

The Impact of Bar Service Operation Practices on Organizational Performance in Indian Hotel Industry

Mohinder C. Dhiman*, Abhishek Ghai**

Abstract *The paper has a two fold purpose - examine the impact of bar service operation practices (BSOP) on organizational performance (OP) and study the relationship between organizational performance and demographic variables. Based on a survey of 362 bar manager's perceptions on the impact of bar service operation practices on organisational performance were assessed by 59 practices and 6 demographic variables. Bivariate test and ANOVA were employed to test the working hypothesis in the study. Results indicated that 'there is a positive relationship between the bar service operation practices and organisational performance. Further, the results indicate some practical and managerial implications to improve organisational overall performance.*

Keywords: Bar, Service, Practices, Hotel, Industry, Performance, India

INTRODUCTION

In the food & beverage operation, the alcoholic and non-alcoholic beverage plays the pivotal role. According to Gonzalez-Gomez & Morini, (2006) alcoholic beverages demand, particularly wine is changing & growing now days. Bar is defined as "a public place where the primary business of the place is to sell alcoholic beverages to the general public, for consumption on the premises" (Arora, 2009). This definition suggests that bars are primarily involved in the sale of alcoholic beverages to the general public for consumption on the premises. There are many revenue generating department in the hotel. Bar is one of the key revenue generating areas of the hotel (Singaravelavan, 2011). The classification of the bar and beverage operation is not an easy task as other food and beverage outlets because there can be so many blends of features. Beverage services differs in many ways with different purposes from the bar or the bar-restaurant combination in hotels i.e. Lobby bar, cocktail lounge, restaurant bar, a night club, pub, room service, mini bar, etc. So a broad classification is one using the groupings

bars and lounges. There are a lot of differences among the operations in each of these broad categories. Based on the definitions of bars presented above, it is evident that both the terms "bar" and "lounge" seem to primarily focus on the selling of alcoholic beverages to the public for consumption at the premises of sale. Hence, for the purpose of this research study, the terms "bar" and "lounge" are seen to relate to hospitality organizations, which are primarily concerned with the sale of alcoholic beverages for consumption on the premises of sale.

According to Beverage Information Group's Handbook Advance 2013, distilled spirits increased for the 15th consecutive year, growing slightly faster than in 2011. New products and the modernization of spirits are helpful in growth as since 2006, 3.6% is the largest increase. Further the report revealed that the consumption of wine is also increased as domestic wine consumption increased by 3.0%, surpassing imported brands but the fortified and aromatized wine category is declined if compare to sparkling wines or champagne. The world bar and pub market includes the various bars, taverns, nightclubs, pubs, lounges and other

* Department of Tourism and Hotel Management KurukshetraUniversity, Kurukshetra, Haryana, India.
E-mail: mohinderchand@rediffmail.com

** Assistant Professor, UIHTM, Panjab University Chandigarh, and Doctoral Candidate, DTHM, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra, Haryana, India. E-mail: abhishekghai87@gmail.com

