



## Factors influencing employee job satisfaction in Ghana's hotel industry

Eunice Fay Amissah, Emmanuel Gamor, Mildred Nuong Deri & Agnes Amissah

To cite this article: Eunice Fay Amissah, Emmanuel Gamor, Mildred Nuong Deri & Agnes Amissah (2016) Factors influencing employee job satisfaction in Ghana's hotel industry, Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism, 15:2, 166-183, DOI: [10.1080/15332845.2016.1084858](https://doi.org/10.1080/15332845.2016.1084858)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332845.2016.1084858>



Published online: 20 Jan 2016.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 1696



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Citing articles: 7 View citing articles [↗](#)

## Factors influencing employee job satisfaction in Ghana's hotel industry

Eunice Fay Amissah<sup>a</sup>, Emmanuel Gamor<sup>a</sup>, Mildred Nuong Deri<sup>a</sup>,  
and Agnes Amissah<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Department of Hospitality and Tourism Management, University of Cape Coast, Cape Coast, Ghana;

<sup>b</sup>School of Applied Science and Technology (SAST), Koforidua Polytechnic, Koforidua, Ghana

### ABSTRACT



This study examined factors affecting job satisfaction and also assessed the level of satisfaction of employees working in the hotel industry. The study gathered descriptive data using questionnaires from 190 hotel employees. Factor analysis was employed to extract job satisfaction factors while the standard multiple regression was used to analyze the predictive factors of job satisfaction. The results showed that employees were slightly satisfied with their jobs. The study also identified four main facets of satisfaction, namely pay, supervision, promotion, as well as training and advancement. Of these factors, pay, supervision, and promotion were found to significantly influence job satisfaction. Managerial implications are that hotel managers can overcome employee dissatisfaction by providing employees with competitive pay and also by training supervisors on the use of good communication, among other techniques.

### KEYWORDS

Employees; Ghana; hotels;  
job satisfaction

### Introduction

The hotel industry is a service-oriented industry that relies heavily on the behavior and attitudes of employees to provide friendly and courteous services to customers. Manpower in the hotel industry is the most important resource. In an industry where service is highly personalized, guest satisfaction can only be achieved when workers are happy and satisfied with their jobs (Lashley & Morrison, 2000). Studies have shown that organizations with more satisfied employees tend to be more effective (Robbins & Judge, 2007). This is due to the fact that happy workers are more likely to be productive. Hotel managers need to better understand what motivates and satisfies their employees in order to increase job satisfaction and reduce employee turnover intentions. For instance, knowing what motivates an employee to work in the hotel industry would give hotel managers a better chance of satisfying and, consequently, retaining their employees. Though there have been a

**CONTACT** Eunice Fay Amissah  [eunicefamissah@gmail.com](mailto:eunicefamissah@gmail.com)  Department of Hospitality and Tourism Management, University of Cape Coast, Cape Coast, Ghana.

© 2016 Taylor & Francis Group, LLC

myriad of research studies on employee job satisfaction in the hotel industry, there is a dearth of empirical data on the subject matter in a Ghanaian context.

In Ghana, the growth of tourism has been rapid in the past decade and this has been reflected in the development of hotels at a fast rate (Hiamey, 2012; Mensah, 2009; Akyeampong, 2007). Hotels in Ghana grew from 992 in 2000 to 1,797 in 2010 (Ghana Tourism Authority, 2011). Though the growth of commercial accommodation in Ghana is nationwide, the spacial distribution is skewed in favour of Accra, which has a greater number of all categories of commercial accommodation (Hiamey, 2012). The bulk of hotel employees can therefore be found in Accra, hence the decision to conduct the study in Accra.

### ***Statement of purpose***

The purpose of this study was to examine factors which influence the job satisfaction of employees. Specifically, the study sought to

1. Assess the satisfaction level of employees in hotels;
2. Identify the factors influencing employee job satisfaction;
3. Examine the relative importance of job satisfaction factors.

