



doi 10.5281/zenodo.6966547

Vol. 04 Issue 12 Dec. - 2021

Manuscript ID: #0541

EMPLOYEE MOTIVATION AND PRODUCTIVITY IN SELECTED TOURISM FIRMS IN PORT HARCOURT

Anwuri, Patience Nwokaego (Ph.D)

*Department of Tourism and Hospitality Management Faculty of Management Sciences
University of Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria.*

Ojo Monday Isiramen (Ph.D)

Department Of Management Rivers State University Port Harcourt, Rivers State

*Corresponding author: *Anwuri, Patience Nwokaego
Email: patience.anwuri@uniport.edu.ng*

ABSTRACT

This study examined the effect of employee motivation on productivity in selected tourism firms in Port Harcourt. The study adopted a descriptive and causal research design in investigating the effects of motivation on tourism firms' productivity levels. The entire population of the study was 475 with a determined sample size of 217. A well-structured self-administered questionnaire was used as the main tool for data collection and was administered to 217 respondents out of which 185 were retrieved and appropriately filled. The reliability of the research instrument was calculated and the Cronbach's alpha coefficient was 0.868. Data were analyzed using simple linear regression analysis. From the hypotheses tested, the result indicated that there is a significant relationship between employee motivation and tourism firms' productivity. Findings also revealed that 35.8% of the variations in productivity can be explained by employee motivation in the tourism firm used as a study in this research. The results also revealed that extrinsic factors were considered to have more significant effects on tourism firms' productivity than intrinsic factors. The study, therefore, recommended that management of tourism firms should take appropriate measures in figuring out those factors that motivate their employees and seek ways of ensuring that they are adequately motivated in order to improve their productivity and productivity levels.

KEYWORDS

Employee, Motivation, Productivity, Tourism, Firm.



INTRODUCTION

Generally most businesses, tourism firms and their managers are faced with numerous challenges. One of such challenges is in the area of management which refers to the utilization of resources effectively and efficiently in order to achieve an tourism firm's goals and objectives. Some of these managerial challenges are obvious in matters concerning employees such as reimbursement, recruitment, productivity, training and career development, health and safety, benefits, motivation and administration amongst others. The human resource is the most vital of all resources among other factors of production and the human capital is what distinguishes one tourism firm from the other (Maimuna & Rashad, 2013). Therefore, for tourism firms to survive and remain relevant and competitive, it is essential for them to be able to motivate and maintain efficient and effective employees in a bid to enhance productivity (Sunia, 2014).

Employees make up the workforce of any tourism firm as such they are an integral part of the organization. Aluko (2014) stated that a tourism firm is only as good as the workforce that runs the tourism firm. This is to say that when employees are motivated chances are that their morale would be high as such productivity and productivity levels would increase thereby to a large extent boosting overall tourism firms productivity level. In order to achieve high levels of productivity as such boost tourism firms productivity or productivity, managers therefore need to continually seek ways of ensuring that their employees stay motivated. This is because a lack of employee motivation leads to reduced productivity which is harmful to tourism firms productivity and continuous success.

James (2014) cited three warning signs of a demotivated workforce these include poor workplace atmosphere, slipping job standards and decreased productivity. He further stated that if any of these factors is observed to be trending downwards then there is a great chance that the tourism firm is dealing with a demotivated workforce. Most businesses and tourism firms especially tourism firms have failed to recognize the importance of motivation as a concept be it intrinsic such as employee well-being, relationship with co-employees, relationship with managers, tourism firms policies etc. or extrinsic such as training and career development, good working conditions, compensation, promotion amongst other factors that enhance or improve employee productivity as well as tourism firms productivity levels.

This in turn has continued to represent major managerial concerns for decades as employee productivity levels has relatively declined which has been acknowledged as a subject of growing concern in the aspect of business and management research (Akerele, 2001). Although a lot of factors may also be responsible or even cause a decline in productivity such as poor strategic and structural changes in decisions and executions, lack of infrastructure, leadership styles and tourism firms culture amongst others. Contemporary investigations that connects the concept of workforce motivation and productivity has laid an emphasis on employee perspective, needs and expectations as factors affecting their productivity and productivity levels respectively. As such investigating those factors of importance to employees in the discharge of their duties at work has taken a new dimension.

Motivation through factors such as employee wellbeing, adequate compensation, promotion, good relationships with co-employees and relationships with managers can enhance an employee's level of effectiveness and efficiency in the workplace. This is because good relationships with co-employees

promote unity and gives the employee a sense of belonging and acceptance which in turn boosts employee productivity and productivity levels. Employees who enjoy such relationships both within and outside the work environment tend to be more effective and efficient as such very productive in discharging their duties. It is predicated on the foregoing that this current study opted to investigate the effect of motivation on productivity in selected tourism firms in Port Harcourt.

Objectives of the Study

The main objective of this study was to determine how employee motivation affects productivity of tourism firms in Port Harcourt. The specific research objectives were to:

- i. Determine the effect of employee well-being on the level of effectiveness of the employees in tourism firms in Port Harcourt.
- ii. Examine the effect of compensation on the level of effectiveness of the employees in tourism firms in Port Harcourt.

Research Questions

- i. What effect does employee well-being have on the level of effectiveness of employees in tourism firms in Port Harcourt?
- ii. What effect does compensation have on the level of effectiveness of the employee in tourism firms in Port Harcourt?

