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Abstract
The study examined the effect of remuneration on employee performance in the Nigerian hospitality industry. The study was based on agency theory, stakeholder theory, social exchange theory, and incentive contract theory. The study adopts descriptive survey designs. The study population was 407, and the sample of the study was 202 respondents, which were selected using a random sampling technique. The survey method of data collection was used. The closed-ended questionnaire was used as an instrument for data collection. Data were analyzed using multiple regression analysis in SPSS Version 21. The findings of the study revealed that there are positive and significant effects of remuneration on the performance of employees in the hospitality industry, whereby, The results from the analysis show that salary has positive and significant effects on employee performance (0.00332 < 0.05); incentive has positive and significant effects on employee performance (0.0024 < 0.05); compensation benefits has positive and significant effects on employee performance (0.00335 < 0.05); and employee stock ownership plan has positive and significant effects on employee performance (0.0017 < 0.05). The study concludes that remuneration has positive and significant effects on employee performance in the hospitality industry in Nigeria. The study recommends that firms review the wage structure in order to motivate employees to retain their jobs and increase performance. The study further recommends that organizations should seek to maintain good relationships with their employees by offering good incentives in the form of financial and non-financial compensation.
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INTRODUCTION

Human resource is the most important asset of any organisation and should be given the highest priority, as it provides the basis for sustainable competitive advantage. Organisations need to develop strategies to acquire and retain competent workforce in order to achieve efficient and effective results (Zaman, 2011). Remuneration is traditionally seen as the total income of an individual, and organizations need highly performing individuals to meet goals, deliver products and services, and achieve high performance (Buchan, Thompson & O'May, 2010). Performance is rewarded by financial and other benefits, and high performers get promoted more easily and have better career opportunities (VanScotter, Motowidlo & Cross, 2019).
Employees are the organization's key resource and their willingness to stay depends on their remuneration packages and reward system (Armstrong, 2016). Compensation management is a complex task that requires integrating employees’ processes and information with business process and strategies to achieve optimal organizational goals and objectives (Fadugba, 2021; Falola, Ibidunni & Olokundun, 2020; Adeniyi, 2013). Remuneration is an essential tool to integrate individual efforts with strategic business objectives and is linked to employee performance. Companies are attempting to identify innovative strategies to improve employee performance in an ever-competitive, dynamic and changing business environment (Adeniyi, 2017; Schell & Solomon, 2017; Barret, 2016; Denis & Michel, 2016 and Inés & Pedro, 2015; Okwuise, Ugherughe & Afunwa, 2017; Okwuise, Oghoghomeh & Kifordu, 2020; Okwuise, Kifordu & Oghoghomeh, 2020; Okwuise & Ugherughe, 2023). Companies tend to provide financial remuneration and employee benefits to retain employees and improve their quality of life, which has created a competitive environment (Long, 2017 and Ali & Raza, 2015).

The Nigerian Business Report (2021) states that: “the hotel and hospitality sector is the world's largest industry and generator of jobs”. It is among the fastest expanding industries in the world and is important top foreign earners for Nigeria. Hotels and recreation centers recorded a growth of 5.0 per cent in 2017 compared to 4.2 per cent in 2015, and tourism earnings increased compared to the previous years. Wood (2015) suggests that hospitality employees have no career structure and that their jobs are perceived as dead ends, making the firms less likely to attract long stay recruits. This is why many university graduates and related certificate holders sojourn at the hospitality industry as they await to determine their career path.

Employees are the most important assets in any organisation, and in the hotel industry, remuneration is of paramount importance. The motivation of the employees is a major issue as it directly corresponds to employee turnover and overall quality of service of the concerned hotels (SHIK, 2017; Chen, 2013). Zhang (2016) opined that the performance of the employees plays an important role in determining the profitability of the hotels, as employees are one of the most vital assets of the hotels. Additionally, the guests have direct interaction with the employees and the employees are responsible for satisfying the guests. Nigeria has a high rate of employees leaving their employers due to low pay, leading to a need for a study to determine if remuneration affects employee performance in the hospitality industry (Ali and Raza, 2015). Incentives can lead to improved motivation, effort, and performance, but if poorly designed or communicated, they can lead to degradation in performance. The lack of adequate remuneration policies can lead to increases in service costs, making performance-related pay schemes costlier than expected.