Since employees are considered as important conduits between customers and a company, this study will augment the understanding of factors that influence employee satisfaction, especially in the hotel industry. The study will also be beneficial to hotel managers since it will help them to better understand the needs of employees in the hotel sector in Accra and provide the best environment for them. By so doing, they would be better able to retain workers.

### ***Literature review***

#### ***Concept of job satisfaction***

There is a plethora of definitions of job satisfaction, put forward by different researchers. Spector (1997) referred to job satisfaction as how people feel about their jobs and different aspects of their jobs. Ellickson and Logsdon (2002) supported this view by defining job satisfaction as the extent to which employees like their work. Schermerhorn (1993) defined job satisfaction as an affective or emotional response toward various aspects of an employee's work. Similarly, McNamara (1999) pointed out that job satisfaction refers to an individual's feeling or state of mind given the nature of the individual's work.

Rue and Byars (1992) stated the view that job satisfaction is related to an individual's mental state about a job. Robbins, Odendaal, and Roodt (2003) added that an individual with high job satisfaction will display a positive attitude toward his/her job, and the individual who is dissatisfied will have a negative attitude about the job. This definition was expanded by Greenberg and Baron (1995), who defined job satisfaction as an individual's cognitive, affective, and evaluative reactions toward his/her job. According to Sempane, Rieger, and Roodt (2002),

the work itself could have an effect on the total quality of life of the employee. Sempane et al. (2002) concluded that job satisfaction is an individual's personal assessment of conditions prevalent in the job, thus evaluation occurs on the basis of factors, which they regard as important to them. According to Cherrington (1994), research on job satisfaction has identified two aspects to understanding of the concept of job satisfaction, namely facet satisfaction and overall satisfaction.

Facet satisfaction refers to the tendency for an employee to be more or less satisfied with various facets or aspects of the job (Johns, 1996). Cherrington (1994) refers to the various aspects or facets of the job as the individual's attitude about their pay; the work itself—whether it is challenging, stimulating, and attractive; and the supervisors—whether they possess the softer managerial skills as well as being competent in their jobs. Cherrington (1994) points out that overall satisfaction focuses on the general internal state of satisfaction or dissatisfaction within the individual. Positive experiences in terms of friendly colleagues, good remuneration, compassionate supervisors, and attractive jobs create a positive internal state. Negative experiences emanating from low pay, less stimulating jobs, and criticism create a negative internal state.

Andersen, Domsch, and Cascorbi (2007) are among recent researchers who follow the first approach. For these authors, job satisfaction is a pleasant or positive emotional state resulting from the work experience, which is produced when the job satisfies certain individual needs. One year later, Chang and Lee (2007) also defined job satisfaction in the broad sense as a general attitude a person has or holds toward his or her job. According to this conceptualization, attitudes should be understood as positive or negative appraisals of objectives, people, and events, and reflect how individuals interpret them. With regards to the individual mental state approach, Wright (2006, p. 270) noted that job satisfaction represents “an interaction between employees and their work environment by gauging the congruence between what employees want from their jobs and what employees feel they receive.” Finally, it is important to highlight a third approach, which analyzes job satisfaction at the group level. In this line, Mason and Griffin (2002) argued that there are many processes in organizations that occur within groups and that it is important to conceptualize job satisfaction at the group or organizational level.

Given that there is no universally accepted definition of job satisfaction, it is a difficult task to develop a single, universal method to measure it. As a result, job satisfaction is measured using direct and indirect approaches (Harpaz, 1983). Of the direct approaches, the subjective method is the most common. This method uses job satisfaction questionnaires to identify and estimate employees' values and needs in their daily life and within the organization. Furthermore, the analysis of determinants of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction has become an area of social interest among researchers. Rahman and Sanzi (1995) found that job satisfaction is not influenced by the same factors across all industries. It is therefore necessary to focus on works dealing specifically with the hotel industry in order to draw relevant conclusions. According to Lee and Way (2010), hotel managers must

evaluate and determine the factors that play an important role in fulfilling the expectations employees have of their jobs. Based on that premise, Santa Cruz, López-Guzmán, and Cañizares (2014) admonished hotel industry researchers and professionals to find effective ways of measuring the factors which mediate employee job satisfaction levels.

