

# Impact of Motivation on Employee Performance in Selected Hotels in Ilaro, Nigeria

**\*Folalu A.A. & Aneke F.O.**

Department of Hospitality Management, The Federal Polytechnic Ilaro, Ogun State  
\*Correspondence: [omobolanle202@gmail.com](mailto:omobolanle202@gmail.com)+2348068226515

## Abstract

The study assesses motivation and reward of employee performance in the hotel industry in some selected hotels in Ilaro, Ogun State Nigeria. A descriptive and cross-sectional study was conducted among sixty workers in three selected hotels in the study area to determine the effectiveness of motivation and reward on employee performance in selected establishments. Three hotels were selected for this research work in Ogun State. A total of 60 respondents were selected through a convenience random sampling technique. A semi-structured questionnaire was used to obtain information on the biodata/socio-economic characteristic and motivation and reward on employee performance of the workers. Correlation and regression analysis were utilized to test the relevant hypothesis. The results showed that there is a weak positive relationship ( $r=0.494$ ) between employee performance and monetary reward. However, there was a very weak insignificant relationship between employee performance and motivation ( $r=0.246$ ). Further analysis shows that only monetary reward that has significant effect on employees' performance. The study suggests that hotel management should always find how they will inculcate other means of compensation for staff welfare.

**Keywords:** Employee motivation, Employee performance, Hotel industry, Reward, Turnover.

## Citation

Folalu, A.A. & Aneke, F.O. (2020). Impact of Motivation on Employee Performance in Selected Hotels in Ilaro, Nigeria, *Ilaro Journal of Women in Technical Education and Employment*, 1(2), 104-110

## ARTICLE HISTORY

Received: September 30, 2020  
Revised: November 14, 2020  
Accepted: December 15, 2020

## 1. Introduction

Motivation is a concept originally derived from the Latin word "movere," meaning "to move," but it has been extended to include the different variables that cause human actions. Motivation is also characterized as the enthusiasm, strength, direction and consistency of work assignment efforts over a period of time (Futrell, 1992). Motivation is a mixture of variables that function within each person and involves a combination of strategies. It can be referred to, in a general sense, as a mixture of intent and behavior. Motivation is characterized as a mechanism used by employees or employees to encourage, improve stamina and work capacity to work or work in an organization through mental satisfaction.

In short, motivation is something that motivates one to work purposefully on one's own. Because of the high rate of customer turnover with the operation of the hospitality industry, employers began to recognize the need to inspire workers in order to maintain quality industry staffing. Quality service can result if employers retain high levels of encouragement for their workers.

Rewards can be described as anything that increases the frequency of an employee's behavior that leads to improved results, according to Page (2008). He noted that incentives can be very beneficial to workers as it helps to build their

workplace confidence and satisfaction and reminds them that they recognize and reward the additional efforts they put into their work.

In the management sector, employee motivation plays a crucial role, both theoretically and practically. It is said that one of the main duties of the human resource manager is to ensure organizational involvement, which can only be done through encouragement. Motivated employee is the understanding of a mission by a person and the reasons why he or she performs it, and then states that "individuals are intrinsically motivated when seeking the job" (George and Jones, 2012). Motivation is an efficient method by the management of the organization to increase the willingness of the workers, which helps to increase productivity and quality within the employees.

Motivation is one of the most important psychological principles and necessary for managers who direct subordinates to accomplish worthwhile objectives (Ali, Abrar and Haider, 2012). Performance is something that a single entity does. Employee efficiency is strongly influenced by motivation. Employees have automatically achieved high standards when their success is inspired. Motivation has a direct and beneficial influence on the output of staff in the field (Brown, 2011).

"The identification and measurement of factors associated with individual differences in employee performance is a key concern for industrial relations." And this recognition and calculation is the fundamental feature of the motivational variables or instruments (Nabi, 2017). For employee efficiency, an incentive system is necessary as this would be more successful in job performance with a high reward system that is crucial for the success of the company and the achievement of the objectives. Unsatisfied workers generate unsatisfactory outcomes, so it is very important for top management to take care of their employees to ensure that they are happy in their jobs; when they are satisfied; when they work for the goals and objectives of the business (Lăzăroiu, 2015). This study explores the effects of motivation on employee productivity in selected hotels in Ilaro, Ogun state, on the basis of this, as well as identifying different ways in which different hotels motivate their employers.

