

## Staff Involvement in Decision Making and Hotel Performance in Abia State, Nigeria

<sup>1</sup>Onyeonoro, C. O, <sup>2</sup>Amaechi-Chijioke, J.I, <sup>3</sup>Ukwuoma, J.K, <sup>4</sup>Onyeonoro, F. N

<sup>1</sup>Department of Hospitality Management and Tourism

Micheal Okpara University of Agriculture Umudike, Abia State, Nigeria.

<sup>2</sup>Department of Hospitality Management and Tourism

Micheal Okpara University of Agriculture Umudike, Abia State, Nigeria.

<sup>3</sup>Department of Hospitality Management and Tourism.

Akanu Ibiam Federal Polytechnic Unwana, Afikpo Ebonyi State, Nigeria.

<sup>4</sup>Department of Hospitality Management.

Temple Gate Polytechnic Aba, Abia State, Nigeria.

doi: <https://doi.org/10.37745/ejtr.2013/vol11n14066>

Published June 17 2023

---

**Citation:** Onyeonoro, C.O., Amaechi-Chijioke, J.I., Ukwuoma, J.K., Onyeonoro, F. N. (2023) Staff Involvement in Decision Making and Hotel Performance in Abia State, Nigeria, *European Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, Vol.11, No.1, pp., 40-66

---

**ABSTRACT:** *The study examined the staff involvement in decision making and hotel performance in Abia State, Nigeria. To achieve the objective of the study, survey research design was adopted. The researcher adopted primary data in getting the required information through the use of structured questionnaire. Structured questionnaire was administered to 175 staff of the selected hotels. The data collected were analyzed using ordinary least square based simple regression analysis. The findings revealed that staff involvement in decision making has a significant influence on staff productivity in hotel establishments. The findings further revealed that staff involvement in decision making has a significant influence on hotel performance. The findings also revealed that staff involvement in decision making has a significant influence on sales growth in hotel establishment. The study concludes that staff involvement in decision making plays significant role in enhancing hotel performance. Based on the findings, the study recommends that hotels should provide an enlightenment program for workers on their rights to seize the opportunity of involvement in decision making. Also, hotels should liberalize management structure so as to allow for greater workers' involvement.*

**KEYWORDS:** staff involvement in decision making, staff productivity, staff job satisfaction, hotel performance, and sales growth.

---

## INTRODUCTION

Employee participation in decision-making attracted the attention of practitioners, researchers and scholars in labour relations circles. Several studies have shown that allowing employees to participate in decision making leads to increase in motivation, job performance, and organizational growth (Gollan & Wilkinson, 2007; Kim, McDuffie & Pil, 2010; Bhatti & Qureshi, 2007). Komal (2013) believes that worker participation is merely a managerial technique that can be used effectively in certain situations. According to Ojokuku and Sajuyigbe (2014), employee participation in decision making has been recognized as a managerial tool for improving organizational performance by striving for the shared goals of employees and managers. This is actualized by way of allowing workers' input in developing the mission statement, establishing policies and procedures, pay determination, promotion, and determining perks. Employee participation in decision making has become a significant topic in human resource management (HRM), and is regarded as one of the chief ingredients of employee voice, which many management scholars have observed to be a growing management concept (Brinsfield, 2014; Emmanuel, Chux, & Charles, 2014).

Over the years, employee unrest and agitations has astonished many organizations the world over and the non-involvement of employees in the management process has accounted for many of these. Decision-making in organizations has been the domain of top management but without the involvement of those on the lower treads of the ranking of management, yet they are the very ones expected to see to the implementation of these decisions (Adu-Amankwah, & Kerster, 2019; Kim, MacDuffie, & Pil, 2010). The non-involvement of lower level management in decision-making also means that vital input from employees is often not factored into decisions made. This gives rise to the glitches that are experienced in organizations when it comes to the acceptance of these decisions and its implementation because employees feel insulted and of no importance because their views were not sought. They also do not feel involved in the decision making process but rather decisions are taken and 'pushed down their throats' (Adu-Amankwah, & Kerster, 2019).

Worker involvement implies arrangements designed to involve staff in the enterprises decision making process. This allows staff involvement in the initiation, formulation and implementation of reasons within the enterprise. The concept can also be understood in terms of a new approach to industry and society in which people want to be interested with the king of decisions which have direct bearing on them. Adu-Amankwah, & Kerster (2019), contends that worker involvement

consist basically in creating opportunity under suitable conditions for people to influence decisions which affect them. It is a special case of delegation in which the subordinate gain greater control, greater freedom of choice with respect to bridging the communication gap between the management and the staff. This serves to create a sense of belonging among the staff as well as a conducive environment in which both the staff would voluntarily contribute to healthy industrial relations.

Employee involvement concerns the extent to which individuals use all the resources of cognitive, emotional, and physical to perform roles associated with the job (Greenberg, 2011; Komal, Samina, & Akbar, 2011). Employees who feel involved and willing to engage in their work generally is the employee who has the characteristics of an energetic, fun, enjoyable, and effective in carrying out their work (Maryam et al; 2016). Pateman (2010); Udu & Aturu-Aghedo, (2016) are of the view that participative decision making can be possible in a certain sector of the economy and not in all government owned enterprises and parastatal because of the government intention to mobilize popular support for development purposes. He goes further to say that staff involvement in the multinational companies, on the other hand has at best remained elusive. Most of these companies are controlled by and depend on their parent bodies abroad for policies and decision. Among the indigenous employers, particularly the small and medium sized organization, their attitude to staff is paternalistic and authoritarians. Their activities are often shrouded on secrecy. They are suspicious of the staff and therefore cannot afford to share information and decision with them. We have experiences of some managers that fail to delegate, as they do not go on leaves, where some go, they are on working leave; still attending work, some while on leave lock up certain jobs/documents in their drawers, thus making such pending till they resume, whereas participative management involves nothing more than sharing information with subordinates (Nwoko, & Emerole, 2017; Kim et al., 2010).

It is unfortunate that most hospitality establishments if not all do not involve their staff during decision making. The decision is only made by the owner of the establishment and their managers. Most staff are educated and knowledgeable enough to give suggestion that can lead to the growth of that organization. However, denying them that chance to involve in decision making would hamper the performance of that organization (e.g. hospitality establishment). Participative decision making can be well practiced only in a stable economic environment because of its time consuming nature and investment in training to enable staff have a contributing capacity. Also the negative attitude of the Nigerian worker to work does not encourage participatory management. They are more interested in what they will get from the employer in terms of salaries and other employment

benefit and not the job itself. Such attitudes definitely cannot give rise to effective participation (Adu-Amankwah, & Kerster 2019).