### ***Level of employee job satisfaction in hotels***

Job satisfaction, which is regarded as a general feeling or attitude that an individual has toward the job he or she does (Gallardo, Sanchez-Canizares, Lopez-Guzman, & Jesus, 2010), is not determined by the same factors in all industries around the world (Gallardo et al., 2010; Rahman & Sanzi, 1995). The literature on job satisfaction in the hotel industry reveals that attributes of job satisfaction, which include wages and salaries, job position, promotion, the job itself, and training (Santa Cruz et al., 2014; Lam, Zhang, & Baum, 2001), are more common to the hotel industry.

Santa Cruz et al. (2014) observed that about 58.4% of hotel employees in the Cordoba province in Spain were satisfied with their job while about 8.4% were dissatisfied. In the same way, respondents in Las Vegas casino hotels were somewhat satisfied with the jobs they were doing (Bai, Brewer, Sammons, & Swerdlow, 2006). These are also in line with the work of authors such as Spinelli and Canavos (2000).

Gu and Siu (2009) opined that hotel employees were satisfied with their salaries and benefits, and with the support and training offered to them. However, their level of satisfaction is only at the mediocre level. On the contrary, a study by Gallardo et al. (2010) revealed that employees in the Iberian hotel industry, specifically in Spain and Portugal, were dissatisfied with remuneration but satisfied with relationships with colleges and the job itself. Employees were, however, satisfied at the mediocre level with training and promotion.

### ***Factors influencing job satisfaction among employees***

Studies have shown that the organizational factors that impact on job satisfaction include the work itself, remuneration/pay, supervision, training, and promotion.

#### ***Pay***

Research appears to be equivocal regarding the influence of pay on job satisfaction (Brainard, 2005; Oshagbemi, 2000). According to Bassett (1994), a lack of empirical evidence exists to indicate that pay alone improves worker satisfaction or reduces dissatisfaction. In a study conducted by Oshagbemi (2000), among U.K. academics, a statistically significant relationship between pay and rank of employees and their level of job satisfaction was established. However, Young, Worchel, and Woehr (1998) failed to find any significant relationship between pay and job satisfaction.

Similarly, results from a survey conducted by Brainard (2005) among post-doctoral scientific researchers found pay and benefits to be weakly associated with job satisfaction. The existence of both financial rewards and recognition has been found to have a significant influence on highly educated employees (Arnolds & Boshoff, 2004). Individuals view their remuneration as an indication of their value to the organization. Employees compare their inputs to received remuneration in relation to that of others (Nel et al., 2004). Lack of recognition and poor pay, therefore, often contribute to employee job dissatisfaction, leading to quitting intention.

### **Promotion**

A number of researchers are of the opinion that job satisfaction is strongly related to opportunities for promotion (Pergamit & Veum, 1999; Peterson, Puia, & Sues, 2003). This view is supported by a study conducted by Ellickson and Logsdon (2002) among municipal government workers in South Africa where job satisfaction with promotional opportunities was found to be positively and significantly related. Kreitner and Kinicki (2001, however, found that the positive relationship between promotion and job satisfaction was dependent on perceived equity by employees. If workers maintain one particular position without promotion for so many years on the job, they are likely to be dissatisfied.

### **Supervision**

Studies have shown that there is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and supervision (Peterson et al., 2003; Smucker, Whisenant, & Pederson, 2003). Supervision is a role relating to job satisfaction in terms of the ability of the supervisor to provide emotional and technical support, as well as guidance with work related tasks (Robbins et al., 2003). According to Ramsey (1997), supervisors contribute to high or low morale in the workplace. Supervisors with high relationship behavior, as explained by Graham and Messner (1998), strongly impact on job satisfaction. Wech (2002) supported this view by adding that supervisory behavior strongly affects the development of trust in relationships with employees.