Research Hypotheses

- i. Employee well-being has no significant effect on the level of effectiveness of the employee in tourism firms in Port Harcourt.
- ii. Compensation has no significant effect on the level of effectiveness of the employee in tourism firms in Port Harcourt.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Conceptual Review

This section extensively examined literatures that are associated and significant to the subject of this study. The review covers the conceptual, empirical, and theoretical explanations required to facilitate a complete examination and comprehension of the research. It provides an insight of other scholars' thoughts and opinions on the effects of motivation on employees and how it affects their productivity levels.

Employee Motivation

Hellriegel (2016) viewed motivation as any influence that portray, direct, or maintain people's goal directed behaviors. It refers to the driving force that makes an individual to act in a specific way. It is an inner drive that causes an individual to behave in a certain manner. The goal of most tourism firms is to improve productivity therefore factors of motivation play significant roles in improving employee job satisfaction levels. This will in turn aid in improving an organization's productivity levels.

George and Jones (2012) stated that motivation can be categorized into two classes namely intrinsic and extrinsic. Intrinsic motivation arises from an employee's internal cravings to execute a task out of self-interest rather than a need or wish for some external reward. External motivation is the type of

motivation that arises when an employee is compelled to act in a specific way either as a result of that employee's desires for external rewards or to avoid punishment.

Extrinsic motivation also helps boost an employee's effectiveness and efficiency levels. This is because certain external factors such as adequate compensation, work environment as well as training and career development appeal to employees as such are essential in inspiring them to resourcefully and successfully discharge their duties. A tourism firm that fails to provide a conducive work environment, compensate its workforce adequately, create room for proper training and career advancement is at risk of having a demotivated workforce. This means that such a workforce being demoralized would fail to effectively and efficiently discharge their duties leading to low productivity and productivity levels (Nwachukwu, 2004). This study therefore focuses on showing the effects of motivation on tourism firms productivity.

Employee Well-being: The concept of employee's well-being in most tourism firms has become a thing of great interest in recent years. In today's world, the increasing reliance on overall market forces places a considerable load on salary earners and those of working age as regards delivery of goods and services. Consequently, this has adversely affected the health, safety and general wellbeing of the workforce. Therefore, the well-being of a workforce cannot be underestimated as employees also have similar needs be it physical or emotional. These needs may vary ranging from welfare, security, health, and a sense that they are capable of coping with life. Employees now look to their tourism firms for assistance in achieving this because a significant amount of their time and lives are expended at work. Most business establishments around the globe understand the necessity for a healthy workforce as they are crucial in enhancing an organization's productivity levels and fiscal productivity. As such, most tourism firms take giant strides in a bid to improve the welfare of their workforces by implementing several health and productivity programs that is aimed at promoting the well-being of their workforce.

Well-being is defined as a concept that encompasses physical, financial, and psychological health, as well as a personal connection and a sense of belonging and not just the absence of an ailment or injury. It is an extensive ideology that takes cognizance of the individual as a whole as regards the physical and mental states of a person (Lu, Cooper & Lin, 2013). Finally, for health and well-being programs to be successful a tourism firm must be able to relate effectively with their workforce and ensure that matters of great concern that may be termed personal to staff and their relations are catered for. Some of these matters may include their welfare packages, health-related behaviors, present and eventual monetary states of affairs as well as their experiences in the place of work. It is imperative to note that the attitude of a workforce provides several clues on how to obtain the best returns on health and productivity investments. Baase (2009) stated that there are proofs showing that the health and wellbeing of an organization's labor force is inseparably associated with their levels of productivity as well as the health of the nation's economy. As such employers of labour are also very much aware of the importance of wellbeing programs and are concerned with seeking out better ways to improve employee wellbeing through various health protection and promotion benefit programs.

Most tourism firms even allow staff to take several days off due to illness without being deprived of their pay. Some even compensate members of their work force for not taking sick leave by giving them additional pay (Mathis, 2013). Shellengarger (2011), also agreed that managers give their

employees paid time off, free lunch and relaxation times, vacations, leave etc. This is done with a view to ensure that employees stay healthy and motivated thereby increasing their levels of effectiveness and efficiency in the workplace resulting in high productivity.

Compensation

Compensation refers to the amount of money and benefits that an employee receives from his tourism firm in return for his or her contributions to the tourism firm (Hamidi, *et al.*, 2014). This practically satisfies material, social and psychological needs of the individual (Altinoz, *et al.*, 2012). Compensation or pay is linked with general satisfaction and more closely linked with pay satisfaction (Lumley, *et al.*, 2011). Employees receive different kinds of benefits in the form of wages, salaries and pay. Mostly individuals with good education, relevant skills and experience are unsatisfied with their job and salary packages resulting in high rates of turnover and low productivity. As such tourism firms make compensation plans for them in a bid to minimize the turnover and to motivate them. In other words you can say that compensation motivates employee for better productivity and higher productivity levels. Compensation may also come in the form of Fringe benefits which focuses on maintaining the quality in terms of lifestyle as employees, provide them with a certain level of safety and financial security taking into consideration their family relations. Some common examples are; retirement or pension plans, medical insurance, education reimbursement and time off. Fringe benefits are forms of indirect compensation provided for a employee or group of employees as a result of their status as members of the tourism firm (Matthias & Jackson, 2003).

