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Abstract

This study examined the influence of job satisfaction on employees’ performance of hotel industry in Lagos State. The study adopted a structured questionnaires to collect data from 330 employees of 63 hotels in the 20 LGAs of Lagos State. Data analysis was performed using Partial Least Square Structural Equation Modelling. It arisen from the study that the relationship between job stress, promotion opportunity and supervisory support, and employees’ performance are statistically significant. In addition, the relationship between payment system and workplace environment, and employees’ performance are not significant. The discoveries offer noteworthy inferences for managers of hotels in Lagos State to give more attention to staff promotion matters for enhanced job performance. The findings further provides significant implication for hotel operators in Lagos State to take staff support initiatives seriously. To the best of our knowledge, the study presents the first major study that proposed and validated job satisfaction and employees’ performance (JOPEF) model for hotels in Lagos State. The new model provide hotel business operators, the government and academics with new insight into the association between job satisfaction and employees’ performance of hotels in an emerging economy.
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Introduction

In the last five years, the performances of hotels in Lagos State had consistently declined thus, exhibiting un-encouraging average occupancy. Average occupancy in this context is a statistical index that represents the physical capacity utilization of accommodation facility hence, used to assess the degree of hotel staff performance (Sun & Lu, 2005; Igbojekwe, 2008). Recent available statistics of hotels in Lagos State shows a non-encouraging hotel occupancy rate of 55%, 44%, 35.2%, 51% and 52% in 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017 and 2018 respectively (Jll, 2016, 2017, 2018 & 2019). The fact that Lagos State hosts about 60% of total hotels and other brands of accommodation establishment in Nigeria makes this data more frightening. This implies that the physical capacity of hotel facilities in Nigeria and Lagos State in particular are underutilized. It was reported that the degree of employees’ performance in an organization is a function of the extent of individual employees’ job satisfaction (Pushpakumari, 2008; Marina,
2017). Ashley, Jeffrey, Oliver & Stephanie (2017) opined that job satisfaction is the most
important element needed for a positive employee’s performance. A satisfied worker is a
productive worker (Latif, Ahmad, Qasim, Mushtaq, Ferdoo & Naeem, 2013). A satisfied
workforce creates a pleasant atmosphere within the organization to perform well (Singh & Jain,
2013). Employee that is job satisfied are less likely to exhibits counter productive work
behavior (Milkovich & Newman, 2008). The problem essentially that call for this study is that
hotel employees had consistently been confronted with dimensions of job satisfaction that is
perceived to be limiting their job performance. These dimensions of job satisfaction include:
accessible promotion opportunity (Evans & Gibb, 2009), and nature of work environment (Lee,
Lain & Chen, 1999; Wistow, Blackman, Byrne & Wistow, 2015). Others include extent of
supervisors’ support (Gupta, Kumar & Singh, 2014; Kang, Gatling & Kim, 2014), magnitude
of job stress (Sprigg & Jackson, 2006), and nature of payment system (McKay, Jefferys,
Paraksevopoulou & Keles, 2012). Empirical literatures that examined the correlation between
job stress and employees’ job performance mainly focused on educational sector (Vazi, Ruiter,
marine industry (Dwamena, 2012), banking industry (Ramzan, 2013; Zeb & Rehman, 2015)
and construction company (Iroegbu, 2014) with limited attention on hotel industry in Lagos
State. The current study therefore intends to fill this gap.

Secondly, studies that examined the relationship between payment system and
employees’ job performance focused on Medical Institutions of Pakistan (Alamdar,
Muhammad, Muhammad & Wasim, 2011), banking industry in Turkey (Pushpakumari, 2008),
hotel industry in China (Gu & Siu, 2009) and marketing companies in Taiwan (Inés & Pedro,
2011). Thirdly, hypothetically studies had examined the correlation between work environment
and employees’ job performance in respect of education industry in Indonesia, Pakistan and
Nigeria (Khan et al., 2011; Amusa, Iyoro & Olabisi, 2013; Aisha, Hardjomidjojo & Yasserli,
2013), and commercial banks in Malaysia (Hameed & Amjad, 2009; Gitahi, 2014). Fourthly,
previous empirical literatures had examined the correlation between promotion opportunity and
employees’ job performance in respect of medical institutions (Alamdar et al., 2011), service
industry (Pushpakumari, 2008), governmental institutions (Sensoca & Philips, 2011) and
manufacturing industry (Ziang & Linchau, 2010). Fifthly, studies that examined the correlation
between supervisor’s support and employees’ job performance have mainly focused on the
organizations in the UK (Axtell & Maitlis, 1997), Malaysia (Ismail, Chandra Segaran,
Cheekiong & Ong, 2007; Ismail, Abu Bakar, Abang Abdullah & Chandra Segaran, 2008), the
USA (Nijman, 2004; Chiaburu & Takleab, 2005) and Taiwan (Tai, 2006). In view of the above
studies it is obvious that no in-depth explorations had reported the relationship between each
of the dimensions of job satisfaction and employees’ job performance in respect of hotel
industry in Nigeria and more so Lagos State. The gaps arisen from these studies call for the
current study hence, aims to examine the relationship between each dimensions of job
satisfaction and employees’ job performance in respect of hotel industry in Lagos State.