Packard and Kauppi (1999) found out that employees with supervisors who display democratic management styles experienced higher levels of job satisfaction compared to those who had supervisors who exhibited autocratic or laissez faire leadership styles. Brewer and Hensher (1998) contended that supervisors whose leadership styles emphasise consideration and concern for employees generally have more satisfied workers than supervisors who are hard on their subordinates. Bassett (1994) maintained that when supervisors bring their humanistic side to the job by being considerate toward their employees, they contribute to increasing the employee's level of job satisfaction. When supervisors are more tolerant, ready to lead, and also help build subordinates' confidence, then they are increasing employee levels of job satisfaction.

### ***The work itself***

Locke (1995) postulated that employee job satisfaction is dependent on satisfaction with job components such as the work itself. Work itself refers to the “the extent to which the job provides the individual with stimulating tasks, opportunities for learning and personal growth, and the chance to be responsible and accountable for results” (Robbins et al., 2003, p. 77). According to Robbins (1993), employees prefer jobs that present them with opportunities to execute their competencies on a variety of tasks and that are mentally stimulating. This view is supported by Lacey (1994), who stated that individuals are more satisfied with the work itself when they engage in tasks that are mentally and physically stimulating. Robbins et al. (2003) posited that jobs that are unchallenging lead to boredom and frustration. Contrary to the above, Johns (1996) is of the opinion that some employees prefer jobs that are unchallenging and less demanding. Vitell and Davis (1990) found a statistically significant relationship between job satisfaction and the dimension of work itself. Results from other studies indicate that a dimension such as the work itself can result in either job satisfaction or dissatisfaction (Oshagbemi, 1997; Ruthankoon & Ogunlana, 2003).

### ***Training and advancement***

Training is an important factor that allows employees to familiarize themselves with new ideas in the work environment (Feldman, 1998). For most employees joining an organization, training programs are often the major functions that facilitate their adaptation to a new work environment and to becoming productive employees, and this should be a continuous practice. Employees’ first experiences with an organization often occur in a training setting, and the initial experience influences the development of employees’ commitment and this should be a continuous process (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). However, Tannenbaum, Mathieu, Salas, and Cannon-Bowers (1991) noted that very little is known about the effects of training on job satisfaction and that there is a need for further studies. Some studies have found that the amount of training received by employees is significantly related to commitment and intention to quit (Saks, 1996). Training will always keep employees abreast of new and current trends in the working environment.

### ***Factors influencing job satisfaction among hotel employees***

In the hotel industry, attributes such as wages, relationships with supervisors, number of working hours, job status, and promotion, among others, are noted to influence job satisfaction (Lee, Nam, Park, & Lee, 2006; Mount & Bartlett, 2002; Lam et al., 2001). To Lam et al. (2001), salary or pay is the most pressing factor that contributes to an employee’s job satisfaction. In the same vein, Charles and Marshall (1992) and Simons and Enz (1995) agreed that the issue of pay is the leading job satisfaction factor.



Kim and Jogaratnam (2010) however, in their study on the effects of individual and organizational factors on job satisfaction and intent to stay in a hotel and restaurant industry, revealed that the job itself, participative decision making, and pressure/stress were good predictors of job satisfaction, while supervisory leadership and intrinsic motivation were not good predictors of job satisfaction. Gallardo, Sanchez-Canizares, Lopez-Guzeman, and Jesus (2010) are of the view that relationships with colleagues, usefulness of the work, relationships with supervisors, and the work itself are perceived by hotel employees to contribute positively to job satisfaction, while remuneration, promotion possibilities, or the prestige of the profession are perceived to contribute little to job satisfaction.

In other studies, pay, working hours, working conditions, greater challenge or opportunity, and management were noted to have contributed to job satisfaction (Pavesic & Brymer, 1990). From the viewpoint of Chun-Fang, Ki-Joon, and Deborah (2005); Wesley and Skip (1999); and Conrade and Woods (1994), training and development is an important factor in the issue of job satisfaction.