places which provide alcoholic beverage to the public. Out of the above mentioned establishments some are serve beverage that are consumed on the premises. In discotheques and nightclubs they offer food service as well along with the alcoholic beverage as their main source of revenue is selling alcoholic beverage in the outlets. These types of establishments have the high product turnaround, but low profit margins (Report linker, 2013). Hospitality operations also determine as service industry are usually involved in economic activities by selling the hotel products like room, food in a restaurant and other product and services. It also determine as lodging industry which provides hospitality services to guests and has the potential to generate revenue and foreign exchange. According to George (2001), the hospitality industry promotes a warm and friendly experience which is helpful for the consumers and is mainly concerned with providing food, drink and accommodation. On the other hand tourism industry refers to the activity that occurs when tourist travel. According to Kotler, et. al., (2003), a service culture focuses on serving and satisfying the customer and it may be defined as the system of values and beliefs that emphasize the concept of providing consumers with quality service (Kotler, Bowen and Makens, 2003). The provision of service quality should firstly highly consistent in all situations (Barry, 1993). All the customers look upon the budget and always select the products according to their choice which offers them the quality and the greatest value for the money. In many conditions customers are not clear on what precisely that they want from a service provider (Ojasalo, 2001). Service providers always try to determine exactly what customers want and need, therefore this cause is a great concern for providers in the service industry. Hospitality industry is the people oriented and research on service quality is now of major concern to this sector. The provision of service quality is concerned with generating customer satisfaction (Gronroos, 1984). Customer satisfaction helps to learn about the business strength and weaknesses. Researchers have proven the concept that customer satisfaction and service quality are extremely interrelated. Cronin and Taylor, 1992; Oliver, 1997; H. Lee, Y. Lee and Yoo, 2000; Ting, 2004 and Kim et al., 2009 revealed that service quality is one of the main drivers of customer satisfaction. According to Bitner, Booms and Tetreault, 1990; Cronin and Taylor, 1992; Oliver, 1981; Parasuraman, Zeithaml and Berry, 1988 customer satisfaction was considered as a transaction-specific evaluation while perceived service quality was explained as a form of attitude and a long-run overall evaluation of a product or service. The service sector involves the main components of the total GDP of India. Out of these components Food & Beverage Service Industry forms the important place. According to WTTC, travel and tourism the direct contribution to GDP in 2013 was INR2178.1bn (2.0% of GDP) and in 2014 this forecast is expected to grow by 7.5% to INR2340.6bn. It

reflects the economic activities generated by various sectors such as travel agents, airlines, hotels and the activities of the restaurant sector and leisure industries directly supported by various tourists. Further the employment contribution of travel and tourism was 22,320,000 jobs directly in 2013 which mean 4.9% of total employment and in 2014 this is forecast to grow to 22,876,000 jobs. The focus of this research study is on the hospitality industry, with specific reference to the bar and beverage sectors of this industry.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

According to Borchgrevink et al, (2003), theft is commonplace in hotel bars. Plotkin and Goumas (2000), opined that in the bar environment there is a countless opportunity for theft because this is the only department in the hotel where bartender works without any supervision and it is quite difficult to detect the theft. There are many practices used to do theft in a bar which includes undercharging for drinks, giving free drinks to customers, selling unrecorded drinks or drinking alcohol behind the bars. Further Nelson 2007, revealed that proper supervision and control helps to prevent the employees from stealing. Managers need to be given training and informed the staff through proper education and training of the control system and policies (Smith, 1997). Management efforts prevent internal theft by creating good team for an outlet and make staff feel that they are from the same family (Malone, 2003). According to Scarpa (2006), technology plays a pivotal role in the prevention of theft in the bars. Most of the operations are switching from pouring to dispensing beverages. This type of practice helps to do the direct and labor cost savings as well as to make the control easier in the outlet (Coltman, 1989). Bartenders are rarely tried to steal if bars are using mechanically dispensing units or measures instead of free pouring of liquors. Beverage operations are losing profits due to the inside theft in the outlets. Thefts in the bar are due to the poor management, improper supervision, unmaintained inventory records are some reasons which are identified (Godsmark, 2003). Further Kotschevar and Tanke (1996) stated that computerized and electronic beverage dispensing equipment helps in inventory control, improves the portion control and even helps in classic drinks recipes. Hanson stated that these electronic dispensing equipment's helps to control over pours as well because bartenders usually use jiggers which can be avoided. Coltman (1989), revealed that electronic dispensing equipment usually linked to the sales register. Further Kotschevar and Tanke (1996) stated that most of the systems are attached to the point of sale system which tells about the total sales, drink dispensed, drink brand and even helps in inventory control by providing the exact amount of left over drinks by abstracting the amount of drinks sold from the opening inventory. Plotkin and Goumas (2000), opined that in the bar environment there is a countless

opportunity for theft because this is the only department in the hotel where bartender works without any supervision and it is quite difficult to detect the theft. Further Nelson 2007, revealed that proper supervision and control helps to prevent the employees from stealing. Managers need to be given training and informed the staff through proper education and training of the control system and policies (Smith, 1997). Management efforts prevent internal theft by creating good team for an outlet and make staff feel that they are from the same family (Malone, 2003).