Literature review

Theoretical underpinning: Affect theory

The Two-factor theory proposed by Fredrick Herzberg in 1964 (Robbins & Judge, 2009) was
adopted in the current study. The theory was first used in the domain of human behavior in
organization. It has exploration based on motivational characteristics of the job. The theory
postulates that hygiene and motivational factors are responsible for job satisfaction or
discontentment hence, impacted on employees’ performance (Robbins, 2003). This theory is
relevant to the current study in that it recognizes that employees have two categories of needs
that operate in them. The theory therefore can guide researchers to establishing determinants
of employees’ satisfaction including, its corresponding impact on employees’ performance. As it applies to the present study, the theory posits that employees in the hotel industry in Lagos State that are satisfied with their jobs, tend to experience high performance if hygiene factors and motivators such as job stress, payment system, work environment, promotion opportunities and supervisor’s support are integrated into the management of hotel industry in the State.

**Definitions of job satisfaction**

Job satisfaction is described as an attitude towards job (Pushpakumari, 2008; Cranny, Smith & Stone, 2014). It is a set of pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences (Robbins, 2005; Bram, Song & Tapon, 2007). Smith, Kendall and Hulin (2007) opined that job satisfaction is an affective responses to facets of the job. Schermerhorn, Hunt and Osborn (2001) defined job satisfaction as the degree to which an individual feel positively or negatively about his or her job. Job satisfaction explains general attitude towards work influenced by the perception of one’s job (Singh & Jain, 2013). The index in the above definitions show that job satisfaction is the extent of pleasure or contentment associated with a job. Based on Maslow’s theory, job satisfaction has been approached by some researchers from the perspective of need fulfillment. According to Simatwa (2011), job satisfaction means a function which is positively related to the degree to which one’s personal needs are fulfilled in the job situation. Job satisfaction is also defined as reintegration of affect produced by individual’s perception of fulfillment of his needs in relation to his work (Pushpakumari, 2008). Job satisfaction depict employees' happiness and fulfillment of their desires at work (Rana & Singh, 2016b). This implies that an employee with low expectations can be more satisfied with a certain job than someone who has high expectations. Weiss (2012) defined job satisfaction as feelings of contentment that the job is assisting in achieving one's goals. Smith (2009) stated that those feelings are caused by the difference between what is expected from the job and what is actually experienced. The index in these definitions shows that the sense of achievement and success that employees feel with their daily work routine is being referred to as job satisfaction. Job satisfaction may also be view as the extent employees like to perform their jobs (Andrew, 2001; Simatwa, 2011). Job satisfaction is worker’s contentment with their organization and their daily duties and responsibilities (Rana & Singh, 2016a).

From the above definitions, it is clear that job satisfaction has three elements. Firstly, it referred to employees’ positive feelings towards all facets of their jobs. Secondly, discrete job elements should cumulate into fulfillment of employees’ needs. Thirdly, the nature of the job, including the corresponding fulfillment employees derived from engaging in it should poise them into performance. Therefore, the working definition of job satisfaction for this study implied attitudinal behavior of individual hotel workers resulting from the appraisal of one’s job experiences and the extent the job could meet their expectations thereby motivating them to perform.

**The concept of employees’ performance**

Pushpakumari (2008) defined job performance in terms of effort extended to the job by employee. Pradhan and Jena (2016) defined job performance as individuals work achievement after exerting required effort on the job. Job performance is therefore defined as the employees’ outcome or contributions in reference to the attainment of set goals (Viswesvaran & Ones, 2000). Job performance is defined as the art to complete the task within the defined boundaries (Igbal, Ijaz, Latif & Mushtaq, 2015). Perrin (2016) and Dhaifallah, Ebrahim, Durrishah Raheleh & Talal Ratyan (2013) defined job performance as an individual outcome based on the set standards in terms of accuracy and completeness over a specified period. Job
en:  