Aksu and Aktas (2005) noted that working conditions including fringe benefits, working hours, and morale conditions are important factors that affect the satisfaction level of employees in hotels, especially managers. Training and development programs for new and well educated employees in the service industry, such as hotels, as noted by Lam et al. (2001), is one of the factors that influence job satisfaction.

## **Research methodology**

### ***Sampling procedure***

A multi-stage sampling technique was used in the study. The sampling was done at two levels to select the hotels and the employees. First, there was a division of the hotel population into strata using the Ghana Tourist Authority (GTA) classifications of hotels by star-rating (i.e., one star, two stars, three stars, four stars, and five stars). A total of 25 hotels were randomly selected from 115 registered hotels in Accra, comprising one five-star, two four-star, four three-star, 10 two-star, and eight one-star hotels.

Secondly, 50 employees were selected from each class of hotel. There is a difficulty in obtaining data from hotel employees due to the irregular and unpredicted working hours as well as shift system (Gamor, Amissah, & Boakye, 2014; Aslam, Shumiala, Azhar, & Sadaqat, 2011; Nicole, 2003). Due to this, the convenience sampling technique was used to collect data from hotel employees who were willing to take part in the study. Fifty employees were selected from each category of hotel because the lower rated hotels had fewer employees and the higher rated hotels had more employees. Table 1 shows how the sampling was done and the total number of respondents from each class of hotel.



**Table 1.** Distribution of sample.

Hotel category	Number of hotels in Accra	Sampled hotels	Sampled employees	Number of respondents
Five stars	1	1	50	33
Four stars	4	2	50	37
Three stars	6	4	50	38
Two stars	53	10	50	43
One star	51	8	50	39
Total	115	25	250	190

### **Research instrument**

According to Gulbahar (2003), it is accepted to be much easier or less risky to use one of the existing scales in order to measure job satisfaction as they have been developed carefully and their reliability and validity have been tested. Based on this, various scales were reviewed and a questionnaire was designed incorporating a broad range of items from the Job Descriptive Index, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, and the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire. Six broad factors made up of 52 statements were extrapolated for this study. The factors and the number of statements were pay (9), promotion (9), work itself (11), supervision (11), training and development (9), and benefits and rewards (9).

This survey questionnaire consisted of two sections. The first section of the instrument included a Likert-type scale for the employees to rate each of the statements from the six factors on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 was strongly agreed and 5 was strongly disagreed. The second section contained questions relating to the socio-demographic characteristics of respondents including age, gender, education, work experience, industry tenure, and positional tenure. To ensure confidentiality, the instrument indicated that no individual or hotel names and addresses would be used.

### **Pre-testing and data collection**

A pre-test of the instrument was conducted in Cape Coast. It involved 30 hotel employees from three hotels. The response led to the rewording and removal of some items on the scale to enhance the validity of the instrument. Also, items with Cronbach's alpha values that were above 0.7 were retained to test the construct reliability of the scale used to measure service quality. At the end, 46 items, namely pay (7), promotion (7), work itself (9), supervision (9), training and development (7), and benefits and rewards (7) remained on the scale.

The questionnaire was mostly self-administered because, according to Armstrong and Overton (1977) as cited in Mensah (2012), self-administered questionnaires yield relative high response rates and avoid non-response bias associated with mailing questionnaires to respondents. Personal calls were made to the sampled hotels. The purpose of the study was then explained to hotel managers. Managers who agreed to allow their hotels partake in the study were asked to inform staff of the impending study. However, those who did not confirm their hotel's

participation were replaced with another hotel. Employees on duty at the time were given questionnaires to complete. Though the questionnaires were mostly self-administered, on a number of occasions the researchers had to administer the questionnaires to some employees through interviewing. Some respondents completed the questionnaires instantly while others asked the researchers to collect the completed questionnaires at a later date in sealed envelopes. This method, according to Oppenheim (1992), ensures a high response rate, accurate sampling, and minimal interviewer bias. Out of the 250 questionnaires, 190 were returned and found to be useful for analysis, yielding a response rate of 76%.