According to Ansel & Dyer, 1999 opined that in the restaurant industry there is a lesser adoption of technology in comparison of overall hospitality industry. There are some specific areas of the restaurant where they made some progress especially in the area of Point of Sale (POS) technology, inventory management software. To minimize the employee theft a video surveillance system can be integrated with the POS system and cash register which helps to identify the particular employee who is giving the incorrect change and to find the theft issues. Upon that this video can be turn into text and helps to match the orders being placed or punched into the POS system (Kooser, 2009). POS system usually work with other programs which can be used in different ways such as to create online orders, process gift cards and credit cards (Kooser, 2009). According to Kimes (2008), demonstrated that the use of technology in the restaurant industry helps to increase the customer satisfaction which leads to the increase revenue of the outlet by giving the customer more control over the dining experience and restaurant service can become more efficient by providing speedy service as well as increase product and service quality. Restaurant industry implemented the use of Radio Frequency Identification systems which helps to track the inventory of the outlet and create the automatic orders (Cetron, 2008). The use of computerized meal ordering systems is adopting in some segments like family restaurants. Further Oronsky & Chathoth, 2007 stated that the technology helped in some other tasks of the restaurants as well such as calculating employee labor hours, tracking guest repeat orders, guest feedback, inventory track, etc. Lynn and Withiam 2008, revealed that service charges and tips practices has its advantages and disadvantages as well. Tips practices vary from property to property, previous research identified the major problems like the retention and recruitment of trained staff faced by the hospitality industry. Tipping practices overcome this problem and finds the best alternatives for the owners (Hinkin & Tracey, 2000; Taylor, Davies & Savery, 2001; Wildes, 2005). Wildes, Nann and DeMicco's (1998) revealed from the survey in the United States to know about the customer preference whether they want to tip themselves or having automatic service charges added to their bills to cover the tip. 95% of the respondents preferred to tipping and rest 5% prefer service charges. According to study of Mills and Riehle (1987), demonstrated

that 58% respondents prefers that stewards should receive a guaranteed wage instead of tips, 13% of respondents were neutral and rest 5% of the respondents clearly said that they "did not know". Pool-tipping has a disadvantage that it may be given to an employee along with the instruction that it must go to the pool. A steward may pocket the some of the tipping amount as his own. In this situation would be to advise the guest to deposit the tip amount in the box directly which is kept in the guest service area. Pooling of tips practices found to be unfair labor practice as non-tipped staff have objection on this that they should also paid the similar amount as the other staff are getting because they also contribute to the final service of the product. In several hotels in the United States prohibit this practice as they have a law which is against this type of practice (Wessels, 1997).

Bendall (1995), stated that the major reason for customer dissatisfaction can be the long waiting time in the restaurant. Table management process means that host assigns dining room tables to customers and to wait staff stations. Managing restaurant table capacity is recognized as an effective operational strategy that can be used to reduce customer waiting times without costly capacity expansion. Further Durocher (2005) opined that it also involves management of when the seats are assigned and how the server handles the station. Proper table management helps to increase revenue by increasing table turnover (Kimes & Thompson, 2004; Thompson, 2002, 2003). By adjusting the configuration of restaurant tables, the owners or managers can try to reduce the table waiting time and helps to provide the speedy service which leads to the increased customer satisfaction and service quality. Despite recognizing the benefit of managing tables, researchers have traditionally limited their focus to revenue management (Bertsimas & Shioda, 2003; Kimes & Thompson, 2004; Thompson, 2002, 2003). Further Thompson's (2002) revealed from his study and determined whether dedicated tables or combinable tables make a difference in Revenue per Available Seat Hour (RevPASH). He found that the impact of the combinability of tables varied depending on restaurant size and mean party size. Combinable tables worked best in terms of RevPASH in small restaurants with small and medium mean party sizes, whereas a table dedicated for eight customers is not efficient in keeping the seat usage high. According to Lockyer (2007), new menu trends in the industry are important to pay attention to. Many trends are adopting by restaurants or food service outlets which include snack offerings, ethnic food, expanded day parts and commitment to freshness. Dumas (2006) stated that another way to offer snack portion would be to allow a child type menu for adults to order and price accordingly. Further Prewitt (2008) analyzed that to maintain profitability is to increase prices in order to improve product margins. Still the other option is to reduce the portion size. To maintain the product margin and profitability reducing portion size is a better option as