Also, overtime is the payment over and above the normal salary and wage rates where the employees are paid extra for working additional hours (Tyson, 1999). Furthermore, Company housing or house rent allowances is offered by tourism firms who feel obliged to help an individual meet one of the basic needs a roof over one's head in order to enable them have access to reasonable accommodation while on official duty. Senior employees are provided with accommodation which may be owned by the tourism firm while other tourism firms reimburse rent payments (Andrews, 2009). In order to avoid a decline in employee productivity levels, employees also require health and safety packages, job security and adequate working conditions (Hamidi, *et al.*, 2014).

According to Allis and Ryan (2008), the cost of compensating employees that is in form of payments, wages, and other benefits - are a huge and increasing part of operational expenditures; yet, productivity may decrease amongst employees if such payments and benefits are not made available to them. Simply put employees are more industrious and productive when reasonable pay is attached to productivity. Although compensating employees may have an effect on productivity, other factors can also increase output with little or no costs to the organization. While pay can be seen as an example, employees also appreciate being validated if they are to be productive in the workplace. The need to feel that their jobs are of value and contribute significantly to the success of the tourism firm is important to the employees. While adequately compensating them may help, validation does not necessarily have to be financial. This is because simply thanking them can also make an employee feel appreciated. As regards validation, employees may also be extremely productive when they can envision where they fit in the big picture. Employees want to be seen as an integral part of the tourism firm as such strives to be indispensable. They want to have a grip on every aspect of operations, which could also be favorable to their hopes and aspirations as this may present them with the opportunity to showcase their capabilities and skills in other areas excluding their areas of

specialization. They also need to know that they have a voice and that their managers are willing to give listening ears to their opinions as well as involve them in decision making processes (Lake, 2000).

Employee Productivity

Jennifer and George (2006) argued that the productivity of employees contribute directly to an organization's level of effectiveness, efficiency and even towards the achievement of administrative goals. It also stated that a corporation's failure to certify that its employees are motivated has a negative influence on its effectiveness and efficiency thereby affecting employee's productivity levels concerning expected goals and objectives. According to Antomioni (1999), an employee's level of productivity is reliant on the extent at which employees believe that certain motivational desires will be fulfilled stating that employees become demoralized as such less productive once they perceive that their desires can't be met or gratified.

Mathis and John (2003) suggested that productivity refers to a measure of the quantity and quality of work done, bearing in mind the cost of capital used. The greater the level of tourism firms productivity, the greater the competitive edge. This is because the costs associated with the production of goods and services are lesser. Better productivity ratios do not automatically mean that more output is manufactured; it could also mean that less employees or less financial resources and time were utilized in producing the similar output. McNamara (2003) stated that productivity may be denoted in form of quality, quantity, time, and cost. He also stated that evaluating productivity has to do with measuring the length of time it takes an average employee to produce a specified level of output. Although measuring productivity may seem difficult, it is however very significant since it directly affects tourism firms profitability.

Brady (2000) claimed that none of the resources utilized for production in the workplace are so thoroughly examined as the human capital. Most of the activities carried out in HR Systems are intended to influence employee or tourism firms' productivity. Compensation, evaluation systems, training and development, recruitment, job characteristics are HR responsibilities directly aimed at productivity. Bernardin (2007) clearly stated that the importance of motivational factors cannot be underestimated by a tourism firm in increasing the productivity levels of a workforce especially when trying to gain competitive advantage. He also stated that productivity may be hard to measure, but it can be evaluated in terms of effectiveness and efficiency of employees.

In general, effectiveness is referred to as the degree to which set objectives are accomplished and policies achieve what they were designed to achieve. It focuses on affecting the purpose that is achieving the required or projected results. A program or service is said to be effective if such a program is able to accomplish set objectives or estimated outcomes. As regards employees, it is a measure of how well employee's productivity levels meet set goals and objectives of the tourism firm (Yesufu, 2000). Therefore, an employee is said to be effective when he/she is able to achieve desired results in line with tourism firms goals and objectives.

Efficiency on the other hand is productivity of estimated effects, specifically productivity without any form of waste. This has to do with employee's abilities to work productively with minimum waste in terms of energy, time, and cost. Efficiency is more or less a contrast between the use of inputs in a clearly defined process and generated outputs. For instance, given a specified number of input or

resources, a decision-making entity be it individual, corporate, administrative institution, or a state realizes a level of output considered to be the maximum achievable based on the present conditions, then such an entity is assumed to be efficient. However, if it generates lesser than what it is estimated to generate it is said to be inefficient. As such efficiency stems from the correlation between inputs and outputs and is referred to basically as the degree to which outputs are produced while minimizing tourism firms' costs (Harris, 2001).

Theoretical Review

Abraham Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs Theory: In the book titled *Motivation and Personality*, Abraham Maslow a distinguished psychologist postulated the Hierarchy of Needs theory (Maslow, 1954). He Stated that human needs can be categorized into five groups and that these groups can be organized in a pecking order ranging from the most important to the least important. These comprised needs such as basic or physiological, safety, belongingness, esteem as well as self-actualization needs. He was of the opinion that an individual is primarily motivated to fulfill physiological needs first before considering others. This is because physiological needs otherwise known as basic needs are essential for an individual's survival. As such once these basic needs are fulfilled they are no longer perceived as primary motivational elements by the individual who now moves up the hierarchy seeking to fulfill safety needs. The process lingers pending when self-actualization needs are fulfilled. In a workplace, the logic to a certain extent is quite reasonable as employees who lack essential needs for continued existence such as food, air and water will barely be able to make any significant impact on productivity as such would put in little effort at work.