The hospitality sector in Nigeria has experienced problems with performance-related remuneration policies, leading to job dissatisfaction and high employee turnover. Remuneration can be successful in improving employee performance and organizational change, but its true impact remains under-researched. This study examined effects of remuneration on employee performance of selected hotels in Delta State. The following questions are raised to guide the study: What are the effects of salary on employee performance at selected hotels in Delta State? What are the effects of incentives on the employee performance of selected hotels in Delta State? What are the effects of compensation benefits on employee performance at selected hotels in Delta State? And what are the effects of the employee stock ownership plan on the employee performance of selected hotels in Delta State?

Having seen the research questions upon which the research hypotheses of this study are built, the rest of the study is divided into four sections: the review of related literature; the conceptual framework, theoretical framework, and empirical review; the methods and materials; the results and discussion; and the conclusion and recommendations.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE
This section presents the conceptual review, theoretical review, empirical review and summary of literature reviewed.

Concept of Remuneration
Remuneration is the aggregate income of an individual, and can include fundamental pay, wages, wellbeing plans, pension plans, transport remittances, over time recompenses and responsibility stipends (Baker & Demerouti, 2017). Remuneration is a technique for promoting morale, increasing inspiration and encouraging team cohesion (Xanthopoulou, 2019 and Calvin, 2017). It can be as simple as a raise or advancement, but can also be powerful in long-term inspiration and profitability. It is trusted that compensation strategy represents one of the best speculations an organization makes, as money can directly impact conduct. The impact of compensation system is an essential ingredient in each association and worker execution is a basic issue for some organizations (Bauer, 2016; Coyle & Conway, 2014; Christensen, 2011 and Baker et al, 2007).

The need to attract, persuade, develop and hold employees is essential for association success, and remuneration is one of the most important determinants of employee attitudes, inspiration and behaviours. Pay is regulated to ensure a decent execution level in the workplace, and when higher outcomes result in high pay increases, execution is strengthened and more prone to be rehashed later (Knippenberg, 2017; Baker & Demerouti, 2017; Wayne, 2012; Peterson, 2011; Masterson, 2010).

Remuneration is an effective investment for organizations, as it is seen as a motivator by employees as well as managers, leading to higher levels of productivity and motivation (Christensen et al, 2011 and Xanthopoulou, 2019). When employees are inspired by striking remunerations, their performance increases and they are more likely to move towards organizational objectives without resistance (Detert, 2017 and Xanthopoulou, 2019). Employees' satisfaction depends on their expectations and how they are fulfilled. Low payments lead to lower motivation and lower performance (Peterson, 2011; Crossman & Zaki, 2013 and Shields, 2015). Organisations must offer non-monetary benefits such as prestige, promotion, and acknowledgment to motivate employees and make them more productive (Luthans, 2018; Xanthopoulou, 2017; Malhotra, 2017; Calvin, 2017).

Employee Performance
Employees who are the most efficient are motivated to perform due to the relationship between rewards and employee performance (Medina, 2002). Rewards may be cash, recognition, or bonuses, and Suesi (2002) states that reward is the key motive to increase employee performance. Osterloh and Frey (2012) states that employees are motivated to monthly rewards to satisfy the social exchange process, Kanfell (1990), Entiwistal (1987) states that 96% of employees feel motivated by organisational rewards, and Freedman (1978) as cited in Rizwan and Ali (2010) states that recognition in a favourable works environment motivates the employee. The employee is an important part of any organisation increasing the performance and can be motivated through financial and non-financial benefits (Holt, 1993).

Compensation should be designed to attract and motivate highly skilled and qualified employees to achieve goals, reducing employee dissatisfaction and increasing turnover, absenteeism, and poor health (Decenzo & Robbins, 1999; Welthel & Davis, 1996 and Davis, 1996).

Mabaso and Dlamini (2017) and Ibrahim and Borerhaneoddin (2010) suggest that a good compensation package encourages effective employees to remain in employment for a longer period of time, leading to job satisfaction, commitment and loyalty. Mabaso and Dlamini (2017), Khan et al (2014) and Greenberg and Baron (2008) agree that employee commitment can be enhanced and satisfaction can be improved through adjustments in the compensation package.

Salary and Employee Performance
Salary is a fixed amount of money paid to a worker, usually expressed in annual terms, with no additions for productivity. It is the most important reward an employee receives at work and is essential for effective performance (Idrees et al., 2015; Wilfred, Elijah & Muturi, 2014 and Muogbo, 2013).