### **Objectives of the Study**

The main objective of the study is to examine staff involvement in decision making and hotel performance in Abia State, Nigeria.

The specific objectives of the study are to:

- (i) examine the extent to which staff involvement in decision making influence staff productivity in hotel establishments.
- (ii) determine the influence of staff involvement in decision making on hotel performance.
- (iii) examine the extent to which staff involvement in decision making influence sales growth in hotel establishments.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **Employee involvement in decision making**

Employee involvement in decision making, sometimes referred to as participative decision-making (PDM) is concerned with shared decision making in the work situation (Galbraith, 1987). Levine & Tyson (2019) define it as ‘joint decision making’ between managers and subordinates. According to Noah (2008), it is a special form of delegation in which the subordinate gain greater control, greater freedom of choice with respect to bridging the communication gap between the management and the staff. It refers to the degree of employee’s involvement in a firm’s strategic planning activities. A firm can have a high or low degree of employee involvement. A high degree of involvement (deep employee involvement in decision making) means that all categories of employees are involved in the planning process. Conversely, a low degree of involvement (shallow employee involvement in decision making) indicates a fairly exclusive planning process (Beardwell & Claydon 2007; Kim et al., 2010) which involves the top management only. A deep employee involvement in decision making allows the influence of the frontline employees in the planning process. These are the people who are closest to the customer and who can facilitate new product and service recognition, a central element in the entrepreneurial process (Gollan, & Wilkinson, 2007; Rosseau, 2016). This means that employee participation in the planning process surrounding the potential innovations may facilitate opportunity recognition throughout the organisation (Kelly & Harrison 2012; Yesufu, 2018).

### **Benefits of Employee Involvement in Decision Making**

There is an assumption held by many scholars and managers that if employees are adequately informed about matters concerning them and are afforded the opportunity to make decisions relevant to their work, then there will be benefits for both the organisation and the individual (Vrba & Brevis 2002). Hence, the following are the benefits of employee involvement in decision making:

1. It increases employee's morale or job satisfaction and enhances productive efficiency (Busck, Knudsen & Lind 2010).
2. It provides employees the opportunity to use their private information, which can lead to better decisions for the organisation (Williamson, 2018).
3. As a result of the incorporation of the ideas and information from employees, organisational flexibility, product quality, and productivity may improve (Eisenfuhr 2011).
4. It contributes to greater trust and a sense of control on the part of the employees (Vrba & Brevis 2002).
5. Through employee involvement, resources required to monitor employee compliance (e.g., supervision and work rules) can be minimized, hence reducing costs (Adewumi, 2013; Milks 2017).
6. When employees are given the opportunities of contributing their ideas and suggestions in decision making, increased firms' performance may result since deep employee involvement in decision making maximizes viewpoints and a diversity of perspectives (Kaneshiro, 2008).

On his part, Helms, (2006) identifies four corresponding outcomes of employees' involvement or participation in decision making:

1. Quality Improvement. Better information flow- and use- can clarify tasks goals, and bring about qualitatively better decisions.
2. Increase in employees' commitment and acceptance of decisions through a sense of "ownership" (having been involved in decision-making). This outcome increases the likelihood that goals will be effectively implemented.
3. Support of the participative approach and continuance of its effects overtime, due to learning through behavioural practice; this represents the behavioural process effect.
4. Increase adaptive capacity of the organisation. Development of shared norms and values may result into more effective use of inter-dependency relations among organisation members, through an organisational process based on collaboration, as opposed to win-lose conflict.

However, any potential benefits from greater employee involvement in decision making require that employee interest be aligned with firm's interests (Imaya, 2014; Levine & Tyson 2019). Individual contingency factors which support or hinder participative decision-making have also been identified by Helms, (2006):

---

Publication of the European Centre for Research Training and Development -UK

1. Participative decision-making is appropriate when sets of choices are clear, individuals show desire for greater involvement, and several individuals can be given similar choice sets (that is, effort in developing choices does not render such a plan economically impractical) this would always be true when technology is low.
2. Participative decision-making may be useful in developing greater individual job responsibility.
3. Participative approach to decision making is inappropriate when choices are complex, difficult to define, and vary in no small way; when task interdependence is very high; when environmental change is rapid.

### **Enhancing Hospitality Productivity through Employee Involvement**

Productivity on its own as a concept has been defined as the output per unit of a factor of production (Imaya, 2014). However, amongst all other productivity measures, labour productivity has received the maximum attention. Labour we know is the most basic or fundamental factor of production. Productivity on the other hand can be improved or enhanced through so many factors for which participative decision making is considered crucial ie. through people. It is on the light of this that, Fashoyin (2018), reported that the needs for involving subordinates in decision making process in the organization are mainly for productivity and morale. In essence, improvement in productivity arises when subordinates' ideas are stimulated involving them in greater participation on decision-making.

To maximize productivity, management must value and nurture its most important assets, namely, people (staff) Authoritative secretive and formal relationships have to be replaced by an environment whereby the importance of every employee is reflected (Blinder, 2010; Keller, & Werner, 2011).

Eisenfuhr, (2011); Nel et al., (2010); Ojokuku, & Sajuyigbe (2014), also reports that better communication between employees and management will be the key factor in separating successful companies from those that will fail in future years. He goes further to state that certain large multinational cooperation such as IBM, and General Motors have come to appreciate the value of keeping their personnel "involved, informed and interested in company. Matters improving productivity will be the single most important factor in determining industry success. Watson, (2016) advanced that undoubtedly, "the greatest productivity improvement will come from using our human resources better-from taking the obstacles away from people so that they

can do their jobs more effectively. From involving them in the affairs of the organization that concerns them. The real secret of productivity is people.

Japanese success is partially dependent upon their ability to accept ambiguity, uncertainty and imperfection in organizational life. They are more willing to invest in people to develop their value orientation and help them gain diverse business experience. This attitude shows that Japan as a country in their business dealings is participative in nature. They adopt collective decision making and also collective responsibility (Probst, 2015; Ojokuku, & Sajuyigbe, 2014).