In support, Jennifer and George (2006) agreed that individuals from all walks of life strive to gratify five elementary needs: physiological needs, safety needs, belongingness needs, esteem needs and self-actualization needs. They claimed that these needs form a hierarchy with the most fundamental need that is physiological and safety needs situated at the lowest part of the hierarchy (Jennifer & George, 2006). They were of the notion that needs at the lowest-level should be satisfied before greater needs can be satisfied.

This theory focuses on the notion that individuals are driven by unfulfilled needs, and that the fulfillment of needs at the bottom end of the pyramid only leads to the pursuit for the fulfillment of those at the higher end (Maslow, 1954). This theory suggested that for an individual to behave in an unselfish manner, every need has to be fulfilled that is both deficiency and growth needs. Therefore, in as much as individuals are interested in satisfying their desires, they are advancing towards growth, which is self-actualization.

In the business setting, this implies that if employees are unable to satisfy their desires, there would be a loss of morale to work and perform excellently in the discharge of their jobs to the organization. Maslow believed that needs can't be fully satisfied citing that needs that are more or less achieved stops to be a motivator. Therefore, managers in a bid to improve productivity need to recognize the position of members of its workforce in relation to the hierarchy so as to be able to motivate them accordingly bearing in mind that motivational tools should be tailored to meeting their desires (Robbins, 2001).

This theory presents businesses particularly in the area of management, an understanding of those elements that arouse or affect an employee's behavior and work productivity levels within a corporation. The theory posited that individuals have diverse needs that are active at different times and that only unfulfilled needs can affect behavior (Obikeze, 2005). Therefore, in order to adequately motivate employees at their place of work, managers are obligated to ascertain and understand the present needs of their workforce. Maslow's model specified basically that needs at the lower end such as physiological and security requirements must be fulfilled before the pursuit of those top level motivators such as esteem and self-fulfillment.

Maslow's theory although one of the earliest propounded theory of motivation is still very much relevant and applicable in present day tourism firms settings. Despite its shortcomings, it has been able to identify those needs that are peculiar to an individual and the effects it may have on an individual's productivity or productivity levels in an organization. Hence, it is vital that managers try to understand those needs affecting members of its workforce and provide adequate motivation tailored to suit or gratify those needs. In order to achieve high productivity levels from members of the workforce, the tourism firm must consider employees the backbone of the tourism firm as such an asset to the organization. Therefore to ensure that employees remain highly productive and in a bid to achieve continuous growth, stability and success of the organization, Maslow's theory posits that the needs of the workforce must first be given due consideration.

Empirical Review

Various studies have examined the effect of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation on a employees' productivity and productivity levels. Also, most of these studies have obtained different results from their analysis. For instance, Rewards that an individual receives be it intrinsic or extrinsic are very essential in understanding the concept of motivation. Previous studies have proposed that rewards leads to fulfillment and can affect a employee' to be affected, which directly influences the productivity as well as productivity levels of the employee. Lawler (1968) stated that certain elements affect employee's productivity levels in relation to their jobs. First, productivity is dependent on the amount of monetary or non-monetary benefits they actually receive as opposed to the amount they feel they deserve. Also, evaluating what other employees receive in comparison to their own affects their individual productivity, while the employee's contentment with both intrinsic and extrinsic rewards acquired has an effect on overall work productivity and productivity levels. Furthermore, employees vary largely in the rewards they crave and the degree of value they attribute to each reward.

Jibowo (2007) in the study; motivation and workplace productivity amongst employees basically assumed the similar methods as (Herzberg, 2000). The study shows some supports for the impact of motivation on productivity. However more value was placed on extrinsic factors than intrinsic. Another research by Centres and Bugental (2007), also based their inquiry on Herzberg's two factor theory of motivation, which divided job variables into several groups: hygiene factors and motivators. They utilized a population of 692 participants to test the rationality of the theory on employee effectiveness and efficiency levels. It was revealed that at higher professional levels, motivators or Intrinsic job elements were more appreciated, while at lower occupational levels hygiene factors or extrinsic job elements were more appreciated. As a result, they concluded that tourism firms that

fulfill both intrinsic and extrinsic elements influencing employees' behavior are able to gain the best out of them.

Also, in a similar research, (Akerere, 2001) equated the comparative position of ten motivational tools such as pay, training, security, etc. considered external to the job, and other internal factors like employee well-being, good relationships with managers, responsibility etc. among 80 employees of an organization. It was assumed that greater value will be put on internal rather than external job factors. However, findings failed to validate the assumption as it was revealed that two extrinsic factors sufficient compensation and job safety were rated as the most important tools. The above are practical works undertaken by various scholars in the area of motivation and productivity. Based on these empirical examinations and conclusions, one may possibly deduce that both intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors are very essential in improving employees productivity levels in the workplace. As such an individual's productivity levels can be expected to result in higher productivity if the right motivational tools are put in place. However, the question is "to what extent can motivation be it extrinsic or intrinsic induce productivity levels taking into deliberation the arguments for and arguments against the fact that motivation as a concept is complex and relative to individuals.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design: The study utilized the descriptive research design (survey strategy) because it creates room for gathering large amounts of data from a sizeable population in a cost-effective way (Osuagwu, 2006).