Employees view salary as the value of their employer place on them, and the level of appreciation a worker feels can have a direct impact on their motivation (Woods, 2017). Traditional pay systems are based on the job, equality in standard pay, and competitive salaries, but employees are not encouraged to acquire new skills and
are not rewarded if they do. This can lead to redundancy and monotony of work, reducing an organisation's volume of output.

Salary is an important part of total pay for non-executive employees, as it acts as a benchmark for other cash incentives and helps to attract and retain employees. Employers pay above market rates to retain employees, and employees are paid based on their skills and competencies, not job value (Shield, 2017; Swanepoel, 2013; Lynch, 2010 and Shield, 2007). Employers should pay employees market-related salaries to avoid strike and poor performance, regardless of salary inefficiencies (Livingstone, 2009 and Armstrong, 2003).

**Incentives and Employee Performance**

The use of re-engineering process and worker incentives can have a positive impact on the organisation, allowing employees to become more involved in decision making and multiple jobs to be done simultaneously, allowing for economies of scale and customisation (David et al, 2005 and Judith, 2018). Work is shifted across organisational and international boundaries, controls and checks are instituted, and non-value adding added work is minimized. Reconciliation is minimized by cutting back on external contact points and creating business allowances.

Incentives can be used by organizations to motivate employees to increase productivity or increase their efforts, and can come in the form of monetary and non-monetary payments. Scholars agree that employees are loyal to an organization if their needs and demands are addressed. (Heathfield, 2013 and Judith, 2018).

Financial incentives increase employee loyalty and help organizations maintain good relationships with their employees by offering financial and non-financial compensation, such as profit sharing, bonus, and promotion, and stock ownership. Studies have found that incentives are key in improving employee performance. (Karim & Reddy, 2013; Saleem, 2011 and Milkovich & Newman, 2008).

The importance of employee incentives in firms is not asset portfolios, but employees working as a team to discover, sell and offer service. However, Mlay et al. (2013) failed to show how to reengineer the labour in conjunction with the reengineering process, and Sethi and King (2003) failed to provide any documentation or empirical evidence concerning the effect of reengineering. Capital holding performed a cultural audit, which showed that unwritten rules of conduct appreciated information hoarding and barely acknowledged the customer. To curb these tendencies, high-ranking executive provided a constant flow of information and raised the performance appraisal system to emphasize the new values of teamwork and cooperation. Reengineering was found to increase efficiency and improve customer service, while the most significant outcome of reengineering were better technology and better customer services.

Sethi and King (2003) found a positive relationship between re-engineering process orientation and non-financial performance measures, suggesting that incentives have a significant impact on employee performance. Re-engineering process is a socio-technical approach that helps shape behavior and mind-set through self-management.

**Compensation Benefits and Employee Performance**

Compensation benefits are payments to employees that enhance their financial position, categorized into base pay and contingent pay. Compensation benefits are indirect financial and non-financial payments employees receive for continuing their employment with the company. Bernardin (2013) defines compensation benefits as indirect forms of compensation that are intended to maintain or improve the quality of life for employees. Gomez et al. (2012) also says that compensation benefits are sometimes called indirect compensation as they are given to employees in form of plan rather than cash to improve their performance. Cascio (2015) classifies benefits into four basic types: supplemental pay benefits, insurance benefits, retirement benefits and personal service and family-friendly benefits. These benefits enhance employee performance in an organisation.

Compensation benefits are linked to extrinsic motivation (external factors) and direct compensation (financial payment). Studies have found that financial compensation does not have an effect on employee performance, but there is a positive relationship between salary and performance. When an employee is motivated, their
performance will improve (Setyadi & Subekti, 2016; Ryan & Deci, 2012; Niode, 2011; Umar, 2011; Khan, Farooq & Ullar, 2010; Mondy, 2008).

**Employee Share Ownership Plan and Employee Performance**

Studies have found that adoption of an employee share ownership plan has a positive impact on firm performance, boosting employee morale and leading to attractive firm outcomes (Daniel, 2011). ESOPs can harm shareholders due to weak or ineffective management and lack of motivation to increase productivity. Blues and Krus (2003) argue that ESOPs can provide maximum long-term work, and Pugh et al. (2000) provide an example of acquisitions purchased by companies by ESOP. ESOPs can harm shareholders due to weak or ineffective management and lack of motivation to increase productivity. Blues and Krus (2003) argue that ESOPs can provide maximum long-term work, and Pugh et al. (2000) provide an example of acquisitions purchased by companies by ESOP.