**Job performance** is the development of quantified objectives (Armstrong, 2006; Platt & Sobotka, 2010), and the degree of an achievement to which an employee fulfills the organizational mission at workplace (Sabir, Iqbal, Rehman, Shah & Yameen, 2012). These definitions connotes that job performance is the combined result of effort, ability and perception of tasks. Muchinsky (2003) suggested that job performance is the set of employees’ behavior that can be measured, monitored and evaluated. Gibson (2012) defined job performance as a measure of employees’ morale, effective and efficient completion of mutually agreed tasks. Job performance involves the recurring activities to establish organizational goals, monitor progress and make adjustments to achieve those goals more effectively and efficiently (Dhaifallah et al., 2013). Platt & Sobotka (2010) defined job performance as quality and quantity achieved by individuals or group of employees after fulfilling a task. Nmadu (2013) defined job performance as a degree of accomplishment of tasks measured against pre-set standards of accuracy, completeness, cost and speed. Job performance is associated with quantity of output, quality of output, timeliness of output, presence or attendance on the job, morale at work, efficiency and effectiveness of work completed (Mathis, Fredrick & Kenneth, 2009). Lee et al. (1999) summarized the concept of job performance in respect of quality, efficiency, and effectiveness of employees. According to the authors, efficiency refers to the workers' output rate and the ability to achieve tasks before deadline. Effectiveness refers to the workers' goal accomplishment, and quality refers to workers' error and complaint rate, managers' satisfaction, customers' satisfaction, and colleagues' satisfaction. Therefore, the working definition of job performance for this study connotes workers' output rate and the ability to achieve tasks before deadline, with limited error and complaint rate in line with hotel organizational set goals.

**Empirical review and hypotheses development**

**Relationship between job stress and employees’ job performance**

Job stress is the perception of a discrepancy between environmental demands and individual capacities to fulfill these demands (Topper, 2007). It is the inability to cope with the pressures in a job (Holmlund-Rytkönen & Strandvik, 2005). Several studies found that job stress influences employees’ overall performance (Karadal, Ay & Cuhadar, 2008; Nilufar, Zaini, David & Syed, 2009; Usman, Ahmed, Ahmed & Akbar, 2011; Hans, Mubeen & Saadi, 2014). Ramzan (2013) and Ramay (2010) examined the impact of job stress on job performance of employees of banking sector in Pakistan. The results show that there is negative and significant relationship. Zeb and Rehman (2015) examined the impact of job stress on employees’ job performance of the banking sector in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Pakistan. The result shows a negative and significant relationship. Iroegbu (2014) investigated impact of role overload on job performance among construction workers. The result shows a negative and significant relationship. Khamisa and Peltzer (2016) examined the impact of employees’ job stressors on job performance of the Canadian firms. The result shows a negative relationship. Ali et al. (2014) investigated the impact of job stress on teacher's performance in Cameroon. The result shows a negative correlation. The gap in these literatures shows that various studies had examined the impact of stress on job performance in the educational sector (Hanif, 2004; Kholifat & Almatarneh, 2010; Vazi et al., 2013; Ali et al, 2014), marine industry (Dwamena, 2012), banking industry (Ramay, 2010; Ramzan, 2013; Zeb & Rehman, 2015) and construction company (Iroegbu, 2014). However, study that examined this phenomenon in the context of hotel industry in Nigeria and more so in Lagos State have not being reported. As such, we assume the following hypothesis:
There is no significant relationship between job stress and employees’ job performance of hotel industry in Lagos State.

Relationship between payment system and employees’ job performance
Dessler (2011) and Armstrong (2006) explained payment system as financial benefits employees receive for continuing their employment with a company. Armstrong (2006) defined payment system as the process of providing financial reward to an individual. Different findings showed that worthy association exist between payment system and employees’ job performance (Omar & Ogenyi, 2006; Uwe, 2006; Milkovich & Newman, 2008; Singh & Loncar, 2010). The evidences in Taiwan suggest that there exist a positive association between bonuses and employees’ job performance (Saetang, Sulumnad, Thampitak & Sungkaew 2010). Viswesvaran and Ones (2000) conducted study of the effectiveness of payment plans in the hotel industry and found that payment plans were related to higher revenues, increased profits and decreased cost. In a related study, Wall, Michie, Patterson, Wood, Sheehan, Clegg & West (2004) found that satisfactory payment system affect job performance among employees. Alamdar et al. (2011) investigated the impact of job satisfaction on employee job performance in autonomous Medical Institutions of Pakistan. Findings revealed that pay affect employees’ performance. Pushpakumari (2008) investigated the impact of job satisfaction on job performance of hotels in Istanbul, Turkey. The result revealed a positive correlation. Nimalathasan and Brabete (2010) carried out a study on job satisfaction and job performance. The findings revealed a positive relationship. A study conducted by Gu and Siu (2009) on relationship between payment satisfaction and job performance among employees working in Macao casino hotels found a significant relationship. Other empirical evidences that validates a positive correlation between payment system and employees’ job performance include: Gneezy and Rustichini (2000); Gardner, Dyne and Pierce (2004); Tessema and Soeters (2006). Based on these reviews, it is obvious that limited study had examined this phenomenon in the context of hotel industry in Nigeria and more so in Lagos State. As such, we assume the following hypothesis:

There is no significant correlation between payment system and job performance of hotel industry in Lagos State.