commodity pricing is increasing day by day. In setting up the pricing strategy a beverage operator needs to take into account the costs of doing business. A restaurant or outlet operator can price items on the basis of preferred pour cost (O'Brien, 2004). The best menu will drive sales through high margin items. To evaluate the velocity of each individual menu items menu engineering in itself is designed. However, when the entire menu is taken into account by activity based costing, menu engineering illuminates an even better picture on the success of the menu (Raab & Mayer, 2007).

OBJECTIVES

1. To examine the impact of bar service operations practice (BSOP) on organizational performance (OP).
2. To study the relationship between organizational variables and demographic variables

HYPOTHESIS

- H1: There is a positive association between bar service operations practice (BSOP) and organizational performance (OP).
- H2: Organizational performance (OP) and demographic variables are positively associated.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Sampling and Data Collection

Data were collected from the hotel managers in India. Prior to data collection, questionnaire was pre-tested with a sample of 150 Bar Managers. Based on the pre-test, several items were revised and some changes were made to the questionnaire format.

Sample hotels were identified from the highly respected directory of the Ministry of Tourism, Govt. of India and FHRAI that serves as a resource Centre for business information and maintains relevant databases of hospitality firms. The research focuses on India as its universe and Bar Managers are the sample. Study will be based on both primary and secondary data. Primary data will be generated through self-administered questionnaires and interviews. To initiate the sample 560 Bar Managers were contacted and out of the total sample only 362 (64.64%) bar managers responded and agreed to participate in the survey. A survey methodology was chosen because it was deemed to be the most efficient way of reaching a large number of respondents, whereas the data required facilitated the use of a mail-administered questionnaire with close-ended questions. Likert 5-point scale was used for close ended questions. Table 1 presents the number and percentage of respondents for this study.

Research Instrument

A structured questionnaire was developed consisting of three parts. The first part contained six questions on demographic profile of the hotel and the second part of 59 bar practices which are used by the bars of the star hotel. Likert-type scale values assigned 1 to "strongly disagree", 2 to "disagree", 3 to "neutral", 4 to "agree" and 5 to "strongly agree". Respondents were asked to give their level of agreement that mostly closely corresponded with the adoption of practices in their outlet.

Analysis of Data

Data analysis was conducted using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS Version 20.0). Factor analysis was used to investigate these bar practices in the study area. To investigate the relationship between bar service operation practices, organizational performance and specific demographic variables (controlled variables) correlation and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were conducted.

Table: 1 presents the distribution of sample hotel organisations with respect to the demographics used in the study. In terms of age of the property, 104 (28.72%) hotels existed for less than 5 years, 148 (40.88%) existed for 6 to 10 years, 57 (15.74%) existed for 11 to 15 years, 43 (11.87%) existed for 16 to 20 years and another 10 (02.76%) for more than 21 years. This shows that most hotels have already established their names in the market, gained stability in the society, and indeed is part of a growing hospitality industry. In terms of capital, 21 (5.80%) hotels spend less than 100 million, 34 (9.39 %) spend 101-300 million, 34 (9.39 %) spend 301-500 million, 112 (30.93%) spend 501-1000 million, 161 (44.47%) spend more than 1001 million. In terms of size of employment, there are 55 (15.19%) hotels have less than 50 numbers of employees, 76 (20.99%) have 51 to 100 employees, 78 (21.54%) have 101 to 200 employees, 87 (24.03%) have 201-300 employees and 66 (18.23%) have more than 301 employees working with the organizations. The findings denote that the number of employees was largely dependent on the organizational set-up of the hotels and the services offered. Finally most hotel organisations are 232 (64.08%) chain properties.