**Conceptual Framework**

Based on the study objectives, the following conceptual relationships are established by the researcher:

```
INDEPENDENT VARIABLE

Remuneration

↓

Salary

Incentives

Compensation Benefit

Employee Stock Ownership Plan

DEPENDENT VARIABLE

Employee Performance
```

**Source: Researcher’s Model (2023)**

The above framework indicates that remuneration is an independent variable, employee performance is the dependent variable, while salary, incentive, compensation benefit and employee stock ownership plan are the dimensions of the independent variable (Remuneration) while Employee Performance is the dependent variables as depicted on frame.

**Theoretical Review**

The study viewed four theories, they are: Agency Theory, Stakeholders Theory, Social Exchange and Incentive Contract theory.
Agency Theory
Agency theory suggests that firm owners bear expenses by hiring people who manage the organization's affairs, leading to a focus on increasing sales instead of profits and earnings management. This shifts affluence away from the people who own the company and erodes shareholder wealth value (Stephen & Barry, 1973).

ESOPs increase employee ownership, but if new owners have no powers for decision making, existing managers will have more control. Fair remuneration adoption encourages more management monopoly, leading to less corporate performance. ESOPs increase voting power, making hostile takeover beneficial to shareholders.

Stakeholders Theory
Stakeholder's theory is general and comprehensive, guiding the structure and operations of established corporations. The management is obligated to take care of the welfare and interests of diverse parties, and ESOPs adoption is in line with the stakeholder's theory (Evan & Freeman, 1993; Okwuise, 2023).

Social Exchange Theory
(Social-exchange theory suggests that companies that give generous reimbursements stand a higher chance to acquire and maintain employees for their skills to be harnessed. Benefits are a useful means to motivate, retain and attract qualified employees, and can improve firm productivity by making employees more affiliated and attached to the firm (Kurlander & Barton, 2003 and Horwitz et al., 2003).

Incentive Contract Theory
Employees are encouraged to put forth ideas to increase productivity and contribute to the production process, as they are key cogs in the conveyer belt of the production process (Jean & David, 2002). The principle of owning property rights is essential to make and develop assets, as it provides absolute right to make decisions and right to revenues after all encumbrances are settled (Milgrom & Roberts, 1992).

Empirical Review
Aliku, Morka and Igemohia (2020) examined the effect of compensation management on Employees Performance in the Manufacturing Industry in Egypt. A descriptive survey research design was adopted and a sample size of 73 respondents was determined. Data presented and analyzed was dichotomized into three parts: descriptive analysis of respondents profile using simple weighted percentage, descriptive statistics of data gotten from the questionnaire using minimum, maximum, mean and standard deviations, and Pearson correlation analysis. The findings revealed that all the independent variables Salary (SLY) and Benefits Programmes (BP) have a significant relationship with Employees Performance.

Twumasi, Sarpong and Opare (2020) examined the effect of compensation on employee's performance in Accra Technical University: Ghana. Results showed that administrators were not attracted by monetary aspects, but rather management sensitivity to their needs.

Suleiman (2019) examined the relationship between remuneration and service delivery in the hospitality industry in Uganda, a case study of International Hotel Muyenga (IHM). The study was guided by three objectives: to examine the types of staff remuneration in IHM and the level of service quality in IHM, to test Pearson's Correlation Co-efficient Technique, and to consider remuneration, staff development and lecturers service delivery. The findings revealed a positive significant relationship, but an insignificant relationship between planning of general welfare and service delivery of IHM staff. Recommendations were drawn to plan well for remuneration through making fair budgets, put proper training, seminars, conferences into plans, and ignore general welfare as it does not relate with service delivery.

Fitsum (2018) examined the factors affecting the performance of employees in the hotel industry in Eritrea and found a positive and significant relationship between motivation, leadership, employee-employer relationship,
training, and working conditions, with training more prevalent in privately-owned hotels than government hotels.

Judith (2018) examined the effect of incentives on employee performance at Kenya Forest Service, Uasin Gishu County, and using descriptive survey research design. A pilot study was done in Nandi County to test for reliability, and a cronbach alpha of 0.72 was obtained. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze data, which indicated that incentives are essential in organizational performance.

Sunday, Nwekpa and Udu (2018) examined the extent to which salary increase as independent variable (x) influences employee productivity in cement manufacturing firms in South-South, Nigeria. The study adopted survey design and questionnaire were distributed. They found that salary increase has a significant relationship with employee productivity in cement manufacturing firms in South-South, Nigeria. They recommended that salary should be determined and increased based on productivity to create competition and motivate employees.