Relationship between promotion opportunity and employees’ job performance
Promotion refers to advancement of an employee to a higher post, carrying greater responsibilities, higher status and better salary (Dessler, 2008; Danish & Usman, 2010; Gupta, 2011). Promotion is therefore an important practice to ensuring mutual existence between the organization and employees (Kosteas, 2009). Firms uses promotion as a reward for highly productive workers, creating an incentive for workers to exert greater effort (Cobb-Clark, 2001, Francesconi 2001). Previous studies had assessed the relationship between promotions and job performance (Oettinger, 2001; McCausland, Pouliakas & Theodossiou, 2005; Latif et al., 2013; Noraani & Zaizura, 2013; Chepkwony & Oloko, 2014). The results of these studies show a direct and positive association between promotional opportunities and job performance. Alamdar et al. (2011) investigated the impact of job satisfaction on employee performance in Autonomous Medical Institutions of Pakistan. The result shows that promotion affects employees’ performance. Pushpakumari (2008) investigated the impact of job satisfaction on job performance of hotels in Istanbul, Turkey. The result revealed a positive correlation. Tessema and Soeters (2006) concluded that there is positive relationship between promotion practices and perceived job performance of employee. Based on the above studies it is obvious that no in-depth explorations had been reported on the relationship between promotion
opportunity and job performance of hotels in Lagos State Nigeria. As such from the previous discussion, we assume the following hypothesis:

\[ H_03: \text{There is no significant correlation between promotion opportunity and job performance of hotel industry in Lagos State.} \]

**Relationship between supervisors’ support and employees’ job performance**

Supervisor support is defined as employees’ views concerning the degree to which their supervisors’ value their contributions and care about their well-being (Banthumnavian, 2003). According to Shuck (2011), supervisors’ support in the workplace can be in three forms, including emotional support (i.e., showing empathy, acceptance and care), informative support (i.e., giving feedback or guidance at work) and material support such as preparing budget, aids, resources and tangible assistance that are related to work to improve the employees. According to Armstrong et al. (2004), supervisor support has significant influence on employees’ job performance. Other studies about the role of supervisors’ support on employees’ job performance in the UK organizations (Axtell & Maitlis, 1997) and in the North Kuching City Hall, Malaysia (Ismail et al., 2008) generally showed that properly implemented supervisors’ support correlates job performance in a workplace. Almdar et al. (2011) investigated the impact of job satisfaction on employee job performance in Autonomous Medical Institutions of Pakistan. The findings revealed that supervisors’ support affects employees’ job performance. Okpara (2004) conducted a study of IT managers in Nigeria and found that job performance among managers can be increased with the help of supervisors’ support. The gap observed based on the above studies is that no in-depth explorations had been reported on the relationship between supervisor’s support and job performance of hotels in Lagos State. As such from the previous discussion, we assume the following hypothesis:

\[ H_04: \text{There is no significant correlation between supervisors’ support and job performance of hotel industry in Lagos State.} \]

**Relationship between workplace environment and employees’ job performance**

Workplace environment is an important factor that determines employees’ productivity (Chandrasekar, 2011; Leblebici, 2012). The quality of the employees’ workplace environment impacted on employees’ job performance (Heath, 2006; El-Zeiny, 2013). When people are working in situations that suit their physical and mental abilities, the correct fit between the person and work task is accomplished (Leblebici, 2012; Garg & Talwar, 2017). Having a proper workplace environment helps in reducing the number of absenteeism and as a result increases job performance (Boles, Pelletier & Lynch, 2004). Gitahi (2014) empirically examined effect of workplace environment on job performance of commercial banks employees in Nakuru Town. The study found that workplace environment boosts job performance. Naharuddin and Sadegi (2013) examined correlation between workplace environment and job performance of Miyazu Malaysia. Findings showed that physical workplace environment had a significant relationship towards job performance. Aisha et al. (2013) examined effects of working ability, working condition, motivation and incentive on employees’ multi-dimensional performance. Result showed that working conditions have a significant effect on employee performance. Amusa, Iyoro and Olabisi (2013) studied work environments and job performance of librarians in public universities in South-West Nigeria. The findings revealed a significant correlation between work environment and job performance. Khan, Azhar, Parveen, Naeem and Sohail (2011) examined association of workplace environment and infrastructure on job performance of educational institutions in Pakistan. Result shows a positive and significant relationship. Hameed and Amjad (2009)
examined the relationship between workplace environment design and job performance of 31 bank branches. The result shows a significant relationship. The gap in these empirical literatures shows that limited study had examined this phenomenon in the context of hotel industry in Nigeria and more so in Lagos State. As such from these review, we assume the following hypothesis:

\[ H_{05}: \text{There is no significant relationship between work environment and job performance of hotel industry in Lagos State.} \]