When one actually examines the people that work in excellent companies, one finds out that they are fairly normal people rather than outstanding ones. The difference is that their companies reinforce degrees of winning rather than degrees of losing. Griffin & Lopez (2005) reported that "nothing is more enticing than the feeling of being needed which is the magic that produces high expectations". M.S.G, Management Study Guide (2016) also says that "the intent of participation as with many leaders approach is to inspire high productivity and maintain a satisfied workforce". To him, participation seeks to achieve these goals through the involvement of subordinates in the decision making process. This concept is contingent on the presumption that participation will increase satisfaction, stimulate interest and thus provoke high productivity.

### **Employee Involvement in Decision Making and hotel performance**

There is growing evidence that hospitality performance rests increasingly on the involvement of staff in decision making (Bhatti & Nawab 2011). Scholars have argued that employee involvement contributes to organisational efficiency because it has the capacity to enhance the quality of decision making by increasing the inputs and promotes commitment to the outcomes of the decision making process in the workplace (Rosseau, 2016). According to Muindi, (2011) staff who have greater choice concerning how to do their own work have been found to have high job satisfaction and consequently high performance. A significant relationship between frequency of employee's consultation and organisation commitment has also been established (Noah, 2012). While employee involvement may reside at the core of many contemporary practices and research, the extent to which organisational-level performance gains are actually achieved through decentralising decision-making authority to lower level employee remains unclear (Rehman, Khalid & Khan 2012). Wainaina, Iravo & Waititu (2014) contend that there is much less research evidence for the value of employee involvement on quality decision making. Scholars have also argued that employees' involvement in decision making may primarily serve to make them feel

good about their jobs and organisations but do little to increase firm's performance (Wagner, 2014; Jemilohun, Ekanem, & Adebara, 2015).

### **Theoretical Framework**

#### ***Human relations and Participatory Theory.***

Human relations and Participatory Theory was propounded by Mills in the year 2005. The human relations and participatory democratic theories are adopted to guide our discussion on worker participation in management decision making. The human relations theory stems from the understanding that the co-operation of staff is desirable for the attainment of the objectives of high productivity and industrial peace. It contends that staff would be better motivated if they are treated like human beings rather than as irrational objects. For instance, by making them recognition by involving them in the decision making process. In the light of theory, the worker is to be perceived in terms of his membership of a social group rather as an individual. Consequently, in terms of his behaviour is seen as a response group norm rather than simply being directed by financial consideration staff should then be expected to reach to group norms so that when they are given the opportunity to take part in management decision making, they are likely to respond positively to organizational issues.

The democratic participatory theory emphasizes on conditions which are necessary for effective participation and function performed by participation to the individuals and society. For instance, Rosseau (2016) contended that through participation in decision making individual sense of freedom by enabling individual sense of freedom increased since it gives him a very real degree of control over the course of his life and structure of his environment. Again, it serves to increase the value of individual freedom by enabling him to be his own master.

#### ***Agency theory***

Agency theory was propounded by Jensen and Meckling, in the year 1976. According to the agency theory, a company consists of a nexus of contracts between the owner of economic resources'' (the principals) and manager (the agents) who are charged with using and controlling those resources'' (Jensen and Meckling, 1976). Agency theory posits that. Agents have more information than principal, and that such information asymmetry adversely affects the principals' ability to monitor whether or not their interests are being properly served by agents. Furthermore, an assumption of agency theory is that, principal and agents act rationally and use contracting to maximize their own wealth.

A consequence of this assumption may be the "moral" hazard" problem (Jensen and Meckling, 1976) where to maximize their own wealth; agents may face the dilemma of acting the interests of their principles. Since principals do not have access to all available information at the time a decision is being made by an agent, they are unable to determine whether (called adverse selection) and the moral hazard problem, principle and agents engage in contracting to achieve pareto-optimality, including the establishment of monitoring processes such as internal auditing. Specifically, internal auditing is considered a bonding cost borne by agents to satisfy the principals for accountability.

### **Empirical Review**

Dede (2019) examined the relationship between employee participation in decision making and organizational productivity among staff in Cross River State Board of Internal Revenue, Calabar. Motivation theory and qualitative data collection approach were employed. The simple and purposive sampling techniques were used to obtained a sample of 80respondents for study, the questionnaire consisting of 40 question on the various employee participation scenarios and an interview were administered. Finding from the study indicated that when employees participate in decision making implementation becomes easy, and creates a good working environment, increases commitment and satisfaction on decisions taken and also increases employee's moral since the feel recognized and as part of the team in the organization and the direct consequence of all this improved productivity. The paper recommended that employees should be given the necessary skills and adequate training need in order to promote creativity and innovation in decision making and work attitude as this enhance organizational productivity.

Umar (2019) examined the relationship between employee's participation in decision making on organizational performance. An employee is also referred to as worker. An employee is an individual who works part-time or full-time under a contract of employment, whether oral or written, express or implied, and has recognized rights and duties. Therefore, an employee is hired for a specific job or to provide labour and who works in the service of someone else referred to as the employer. On the other hand, an organization or organisation is an entity comprising multiple people, such as an institution or an association that has a particular purpose. A pilot study requires a range of few respondents (10-30), it was used by picking respondents at random, and the data collected were analysed using tables and percentages. The research work has found out that involving employee in decision-making is very vital and important in achieving the highest peak in performance of an organisation. In addition, Employees" participation in decision making positively affect their morale and enhances productive efficiency in the organization. Employee

participation in decision making in an organization influence them positively by making them give in their very best to growth and development of the organisation and Employee's nonparticipation in decision making in an organisation can result to conflict between management and employees and lead to indifferent to the decision-making reached by the organizational productivity.

Harpreet (2019) examined the impact of employee participation in decision making on organizational productivity. Three objectives were raised which included: To assess the impact of employee participation in management decision making EMENITE PLC, to investigate the impact of employee participation in management decision on productivity o the organization, to make recommendation based on the research finding. In line with 49 these objectives, two research hypotheses were formulated and two null hypotheses were posited. The total population for the study is 200 staff of EMENITE PLC, Lagos state. The researcher used questionnaires as the instrument for the data collection. Descriptive Survey research design was adopted for this study. A total of 133 respondents made human processing engineers, electricians, senior staff and junior staff were used for the study. The data collected were presented in tables and analyzed using simple percentages and frequencies. Employee participation in decision making has been found to have favorable effects on employee attitude, commitment and productivity even also on the efficiency of the managers. Thus participative management should be seen as an inevitable tool in any organization both public and private. However before this could be done or undertaken, a thorough examination of the organization policy should be looked into and amended to affect this. In this study, some recommendations have been made to increase the importance and benefits of employee's participation in decision making and its recognition.