Fayyaz, Fiza and Ahsan (2017) examined the impact of employee stock ownership plans (ESOPs) on the overall performance of organizations in Karachi, Southern Pakistan. Results showed a statistically significant correlation between ESOPs and overall performance, with employees' turnover having moderate positive significant correlation.

Kimani, Thomas and Arasa (2017) conducted a case study of Mombasa Cement Limited, Kenya to determine the effect of compensation strategies on employee performance. The study used survey research method and a stratified sampling technique to select respondents. Quantitative data was analyzed, presented and interpreted using descriptive statistics. Pearson correlation method was used to evaluate the linear relationship between two continuous variables. The study found that reasonable salary, benefits in form of bonuses and allowances, and recognition through certification or verbally promoted employee performance. It also concluded that employees in the company consider recognition as a means of appreciation and believes that provision of certification awards generally motivates them to perform better.

Murray (2017) examined the effect of remuneration on motivation and performance of employees at the Nation Media Group in Nairobi Kenya. Qualitative research was used to identify variables and a sample size of 100 employees was used. Forty one of the targeted 100 staff responded by returning the questionnaire, indicating that employees are the most important of all the factors of production and if their motivation is low then there will be an influence on their effectiveness and efficiency.

Ojeleye (2017) examined the impact of remuneration on employees' performance, eighty three employees of Abdul Gusau polytechnic and state college of education both in Zamfara State, Nigeria. The study found a strong and positive relationship between remuneration and employees' performance, suggesting prompt payment of salaries, wages and all entitlements and encouragement of participation in pay determination.

Augustina (2016) investigated the effect of owner of shares by employees on financial performance of listed firms in the NSE, Kenya. The study used purposeful sampling to pick 8 companies with employee stock ownership, and secondary data was exposed to sensitivity analysis using OLS regression. The results showed that ESOPS had a strong positive and significant influence on the financial performance of the companies. Companies should put in place and implement corporate policies to encourage employees to take up ESOPs, and public policy should encourage investors and entrepreneurs to promote broad based ESOPs.


Edirisooriya (2014)examined the impact of extrinsic rewards and intrinsic rewards on employee performance: With Special Reference to ElectriCo Sri Lanka. Self-designed questionnaire was used as the primary data collection method. The data was analyzed using descriptive statistics and inferential statistics. The representative sample of 100 employees is selected from a population of 1075 employees in the ElectriCo.
results revealed that there is a positive relationship between extrinsic reward, intrinsic reward and employee performance. Hameed, Ramzan, Zubair, Ali and Arslan (2014) examined the impact of compensation on employee performance in the banking sector of Pakistan. Their results suggest that compensation has a positive impact on employee performance.

Sajuyigbe, Olaoye and Adeyemi (2013) investigated the impact of reward on employees’ performance in selected manufacturing companies in Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria. Structured questionnaire was used to collect data from one hundred (100) participants through purposive sampling method and data were analyzed by multiple regression analysis with the aid of statistical package for social science (SPSS) version 16. Result showed that reward dimensions jointly predict employees’ performance which accounted for 71% variance of performance.

METHODS AND MATERIALS
This section describes the research design, population and sample size, data collection method, research procedures and data analysis methods.

Research Design
The study adopts a descriptive research design. The design is suitable for this study because it is economical, simple, and clear. It also helps in understanding the entire population from the selected part of it. Reliability and validity of data collection methods are tested, as required by descriptive studies. Practical relations between variables, hypothesis testing, and the development of generalizations across populations are determined using a descriptive research design. The results of descriptive surveys are helpful in that they give information that facilitates practitioners and researchers in explaining how distinctive variables could link to other variables.

Population of the Study
The population of the study are the employees of the selected hotels in Delta State, which are; Elomax Hotel (Asaba), Grand Hotel (Asaba), Top Rank Hotel (Asaba), Vienna International Hotel (Asaba), Brook View Hotels (Warri), Luxury Hotel (Sapele), Gordons Resort Hotel (Sapele), Eliko Hotel (Warri), which amounts to a total of two hundred and twenty six (226) employees. See table 1 for evaluation.