Table 1. Distribution of Sample According to Hotel Characteristics (N=362)

	Number	Percentage
Category of hotels		
3 star	76	20.99
4 star	101	27.90

5 star	122	33.70
5 star Deluxe	63	17.40
Years of Existence		
≤ 5	104	28.72
6 – 10	148	40.88
11 – 15	57	15.74
16 – 20	43	11.87
≥ 21	10	2.76
Capital (in million Rs)		
≤ 100	21	5.80
101 – 300	34	9.39
301 – 500	34	9.39
501 – 1000	112	30.93
≥ 1001	161	44.47
Employees (numbers)		
≤ 50	55	15.19
51 – 100	76	20.99
101 – 200	78	21.54
201 – 300	87	24.03
≥ 301	66	18.23
Type of ownership		
Chain	232	64.08
Individuals	130	35.91

Table 2: To find the impact of bar service operation practices on organizational performance in Indian hotel industry,

Correlation co-efficient was applied which is a common measure to examine the relationship between the two or more than two variables. The research used the existence of 12 performance variables (Table 2) measured on Likert-type 5-point scale ranging from 1=stronglydisagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=strongly agree.

Standard Bar practices improves profitability is highly correlated with Innovation (IVT) factor where as there is no relationship with Point of sale (POS) factor. Further, other factors bar service operation practices are significant at 10 % level. Standard Bar practices enhances Market share compared to major competitor found significantly correlated with Smooth operation (SO) at 1% level and revealed no correlation with service standard (SS). Adoption of uniform bar service practices impacts sales growth revealed significant correlation with all factors of bar service operation practices. Good bar practices is highly correlated with Service standards (SS) factor where as Sales volume compared to business unit objectives is least correlated but it is significant at 10% level. Uniform Bar practices impacts Return on investment compared to industry average is highly correlated with smooth operation factor (SO) at different levels. Customer retention is achieved through implementing standard Bar practices is also found highly correlated with smooth operation factor (SO) at different levels.

Table 3: In order to assess the relationship between some of the controls (or demographic variables) and bar service operation practices, or in other words to be able to test

Table 2: Correlation coefficients between Bar Service Operation Practices and organisation performance Variables

	Bar Service Operation Practices (Factors)						
	SS	IVT	POS	CRM	CC	DC	SO
Standard Bar practices improves profitability							
Standard Bar practices enhances Market share compared to major competitor	0.478**	0.446*	0.354	0.478**	0.433**	0.487**	0.455*
Adoption of uniform Bar service practices impacts sales growth	0.347	0.577**	0.447*	0.457**	0.498***	0.378	0.556**
Uniform Bar practices impacts Return on investment compared to industry average	0.467***	0.347***	0.297**	0.310**	0.454**	0.462***	0.324***
Standard Bar practices helps in employees performance	0.314	0.334	0.242	0.247	0.313***	0.344	0.336
Bar practices helps in customer satisfaction vis-a-viz loyalty	0.488***	0.244**	0.214**	0.474***	0.354**	0.424***	0.235**
Uniform Bar practices has positive impact in achieving organisational goals	0.324	0.342*	0.285	0.375	0.385	0.395	0.348*
Good Bar practices helps in improving service quality	0.425***	0.364***	0.279**	0.347**	0.413**	0.418***	0.327***
Weekend sales are improved in comparison to industry average	0.478*	0.218**	0.234**	0.438*	0.349**	0.369	0.341
Customer retention is achieved through implementing standard Bar practices	0.382*	0.391	0.273**	0.293	0.376	0.499***	0.277**
Productivity is improved by standard Bar practices	0.433***	0.377***	0.245**	0.311**	0.408**	0.379	0.387*
Overall performance of your organisation enhanced as compared to industry average	0.344	0.352	0.254	0.246	0.381***	0.478***	0.344***

Note: *p≤0.05, **p≤0.01, ***p≤0.001;

Service Standards =SS; Innovation =IVT; Point of Sale =POS; Customer Relationship Management =CRM; Cost Control =CC; Delighted Customer = DC; Smooth Operation = SO.