Oyebamiji (2018) examined the influence of employees' participation in decision making on organization productivity with particular reference to LadokeAkintola University of Technology (LAUTECH) Teaching Hospital, Ogbomoso, Oyo State, Nigeria. Purposive random sampling technique was used to select LadokeAkintola University of Technology Teaching Hospital, Ogbomoso Oyo State, Nigeria, while simple random sampling method was used to select two hundred and five (205) respondents. Data were sourced via a structured questionnaire and frequency, percentage, means, standard deviation and linear regression analysis were employed to analyze the data. Results reveal that both direct participation and representative participation have positive and significant impact on organizational productivity. Furthermore, results indicate that level of employees' participation in decision making in LadokeAkintola University of Technology Teaching Hospital, Ogbomoso is very low due to unwillingness of management to share decision-

making with employees. The study therefore concludes that employees' participation in decisions making is an alternative paradigm to organization productivity.

Nwoko and Emerole (2017) examined the effect of employees' participation in decision making on organizational productivity, with reference to National Root Crops Research Institutes Umudike. Specifically, the study sought to: ascertain the impact of employees' participation in decision making on work commitment and examine the effect of employees' participation in decision making on the productivity of NRCRI Umudike. The study adopted survey research design; primary and secondary data were used. The population of the study consists of all the employees of the institution. Logistic Regression analysis and Pearson Product Moment Correlation were used to run the analysis through SPSS version 20. The major findings revealed that: there is a positive relationship between employees' participation in decision making and work commitment of the employees in the institution. Employees participation in decision making has a low positive effect on the productivity of the institution with correlation coefficient. The study concluded that employees' participation in decision making have a positive effect on organizational productivity, and recommends that the management of National Root Crops Research Institutes Umudike should adopt adept participatory approach in administration/decision making in order to encourage employees' affirmative commitment to organizational goals and objectives.

## **METHODOLOGY**

Newman (2020), posit that research methodology is a theoretical and systematic analysis of methods used in a research project consisting of data collection and analysis techniques. Hence, this chapter describes the research philosophical approach that was used in this investigation. In addition, the chapter discussed the research approach, research strategy, research hypotheses, data collection, sample size, ethical consideration, data analysis techniques and procedures employed in this study.

### **Philosophical Assumption**

This research aims to explain the relationship between two variables (consumption and academic performance), evaluate the variables, and draw conclusions based on the findings. The positivist paradigm is used (Denscombe, 2010). During this research work, a deductive approach was adopted. The quantitative research method was used to gather and analyze data in this study.

Because this research involved testing hypotheses and the data acquired was tested using statistical techniques, quantitative research was used.

### **Research Approach and Strategy.**

A positivistic method to quantitative research typically posits that hypotheses/assumptions are derived from some theoretical or imaginary concept, making it deductive in nature, which is occasionally referred to as theory testing (Newman, 2020). Because the goal is to see if current theoretical frameworks can be applied to our empirical study data, deductive research approach was adopted on this thesis titled “staff involvement in decision making and hotel performance”. The aim of the study is to determine the extent of staff involvement in decision making in hotel operation and how it affect hotel performance.

### **Research Hypotheses**

The following hypothesis was tested in the course of this study

**H<sub>01</sub>:** Staff involvement in decision making has no significant influence on staff productivity in hotel establishments.

**H<sub>02</sub>:** Staff involvement in decision making has no significant influence on hotel performance.

**H<sub>03</sub>:** Staff involvement in decision making has no significant influence on sales growth of hotels.

### **Data Collection**

The survey research design was used in this study. This is a quantitative approach of data collection from a group of people by asking them question relating to staff involvement in decision making and how it affect hotel performance. The usage of a survey in data gathering is focused toward answering the research questions inherent in the project in order to meet the research's goals and objectives. This helped in the development of remedies to the identified issue (Jacobsen, 2012). To generate data from respondents, questionnaire instrument was used. Closed ended questions on a four -point scale were used to create the questionnaire. In addition, the questions are well-structured. The close ended includes; Strongly Agreed (SA) = 4, Agreed (A) = 3, Disagreed (D) = 2 and Strongly Disagreed (SD) =1

### **Sample Size**

The sample size of the study are 175 selected staff of 10 selected hotels in Abia State Nigeria. Only available staff were evaluated, and convenient sampling method were used.

### Data Analysis Techniques and Procedures

Descriptive statistics was used to summarize the gathered data in a clear and understandable manner using a numerical technique. To test hypotheses, simple regression approaches based on ordinary least square regression (OLS) was used.

**Decision rule:** The variables are significant when the significant value is less than 0.05, otherwise not significant. As for decision on mean, mean value equal or greater than 3.0 is acceptable and vice versa.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Analysis of Research Questions

**Question 1:** To what extent does staff involvement in decision making influence staff productivity?

Table 4.1 Mean responses of respondents on the extent does staff involvement in decision making influence staff productivity

S/N		Total score	Mean	Remark
1	Influences job performance	614	3.57	Accept
2	Improving productivity	596	3.47	Accept
3	Enhances staff confidence thereby increasing their job performance	594	3.45	Accept
4	Gives staff an insight of the hotel activities as well as the hotel goals and objectives	626	3.64	Accept
		<b>Grand mean</b>	<b>3.53</b>	

The table above shows the result on the mean responses of respondents on the extent does staff involvement in decision making influence staff productivity. The result shows that Staff involvement in decision making influences their job performance, staff involvement in decision making enlighten staff on their job and thereby improving their productivity, staff involvement in decision making enhances staff confidence thereby increasing their job performance, staff involvement in decision making gives staff an insight of the hotel activities as well as the hotel goals and objectives thereby improving their productivity, staff involvement in decision making gives staff an insight of the hotel activities as well as the hotel goals and objectives thereby

improving their productivity. All the items had an acceptable mean response score of 2.5. The grand mean of 3.53 shows that staff involvement in decision making influence staff productivity.