Table 1: Population Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>N0</th>
<th>Staff Strength</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elomax Hotel</td>
<td>Asaba</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Hotel</td>
<td>Asaba</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Rank Hotel</td>
<td>Asaba</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna International Hotel</td>
<td>Asaba</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brook View Hotels</td>
<td>Warri</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliko Hotel</td>
<td>Warri</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxury Hotel</td>
<td>Sapele</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordons Resort Hotel</td>
<td>Sapele</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Human Resource Department of Selected Hotels (2023)

Sample Size
For the purpose of this study, given a target population of four hundred and seven (407) members, the sample size was derived using the sample size determination formula by Taro Yamane (1973). Taro Yamane developed this formula to calculate or determine the sample size in relation to the population under study. So that
inferences and conclusions reached after the survey can be generalized to the entire population from which the sample was gotten.

Where:

\[ n = \text{sample size} \]
\[ e = \text{level of significance} \]
\[ N = \text{population size} \]

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

The working reveals the desired sample size thus:

\[ n = \frac{407}{1 + 407(0.0025)^2} \]
\[ n = \frac{407}{1 + 407(0.5)^2} \]
\[ n = \frac{407}{1 + 407(0.0025)} = 202 \]

The sample size for the study was approximately 202 respondents. A sample size of 202 employees of the target population was used in this research. Just like any other descriptive studies that have been conducted before, this research may experience errors. These are non-observation and observation errors. The errors that may occur from the respondents are non-response errors and response bias. There may also be administrative errors and data processing errors in the process of analyzing data. To allocate the sample size of 202 to the selected hotels in Delta State, the study adopted the Bowley’s (1926) proportional allocation formula.

The formula is as stated below:

\[ n_h = \frac{nN_h}{N} \]

Where:

\[ n_h = \text{Number of units allocated to each institution} \]
\[ N_h = \text{Number of employees in each firm stratum in the population} \]
\[ n = \text{Total Sample} \]
\[ N = \text{The total population size under study} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Hotel</th>
<th>Computation</th>
<th>Sample Size Derived</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elomax Hotel</td>
<td>[ n_h = \frac{202 \times 43}{407} = 31 ]</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Hotel</td>
<td>[ n_h = \frac{202 \times 74}{407} = 37 ]</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Rank Hotel</td>
<td>[ n_h = \frac{202 \times 41}{407} = 20 ]</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna International Hotel</td>
<td>[ n_h = \frac{202 \times 43}{407} = 21 ]</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brook View Hotels</td>
<td>[ n_h = \frac{202 \times 49}{407} = 24 ]</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliko Hotels</td>
<td>[ n_h = \frac{202 \times 45}{407} = 23 ]</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxury Hotel</td>
<td>[ n_h = \frac{202 \times 44}{407} = 22 ]</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordons Resort Hotel</td>
<td>[ n_h = \frac{202 \times 48}{407} = 24 ]</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Analysis (2023)

Sampling Technique
The target respondents were selected using a simple random sampling technique. The individuals from the chosen population shared similar characteristics, like similar operations and similar reward and remuneration schemes. It is identified that there are several advantages to sampling as opposed to a census. These are lower costs, greater accuracy in results, a greater speed of data collection, and a higher availability of population elements. Based on the above assertions, this study adopted a simple random sampling technique. The simple random sampling design was aimed at ensuring high accuracy and precision.

**Research Instrument**

Structured sets of questionnaire were used as the primary instrument in this study. The questionnaire was divided into two sections. Section A covered the bio data of respondents. Section B covered the dimensions and relevant questions of remuneration and employee performance. The participant were given a period of one week to respondent to the various questions without external influence. However the researcher retrieved the copies of questionnaire at the end of one week interval by hand. The response format in five (5) point likert scale, whereby the respondents were asked to give answers ranging from (1) = strongly disagree, (2) = disagree, (3) = undecided, (4) = agree, and (5) = strongly agree, all to measure the chosen variables in the study.

**Validity of the Research instrument**

It is a measure of how well a test measures what it was supposed to measure. In order to test for the validity of the data collection instruments, the researcher conducted a pilot study, the aim for the pilot study was to get information from professionals from the field of management sciences that enabled the researcher to modify and improve the research instrument.

**Reliability of Research Instrument**

In order to ensure that the results are reliable, the same sets of questions were asked. Therefore, since all sampled respondents were randomly administered, subject bias was controlled to a large extent. Cronbach's alpha was used to measure reliability to test if the questionnaire is considered reliable and consistent. A reliability coefficient of .7 is acceptable, while the reliability coefficient of .6 and below shows poor reliability (Sekaran, 2003).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table3: Reliability Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach's Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.868</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistical Package for Social Sciences

From the above Table 3, a reliability coefficient of 0.868 and above is higher and is acceptable, while the reliability coefficient of 0.6 and below shows poor reliability (Sekaran, 2011).

