rating scale (4=Highly Adequate to 1=Not Adequate) was used. The instrument was pilot-tested and demonstrated good reliability (Cronbach's alpha = 0.809).

The questionnaires were personally administered by the researcher after securing permission from hotel management and appropriate institutional approval. Ethical standards, including informed consent and confidentiality, were observed.

Data analysis utilized frequency and percentage, weighted mean and ranking, chi-square test, and t-test or ANOVA, to describe variables, examine relationships, and analyze challenges encountered.

RESULTS

A. Results

Table 1. Profile of the Respondents

Variables	f	%
Age		
40 - 49	2	13.3%
30 - 39	7	46.7%
29 - 18 years old	6	40.0%
Gender		
Male	7	46.7%
Female	8	53.3%
Civil Status		
Single	11	73.3%
Married	4	26.7%
Years of Service in the Establishment		
15 years above	1	6.7%
11 - 14 years	1	6.7%
7 - 10 years	3	20.0%
Less than 6 years	10	66.7%

The respondents were predominantly within the 30–39 age group (46.7%), followed by those below 29 years old (40.0%), indicating a relatively young managerial cohort. Females slightly outnumbered males (53.3% vs. 46.7%). Most respondents were single (73.3%), and the majority had less than six years of service (66.7%), suggesting a workforce composed largely of early- to mid-career housekeeping managers.

Table 2. Status of the Housekeeping Department

Indicator	Mean	Interpretation
1. Clean and report any safety hazards to the housekeeping manager immediately.	3.80	Highly Adequate
2. Ensures that the guest is satisfied with the cleaning service, and other requests.	3.73	Highly Adequate
3. Complete tasks under strict time constraints.	3.53	Highly Adequate
4. Shows honesty, politeness, professional work ethics, and reliability to both guests and colleagues for a long-lasting relationship.	3.80	Highly Adequate
5. Collaborate with other housekeeping teams to ensure productivity and efficiency of the assigned tasks.	3.87	Highly Adequate
Aggregate Mean	3.75	Highly Adequate

Table. 3 Status of the Housekeeping Department in Selected Hotels in Terms of Tools and Equipment

Indicator	Mean	Interpretation
1. Provides complete tools and equipment to effectively perform their jobs.	3.47	Highly Adequate
2. Provide and follow standard operating procedures on how to handle tools and equipment as well as wear prescribed protective gear during working time schedules.	3.53	Highly Adequate
3. Provides high-attention level on the preventive maintenance system of the tools and equipment.	3.53	Highly Adequate
4. Provide immediate action or feedback on the status of the damaged or defective tools and equipment for possible maintenance and replacement.	3.80	Highly Adequate
5. Provide proper training on how to use or operate tools and equipment in the workplace.	3.47	Highly Adequate
Aggregate Mean	3.56	Highly Adequate

The overall rating of Highly Adequate ($M = 3.54$) for the housekeeping departments indicates that these units are performing at a level that meets or exceeds expected operational standards. Among the assessed dimensions, Housekeeping Staff received the highest mean ($M = 3.75$), reflecting strong performance in teamwork, professionalism, safety awareness, and guest satisfaction. This suggests that the human element—skills, collaboration, and adherence to service protocols—is the primary driver of departmental effectiveness, consistent with prior studies highlighting employee competence and coordination as critical determinants of service quality in hotel operations.

Similarly, Tools and Equipment were rated Highly Adequate ($M = 3.56$), particularly in terms of maintenance responsiveness and adherence to standard operating procedures. This finding underscores the importance of resource availability and operational infrastructure in supporting staff performance. While well-maintained tools facilitate efficiency and compliance with housekeeping standards, the slightly lower rating compared to staff performance indicates potential areas for improvement in equipment modernization, availability, and preventive maintenance programs. Together, these results highlight that effective housekeeping operations are contingent not only on competent personnel but also on reliable operational resources, reinforcing the integrated nature of human and material factors in sustaining high service quality.

Table 4 presents the status of the housekeeping departments in selected hotels with respect to Training and Development, highlighting staff orientation, ethical training, skill enhancement, and performance monitoring practices.