**Operational Framework**

This study aimed to determine the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance of hotels in Lagos State. To achieve the objective of the current study, job satisfaction and job performance operational framework (JOPEF) for hotel industry in Lagos State was proposed as shown in Figure 1.

![Figure 1: Job satisfaction and job performance model (JOPEF) for hotel industry in Lagos State.](image1.jpg)

**Research methodology**

The JOPEF model comprise of independent variable of five dimensions (i.e., job stress, payment system, promotion opportunities, supervisors’ support and workplace environment). The dependent variable for the study is employees’ job performance. The JOPEF model is therefore expected to explain the relationship between the five dimensions of job satisfaction and the dependent variable (i.e., employees’ job performance) of selected hotels in Lagos State, Nigeria. This study adopts a survey research design. The research population used in the study comprised of 792 registered hotels in the 20 LGAs in Lagos State Nigeria. 2. Since it is practically impossible for the researchers to sample the entire staff in each of the 63 selected
hotels in the 20 LGAs in Lagos State hence, Taro Yamane formula which is given as follows were adopted to determine the sample size:

\[ n = \frac{X}{1 + N (e)^2} \]

Where \( n \) = sample size.
\( X \) = Observation Unit.
\( N \) = Population Size.
\( e \) = Sample Error or level of significance.

To determine the sample size from the 63 selected hotels vis-à-vis the population of the staff, the present study conceded to the method of proportional allocation suggested in Kothari (1990). Before applying the Taro Yamane formula as suggested in Sekaran (2003), the researchers contacted the management of the 63 selected hotels to obtain the total number of staff on their employment thus, the populations (\( N \)) size of 1,624 staff out of which the sample size of 330 were obtained. Convenience sampling technique were adopted by the researchers to administer the questionnaires in each of the 63 selected hotels until the sample size of 330 were met.

The questionnaire used in this study has three sections; section 1 contains the respondent’s bio data such as age, marital status, gender, religion etc. Section 2 contains five dimensions of job satisfaction (i.e., job stress, payment system, workplace environment, promotion opportunity, and supervisor support) and section 3 contains measures of employees’ job performance, all structured on a five (5) point likert scale with weights assigned as follows: 5 - strongly agree, 4 - agree, 3 – neutral, 2 - disagree, and 1 – strongly disagree. Job stress were measured by the Occupational Roles Questionnaire (ORQ) from Wu et al. (2010) and Occupational Stress Indicator (OSI) from Chang and Lu (2009). These scales include two elements from ORQ, namely role ambiguity and role overload which comprised 10 items for each element were modified into a 6 items job stress on a 5-point Likert scale. Job description index, pay satisfaction questionnaire, and Job satisfaction survey by Intaraprasong, Dityen, Krugkrunjit & Subhadrabandhu (2012); Ramirez (2012), Özturk (2010) and Smith-Randolph (2005) were adopted and modified to measure payment system. The original instrument was used to measure pay satisfaction in a nursing context and are very similar to many in the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. The modified scale consists of 7 items. Also, 10 items workplace environment scale developed by Mohapatra & Srivastava (2003) and Chiang, Back & Canter (2005) were adopted and modified into a 6-item workplace environment scale for this study. In addition, the promotion opportunity scale developed based on Intaraprasong et al. (2012); Ramirez (2012) and Özturk (2010) studies were modified into a 4 items promotion opportunity scale used for the current study. In addition, a 4 items scale in Job description index, and Job satisfaction survey by Intaraprasong et al. (2012); Ramirez (2012) and Özturk (2010) studies were modified and used for measuring supervisors’ support. Finally, 8 items job performance survey questionnaire developed by Lee et al. (1999) were adopted, modifies and used for the current study.

Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modelling (PLS_SEM) approach that explore the linear relationships between multiple independent variables and a single or multiple dependent variable (Hair, Hult, Ringle & Sarstedt 2014; Ugwuanyi, Ehimen & Uduji, 2021) were adopted for the analysis of data collected in this study. This was done with the aid of SmartPLS v3. Software. The PLS-SEM relies on pre-specified networks of relationships between constructs as well as between construct and their measures (Hair, Hult, Ringle & Sarstedt, 2014) thus, making it different from the regular regression approach.
Results
To determine the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance of hotels in Lagos State, 5 hypotheses in JOPEF Model as shown in Figure 1 were analyzed using the following PLSSEMP analysis procedures:

Measurement model estimation
The JOPEF hypothesized model in Figure 1 was evaluated for its construct reliability including, convergent, and discriminants validity using SmartPLS 3.3 (Hair et al. 2014). As part of the requirement for the evaluation of the validity and reliability of the JOPEF hypothesized model, the researchers examined factor loadings of items variables. The result of the factor loadings of the initial JOPEF hypothesized model as shown in Figure 2 revealed that the model did not fit well with the data. Therefore, items whose factor loadings is less than acceptable threshold of 0.7 as suggested in (Hair et al., 2012; 2014; 2017) were deleted.

In view of this, having deleted the following 12 items (i.e., JOBP6, JOBP7, JOBP8, JOBS5, JOBS6, PAY6, PAY7, SUPS6, SUPS7, SUPS8, WORK6, and PROM4) from the initial JOPEF Measurement Model one item at a time starting from the lowest loading, the final JOPEF Measurement Model yielded a better result hence, fit well with the data as shown in Figure 3.

Figure 2: Initial JOPEF measurement model
Figure 3: Final JOPEF measurement model with fit factor loadings

Table 1 presents the results of the JOPEF measure model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent Variables</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Composite Reliability (AVE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>JOB1</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOB2</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOB3</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOB4</td>
<td>0.708</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOB5</td>
<td>0.770</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.851</td>
<td>0.893</td>
<td>0.627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Stress</td>
<td>JOBS1</td>
<td>0.757</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOBS2</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOBS3</td>
<td>0.727</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOBS4</td>
<td>0.761</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>0.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment System</td>
<td>PAYS1</td>
<td>0.810</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PAYS2</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PAYS3</td>
<td>0.855</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PAYS4</td>
<td>0.743</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PAYS5</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.870</td>
<td>0.905</td>
<td>0.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion Opportunity</td>
<td>PROM1</td>
<td>0.883</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROM2</td>
<td>0.893</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROM3</td>
<td>0.829</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td>0.838</td>
<td>0.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors’ Support</td>
<td>SUPS1</td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUPS2</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUPS3</td>
<td>0.795</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUPS4</td>
<td>0.722</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUPS5</td>
<td>0.781</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.851</td>
<td>0.893</td>
<td>0.627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Environment</td>
<td>WORK1</td>
<td>0.810</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WORK2</td>
<td>0.826</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WORK3</td>
<td>0.771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WORK4</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WORK5</td>
<td>0.780</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td>0.649</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Table 1 shows the result of the final JOPEF Measurement Model indicators such as Cronbach alpha (α), composite reliability (CR), and average variance extracted (AVE) including, factor loadings of all items of the study variables in the model yielded a better result.

As shown in Table 1, the results of the convergent validity of the final hypothesized JOPEF model shows that factor loadings of all the items of the variables in the final JOPEF hypothesized model exceeded the minimum acceptable threshold of 0.7 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Also, the average variance extracted (AVE) exceed the minimum acceptable threshold value of 0.5 (Hair, William, Barry & Rolph, 2010). In addition, the model was assessed for the internal consistency of the data hence, Cranach’s Alpha (α), and Composite Reliability (CR) values of all the variables meet the required threshold of 0.7. This implies that all the variables in the JOPEF model have a satisfactory level of internal consistency. Furthermore, the discriminant validity of the final JOPEF hypothesized model was assessed to assure the external consistency of the data. Based on the correlation between the latent variables, the constructs were compared with the square root of AVEs (Hair et al., 2014). The result shown that the correlations between the constructs are lower than square root of AVEs along the diagonal as shown in Table 2. This validates fulfillment of discriminant validity requirement.

Table 2: Discriminant Validity of the Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Job Performance</th>
<th>Job Stress</th>
<th>Payment System</th>
<th>Promotion Opportunity</th>
<th>Supervisor’s Support</th>
<th>Work Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Stress</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>0.766</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment System</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>0.435</td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion Opportunity</td>
<td>0.949</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>0.351</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor’s Support</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.309</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>0.941</td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Environment</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>0.361</td>
<td>0.396</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td>0.806</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Structural model hypotheses testing**

Figure 4 illustrates the structural JOPEF model.