Table 3. F-values from the one-way ANOVA on organisation performance variables

Performance variables		Control variables				
Measures	Mean scores	Category of hotel	Age	Size in capital	Size in employees	Type of enterprise
Standard Bar practices improves profitability	4.40	5.245**	1.447	1.771	1.544	5.365**
Standard Bar practices enhances Market share compared to major competitor	4.66	4.453**	1.545	1.467	0.848	5.641***
Adoption of uniform Bar service practices impacts sales growth	4.30	4.242**	0.750	0.799	0.811	3.581*
Uniform Bar practices impacts Return on investment compared to industry average	4.88	4.581**	1.652	0.447	1.104	4.810**
Standard Bar practices helps in employees performance	4.55	4.782**	1.668	1.128	1.450	3.455
Bar practices helps in customer satisfaction vis-a-viz loyalty	4.45	4.0**	0.927	0.671	1.035	3.541**
Uniform Bar practices has positive impact in achieving organisational goals	5.42	4.552**	0.655	0.699	0.621	3.770**
Good Bar practices helps in improving service quality	4.45	4.782**	1.302	0.651	0.665	3.462**
Weekend sales are improved in comparison to industry average	4.60	3.420*	1.421	1.525**	0.454	0.850
Customer retention is achieved through implementing standard Bar practices	4.46	4.451**	1.542	0.542	1.225	4.785**
Productivity is improved by standard Bar practices	4.63	4.685**	1.754	1.225	1.552	3.487
Overall performance of your organisation enhanced as compared to industry average	4.35	4.789**	0.754	0.542	1.065	3.748**

Note: * $p \leq 0.05$, ** $p \leq 0.01$, *** $p \leq 0.001$

Hypothesis 4, one-way ANOVA were performed. The results of this analysis are summarised in table 5, which presents the corresponding F-values. The findings in this table are informative. In column 'mean scores' the average scores of the corresponding control variables are reported. It is seen that all means are above 3 in the 5-level Likert scale.

The calculated f-value from one - way ANOVA exhibited in the table 3. The dimensions of 'hotel category' and 'type of enterprise' found to be statistically significant on almost all bar service operation practices variables. Category of hotel and types of enterprises are significant at 5% levels, (** $p < (0, 05)$). Moreover, it is found that hotels were using bar service operation practices when they were belonging in a large size. On the contrary, the dimensions of 'age', 'size in capital' and 'size in employees' did not produce statistically significant results with respect to the bar service operation practices variables.

In the light of these results, regarding Hypothesis 4, we found that there is a positive relationship between bar service operation practices variables and hotel category and type of enterprise, and there is no relationship between bar service

operation practices variables and hotel age and size (capital or employees).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Standard Bar practices improves profitability is highly correlated with service standard practices and moderately correlated with innovation practices, cost control practices and other practices but there is no relationship with point of sale practices. Standard Bar practices improves profitability is highly correlated with customer relationship management practices and moderately correlated with delighted customer and smooth operation practices, it is less correlated with point of sale practices and there is no correlation with service standard practices. Standard Bar practices enhances Market share compared to major competitor is highly correlated with service standards and innovation practices and moderately correlated with CRM, Cost control and delighted customer practices. Adoption of uniform bar service practices impacts sales growth is highly correlated with delighted customer practices but there is no correlation with service standards, CRM, cost control and smooth

operation practices. Uniform Bar practices impacts Return on investment compared to industry average is highly correlated with service standards and point of sale practices and moderately correlated with innovation, cost control and smooth operation practices. Standard Bar practices helps in employees performance is moderately correlated with innovation practices and there is no correlation with point of sale, delighted customer, CRM and smooth operation practices. Bar practices helps in customer satisfaction vis-a-viz loyalty is highly correlated with service standards and innovation practices and moderately correlated with cost control, delighted customer and smooth operation practices. Uniform Bar practices has positive impact in achieving organisational goals is highly correlated with service standards, innovation practices, cost control and delighted customer practices but moderately correlated with smooth operation and CRM practices. Good Bar practices helps in improving service quality is highly correlated with innovation practices and moderately correlated with cost control practices and there is no correlation with other practices like CRM, Point of sale and smooth operation practices.