Table 4. Status of the Housekeeping Department in Selected Hotels in Terms of Training and Development

Indicator	Mean	Interpretation
1. Provides key performance indicators to housekeeping staff on the average time taken to clean a room and other areas of responsibilities.	3.40	Highly Adequate
2. Provides a clear orientation on the specific functions on the provisions of the assigned tasks.	3.53	Highly Adequate
3. Provide further training and development to every housekeeping staff to ensure efficiency and productivity and cope with the new trends.	3.53	Highly Adequate
4. Provides housekeeping training by the industry standards and ensures employees know, when, where, and how to use different methods and equipment to keep the facility in tip-top shape.	3.47	Highly Adequate
5. Provides proper training, and ethical standards, and keeps employees from developing bad habits to minimize problems.	3.67	Highly Adequate
Aggregate Mean	3.52	Highly Adequate

Training and Development received a mean of 3.52, indicating that the housekeeping departments provide generally adequate orientation, ethical training, and opportunities for continuous skill enhancement. The high ratings for ethical standards and proper work habits suggest that staff are well-prepared to maintain professionalism and service quality, consistent with findings by Gonzales (2018) on the role of structured training in enhancing operational efficiency. However, the relatively lower emphasis on performance benchmarking through Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) highlights a potential gap in quantifying and monitoring staff productivity and efficiency. Incorporating clear KPIs could strengthen accountability, provide measurable targets for improvement, and align training outcomes with operational goals. This aligns with literature emphasizing that while foundational training develops competency, ongoing

performance metrics are essential for sustaining high standards and facilitating continuous professional growth in hospitality operations.

Table 5. Status of the Housekeeping Department in Selected Hotels in Terms of Staff Recognition and Appreciation

Indicator	Mean	Interpretation
1. Recognized and appreciated housekeeping staff and let them know that they doing a good job.	3.73	Highly Adequate
2. Offers vouchers, tokens, or gift certificates to the best-performing housekeeping employees.	2.93	Moderately Adequate
3. Provide or present everyone with a personalized email, messages or notes, and words of appreciation to all housekeeping staff members.	3.27	Highly Adequate
4. Acknowledge housekeeping staff immediately for the job well done.	3.60	Highly Adequate
5. Provide incentives or other surprise gifts as a way of expressing gratitude to the best-performing housekeeping staff.	3.20	Moderately Adequate
Aggregate Mean	3.35	Highly Adequate

Staff Recognition and Appreciation recorded the lowest mean (3.35) but remained within the highly adequate range; verbal recognition was strong, while material incentives were less consistently implemented.

Table 6. Challenges Encountered

Challenges	f	Rank
Maintaining operational efficiency	5	1
Lack of tools, materials, and equipment	4	2
High turnover rate	2	3
Long hours, low pay, and little recognition	2	3
Lack of management support	2	3
Inconsistent customer service	2	3
Staff shortages and retention	1	4
Unskilled employees	0	5

The most frequently cited challenge was maintaining operational Training and Development received a mean of 3.52, reflecting adequate orientation, ethical training, and continuous skill development, though performance benchmarking using KPIs was relatively lower. efficiency, followed by lack of tools and equipment. Other recurring concerns included

high turnover, long working hours with limited recognition, and lack of management support. Staff shortages and skills gaps were reported less frequently.

Table 7. Relationship between Respondents' Profile and Housekeeping Status

Variables	Chi-Square p-value	Critical Value	Significance	Result
Age				
Housekeeping Staff	0.520	0.05	Not Significant	Ho Accepted
Tools and Equipment	0.075	0.05	Not Significant	Ho Accepted
Staff Training and Development	0.736	0.05	Not Significant	Ho Accepted
Staff Recognition and Appreciation	0.349	0.05	Not Significant	Ho Accepted
Gender				
Housekeeping Staff	0.038	0.05	Significant	Ho Rejected
Tools and Equipment	0.205	0.05	Not Significant	Ho Accepted
Staff Training and Development	0.063	0.05	Not Significant	Ho Accepted
Staff Recognition and Appreciation	0.343	0.05	Not Significant	Ho Accepted
Civil Status				
Housekeeping Staff	0.770	0.05	Not Significant	Ho Accepted
Tools and Equipment	0.634	0.05	Not Significant	Ho Accepted
Staff Training and Development	0.228	0.05	Not Significant	Ho Accepted
Staff Recognition and Appreciation	0.092	0.05	Not Significant	Ho Accepted
Years of Service in the Establishment				
Housekeeping Staff	0.841	0.05	Not Significant	Ho Accepted
Tools and Equipment	0.614	0.05	Not Significant	Ho Accepted
Staff Training and Development	0.798	0.05	Not Significant	Ho Accepted
Staff Recognition and Appreciation	0.798	0.05	Not Significant	Ho Accepted

Chi-square tests revealed no significant relationship between age, civil status, and years of service and any dimension of housekeeping status ($p > 0.05$). However, gender showed a significant relationship with the assessment of housekeeping staff ($p = 0.038$), indicating differing perceptions between male and female managers in this area.