## **2. Methodology**

This study was carried out in selected hotels in Ilaro areas of Ogun State. The study was cross sectional and descriptive in nature and involved hotel workers in selected hotels in Ogun state. Three (3) hotels were selected for this research work in Ogun State. A total of 60 respondents were selected through a convenience random sampling technique. A semi structured questionnaire was administered for data collection, questions were asked on areas peculiar to the study.

## **3. Results**

Table 1 shows the socioeconomic characteristics of the respondents. It shows that 55% of the respondents were male and 45% of the respondents were female respectively. It also shows that 65% of the respondents were between the age limit of 25-34yrs, 26.7% were between 18-24yrs and 8.3% were between 35 and above respectively. It shows that 40.00% of the respondents were SSCE holders, 33.0% primary school certificate, 23.3% were OND/NCE and 3.3% were HND/BSc holders respectively. It also revealed that 71.7% of the respondents were single, 28.3% were married respectively. The table also shows that 78.3% of the respondents have been working for 0-5 years, 18.3% of the respondents have been working for 6-10yrs, and 3.3% of the respondents have been working for 11-20 years respectively. The table further reveals that 25.0% of the respondents are working in housekeeping and food and

beverage department, 18% of the respondent are security, 15% of the respondent at the front office, and 6.7% of the respondent as laundry.

Table 1: Socio-economic characteristics of respondents

Variable	Frequency	Percentage (%)
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	33	55.0
Female	27	45.0
Total	60	100.0
<b>Age</b>		
18-24 years	16	26.7
25-34 years	39	65.0
35-44 years	5	8.3
Total	60	100.0
<b>Educational Qualification</b>		
Primary School Certificate	20	33.3
SSCE	24	40.0
OND/NCE	14	23.3
HND/BSc	2	3.3
Total	60	100.0
<b>Marital Status</b>		
Single	43	71.7
Married	17	28.3
Total	60	100.0
<b>Years of Service</b>		
0-5 years	47	78.3
6-10 years	11	18.3
11-20 years	2	3.3
21-30 years	-	-
31-40 years	-	-
Total	60	100.0
<b>Department in the hotel</b>		
Front office	9	15.0
Housekeeping	15	25.0
Food and Beverage	15	25.0
Maintenance	6	10.0
Security	11	18.0
Laundry	4	6.7
Total	60	100

### Test of Hypotheses

$H_1$ : There is no significant relationship between motivation and employees' performance in the selected hotels.

*Table 2: Correlation between Motivation, Monetary Reward and Employees Performance*

Variable	Motivation	Monetary Reward
Employees Performance	0.246 (0.624)	0.494 (0.000*)

The result presented in table 2 shows the relationship between employees’ performance, motivation and monetary reward. It is observed that there is a weak positive insignificant relationship between motivation and employees performance ( $r=0.246$ ,  $p\text{-value}=0.624$ ). This result is further supported by the respondents opinion that company’s motivation package has not meet up with the employees expectation.

In addition, there is weak positive significant relationship between monetary reward and employees performance ( $r=0.494$ ,  $p\text{-value}=0.000$ ). Though the relationship is weak but is significant, buttressing the response from the respondents that they prefer monetary reward.

$H_2$ : Motivation does not have significant effect on employees’ performance in the hotel industry in Ogun State.

*Table 3: Model Summary Contribution of Motivation to Employees Performance*

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.246 <sup>a</sup>	.060	.058	.685

The model summary as presented in table 3 shows that about 6% variation in employees’ performance could be attributed to motivation of the workers by the management of the hotels. Moreover, the model is not adequate (table 4) in relating the variables understudy because of the F-value if 0.241 with  $p\text{-value}>5\%$  significance level.

*Table 4: ANOVA Contribution of Motivation to Employees Performance*

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.113	1	.113	.241	.624 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	53.052	113	.469		
	Total	53.165	114			

The result in table 5 shows motivation only cause about 4.1% increase in employees performance, however the t-value is 0.491 with p-value of 0.624 (<5% significance) which in an indication that motivation is not significant. Hence, we conclude by accepting the null hypothesis that motivation does not have significant effect on employees’ performance.

*Table 5: Coefficients Contribution of Motivation to Employees Performance*

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	4.210	.357		11.778	.000
	Motivation	.041	.084	.046	.491	.624

$H_3$ : Monetary Reward does not have significant effect on employees’ performance in the hotel industry in Ogun State.

The result as presented in table 6 shows that about 24.4% variation in employees’ performance could be attributed to monetary reward in the hospitality industry in Ogun State. In addition the ANOVA table (table 9) indicates F-value of 36.505 with p-value of 0.000 which is less than 5% significance level. Hence the model is adequate and sufficient in relating employees’ performance and monetary reward.