Figure 4: Structural JOPEF Model.
The significance of the path coefficients is determined by the beta values of the coefficient of the regression and t-values which is calculated using the bootstrapping method (Hair et al., 2014). The rule of thumb of critical values for a two-tailed test ≥1.96 (significance level = 5%) is considered to be significant (Hair et al., 2014). As it applied to the current study, five direct hypothesized relationships in JOPEF model as of the following were tested. The result shows that three of the relationships were proven to be supported and two not supported as shown in Figure 4. Furthermore, for precision, Table 3 show the summary of the result of analysis as follows.

Table 3: Summary of Direct Hypothesis Testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/n</th>
<th>Hypothesized Path</th>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>T Value</th>
<th>Decisions</th>
<th>f-Squared</th>
<th>Effect size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>JOBS -&gt; JOBP</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>2.139</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>PAYS -&gt; JOBP</td>
<td>0.474</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>PROM -&gt; JOBP</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>16.547</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>SUPS -&gt; JOBP</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>6.138</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>WORK -&gt; JOBP</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>1.681</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P<0.05.

Table 3 show that the three hypotheses that were supported (i.e., H01, H03, and H04) have t-value >1.96 while the hypotheses (i.e., H02 and H05) that failed to support have t-value < 1.96 hence, shows the effect of individual latent constructs (i.e., dimensions of job satisfaction) on the dependent variable (i.e., job performance).

**Effect size**

As shown in Table 3, the effect size of dimensions of job satisfaction on the dependent variable are 0.006, 0.001, 0.767, 0.113 and 0.006 respectively. Following Cohen (1988) rule of thumb to interpret the impact of $f^2$ at the structural level, it has been suggested that the effect is large when $f^2$ is 0.35, medium when $f^2$ is 0.15 and small when $f^2$ is 0.03. Therefore, the effects sizes of Job stress, Payment system and Work environment on job performance could be viewed as small, while Promotion opportunity and Supervisors’ support could be viewed as large and medium respectively as shown in Table 3.

**Predictive relevance of the model**

This study used the blindfolding procedure to test the predictive relevance of the model (Hair et al., 2014). Predictive relevance is denoted by $Q^2$ hence, used to assess the parameter estimates, how values are built around the model including, explanations on the quality of the model (Hair et al., 2014). The rule of thumb for determining the predictive relevance of the endogenous variables is that the structural models with $Q^2$ greater than zero are considered to have predictive relevance (Hair et al. 2011). As it applied to the current study, the results were retrieved from the blindfolding output of PLS through the variable score out of which cross validated redundancy were extracted as shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Results of the Predictive Relevance of the Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>SSO</th>
<th>SSE</th>
<th>$Q^2$(1-SSE/SSO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>1650.000</td>
<td>628.607</td>
<td>0.619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Stress</td>
<td>1320.000</td>
<td>1320.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment System</td>
<td>1650.000</td>
<td>990.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion Opportunity</td>
<td>990.000</td>
<td>990.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors’ Support</td>
<td>1650.000</td>
<td>1650.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Environment</td>
<td>1650.000</td>
<td>1650.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Table 4, the results of construct cross validated redundancy show that $Q^2$ is 0.619. Since the value of $Q^2$ greater than zero is considered to have predictive relevance therefore, the structural model provides a prediction of the endogenous latent variable’s indicators.

**Discussion**

Concerning the association between job stress and employees’ job performance of hotel industry in Lagos State, the study found a significant relationship. This finding conforms to the report in Dwamena (2012) that empirically determined the impact of job stress on employees’ job performance at Ghana Ports and Harbors Authority (GPHA), Takoradi. The results of Dwamena’s study shows a significant relationship between job stress and employees’ job performance. Furthermore, the result of the current study also agrees with other existing literature such as Ramzan (2013) and Ramay (2010) that examined the impact of job stress on job performance in respect of employees of banking sector of Pakistan. The results of these studies show a significant relationship. Also, the outcome of the current study conforms to the report in Zeb and Rehman (2015) which examined the impact of job stress on employees’ job performance in the banking sector of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Pakistan. The result of their study shows a significant relationship.

Regarding the connection between payment system and job performance of hotel industry in Lagos State, the study establishes a non-significant relationship. The outcome of this study negates the outcome of the survey performed by Alamdar et al. (2011). The study investigated the impact of job satisfaction on employee job performance in an autonomous Medical Institutions of Pakistan. The findings of the study revealed that payment system correlates employees’ job performance. Also, findings of the current study negate the report in Pushpakumari (2008) that investigated the impact of job satisfaction on job performance of hotel industry in Istanbul, Turkey. The result of the study revealed a significant correlation. Furthermore, findings of the current study did not conform to the report in Gu and Siu (2009) that explored the relationship between pay satisfaction and job performance among employees of hotels in Macao Casino, China. The study found a significant relationship. Other empirical evidences that validated a significant correlation between payment system and job performance include (Gneezy & Rustichini, 2000; Gardner, Dyne & Pierce, 2004; Frye, 2004; Tessema & Soeters, 2006; Nimalathasan & Brabete, 2010). The outcome of these studies negates the result of the current study.