**Question 2:** What is the influence of staff involvement in decision making on hotel performance?

Table 4.2 Mean responses of respondents on the influence of staff involvement in decision making on hotel performance

S/N		Total score	Mean	Remark
1	Influences hotel productivity	572	3.33	Accept
2	Influences hotel performance	594	3.45	Accept
3	Enhances staff confidence thereby increasing hotel productivity performance	590	3.43	Accept
4	Influence hotel sustainability.	592	3.44	Accept
		<b>Grand mean</b>	<b>3.41</b>	Accept

The result on Table 4.2 shows the influence of staff involvement in decision making on hotel productivity. The responses shows that staff involvement in decision making influences hotel productivity, staff involvement in decision making influences hotel performance, staff involvement in decision making enhances staff confidence thereby increasing hotel productivity performance, staff involvement in decision making influence hotel sustainability. All these items have mean greater than 2.5 which is the criterion mean. The grand mean of 3.41 implies that staff involvement in decision making influences hotel performance.

**Objective 3:** To what extent does staff involvement in decision making influence sales growth in hotel establishments?

Table 4.3 Mean responses of respondents on the extent does staff involvement in decision making influence sales growth in hotel establishments.

S/N		Total score	Mean	Remark
1	Influence sales growth in hotel establishments	578	3.36	Accept
2	Influence sales volume in hotel establishments	584	3.40	Accept
3	Influence sales customer patronage in hotel establishments	592	3.44	Accept
4	Enhances staff confidence thereby increasing sales growth in hotel establishments	572	3.33	Accept
		<b>Grand mean</b>	<b>3.38</b>	Accept

The result presented on Table 4.3 shows the mean response of the extent does staff involvement in decision making influence sales growth in hotel establishments. The result indicated that Staff involvement in decision making influence sales growth in hotel establishments, Staff involvement in decision making influence sales volume in hotel establishments, Staff involvement in decision making influence sales customer patronage in hotel establishments, Staff involvement in decision

---

Publication of the European Centre for Research Training and Development -UK

making enhances staff confidence thereby increasing sales growth in hotel establishments. All the items had mean responses above the criterion mean of 2.5. The grand mean of 3.38 implies that staff involvement in decision making influences sales growth in hotel establishments.

**Table 4.4: Descriptive statistics of the study variables**

	<b>STAFF INVOLVEMENT</b>	<b>STAFF PRODUCTIVITY</b>	<b>HOTEL PERFORMANCE</b>	<b>SALES GROWTH</b>
Mean	4.543554	3.979094	4.191638	2.038328
Median	5.000000	4.000000	5.000000	1.000000
Maximum	5.000000	5.000000	5.000000	5.000000
Minimum	2.000000	2.000000	1.000000	1.000000
Std. Dev.	0.594866	0.479928	1.144247	1.422323
Skewness	-1.416375	-1.770153	-1.249164	1.254376
Kurtosis	6.349803	11.18749	3.225050	3.082957
Jarque-Bera Probability	230.1460 0.000000	951.5089 0.000000	75.24531 0.000000	75.34607 0.000000
Sum	1304.000	1142.000	1203.000	585.0000
Sum Sq. Dev.	101.2056	65.87456	374.4599	578.5784
Observations	172	172	172	1727

**Source: Extracted from E-View result in the appendix**

Table 4.4 presents the descriptive statistics of all the variables used for regression analysis. The number of observation for the study is 172. From the table above, the following information is distilled.

For staff involvement (SI), the result revealed maximum and minimum values of 5.000 and 2.0000. Staff involvement in decision making also reveals mean and standard deviation of 4.543554 and 0.594866. Staff productivity (SP) has a mean of 3.979094 with a deviation of 0.479928. Furthermore, Staff productivity records a maximum and minimum value of 5.0000 and 2.0000. Furthermore, hotel performance result reveals maximum and minimum values of 5.0000 and 1.0000. Hotel performance (HP) also reveals mean and standard deviation of 4.191638 and 1.144247. Sales growth, the result revealed maximum and minimum values of 5.0000 and 1.0000.

Publication of the European Centre for Research Training and Development -UK

Sales growth (SG) also reveals mean and standard deviation of 2.038328 and 1.422323 respectively.

As shown in the table above, staff involvement, staff productivity, hotel performance and sales growth have Jargue-Bera statistics of 230.1460, 951.5089, 75.24531, and 75.34607 with its associated probability values 0.0000, 0.0000, 0.0000, and 0.0000 which indicates that the they data are not normally distributed. Although data are not normally distributed, the current study will not rely on that judgement since the data collected are ranked data and expresses the opinion of the general respondent which is not meant to be manipulated. The concern for a ranked data is the level of skweness which reveals the direction of expression by the respondent whether it contains level of biases.

The skweness result for staff involvement, staff productivity, hotel performance and sales growth reveal values between -2.5 to +2.5 which means that data distribution for the variables are normally distributed; this means that there is no bias in term of the responses gotten and it thus expresses a valid responses for further analysis.

### Diagnostic test results

**Table 4.5 Diagnostic test**

TEST	TEST STAT	MODEL SP (Prob.)	MODEL HP (Prob.)	MODEL SG (Prob.)
Independence of residuals	Durbin Watson	1.620120 (DW)	0.482032 (DW)/ R <sup>1</sup> = 2.693522 (DW)	1.217695 (DW)
Linearity test	Ramsey Reset test	0.8098 (tau-P)	0.0022 (tau-P)	0.2872 (tau-P)
Serial autocorrelation	Breusch-Godfrey SLLM test	0.0008 (Prob)	0.0000 (Prob)	0.0000 (Prob)
Multicollinearity	Variance Inflation factor (VIF)	1.052654	1.052654	1.052654
Heteroscedasticity	Breusch-Pagan-Godfrey Test	0.1216 (Obs. Chi.Sq. Prob)	0.0043 (Obs. Chi.Sq. Prob)	0.0000 (Obs. Chi.Sq. Prob)

**Source: E View result in appendix**

From Table 4.5 above, the following diagnostic result is revealed:

Result for model 1 (SP) reveal a Durbin Watson statistics of 1.620120. This indicates that the set of data for the model variables has residuals that cannot influence the outcome of the linear regression. This is supported by Field (2009) who posited that a Durbin Watson statistic within the range of 1 to 3 is appropriate for a linear model. The Ramsey reset test with a probability value of 0.8098 further prove that there is no need to include the residuals in order to reset the linear model since the observations are free from autocorrelation. The VIF statistics of less than 10 proves that the set of independent variables are free from multicollinearity issues. Thus the ordinary least square regression can be adopted for model 1 without reset to include residuals.