Discussion

The findings indicate that housekeeping departments in selected hotels in Leyte are generally functioning at a highly adequate level, particularly in terms of staff competence and teamwork. The strong performance of housekeeping staff suggests effective supervision and adherence to service standards, which are critical in sustaining guest satisfaction in the hospitality industry.

Despite the positive overall ratings, the lower scores in time management, KPI use, and tangible staff rewards point to operational areas that warrant improvement. These gaps suggest that while staff are competent, performance monitoring systems and incentive structures may not be fully institutionalized. This aligns with Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory, where the absence of motivators such as recognition and rewards may limit sustained performance despite acceptable working conditions.

The identification of operational efficiency and resource constraints as primary challenges underscores the importance of adequate logistical support and staffing stability. High turnover and limited recognition further reinforce the need for retention-focused strategies, including competitive compensation, structured recognition programs, and management support.

The absence of significant relationships between most demographic variables and housekeeping status suggests that assessments of departmental performance are largely consistent across age, civil status, and tenure. However, the significant effect of gender on perceptions of housekeeping staff may reflect differences in leadership styles or evaluative focus, consistent with prior studies highlighting gender-based variations in managerial perspectives within hospitality settings.

Overall, the results suggest that while housekeeping operations in Leyte hotels are effective, enhancements in performance monitoring, resource provision, staff recognition, and retention strategies are necessary to strengthen long-term operational sustainability and employee motivation.

Data analysis utilized frequency and percentage, weighted mean and ranking, chi-square test, and t-test or ANOVA, to describe variables, examine relationships, and analyze challenges encountered.

Conclusions

This study finds that housekeeping departments in selected hotels in Leyte operate at a highly adequate level, particularly in staff competence, teamwork, and adherence to service standards. These strengths highlight the critical role of housekeeping in sustaining operational efficiency and guest satisfaction.

However, the study also identifies ongoing challenges related to operational efficiency, resource availability, staff turnover, and limited formal recognition. While training programs are generally adequate, greater emphasis on structured performance monitoring and recognition systems is needed. The lack of significant relationships between most managerial characteristics and housekeeping status suggests consistent performance assessments across demographic groups, although gender differences in perceptions of housekeeping staff were observed.

Overall, sustaining and improving housekeeping performance requires continued investment in employee development, recognition, and supportive management practices to enhance service quality and workforce stability.

Recommendations

1. Implement the proposed housekeeping action plan to address operational and workforce gaps.
2. Strengthen formal staff recognition and incentive systems to improve motivation and retention.
3. Enhance training, performance monitoring, and evaluation mechanisms aligned with industry standards.
4. Ensure adequate operational support, including tools, equipment, and management engagement.

Future studies may examine housekeeping performance across broader hotel samples or through longitudinal approaches to deepen understanding of management practices in the hospitality sector.

REFERENCES

Andrews, S. (2013). *Hotel housekeeping: Training manual*. Tata McGraw-Hill Education.

Baum, T. (2007). *Human resource management for tourism, hospitality, and leisure: An international perspective*. Cengage Learning EMEA.

Engeset, A. B. (1996). *Hotel housekeeping: A practical approach*. Cengage Learning.

Herzberg, F. (1959). *The motivation to work*. John Wiley & Sons.

Imai, M. (2021). *Kaizen: The key to Japan's competitive success*. McGraw-Hill Education.

Jones, T. (2008). *Professional management of housekeeping operations*. Wiley.

Lockwood, A. & Guerrier, Y. (2008). *Managing people in hospitality*. Cengage Learning EMEA.

Meyer, J. P. & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. Sage Publications.

Pinder, C. C. (2014). *Work motivation in organizational behavior*. Pearson Education.

Pizam, A. (2010). *International encyclopedia of hospitality management*. Routledge.