Scope of the Study: The scope of this study was limited to a selected tourism firms in Port Harcourt L.G.A. of Rivers State. This study examined employee motivation and productivity in selected tourism firms in Port Harcourt L.G.A. of Rivers State.

Population of the Study: The study population was 475 staff of the tourism firms in Port Harcourt Local Government Area of Rivers State.

Determination of Sample Size: The sample size for the study was determined using Taro Yemani formula as two hundred and seventeen (217) for a sample population of four hundred and seventy five (475).

The Sampling Technique: The stratified random sampling was utilized in this study. This was done by segmenting the employees based on their job status ranging from senior staff, junior staff, contract and casual employees. This technique is appropriate in order to ensure that every element in the sampling frame has an equal opportunity of being selected.

Sources of Data Collection: Primary source of data was used for gathering data in this research work. It is the data collected for the purpose of the research, these are the responses generated or obtained from administered questionnaires. The questionnaire research instrument was used in this research work to gather information because it helps to access a large number of respondents at a minimal cost.

Instrument for Data Collection: The instrument used for data collection for in this study is the questionnaire. The questionnaire used for this study consists of three sections. Section A was based on the respondents' bio-data using five items, section B contained 10 statements concerning workplace motivation and section C contained 10 statements about employee productivity. Five-point Likert scale (5-Strongly Agreed, 4- Agree, 3-Undecided, 2- Disagree, 1 - Strongly Disagree) that best describes the extent to which the respondents agree with each item in the questionnaire was used.

Validity of Research Instrument: The validity of the research instrument is determined by the amount of build in error in measurement. Copies of the survey were made accessible to experts in the University of Port Harcourt who confirmed the validity of the measuring instrument.

Reliability of Research Instrument: Reliability of the research instrument involves the consistency of the result obtained with a value of .868. This was achieved using Cronbach's alpha test method.

Data Collection: Two hundred and seventeen (217) copies questionnaire instrument was administered and collected by the researcher with the help two research assistance.

Method of Data Analysis: For the analysis of data, the statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) was used. The statistical tools used to analyze the data include the following: descriptive analysis and inferential statistics where simple linear regression analysis was used to test the two hypotheses.

RESULTS

Research Question One: What effect does employee well-being have on the level of effectiveness of employees in tourism firms in Port Harcourt?

Table 1: Employee Well-being of the Employees

S/No	Items	SA (%)	A (%)	U (%)	D (%)	SD (%)	\bar{x}	S.D
1	I am okay with my present working conditions	4.3	13.0	30.8	43.2	8.6	2.61	.967
2	Work pressure puts stress on me	10.8	21.1	49.2	14.6	4.3	3.19	.964
3	I feel safe at work	2.2	39.5	36.8	17.3	4.3	3.18	.894
4	The company provides me with adequate leave and holiday period	4.3	16.8	27.0	43.2	8.6	2.65	1.000
5	My company does a lot as regards the health and safety of its employees	2.2	21.6	28.1	45.9	2.2	2.76	.891

Table 1: describes the responses of participants as regards the well-being of employees. In item 1, the table shows that majority of the respondents, precisely 80(43.2%) disagree with the statement. Also a significant number of the respondents specifically 57(30.8%) were neutral while 24(13.0%) respondents tend to agree with the statement. 16(8.3%) of the respondents strongly disagree as opposed to the remaining 8(4.3%) who strongly agree with the statement. The implication of the mean at 2.61 indicates that most of the respondents are inclined towards disagree. In item 2, a vast number of the respondents 91(49.2%) are neutral while 39(21.1%) agree with the statement. Also 20(10.8%) of the respondents strongly agree while 27(14.6%) disagree with the statement. Only 8(4.3%) of the respondents strongly disagree with the statement. The implication of the mean at 3.19 indicates that most of the respondents are leaning towards agree. In item 3, a greater number of the respondents

73(39.5%) elected to agree with the statement. Although 68(36.8%) of the workforce were neutral, 32(17.3%) of the respondents disagree while 8(4.3%) strongly disagree with the statement. Only 4(2.2%) of the workforce strongly agree with the statement. The implication of the mean at 3.18 indicates that most of the respondents are leaning towards agree. In item 4, Majority of the respondents, precisely 80(43.2%) of the workforce tend to disagree with the statement while 50(27%) of the respondents are neutral. 31(16.8%) tends to agree with the statement while 16(8.6%) of the workforce strongly disagree with the statement. Only 8(4.3%) of the workforce tend to strongly agree with the statement. The implication of the mean at 2.65 indicates that most of the respondents are leaning towards disagree. Finally in item 5, 85 respondents constituting a majority of 45.9% disagree with the statement while 52(28.1%) are neutral. Also 40(21.6%) of the workforce agree with the statement. Of the 8 respondents remaining, 4 respondents tend to strongly agree while the other 4 strongly disagree with the statement each making up 2.2% of the entire workforce. The implication of the mean at 2.76 indicates that most of the respondents are leaning towards disagree.