Result for model 2 (HP) reveal a Durbin Watson statistics of 0.482032. This indicates that the set of data for the model variables has residuals that can influence the outcome of the linear regression. As posited by Field (2009), a Durbin Watson statistic within the range of 1 to 3 is appropriate for a linear model. This is not the case with the study result. The Ramsey reset test with a probability value of 0.0022 further prove that there is need to include the residuals in order to reset the linear model since the observations are not free from autocorrelation. To this, the Breusch-Godfrey test for 1<sup>st</sup> residual reset is done to see if the serial autocorrelation is corrected. From the Breusch-Godfrey serial test, the result reveals a DW statistic of 2.693522 with a probability value of 0.000. This indicates that the inclusion of the 1<sup>st</sup> dependent variable residual corrects the autocorrelation issue in the model. The VIF statistics of less than 10 for the model proves that the set of independent variables are free from multi collinearity issues. Thus the 1<sup>st</sup> residual (Breusch-Godfrey SLLM) ordinary least square regression is adopted for model 2 after reset to include 1<sup>st</sup> residual from the dependent variable.

Result for model 3 (SG) reveal a Durbin Watson statistics of 1.217695. This indicates that the set of data for the model variables has residuals that cannot influence the outcome of the linear regression. This is supported by Field (2009) who posited that a Durbin Watson statistic within the range of 1 to 3 is appropriate for a linear model. The Ramsey reset test with a probability value of 0.2872 further prove that there is no need to include the residuals in order to reset the linear model since the observations are free from autocorrelation. The VIF statistics of less than 10 proves that the set of independent variables are free from multicollinearity issues. Thus the ordinary least square regression is adopted for model 3 without reset to include residuals.

**REGRESSION ANALYSIS****TABLE 4.6: Summary of data analysis (regression analysis)**

	Staff Productivity	Hotel performance	Hotel growth
<b>Coefficient</b>	1.392	0.805	0.870
<b>STD Error</b>	0.044	0.044	0.867
<b>T-statistics</b>	31.776	18.098	22.675
<b>R2</b>	0.856	0.658	0.752
<b>Adjusted R2</b>	0.855	0.656	0.750
<b>P-value</b>	0.000	0.000	0.000

**Source: Extracted from Appendix**

**Test of Hypotheses****Hypothesis one**

**H<sub>0</sub>1:** Staff involvement in decision making has no significant influence on staff productivity in hotel establishments.

With reference to table 4.6 the findings of the regression indicate the impact of staff involvement in decision making has no significant influence on staff productivity in hotel establishments. According to the coefficient of determination R-square = 0.856. The explanatory variable (staff involvement in decision making) explains or causes 85.6% of the sample variation in the dependent variable (staff productivity), whereas 14.4 percent is unexplained. Other factors or variables not included in the model could account for the remaining 14.4 percent. The T-statistics of 31.776 has probability value of 0.0000. We would reject the null hypothesis, H<sub>0</sub>, because the probability of the T-statistics is less than 5%, and so conclude that Staff involvement in decision making has a significant influence on staff productivity in hotel establishments. The finding is consistent to the findings of Saha and Kumar (2017); Oluwatoyo Opoko & Ezma (2017) who assessed the impact of participation in decision making on job satisfaction, group commitment, and group learning. The findings of the study suggest that participation in decision making had a positive and significant relationship with job satisfaction. Further, participation in decision making had

significant impact on group learning, but had no impact on group commitment. Job satisfaction had a positive and significant impact on group commitment. Consequently, the finding is in line to the findings of Isichei, & Godwin (2015); Omobude & Igbudu (2012) which investigated employee's participation in decision making and the hospitality industry in Nigeria, a study of selected hotels in the federal capital territory in Abuja. Findings in the study showed that employee's participation in decision making impacts on the job performance of hotel employees in Nigeria.

### **Hypothesis two**

**H0<sub>2</sub>:** Staff involvement in decision making has no significant influence on hotel productivity.

With reference to table 4.6 the findings of the regression indicate the impact of staff involvement in decision making on hotel productivity. According to the coefficient of determination R-square = 0.658. The explanatory variable (staff involvement in decision making) explains or causes 65.8% of the sample variation in the dependent variable (staff productivity), whereas 34.6 percent is unexplained. Other factors or variables not included in the model could account for the remaining 34.6 percent. The T-statistics of 18.098 has probability value of 0.0000. We would reject the null hypothesis, H<sub>0</sub>, because the probability of the T-statistics is less than 5%, and so conclude that staff involvement in decision making has a significant influence on hotel productivity. The finding is consistent to the findings of Harpreet (2019); Jemilohun et al., (2015) who examined the impact of employee participation in decision making on the productivity of hotel establishments. Employee participation in decision making has been found to have favorable effects on employee attitude, commitment and productivity even also on the efficiency of the managers. Thus participative management should be seen as an inevitable tool in any organization both public and private. Also, Dede (2019); Komal, Samina, & Akbar (2011) examined the relationship between employee participation in decision making and organizational productivity among staff in Cross River State Board of Internal Revenue, Calabar. Finding from the study indicated that when employees participate in decision making implementation becomes easy, and creates a good working environment, increases commitment and satisfaction on decisions taken and also increases employee's moral since they feel recognized and as part of the team in the organization and the direct consequence of all this improved productivity.

### **Hypothesis three**

**H0<sub>3</sub>:** Staff involvement in decision making has no significant influence on sales growth in hotel establishments.

Table 4.6 showed the findings of the regression indicate the impact of staff involvement in decision making on sales growth in hotel establishments. According to the coefficient of determination  $R$ -square = 0.752. The explanatory variable (staff involvement in decision making) explains or causes 75.2% of the sample variation in the dependent variable (staff productivity), whereas 24.8 percent is unexplained. Other factors or variables not included in the model could account for the remaining 24.8 percent. The T-statistics of 22.675 has probability value of 0.0000. We would reject the null hypothesis,  $H_0$ , because the probability of the T-statistics is less than 5%, and so conclude that staff involvement in decision making has a significant influence on sales growth in hotel establishments. The finding is consistent to the findings of Umar (2019) who examined the relationship between employee's participation in decision making on organizational performance. The research work has found out that involving employee in decision-making is very vital and important in achieving the highest peak in performance of an organisation. In addition, Employees' participation in decision making positively affect their morale and enhances productive efficiency in the organization. Employee participation in decision making in an organization influence them positively by making them give in their very best to growth and development of the organisation and Employee's nonparticipation in decision making in an organisation can result to conflict between management and employees and lead to indifferent to the decision-making reached by the organizational productivity.