In the light of these results we may accept Hypothesis, supporting thus, that there is a positive relationship between bar service operation practices and organisational performance.

CONCLUSION

The scope of this paper was to testing the organizational performance in relation to bar service operation practices of Indian hotels. The performance variables such as Standard Bar practices improves profitability, Standard Bar practices enhances Market share compared to major competitor, Adoption of uniform bar service practices impacts sales growth, Uniform Bar practices impacts Return on investment compared to industry average, Standard Bar practices helps in employees performance, Bar practices helps in customer satisfaction vis-a-viz loyalty, Uniform Bar practices has positive impact in achieving organisational goals, Good Bar practices helps in improving service quality, Weekend sales are improved in comparison to industry average, Customer retention is achieved through implementing standard Bar practices, Productivity is improved by standard Bar practices, Overall performance of your organisation enhanced as compared to industry average are highly affected by bar service operation practices whereas performance variables such as return on investment compared to industry average and Overall performance of your organisation enhanced as compared to industry average are least affected by bar service operation practices. It would be appropriate to opine, if hotel enterprises want to achieve higher performance levels and compete in hotel marketplace, they should preferably

increase the application of bar service operation practices.

In general, bar service operation practices have not been widely researched so there a need for further research in this field. In the last two decades very few academic studies have concentrated on this area, which means that the knowledge of bar operation literature has not advanced very far. This study investigates several new bar service dimensions, which have never been tested before in hospitality literature. These new aspects reflect new insights from services research. Hotel organisations have to continuously develop new bar services practices in order to be successful and the results of these and further investigations will be of potential value to hotel and generally hospitality managers, as it will enable them to focus on bar services more strategically and professionally.

According to demographic findings, hypothesis indicates that there is a positive relationship between the bar service practices and organisation performance. The study found that the hotels in India should enhance the application of bar service operation practices to achieve the higher performance levels, thus to compete in hotel marketplace.

REFERENCES

- Ansel, D., & Dyer, C. (1999). A framework for restaurant information technology. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 40(3), 74-84.
- Barry, T. (1993). Empowerment : The US experience. *Empowerment in Organisations*, 1(1), 24-28.
- Bendall, D. (1995). Table management tools. *Restaurant Hospitality*, 79(6), 102.
- Bertsimas, D., & Shioda, R. (2003). Restaurant revenue management. *Operations Research*, 51(3), 472-486.
- Borchgrevink, C., & Anchill, D. (2003). Beverage control systems and the guests perspective: Standardization and value. *Journal of Hospitality and Leisure Marketing*, 10(1/2), 151.
- Bitner, M. J., Booms, B. H., & Tetreault, M. S. (1990). The service encounters: Diagnosing favorable and unfavorable incidents. *Journal of Marketing*, 54(1), 71-84.
- Cetron, M. J. (2008). 10 trends now shaping the future of hospitality. *HSMIAI Marketing Review*, 25(1), 20-31.
- Coltman, M. (1989). *Cost Control for the Hospitality Industry*. (2nd ed.). New York: Van, Nostrand Reinhold.
- Cronin, J. J., & Taylor, S. A. (1992). Measuring service quality: Are examination and extension. *Journal of Marketing*, 56, 55-68.
- Durocher, J. (2005). Multiplication tables. *Restaurant Business*, 104(11), 66-68.
- Dumas, K. (2006, Aug 9-Aug 15). Diners should pay by portion, not age. *Michigan Chronicle*, pp. A6.