Research Question Two: What effect does compensation have on the level of effectiveness of the employee in tourism firms in Port Harcourt?

Table 2: Employee responses regarding Compensation

S/No	Items	SA (%)	A (%)	U (%)	D (%)	SD (%)	\bar{x}	S.D
1	My company pays me well	2.2	27.6	29.2	32.4	8.6	2.82	1.003
2	I believe more incentives should be included in my total reward package	75.1	20.5	2.2	2.2	0	4.69	.625
3	I am not satisfied with my current pay	13.0	39.5	37.3	8.1	2.2	3.53	.897
4	I prefer in-kind rewards to cash rewards	33.0	3.8	2.2	18.9	42.2	2.66	1.771
5	I receive allowances for special duties and overtime on the job	11.9	19.5	38.4	30.3	0	2.13	.980

The Table 2 above shows that in item 1 most of the respondents 60(32.4%) tend to disagree with the statement. 54(29.2%) are neutral while 51(27.6%) agree with the statement. Only 16(8.6%) of the respondents strongly disagree as opposed to 4(2.2%) who strongly agree with the statement. The implication of the mean at 2.82 indicates that most of the respondents are leaning towards disagree. In item 2, a great number of the respondents precisely 139(75.1%) strongly agree with the statement. Another 38(20.5%) also agree with the statement. Of the remaining 8 respondents 4(2.2%) are neutral while the other 4(2.2%) disagree with the statement, none of the respondents strongly disagree with the statement. The implication of the mean at 4.69 indicates that most of the respondents are leaning strongly towards agree. In item 3, majority of the respondents specifically 73(39.5%) of the workforce agree with the statement. 69(37.3%) are neutral while 24(13.0%) strongly agree with the statement. Also 15(8.1%) of the respondents as well as 4(2.2%) tends to disagree and strongly disagree with the statement respectively. The implication of the mean at 3.53 indicates that most of the respondents are leaning towards agree. The table also shows in item 4 that the highest number of respondents precisely 78(42.2%) of the respondents strongly disagree with the statement as opposed to 61(33.0%) who strongly agree with the statement. Also it shows that 35(18.9%) of the workforce disagree while 7(3.8%) agree with the statement. Only 4(2.2%) are neutral. The implication of the mean at 2.66 indicates that most of the respondents are leaning towards disagree. Finally in item 5, most respondents 71(38.4%) are neutral about the statement. 56(30.3%) disagree, 36(19.5%) agree while

22(11.9%) strongly agree with the statement. None of the respondents strongly disagree with the statement. The implication of the mean at 3.12 indicates that most of the respondents are leaning towards disagree.

Test of Hypotheses

Hypothesis One: Employee well-being has no significant effect on the level of effectiveness of the employee in tourism firms in Port Harcourt.

Table 3a: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.663 ^a	.440	.431	.37617

- a. Predictors: (Constant), Employee Well-being Table 3a above revealed that there is a strong relationship at $R = .663$ between employee well-being and the level of effectiveness of the employee. An examination of the table shows that $R^2 = .440$ which implies that employee well-being accounts for 44% of variations having a significant effect on the level of effectiveness of the employee.

Table 3b: ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	20.123	3	6.708	47.403	.000b
	Residual	25.612	181	.142		
	Total	45.735	184			

- a. Dependent Variable: Effectiveness b. Predictors: (Constant), Employee Well-being Table 3b shows that the F-value is the Mean Square Regression (6.708) divided by the Mean Square Residual (0.142), yielding $F=47.403$. From the results, the model in this table is statistically significant ($Sig = .000$). Therefore, employee well-being is a significant predictor of effectiveness at $F(3,184) = 47.403$.

Table 3c: Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.782	.236		3.309	.001
	EW	.230	.054	.266	4.272	.000

- a. Dependent Variable: Effectiveness The table above revealed the degree of influence of employee well-being on the effectiveness of the employee and its level of significance. The statistical results is given as; (Employee Well-being; $\beta=.230$; $t=4.272$; $p<0.01$). The statistical result implies that employee well-being is a statistically significant predictor of effectiveness. Linear Regression Model is given as $Y = a + \beta X$ Where $Y = \text{Effectiveness}$ $a = \text{constant}$ $\beta x = \text{Coefficient of } X$ Therefore $\text{Effectiveness} = .782 + 0.230EW$ Based on the results in the Anova table above, the significance level for all items are less than 0.01 therefore we accept the alternative hypothesis and reject the null hypothesis. That is, employee well-being has a significant effect on the level of effectiveness of the employee.

a. Predictors: (Constant), Compensation Table 4a above revealed that there is a relationship at $R = .740$ between compensation and the level of effectiveness of the employee. An examination of the table shows that the $R^2 = .548$ which implies that compensation accounts for 54.8% of variations having a significant effect on the level of effectiveness of the employee.

Table 4b: ANOVAa

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	25.064	3	8.355	73.155	.000 ^b
	Residual	20.671	181	.114		
	Total	45.735	184			

a. Dependent Variable: Effectiveness b. Predictors: (Constant), Compensation Table 3b shows that the F-value is the Mean Square Regression (8.355) divided by the Mean Square Residual (0.114), yielding $F = 73.155$. The model reveals that compensation is statistically significant at ($\text{Sig} = .000$) therefore it is a significant predictor of effectiveness at $F(3, 184) = 73.155$.