## **CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **Conclusion**

Based on the findings of the study, it concluded that workers involvement in decision making affects both the productivity and growth of hotels under study but workers in the study establishments are generally not much involved in the management decision making within their respective establishment. On the other hand, the workers generally demonstrated high-interest in management decision making. The study therefore confirmed that while the workers demonstrated positive attitude towards involvement in decision making, the actual level of involvement they exercise is low. Workers who are subjects of this study generally demonstrated willingness to accept the responsibility of involvement in management decision making whenever such opportunity arises, however, many hold the view that management decision making is the preserve of the management. This implies that while the workers are willing to accept the responsibility of

---

Publication of the European Centre for Research Training and Development -UK

greater involvement in management decision making they are role reading to challenge the management in the regard. Based on the analysis conducted, the study concludes that:

- i. Staff involvement in decision making has a significant influence on staff productivity in hotel establishments.
- ii. Staff involvement in decision making has a significant influence on hotel performance.
- iii. Staff involvement in decision making has a significant influence on sales growth in hotel establishments.

### **Recommendations**

Based on the findings and conclusion of the study, the following recommendations were made:

- i. Hotels should provide an enlightenment program for workers on their rights to seize the opportunity of involvement in decision making.
- ii. Hotels should liberalize management structure so as to allow for greater workers involvement.
- iii. Hotels should provide training programs for workers in management functions as a way of properly equipping them on their decision making role.
- iv. Participations should be selected on the basis of their technical expertise or their experience based expertise. Stakeholders that have vested interest (e.g. employees and employers) in the outcomes of any participating scheme should be indirectly or directly involved.

### **REFERENCES**

- Adewumi, F. (2013), *Industrial Relations Economics Development and Democracy*". A Preliminary Vote, challenges Facing Industrial Relations in Nigeria in the Context of Emerging New Economic and Political Order.(Department of Audit Education University of Ibadan).
- Adu-Amankwah, K. & Kerster, G. (2019), *How to Make Democratic Participation A Success: An African Trade Union Challenge Rotterdam Fexua*.
- Beardwell, J. & Claydon, T. (2007). *Human Resource Management: A Contemporary Approach*, (6<sup>th</sup> ed.), Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Bhatti K, K., & Qureshi, T. M. (2007). Impact of employee participation on job satisfaction, employee commitment and employee productivity, *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 3(2); 54-68.
- Bhatti, K. & Nawab, S. (2011). Effect of Direct Participation on Organizational Commitment. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2 (9).

- Brinsfield, C., (2014). *Employee voice and silence in organizational behavior*. Handbook of research on employee voice, pp.114-131
- Busck, O, Knudsen, H. & Lind, J. (2010). The Transformation of Employee Participation: Consequences for the Work Environment.
- Dede, C. H. (2019). Employee participation indecision making and organizational performance: case study of cross river state board of internal revenue, Calabar. *International Journal of Economics and Business Management*..5 (1) 84-104
- Eisenfuhr, F. (2011). Decision Making. *Academy of Management Review*, 19 (2), pp. 312-330.
- Emmanuel, T. T, Chux, G. I & Charles, A (2014). Employee participation and productivity in a South African University. Implications for human resource management. *Problems and Perspectives in Management (open-access)*, 12, 293- 306.
- Fashoyin, T. (2018). *Industrial Relations and African Development*, New Delhi: South Asian Pushlising Ltd.
- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS. #rd Edition*, Saga Publication Limited, London.
- Gollan, P. J., & Wilkinson, A. (2007). Contemporary developments in information and consultation. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18(7), 1133-1144.
- Greenberg, J. (2011). *Behavior in Organizations*,(10th ed.), New Jersey: Upper Saddle River.
- Griffin, R. W. & Lopez, Y. P. (2005). Bad Behavior in Organizations: A Review and Typology for Future Research. *Journal of Management, December*, pp. 988-1005.
- Harpreet, D. (2019). Employee engagement: A sceptical analysis. *Journal of Org Effectiveness Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, 1(2), 141-156.
- Helms, M. M. (2006). Theory X and Theory Encyclopedia of Management Education. Available:<http://www.enotes.com/managementencyclopedias/theory-x-theory-y%5> (December 7, 2017).
- Imaya, E.U. (2014). *Industrial Democracy in the third World: A study Nigeria and India*, New Delhi South Asia Polishers.
- Isichei, E. E. & Godwin, U. D. (2015). Employees' Participation in Decision Making and the Performance of the Hospitality Industry in Nigeria: An Investigative Study of Selected Hotels in the Federal Capital Territory, Abuja, Nigeria. *Academic Journal of Economic Studies*, 1 (4), pp. 54–6.
- Jemilohun, A., Ekanem, G., &Adebara, I. (2015). Employee Participation In Decision-Making In Architectural Firms. *Urbanism. Arhitectură. Construcții*. 8 (2); 193-207
- Kaneshiro, P. (2008). Analyzing the Organizational Justice, Trust and Commitment Relationship in a Public Organization: Submitted to North Central University, University, University Microfilms. *The Humanities and Social Sciences*, pp. 14-20.
- Keller, B. & Werner, F. (2011) New Forms of Employee Involvement at European Level The Case of the European Company (SE) *British Journal of Industrial Relations* doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8543.2011.00860.x