### **Data analysis**

The data was coded and entered into the SPSS (version 17) software for analysis. Descriptive statistics, such as averages and frequencies, were employed to present background characteristics of respondents factor analysis was used to identify factors of hotel employee job satisfaction, and standard multiple regression was also employed to determine the factors predicting job satisfaction in the hotel industry.

## **Results and discussion**

### **Profile of hotel employees**

The gender distribution of the respondents indicated that of the 190 respondents, 54.2% were males, while 45.8% were females. It is evident that the highest proportion (53.7%) of the respondents was between the ages of 21–30, while 31.1% were between 31 and 40 years. There were more unmarried (58.9%) than married (41.1%) respondents. The highest proportion (28.5%) of respondents was in the front office department, with housekeeping department being the least (20.5%). Among the respondents, 86.8% were full-time workers, whereas the other workers (13.2%) were casuals. The results show that 37.6% of the respondents had worked between one and three years, while 7.4% had spent more than 6 years in the industry. On educational attainment, those with secondary/high school qualification (32.1%) were the same as those with post-secondary certificates. Those who had basic qualification were the least (4.7%). [Table 2](#) depicts the background characteristics of the sampled respondents.

### **Level of employee job satisfaction**

[Table 3](#) shows that employees were very much dissatisfied with four facets of job satisfaction: the work itself (mean = 1.71, *SD* = 0.80), supervision (mean = 1.75, *SD* = 0.71), pay (mean = 1.96, *SD* = 0.83), and promotion chances (mean = 1.97, *SD* = 0.85). They were moderately dissatisfied with training and development opportunities (mean = 2.02, *SD* = 0.85), while slightly satisfied with benefits and

**Table 2.** Profile of hotel employees.

Background characteristic	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Male	103	54.2
Female	87	45.8
Age		
<20	7	3.7
21–30	102	53.7
31–40	59	31.1
41–50	18	9.5
51–60	4	2.1
Educational level		
Primary/JSS	9	4.7
Secondary	61	32.1
Post-secondary (non-degree)	61	32.1
Degree	59	31.1
Marital status		
Married	78	41.1
Unmarried	112	58.9
Department		
Housekeeping	39	20.5
Front office	54	28.5
Accounts/administration	54	28.4
Food and beverage	43	22.6
Work status		
Full time	165	86.8
Casual	25	13.2
Years of service in this hotel		
<1	54	28.4
1–3	72	37.9
4–6	50	26.3
>6	14	7.4
Years of service in the hotel industry		
1–5	89	46.8
6–10	74	38.9
>10	27	14.3
Hotel star-rating	33	17.4
One star	37	19.5
Two stars	38	20.0
Three stars	43	22.6
Four stars	39	20.5
Five stars		

rewards (mean = 3.13, *SD* = 0.80). Overall, employees were slightly satisfied with their jobs (mean = 3.36, *SD* = 0.885).

With regard to overall job satisfaction, the study strengthens the point that, on a whole, hotel employees are slightly satisfied with their jobs, which was posited by Bai et al. (2006) and Spinelli and Canavos (2000). It is in line with studies by Gu and Siu (2009) and Santa Cruz et al. (2014), who asserted that hotel employees are satisfied with their jobs. However, the current study contradicts studies by Gallardo et al. (2010), who were of the view that hotel employees are dissatisfied with their jobs. The difference in the study results can be an upshot of the of environmental factors, including tradition (Gamor et al., 2014), that make Africans, especially in the hotel industry, susceptible to different indicators of job satisfaction.

**Table 3.** Level of satisfaction with aspects of job ( $N = 90$ ).

Factor	Mean	SD
Pay	1.97	0.855
Promotion	1.96	0.834
The work itself	1.71	0.804
Supervision	1.75	0.706
Training and advancement	2.02	0.845
Benefits and rewards	3.13	0.809
Overall satisfaction	3.36	0.852

Note. Mean (1.0–1.49 = very satisfied; 1.5–2.49 = satisfied; 2.5–3.49 = slightly satisfied; 3.5–4.49 = dissatisfied; 4.50–5.0 = very dissatisfied).