Table 3c: Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.806	.203		3.973	.000
	COMP	.146	.047	.161	3.118	.002

a. Dependent Variable: Effectiveness The table above revealed the degree of influence compensation had on the effectiveness of the employee and its level of significance. The statistical results is given as; (Compensation; $\beta = .146$; $t = 3.118$; $p < 0.05$). The statistical result implies that compensation is a statistically significant predictor of the level of effectiveness of the employees. Linear Regression Model is given as $Y = a + \beta X$ Where $Y = \text{Effectiveness}$ $a = \text{constant}$ $\beta x = \text{Coefficient of } X$ Therefore $\text{Effectiveness} = .806 + 0.146\text{COMP}$ Based on the results in the Anova table above, the significant levels for compensation is less than 0.01 therefore we accept the alternative hypothesis and reject the null hypothesis. That is, compensation has a significant effect on the level of effectiveness of the employee.

Discussion of Findings

The findings of this study are presented below in line with the objectives of the study: effect does employee well-being have on the level of effectiveness of employees in tourism firms in Port Harcourt. The findings of this study are based on statistical data analyses and hypothesis testing. The descriptive analysis of data collected revealed that the above stated employee well-being is a significant predictor of effectiveness. Therefore, the alternate hypothesis which states that employee well-being has a significant effect on the level of effectiveness of the employee is accepted and the null hypothesis rejected. These findings corroborate the findings of Lin (2013) in the research titled assessment of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation on employee productivity. Findings from the study revealed that intrinsic factors like employee well-being and tourism firms policy have a significant effect on employee's effectiveness which is also a measure of productivity. This was further validated by Jibowo (2007) establishing that intrinsic motivation is a significant predictor of employee effectiveness and plays a major role in improving employee productivity and productivity levels in an organization. He further stated that managers should ensure that employee's well-being is taken

seriously and that employees are extrinsically well rewarded to remain intrinsically committed to their jobs.

To examine the effect of compensation on the level of effectiveness of the employees. The findings from the study reveal that compensation is a significant predictor of employee effectiveness. As such the alternate hypothesis which states that compensation has a significant effect on the level of effectiveness of the employee was accepted while the null was rejected. Findings also showed that compensation was rated highly by the respondents and is believed to have a great effect on the level of effectiveness of the employees. This could be due to the fact that extrinsic factors especially monetary rewards tend to appeal more to employees especially in developing nations where the standard of living is poor and basic amenities are lacking is seen as a way of fulfilling other needs which intrinsic factors may not provide. These findings correspond with the findings of Taylor & Vest (1992) in his research, which investigated the influence of monetary incentives and its removal on employee's productivity and productivity; it was observed that subjects in the experimental group who received monetary incentives performed better than those who did not. Also (Assam, 2002) further pointed out in his study that extrinsic factors like adequate compensation tend to positively influence the level of a employee's effectiveness much more than intrinsic factors.

CONCLUSION

The concept of motivation may be complex particularly in the workplace and may pose a serious challenge to managers as it is relative to individuals. This is because people differ in what they need and want as such what may be seen as a source of motivation to an individual may not seem so to another. Although, several factors may affect employee productivity levels in an tourism firm such as tourism firms culture, leadership style, tourism firms strategy and structure etc. The aspect of motivation however plays a major role in improving employee productivity levels and therefore should not be underestimated. This study concludes that employee motivation be it intrinsic or extrinsic in nature has a significant effect and is a predictor of productivity levels in an organization.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made based on the findings of the study;

1. Managers must ensure that employees are adequately motivated. Employee well-being should be given due consideration and health and well-being programs should be organized to cater for the needs and welfare of employees.
2. Adequate compensation packages in form of monetary or non-monetary rewards are essential in order to ensure that employees stay productive. Management should ensure that rewards and benefits are fairly, justly, and competitively allocated to employees.