- Kelly, M.R. & Harrison, B. (2012). Unwuns, Technology and LabourManagement Co-operation. In L. Mishel and P.b. Voos eds. Unions and Economic Competitiveness. Armonk NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Kim, J., MacDuffie, J. P., & Pil, F. K. (2010). Employee voice and organizational performance: Team versus representative influence. *Human Relations*, 63(3), 371-394.
- Komal, K.B, Samina, N., & Akbar, A (2011). Effect of Direct Participation on Organizational Commitment. *International Journal of Business and Social Science Vol. 2 No. 9, 15 -24*.
- Komal, K. D. (2013). Impact of Different Types of Employee Participation on Organizational Commitment: A Comparative Study of Pakistan and United States of America. PhD Thesis of Mohammad Ali Jinnah University, Islamabad.
- Levine, D. & Tyson J. (2019). "participation productivity and the Firm's Environment" in A. Blinder ed. Paying for productivity: A look at the Evidence, Washington DC:, Brookings Institute.
- M.S.G, Management Study Guide (2016). *Advantages of Participative Management*. Available: <https://www.managementstudyguide.com/participative-management-advantages-disadvantages.htm> (December 17, 2017).
- Maryam, K., Nejadjavad, U., &Shahram, G. (2016). Contributions and challenges of associate faculty in the expansion of higher education in Kenya. *International Journal of Education and Research* 3 (4), 45-67.
- Muindi, F. K. (2011). The Relationship between Participation in Decision making and Job Satisfaction among Academic Staff in the School of Business University of Nairobi. *Journal of Human Resource Management Research*, 34.
- Nel, P.S., Swanepoel, B.J., Kirsten, M., Erasmus, B.J., and Tsabadi, M.J. (2005). *South African Employment Relations: Theory and Practice*. 5th ed. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.
- Noah, Y. (2008). A Study of Worker Participation in Management Decision Making Within Selected Establishments in Lagos. *Nigeria Journal of Social Science*, 17 (1), pp. 31-39.
- Nwoko, V, O., &Emerole, G. A. (2017). Effect Of Employees Participation In Decision Making On Organizational Performance: A Study Of National Root Crops Research Institutes Umudike. *International Journal of Economics, Business and Management Research*, 1(5); 27- 46.
- Ojokuku, R.M & Sajuyigbe, A. S. (2014). Effect of Employee Participation in Decision Making on Performance of Selected Small and Medium Enterprises in Lagos, Nigeria". *European Journal of Business and Management*. 6(10), 93-97.
- Oluwatoyo, A., Opoko, A., & Ezma, I. (2017). Employee Participation In Decision-Making In Architectural Firms. *Urbanism. Arhitectură. Construcții*. 8 (2); 193-207,
- Omobude, M & Igbudu, U. (2012). Influence Of Teachers Participation In Decision Making On Their Job Performance In Public And Private Secondary Schools In Oredo Local Government Area Of Edo State, Nigeria. *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*. 1(5); 12-22,

- Omobude, M. &Igbudu, U. (2012). Influence of Teachers Participation in Decision Making on their Job Performance in Public and Private Secondary Schools in Oredo Local Government Area of Edo State, Nigeria. *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, 1 (5), pp. 12-22.
- Oyebamiji, F. F. (2018). Influence of employees“ participation in decision making on organization productivity: A Study of LadokeAkintola University of Technology Teaching Hospital, Ogbomoso, Oyo State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Innovative Social Sciences & Humanities Research*. 6(3),8-17
- Pateman, C. (2010). *Participation and Democracy Theory*: New York; Cambridge University Press. Prentice Hall.
- Probst, T. M. (2005). Considering the Negative Effects of Job Insecurity through Participative Decision Making: Lessons from the DemandControl Model. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 10, pp. 320-329.
- Rehman, R. R., Khalid, A. & Khan, M. (2012). Impact of Employee Decision Style on Organizational Performance: In the Moderating Role of Emotional Intelligence. *World Applied Science Journal*, 17 (10), pp. 1305-1315.
- Saha, G., & Kumar, A. (2017) Giving up control without losing control: Effects on managers“ involving employees in decision making. *Group and Organization Management*, 24 (2): 155-187
- Udu, G..O. & Aturu-Aghedo, C.A. (2016), Effects Of Participative Decision Making On The Performance Of Federal Airports Authority Of Nigeria (Faan), Lagos. *International Journal of Human Resource Management and Research (IJHRMR)*. 6(4); 2249-6874
- Umar, K. (2019). Participative decision making and employee performance in the hospitality industry: A study of selected hotels in Owerri Metropolis, Imo State. *Management Studies and Economic Systems* 4 (1), 57-70
- Vrba, M. J. &Brevis, T. (2002). *A Guide to Passing: General Management*, Claremont: New Africa Education.
- Wainaina, L. M. Iravo, M. &Waititu, A. (2014). Effect of Employee Participation in Decision Making on the Organizational Commitment Amongst Academic Staff in the Private and Public Universities in Kenya. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Social Science*, 3 (12), pp. 131-142.
- Watson, W. W. (2006). A Comparison of Attitudes around the Globe. Available: <http://www.watsonwayatt.com/research> (December, 21, 2017).
- Williamson, M. G. (2018). The Effects of Expanding Employee Decision Making on Contributions to Firm Value in an Informal Reward Environment. *Contemporary Accounting Research*, 25 (4), pp. 1184-1209.

**APPENDIX**

	<b>STAFF INVOLVEMENT</b>	<b>STAFF PRODUCTIVITY</b>	<b>HOTEL PERFORMANCE</b>	<b>SALES GROWTH</b>
Mean	4.543554	3.979094	4.191638	2.038328
Median	5.000000	4.000000	5.000000	1.000000
Maximum	5.000000	5.000000	5.000000	5.000000
Minimum	2.000000	2.000000	1.000000	1.000000
Std. Dev.	0.594866	0.479928	1.144247	1.422323
Skewness	-1.416375	-1.770153	-1.249164	1.254376
Kurtosis	6.349803	11.18749	3.225050	3.082957
Jarque-Bera	230.1460	951.5089	75.24531	75.34607
Probability	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000
Sum	1304.000	1142.000	1203.000	585.0000
Sum Sq. Dev.	101.2056	65.87456	374.4599	578.5784
Observations	172	172	172	1727

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.925 <sup>a</sup>	.856	.855	.35630

a. Predictors: (Constant), STAFF INVOLVEMENT

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	128.186	1	128.186	1009.724	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	21.582	170	.127		
	Total	149.767	171			

a. Dependent Variable: STAFF PRODUCTIVITY

b. Predictors: (Constant), STAFF INVOLVEMENT

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-1.643	.159		-10.354	.000
	STAFF INVOLVEMENT	1.392	.044	.925	31.776	.000

a. Dependent Variable: STAFF PRODUCTIVITY

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.811 <sup>a</sup>	.658	.656	.36177

a. Predictors: (Constant), STAFF INVOLVEMENT

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	42.867	1	42.867	327.527	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	22.250	170	.131		
	Total	65.116	171			

a. Dependent Variable: HOTEL PERFORMANCE

b. Predictors: (Constant), STAFF INVOLVEMENT

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.522	.161		3.239	.001
	STAFF INVOLVEMENT	.805	.044	.811	18.098	.000

a. Dependent Variable: HOTEL PERFORMANCE