**Data Collection Method**

The study collected data using a self-administered questionnaire. In this proposal, the questionnaire had two distinct parts, Section A and Section B: Section A was used to collect background information about the employees. Section B consists of the main questions that were used to determine the effects of remuneration on employee performance in the hospitality industry. The copies of the questionnaire were left with the respondents for a period of one week before collection. The questionnaire had closed-ended questions measured on a 5-point Likert scale where 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree. Each question allowed the respondents to check "not applicable" if necessary. There were open-ended questions that sought further explanations from the respondents.

**Source of Data Collection**

Primary data was collected using the structured questionnaire. A questionnaire is used because it manages to collect information from a large number of people in a short period of time and in a relatively cost-effective way. This tool gave room and freedom of expression to the respondents, who expected to get more information to capture important themes of the study on the effects of remuneration on employee performance. The
questionnaire is used to collect data from the employees of the selected organisation under investigation to determine the effects of remuneration on employee performance. The questionnaire was developed based on the research objectives.

**Data Analysis Technique**

The study edited and coded the collected data. The editing is done in order to detect errors and omissions, ensure data accuracy, be uniformly entered and complete, be consistent with the intent of the question and other information in the survey, and be arranged to simplify coding and tabulation. Alpha-numeric data coding is carried out to assign numbers and other symbols to the questions. It is done in order to group the respondents into a limited number of classes or categories that facilitate efficient analysis. Coded data is tabulated in the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) in a frequency distribution table to capture the effect of remuneration on employee performance.

**Model Specification**

In order to establish the effects of remuneration on employee performance at selected hotels in Delta State, a multiple regression analysis is carried out using the following regression model:

\[ Y = f(X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4) \]

\[ \text{Model 1} \]

The mathematical multiple regression equation is as follows:

\[ Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \epsilon \]

\[ \text{Equation 1} \]

Where:

- \( Y \) = Employee Performance.
- \( X_1 \) = Salary.
- \( X_2 \) = Incentive.
- \( X_3 \) = Compensation Benefit.
- \( X_4 \) = Employee Stock Ownership Plan.
- \( \epsilon \) = Error term
- \( \beta_0 \) = Constant

Apriori expectation: Mathematically it is expected that \( \beta_1 \) to \( \beta_4 \geq 0 \).

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Hypothesis One**

\( \text{H}_01 \): Salary has no positive and significant effects on employee performance of selected hotels in Delta State

**Tables 4:**

**Model Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>1.6560</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Salary (S)

**Tables 5:**

**ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>66.393</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66.393</td>
<td>24.210</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>534.774</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>2.742</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>601.168</td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance (EP)
b. Predictors: (Constant), Salary (S)
From the regression result in the table above, the p-value is less than 0.05. This shows a positive beta value of 0.332 (approximately 33%), which shows that salary (S) has positive and significant effects on employee performance (EP), as the probability value of 0.000 is also less than the critical level of significance (i.e., P < 0.05). With these statistics, we reject the null hypothesis and wish to state here that there is a positive and significant effect between salary (S) and employee performance (EP).

Hypothesis Two:
$H_{02}$: Incentive has no positive and significant effects on employee performance of selected hotels in Delta State.

In the tables above, even when the p-value is greater than 0.05, this shows a positive beta value of 0.156 (approximately 16%), which shows that incentive (I) has a significant effect on employee performance (EP) (i.e., P > 0.05). These statistics indicate that we reject the null hypothesis and state here that incentives (I) significantly affect employee performance (EP).

Hypothesis Three:
$H_{03}$: Compensation benefits have no positive and significant effects on employee performance of selected hotels in Delta State.
Table 11:

**ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.271</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.271</td>
<td>7.153</td>
<td>.008a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>579.897</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>2.974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>601.168</td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance (EP)
b. Predictors: (Constant), Compensation (C)

Table 12:

**Coefficients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>13.269</td>
<td>.993</td>
<td>13.364</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation (C)</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance (EP)

Source: Field Analysis, 2023

In the tables above, even when the p-value is greater than 0.05 (P = 0.008), it still shows a positive beta value of 0.188 (approximately 19%), which shows that compensation (C) has a significant effect on employee performance (EP) (i.e., P > 0.05). With these statistics, we reject the null hypothesis and state here that compensation (C) significantly has effects on employee performance (EP).