- Godmark, E. (2003). *Controlling liquor, Wine and Beverage costs*, Florida: Atlantic Publishing Group, Inc.
- Gonzalez-Gomez, J. I., & Morini, S. (2006). An activity-based costing of wine. *Journal of Wine Research* 17(3), 195-203. doi:10.1080/09571260701286650
- Grönroos, C. (1984). A service quality model and its marketing implications. *Journal of Marketing*, 18, 36-44.
- Hinkin, T., & Tracey, J. B. (2000). The cost of turnover. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Quarterly*, 41(3), 14-21.
- Kimes, S. E., & Thompson G. M. (2004). Restaurant revenue management at Chevys: Determining the best table mix. *Decision Sciences*, 35(3), 371-392
- Kimes, S. E. (2008). The role of technology in restaurant revenue management. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 49(3), 297-309.
- Kim, W. G., Ng, C. Y. N., & Kim, Y. (2009). Influence of institutional DINESERV on customer satisfaction, return intention, and word-of-mouth. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 28, 10-17.
- Kotschever, L., & Tanke, M. (1996). *Managing Bar and Beverage Operations*, Educational Institute of the American Hotel & Motel Association, USA.
- Kooser, A. C. (2009). The latest in POS: The next generation is here. *Restaurant Business*, 108(5), 28-29.
- Lee, H., Lee Y., & Yoo D. (2000). The determinants of perceived service quality and its relationship with satisfaction. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 14(3), 217-231.
- Lockyer, S. (2007). Food trends. *Nation's Restaurant News*, 41(49), S34.
- Lynn, M., & Withiam, G. (2008). Tipping and its alternatives: Business considerations and directions for research. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 22(4), 328-336.
- Malone, M. (2003). Hands in the till. *Restaurant Business*, 102(7).
- Ministry of Finance, Govt. of India, (2012). *Economic survey on services sectors*, India.
- Mills, S., & Riehle, H. (1987). Tips vs service charges. *Restaurants USA*, (October), 20-22.
- Nelson, P. (2007), Preventing employee theft, *Grill*, 5(7), 24.
- O'Brien, L. (2004). Established procedures help by-the-glass sales flow. *Nation's Restaurant News*, 38(12), 80.
- Oliver, R. L. (1997). Satisfaction: A behavioural perspective on the consumer. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Oronsky, C. R., & Chathoth, P. K. (2007). An exploratory study examining information technology adoption and implementation in full-service restaurant firms. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 26(4), 941-956.
- Oliver, R. L. (1981). Measurement and evaluation of satisfaction processes in retail settings. *Journal of Retailing*, 57(3), 25-48.
- Ojasalo, J. (2001). Managing Customer Expectations in Professional Services. *Managing Service Quality*, 11(3), MCB University Press
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A multiple item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 64(1), 12-40.
- Plotkin, R., & Goumas, S. (2000). *Successful Beverage Management: Proven Strategies for the On-premise Operator*, Bar Media: Tucson.
- Prewitt, M. (2008). Rising costs threaten operators' margins. *Nation's Restaurant News*, 42(15), 1.
- Raab, C., & Mayer, K. (2007). Menu engineering and activity-based costing - can they work together in a restaurant? *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 19(1), 43.
- Singaravelavan R. (2011). *Food & Beverage Service*. Oxford University Press, New Delhi.
- Smith, J. (1997). How to protect your bar against employee theft. *Nation's Restaurant News*, 31(24), pp. 36.
- Scarpa, J. (2006). Beverage controls elevate bar profits by cutting waste, theft. *Nation's Restaurant News*, 40(43), 4-32.
- Taylor, R., Davies, D., & Savery, L. (2001). The role of appraisal and training in reducing staff turnover in the Western Australian accommodation industry. *Management Research News*, 24(10/11), 56-57.
- Thompson, G. M. (2002). Optimizing a restaurant's seating capacity: Use dedicated or combinable tables? *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 43(4), 48-57.
- Thompson, G. M. (2003). Optimizing restaurant-table configurations: Specifying combinable tables. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 44(1), 53-60.
- Ting, D. H. (2004). Service quality and satisfaction perceptions: Curvilinear and interaction effect. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 22(6), 407-420.
- Wessels, W. J. (1997). Minimum wages and tipped servers. *Economic Inquiry*, 35(2), 334-349.
- Wildes, V. (2005). Stigma in food service work: How it affects restaurant servers' intention to stay in the business or recommend a job to another. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 5(3), 213-233.
- Wildes, V., Nann, S., & DeMicco, F. (1998). The Penn State/USA Today restaurant service survey or (un)forkedible frequencies. *Journal of International Hospitality, Leisure and Tourism Management*, 1(3), 103-115.