Raghulanan, G. & Raghulanan, S. (2015). *Hotel housekeeping: Operations and management* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Riley, M. (2005). *Human resource management in the hospitality and tourism industry*. Routledge.

Tesone, D. V. (2012). *Principles of management for the hospitality industry*. Pearson Education.

Journal Articles

Awan, M. M., Nadeem, S. M. & Ali, S. (2018). The impact of employee motivation on organizational performance in the hospitality industry. *Journal of Business and Social Review in Emerging Economies*, 4(2), 219–227.

Caibigan, R. A. & Javier, F. V. (2025). Leadership styles on gender equality and work-life balance among hotels in Central Luzon: Basis of a strategic plan. *International Journal of Research Studies in Management*, 13(1), 163–176.

Charoensukmongkol, P. (2022). Effects of psychological capital and person-job fit on hospitality employees' work-family conflict, family-work conflict, and job performance: The moderating role of marital status. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 868971.

Chela-Alvarez, M. et al. (2022). Leadership in hospitality: Managerial strategies for effective performance in hotels. *Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 30(5), 289–304.

Chen, C. & Liu, H. (2017). Exploring the impact of airline service quality on customer loyalty: Evidence from Taiwan. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 12(5), 36.

Cheng, A. & Chan, D. K. S. (2008). Who suffers more from job insecurity? A meta-analytic review. *Applied Psychology*, 57(2), 272–303.

Fiedler, F. E. (1960). A contingency model of leadership effectiveness. In *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 149–190). Academic Press.

Garcia, J. & Silva, R. (2020). The impact of effective housekeeping management on operational efficiency in hotels. *Hospitality Management*, 35(2), 120–135.

Gonzales, L. (2018). Work-life balance among housekeeping staff in the hospitality industry: A study on operational challenges. *International Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 15(4), 92–103.

Gupta, S. & Mishra, P. (2017). Employee motivation and its role in service quality in the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 28(3), 56–67.

Hayes, D. K. & Ninemeier, J. D. (2009). Human resources management in the hospitality industry. *Wiley*.

Karatepe, O. M. (2013). High-performance work practices and hotel employee performance: The mediation of work engagement. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 32, 132–140.

Karatepe, O. M. & Uludag, O. (2007). Role of self-efficacy, intrinsic motivation, and job satisfaction in job performance: Evidence from the hotel industry. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, 8(4), 53–74.

Kuo, Y. & Lee, C. (2017). The role of perceived customer value in mobile service: A customer satisfaction and customer loyalty perspective. *Computers in Human Behavior*.

Kuslukan, S., Kuslukan, Z., Ilhan, I. & Buyruk, L. (2010). The human dimension: A review of human resources management issues in the tourism and hospitality industry. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 51(2), 171–214.

Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370–396.

Mercan, M., Bilen, M. & Gündüz, Y. (2020). Workplace motivation and its effect on employee satisfaction in hotel housekeeping departments. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 27(3), 195–207.

Mohammad, A. (2018). Employee engagement in hospitality: Motivational factors that drive service excellence. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 36, 45–54.

Moss, J. & Solis, J. (2020). Hospitality management: A study of employee motivation in hotel housekeeping. *International Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, 29(2), 215–228.

O'Neill, J. W. & Mattila, A. S. (2018). Hospitality management: How effective leadership influences hotel performance. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 59(2), 134–146.

Ramos, R. (2019). Housekeeping management in luxury hotels: An analysis of key operational challenges. *Journal of Hospitality Leadership*, 8(1), 120–130.

Ruth, T. & Day, M. (2015). Service quality and its impact on customer satisfaction in the hotel industry. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 21(4), 349–363.

Serrano, C. & Tañada, S. (2020). Work-life balance of hotel employees: An empirical study in Southeast Asia. *Journal of Hospitality Management*, 26(1), 72–85.

Singh, A., Sharma, S. & Mishra, P. (2022). Leadership in the hospitality industry: A comprehensive review. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, 18(2), 231–249.

Smith, R. & Johnson, P. (2020). Enhancing employee productivity in hotel housekeeping departments: A focus on motivation strategies. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 35(4), 501–515.

Testa, M. R., Skaruppa, C. & Pietra, L. (2008). Creating the perfect employee: Five rules for aligning HR with business strategy. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 49(2), 132–138