**Hypothesis Four:**

**H_{04}:** Employee stock ownership plan has no positive and significant effects on employee performance of selected hotels in Delta State.

Tables 13:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.129a</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>1.7411</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Employee stock ownership plan (ESOP)

Table 14:

**ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.045</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.045</td>
<td>3.314</td>
<td>.070a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>591.123</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>3.031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>601.168</td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance (EP)
b. Predictors: (Constant), Employee stock ownership plan (ESOP)

Table 15:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The results presented in the tables above show that even when the p-value is greater than 0.05 (P = 0.07), it exhibits a positive beta value of 0.129 (approximately 13%), which shows that the employee stock ownership plan (ESOP) has a significant effect on employee performance (EP) (i.e., P > 0.05). With these statistics, we reject the null hypothesis and state here that employee stock ownership plans (ESOP) significantly affect employee performance. This revealed that 13% (0.129) of the variance in employee performance (EP) is explained by the employee stock ownership plan (ESOP), with an adjusted $r^2$ value of 0.012.

**Table 16: Results of dimensions of remuneration and its significant effects on Employee Performance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>1.6607</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Salary (S), Incentive (I) Compensation (C), Employee Stock Ownership Plan (ESOP)

**Table 17:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Regression</td>
<td>71.657</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.914</td>
<td>6.496</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>529.510</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>2.758</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>601.168</td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance (EP)
b. Predictors: (Constant), Salary (S), Incentive (I) Compensation (C), Employee Stock Ownership Plan (ESOP)

**Table 18:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>9.837</td>
<td>1.390</td>
<td>7.075</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>-6.631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentive</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Stock Ownership Plan</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>3.790</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

**Source: Field Analysis, 2023**

The results in Table 18 above show that the tested variables exhibited positive coefficients ranging from 0.073 to 0.304, implying that there is a significant effect association between the studied variables of remuneration and employee performance. Also, apart from knowledge management, which had a negative beta value of -0.050, salary, incentive, compensation, and the employee stock ownership plan all exhibited positive beta values. Amongst all, salary seems to be the most significant variable to employee performance.

**Discussion of Results**

The results of the regression analysis showed that incentives, as a measure of remuneration, have a positive and significant effect on employee performance, as evidenced by the beta value of the standardised coefficients.
This corroborates the findings of Muogbo (2013), who found that attractive salaries are valuable tools for increasing employee performance and the productivity of an organisation. To motivate people to put in maximum efforts, it is essential that their needs are met as far as is practicable.

Incentives have a positive effect on employee performance in the Nigerian hospitality industry, with a positive beta value of 16% and a p-value greater than the critical value of 0.005. This is in agreement with the findings of Saleem (2011), who asserts that financial incentives increase employee loyalty in the organization. Organisations should seek to maintain good relationships with their employees by offering incentives in the form of financial and non-financial compensation, such as profit sharing, bonuses, and promotion. Compensation benefits have a positive and significant effect on employee performance, even when the p-value is greater than 0.005. This agrees with the findings of Khan, Farooq, and Ullar (2010) that there is a direct and positive relationship between financial compensation and employee performance.

The results of the fourth objective showed that an employee stock ownership plan is significantly linked to employee performance, with 13% of variance explained by knowledge management. This aligns with the study of Daniel (2011), which found that an employee stock ownership plan boosts employee morale and leads to good employee behavior and perceptions, leading to attractive firm outcomes in the form of profitability and customer contentment. From the foregoing, it has been statistically and empirically established that all measures, proxies, and indicators of remuneration used in this study have a statistically significant positive effect on employee performance, as evidenced in existing literature.

**CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Conclusion**
The study found that remuneration has a significant and positive effect on employee performance in the Nigerian hospitality industry, and that organizations should focus on their remuneration plans to motivate employees to have positive attitudes and contribute positively towards organizational goals.

**Recommendations**
From the outcome of the study, the following recommendations are made:

i. The study recommends that firms review the wage structure in order to motivate employees to retain their jobs and increase performance.

ii. Organisations should seek to maintain good relationships with their employees by offering good incentives in the form of financial and non-financial compensation.

iii. For organisations that do not have remuneration systems in place, a lot of informative awareness and campaigning should be done to enable the workforce to see reasons and appreciate why compensation is necessary both for employees as well as other stakeholders as a cooperative entity.

iv. Provide stock incentives and increase motivational measures and the commitment of employees due to employee ownership in the organisation, which is expected to increase employee productivity and overall organisation performance.
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