In addition, concerning the relationship between promotion opportunity and job performance of hotel industry in Lagos State, the study found a significant relationship. This finding agrees with the report in Alamdar et al. (2011) that investigated the impact of job satisfaction on employee performance of Autonomous Medical Institutions in Pakistan. The result of the study shows a significant correlation. Again, the outcome of the current study also conforms to the report in Pushpakumari (2008) which investigated the impact of job satisfaction on job performance of hotels in Istanbul, Turkey. The result revealed a significant correlation. Once more, the result of the current study supports the reports in Tessema & Soeters (2006) that concluded a statistically significant relationship. Other empirical evidences that aligned with the outcome of the current study include Oettinger (2001), Chepkwony and Oloko (2014) and Kreitner and Kinicki (2016) that affirmed a significant relationship.

In respect of the relationship between supervisor’s support and employees’ job performance of hotel industry in Lagos State, the study found a significant relationship. The finding of the current study conforms to the report in Alamdar et al. (2011) that investigated the impact of job satisfaction on employee’s job performance of Autonomous Medical Institutions in Pakistan. The findings revealed a significant correlation. Furthermore, the result of the current study also follows the report in Okpara (2004) that examined the relationship
between supervisor’s support and job performance of IT managers in Nigeria. The result found that a statistically significant relationship. Several studies about supervisor’s support and employees’ job performance in the UK organizations (Axtell & Maitlis, 1997) and North Kuching City Hall, Malaysia (Ismail et al., 2008) generally showed a significant relationship. Other studies have suggested a significant association between supervisor’s support and employees’ job performance (Ellinger et al., 2003; Agarwal, Angst & Magni, 2009).

Furthermore, relating the relationship between workplace environment and job performance of hotel industry in Lagos State, the study found a non-significant relationship. The finding of the current study opposes reports in Gitahi (2014) that examined the effect of workplace environment on job performance of commercial banks employees in Nakuru Town. The findings of the study showed a significant relationship. In addition, the outcome of the current study differs with the report in Naharuddin and Sadegi (2013) that studied the relationship between workplace environment and employees’ job performance in Miyazu Malaysia. The findings showed a significant relationship. Furthermore, the outcome of the current study fails to conform to the report in Aisha et al. (2013) that examined the link between workplace environment and employees’ multi-dimensional performance in an Indonesian university. The result showed a significant effect.

**Conclusion**

One of the conclusions that could be drawn from this study is that there is a positive and significant relationship between job stress and employees’ job performance of hotel industry in Lagos State. The managerial implication of this is that adequate acknowledgement or appreciation of staff by hotel managers when work is really good serves as motivation for job performance of hotel staffs in Lagos State. Aside, manager’s friendliness and ability to mitigate intrusions of work by employees’ family, personal need, and social obligations, including effective utilization of employees for tasks that requires high level of knowledge and technical skills are remedies to employees’ job performance of hotel industry in Lagos State. In addition, the study also conclude that there is a positive and significant relationship between promotion opportunity and employees’ job performance of hotel industry in Lagos State. The managerial implication of this is that practicing appreciable and satisfactory promotion speed, including upholding fair chances of staff promotion based on performance are solutions to employees’ job performance of hotels in Lagos State.

Furthermore, the study also concluded that a positive and significant relationship exists between supervisors’ support and employees’ job performance of hotels in Lagos State. The managerial inference of this is that hotel managers’ tendency to valuing the views and thoughts of their staff, developing a cooperative approach in supervision, showing interest toward the emotion of subordinates, and encouraging subordinates to attend training programs to acquire relevant knowledge and skills are treatments to employees’ job performance of hotel in Lagos State. Again, this study amazingly concluded that there is no significant relationship between payment system and employees’ job performance in respect of hotels in Lagos State. The managerial inference of this is that determinants of pay rise base on employees’ performances, frequency of salary increase and appreciable salary amount are not likely to motivate employees’ job performance of hotels in Lagos State. Finally, it is concluded from this objective that there is no significant correlation between workplace environment and employees’ job performance of hotels in Lagos State. The managerial implication of this is that friendly and favorable workplace environment, satisfactory hotel hygiene practices, and promotion of feasible maintenance culture are not likely to motivate employees’ job performance of hotel industry in Lagos State. In view of these findings, the researchers thus
recommend that managers and operators of hotels in Lagos State should give more attention to staff promotion and unconditional supervisors’ support.
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