### **Factors influencing job satisfaction among hotel employees**

Forty-six variables were subjected to factor analysis and four main factors, consisting of 32 variables, emerged as having accounted for job satisfaction among the hotel employees. Before employing factor analysis in this study, the sampling adequacy and the factorability of the data were examined to ensure that all assumptions were met. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2001), the Bartlett's test of sphericity should be significant ( $p < 0.05$ ) for the factor analysis to be considered appropriate, while the Kaiser-Meyer-Oklin measure of sampling adequacy (KMO) index ranges from zero to one with 0.6 recommended as the minimum value for a good factor analysis. For this study, the Bartlett's test of sphericity was found to be very significant ( $p = 0.00$ ) while the KMO index of 0.858 confirmed the suitability of the data for factor analysis. Table 4 presents the factors, their eigenvalues, percentage of variance explained, and the Cronbach's alpha.

Results from Table 4 show that the four main categories together explained 74.6% of the total variance. The factors, however, contributed differently to the explanation of the total variance. Factor 1 labeled as "pay" consisted of seven statements pertaining to pay rate, pay fairness, salary increment and its determining factors, such as level of experience and job performance. This factor explained 17.95 (30.8%) of the eigenvalue. All the sub-dimensions explaining the major construct loaded between 0.690–0.806. The finding confirms the assertion of Lee et al. (2006) that hotel employees view their remuneration as a leading indicator of their value to the organization. Employees compare their inputs to received outputs relevant to that of others (Nel et al., 2004). This finding confirms the assertion by Lam et al. (2001),

**Table 4.** Results of factor analysis on job satisfaction.

Factor	Eigenvalues	Percent of variance explained	Cronbach's alpha
Pay	17.953	30.840	0.816
Supervision	9.342	20.093	0.814
Training and development	8.014	13.989	0.813
Promotion	7.511	11.688	0.795
Total		74.609	

Notes. Bartlett's test of sphericity (approximate Chi-square) = 5,509.848; alpha value = 0.00; KMO measure of sample adequacy = 0.858.

Simons and Enz (1995), and Charles and Marshall (1992), that salary or pay is the most pressing factor that contributes to an employee's job satisfaction. This shows that remuneration is the most important factor to consider when dealing with issues of an employee's satisfaction with his or her job.

Factor 2 looked at supervision as a major construct that explains employee satisfaction. It had eight sub-variables that looked at supervisor–subordinate relationship and how that could explain job satisfaction. Together, these variables explained 20.0% of the variance. Factor loadings under this construct ranged from a low of  $-0.680$  to a high of  $0.797$ . This supports the views of researchers such as Peterson et al. (2003), Smucker et al. (2003), and Packard and Kauppi (1999), that supervision influences an employee's satisfaction with his or her job. This also agrees with the findings of Lee et al. (2006), Mount and Bartlett (2002), and Lam et al. (2001), that the relationship between hotel employees and their supervisors contributes to the feeling of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with their jobs in the hotels they work in.

Training and development was identified as the third factor that contributes to job satisfaction. The sub-statements, which were addressed under "training and advancement," included issues on training availability in the hotels, likeness, satisfactoriness, likeability, and its regularity. They explained 8.01 (13.9%) of the eigenvalue and, individually, the sub-factors had factor loadings ranging from,  $-0.512$  to  $0.729$ . This finding supports that of Pavesic and Brymer (1990), that greater challenge or opportunity for advancement were noted to have contributed to job satisfaction. Again, this study is in line with findings by Chun-Fang et al. (2005), Wesley and Skip (1999), and Conrade and Woods (1994), that training and development is an important factor that determines job satisfaction among hotel employees.

Finally, factor 4 explained 11.7% of the variance. It measured promotion as a factor that affects employees' job satisfaction. It was comprised of nine statements; however, others were suppressed due to their low factor loadings as compared to the recommended values. This supports Ellickson and Logsdon's (2002) claim that promotion is a predictor of job satisfaction. If workers find themselves at one particular position without promotion for many years on the job, they are more likely to be dissatisfied. It also supports the finding of Gallardo et al. (2010), that promotion is a contributing factor to hotel employees' job satisfaction.