REFERENCES

- Akerele, A. (2001). Role of labour in productivity. *Nigeria Journal of Industrial Relation*, 5, 50-58.
- Allis, O., & Ryan, P. (2008). *Zero to One Million* (1stEd.): McGraw-Hills.
- Aluko, N. (November, 2014). 6 Challenges Facing Tourism firmsCompanies in Nigeria and Ghana. Kpakpakpa.com. Retrieved 13th January, 2017 from <http://kpakpakpa.com/spotlight/challenges-facing-manufacturing-in-nigeria-ghana/>
- Altinoz, M., Kakiroglu, D., & Cop, S. (2012). The effect of job satisfaction of the talented employees on tourism firmscommitment: A field research. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 58, 322-330.
- Andrews, S. (2009). *Human Resource Management: A Textbook for Hospitality Tourism firm*. Tata McGraw Hill
- Assam, A. P. (2002). *Motivation and job satisfaction*. (Unpublished Masters' Thesis, University of Lagos, Nigeria.)
- Baase, C. M. D. (2009). Testimony before the senate committee on health, education, labor and pensions 23. *International Journal of Management, Business, and Administration*, 17(1), 4-9.
- Banjoko, S. (2006). *Managing Corporate Reward Systems*, Lagos: Pumarck Nigeria Limited. Banjoko, S. A (2010). *Human resources management*. Lagos: Saban Publishers.
- Basset-Jones, N. & Lloyd, G. C. (2005), Does herzberg's motivational theory have staying power? *Journal of Management Development*, 24(10), 57-56.
- Bernadin J. H. (2005). *Human Resource Management, an Experimental Approach*, (4th Edition) McGraw Hill/Irin (Boston), USA, 252 – 253 Bernardin, H. J. (2007). *Human Resource Management: An Experiential Approach*. Tata McGraw Hill
- Brady, M. (2000). Employee work engagement: Best practices for employers. *Research Works:Partnership for Workplace Mental Health*, 1, 1-11.
- Centers, R. & Bugental D. E. (2007), Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations among different aspects of the working population. *Journal ofApplied Psychology*, 15(1), 7-20.
- Ezulike, A. (2001). "Evaluating productivity level in Nigerian civil service: A case study of Imo State" *Unpublished Postgraduate Thesis*, Calabar: University of Calabar.
- George, J. M. & Jones, G. R. (2012). *Understanding and Managing Tourism firmsBehavior*. 6th edition. Reading, MA: Prentice Hall.
- Greenberg, J., & Baron, R. A. (2003). *Behavior in tourism firms: Understanding and managing the human side of work*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice
- Hamidi, N., Saberi, H., & Safari, M. (2014). The effect of implementation of talent management on job satisfaction governmental tourism firms (Case Study: Ministry of Roads and Urban). *Journal of Novel Applied Sciences*, 3(1), 100-113
- Harris, P. (2001). The impact of working life on health behavior: The effect of job strain on the cognitive predictors of exercise. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 7, 342-353.
- Hellriegel, D. S. (1996). *Management* 7th ed. Cincinnati Ohio: South Western college publishing.
- Iheriohanma, E. (2006). Perceiving employee's interest in participatory management: issues and challenges, *International Journal of Social Sciences*, 5: 113-129.
- James A. F, Stoner, R. F. (2009). *Management*. Patarang, Delhi, India: Dorling Kindersley.
- James, C. (2014). "The warning signs of a demotivated workforce". LinkedIn, retrieved on May 12, 2017 from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZIVT_9LUJMc
- Jennifer, M. & George, G. R. (2006). *Contemporary Management. Creating value in tourism firms*. New York, USA: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Jibowo, A. A. (2007). —Effect of motivators and hygiene factors on job productivity among extension employees in the former Western State of Nigerial. *The Quarterly Journal of Administration*, 12 (1):45-54.
- Lawler, E. E. (2003). Reward practices and productivity management 52 system effectiveness. Center for effective tourism firms.
- Lu, L., Cooper, C. L. & Lin, H. Y (2013). A cross-cultural examination of presentism and supervisory support. *Career Development International*, 18, 440–456

- Lumley, E. J., Coetzee, M., Tladinyane, R., & Ferreira, N. (2011). Exploring the job Satisfaction and tourism firmscommitment of employees in the information technology Environment. *Southern African Business Review*, 15(1), 100-118.
- Maimuna, M. N., & Rashad, Y. F. (2013). The impact of employee training and development on employee productivity. *Global Journal of Commerce and Management Perspective*, 2(6), 91-93
- Martocchio, J. (2006). *Strategic Compensation: A Human Resource Management Approach*, New Jersey: Prentice Hall
- Maslow, A. (1954). *Motivation and Personality*. New York: New York Harper& Row.
- Mathis, Robert L., & John H. Jackson. (2003). *Human Resource Management*. (11 th Ed). Mason, OH: Thomson/South-Western.
- Mbogou, G. (2001). Implications of leadership styles of Administrators on Job Productivity in Two Selected Tourism firms in Owerri, Imo State” *Unpublished Thesis*, Calabar: University of Calabar
- McNamara C., (2003). *Field Guide to Leadership and Supervision for Nonprofit Staff*. (2nd Ed.). Amazon
- Noe, R. A., Hollenbeck, J. R., Gerhart, B. & Wright, P.M. (2006) *Human resource management* (5th Ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Nwachukwu, C. C (2004). Effective leadership and productivity. Evidence from a national survey of industrial organization. *African Journal for the study of Social Issues*, 1: 38 46.
- Obikeze, S. O. (2005). *Personnel Management*. Onitsha: Book point ltd.
- Ofori, D., & Aryeetey, M. (2011). Recruitment and selection practices in small and medium enterprises: Perspectives from Ghana. *International Journal of Business Administration*, 2 (3), 45-60.
- Osuagwu, L. (2006). *Business Research Methodology: Principles and Practice*. Surulere, Grey Resource Limited.
- Reilly, P. (2003). “New Approaches in Reward: Their Relevance to the Public Sector”, *PublicMoney and Management*, 23, 4:245-352.
- Robbins, S. P., & Coulter, M. (2009). *Management*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Sunia, F. (2014). Factors that predict employee retention in profit and not-for-profit Tourism firms. *Global Journal of Human Resource Management* 2(4), 1-8.
- Tongo, C. I. (2005). “Public service motivation in Edo state of Nigeria” in *Wither Nigeria* (14th General Assembly Proceedings), *Social Science Academy of Nigeria*, 188-198.
- Tyson S. (1999). Human resource strategy: A process for managing the contribution of HRM to tourism firms productivity, in Schuler, R.S., Jackson, S.E. (Ed), *Strategic human resource management*, 110-123.
- Yesufu T. M. (2000). *The human factor in national development*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Limited.