*Table 6: Model Summary Contribution of Monetary Reward to Employees Performance*

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.494 <sup>a</sup>	.244	.237	.596

*Table 7: ANOVA of Monetary Reward to Employees Performance*

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	12.981	1	12.981	36.505	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	40.184	113	.356		
	Total	53.165	114			

From table 8, increase in monetary reward resulted in about 39.5% increase in employees’ performance in hotels in Ogun State. The t-value is 6.042 with p-value of 0.000 which is less than 5% significance level. Hence the alternative hypothesis is accepted then we conclude that monetary reward has significant effect on employees’ performance in hotels in Ogun State.

*Table 8: Coefficients of Monetary Reward to Employees Performance*

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.674	.288		9.282	.000
	Monetary Reward	.395	.065	.494	6.042	.000

#### 4. Discussion of findings

It was found out that the hotels have different methods of motivating their staff such as praise, benefits, incentives, safe work environment, training, recognition and respect which is in conformity with Luthans (2000) findings. Majority of the staff preferred monetary reward to non-monetary reward which is in line with Deeprose (2014) findings. Also, the respondents confirmed that their hotel celebrate the best staff for good work/job done, which is also in line with Dewhurst (2010) findings. The motivational packages adopted by the hotels do not meet up with the employee expectations, when employees are expecting higher, they are receiving low thereby making the employees

productivity output relatively low. Also, respondents confirmed that inadequate reward system does not lead to resignation by staff compared to other industry.

Despite the reward been given, it does not make them to leave the job. Majority of the respondents made us understand that the hotel management do educate its employees the reason behind their motivation which is to increase productivity or deliver more than expected on the part of the employees to its prospective customers. It was also found out that motivation helps to improve employee's performance as lack of motivation will lower their strength which will affect the hotel productivity. Also, the respondents confirmed that the management is inconsistent in providing the expected motivation packages for the staff in the hotels which causes friction between staff and the hotel industry management. In which the employees fail to perform their duties as a result of inconsistent motivation package required from the hotel management.

Finally, the respondents confirmed that motivation system adopted by the hotel management has positive impact on employee's performance which has really boosts their financial status in one way or the other. It came to limelight that training should be suggested on motivational policies by the employer to employees in order to achieve its defined goals Frey (1997).

## 5. Conclusion

The study on the impact of motivation and its effect on employee performance in the selected hotels tell that the hotel industry needs employees who are willing to perform effectively on their jobs in order to increase the productivity of the company. Content analysis was used to analyze data through tables and figures. Study findings reveal that money is not the only motivational instrument for staff to perform better in the hotel industry, there are some factors like praise and recognition, good allowances, achievement awards, working conditions, training and development, appreciation and fair promotions. This implies that motivational packages are crucial to employees' performance.

## References

- Ali, A, Abrar M. and Haider, J. (2012). Impact of motivation on the working performance of Employee-a case study of Pakistan. *Global Advanced Research Journal of Management and Business studies* 1(4):126-133.
- Brown, D. (2011). *An experimental approach to organizational development (8th ed)*, New Jersey, Pearson Education, Inc.
- Futrell, C. (1992). *Personal selling: How to succeed in sales*. Irwin Professional Publishing.
- Deeproose (2014). Motivation in the workplace to improve the employee performance. *International Journal of Engineering Technology, Management and Applied Sciences*, 2(6). Retrieved from [www.ijetmas.com](http://www.ijetmas.com).
- Dewhurst (2010). Impact of financial rewards on Employee's motivation and satisfaction in Pharmaceutical Industry, Pakistan. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*, 12(17), Version 1.0.
- Frey (1997). *The Motivation to Work*. New York:Mc Graw-Hill,
- George and Jones, (2012). *The Influence of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation on employee engagement*. Umea School of Business and Economics, Umea University. SE – 901 Umea: Sweden, P. 159.
- Lăzăroi, G. (2015). Work motivation and organizational behavior. *Contemporary Readings in Law and Social*



*Justice*, 7(2), 66-75.

Luthans, K. (2000). Recognition: A powerful, but often overlooked, leadership tool to improve employee performance. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 7(1), 31-39.

Nabi, N. (2017). *Impact of Motivation on employee performance*. Bangladesh University, Bangladesh: Business Management Press, (7). P. 293.

Page, L. (2008). Do not show me the money? The growing popularity of non-monetary incentives in the workplace. *American Journal of Economics*, 93-96