### ***Relative importance of job satisfaction factors***

Regression analysis was used to determine the relative importance of the four job satisfaction factors extracted with the factor analysis. The four factors were used as independent variables and overall satisfaction was the dependent variable. Analysis results in Table 5 indicate that the regression model was statistically significant. Variance inflation factor (VIF) and tolerance values were examined to test the multi-collinearity in the model. Generally, a tolerance

**Table 5.** Relative importance of job satisfaction factors.

Predictor variable	Beta	t-value	p-value	Part	95% Confidence interval	
					Lower bound	Upper bound
Pay	0.701	11.478	0.000**	0.516	0.718	1.016
Supervision	0.204	3.713	0.000**	0.167	0.150	0.489
Training and development	0.009	0.143	0.886	0.006	-0.125	0.145
Promotion	0.127	2.619	0.010*	0.118	0.037	0.266
Overall job satisfaction		-2.519	0.013		-1.016	-0.205

Notes.  $R^2 = 0.628$ ; adjusted  $R^2 = 0.618$ ;  $F$ -value = 62.174; significance = 0.000.

\* $p < 0.05$ ; \*\* $p < 0.00$ .

value of less than 0.10 or a VIF value of greater than 10 indicates significant multi-collinearity (Hair et al., 1998). Since all VIF values were less than 10 and tolerance values were greater than 0.10, there was no evidence of multi-collinearity.

Evidence from Table 5 indicates that pay factors predicted 70% of employees' job satisfaction, followed by supervision, which predicted 20%, promotion (13%), and the least predictive factor was training and development (1%). Overall, the four factors explained about 62% of the variables in job satisfaction among hotel employees. Statistically, three factors, namely pay ( $t = 11.478$ ;  $p = 0.000$ ), supervision ( $t = 3.713$ ;  $p = 0.000$ ), and promotion ( $t = 2.619$ ;  $p = 0.010$ ), were significant in predicting job satisfaction. When management concentrates on these three factors, it should improve employees job satisfaction in the hotel industry in Accra, Ghana. Among these factors, pay is the most important predictive factor of employees' satisfaction in hotels. This is in line with the findings of Lam et al. (2001), that remuneration is the most important factor that predicts employees' satisfaction in hotels. It, however, contradicts Gallardo et al.'s (2010) assertion that pay is the least important factor, while supervision is the most important factor in predicting employee job satisfaction. In the same way, supervision was noted to be the least predictive factor in a study by Kim and Jogaratnam (2010), which is not supported by the current study. On the contrary, the study affirms the observation by Gallardo et al. (2010), that supervision is one of the most important factors of employee job satisfaction.

## Conclusion and implications

For an employee to be satisfied, certain factors come together to influence the satisfaction. The findings of the study revealed that overall, hotel employees are slightly satisfied with their jobs and this will invariably affect their commitment and performance in the workplace, and would also have a corresponding increase in the cost of recruiting, hiring, and training replacements. To increase the level of organizational commitment, hotel managers in Ghana need to invest in strategies leading to employee satisfaction with their job, such as the bottom up management

approach, involving the employees in decision making, instituting financial rewards, and fringe benefits, as well as making working hours flexible.

Employees are very much dissatisfied with the work itself, supervision, pay, and promotion chances. They are moderately dissatisfied with training and development opportunities while slightly satisfied with benefits and rewards. Special attention should be paid to work involvement and flexibility, remuneration, the relationship between employees and supervisors, and benchmarks for promotion from one level to another. If these areas of importance are well addressed by managers in Ghana, hotel employees would be more satisfied with their jobs and, in effect, employees will be committed to their organization and problems associated with job satisfaction would decrease.

When it comes to pay, employees want good pay for the work they do. They also want to be paid according to their experience and qualifications. According to Parvin and Kabir (2011), money is a good motivator. Generally, all employees work for money and they need fair salary and good compensations to be satisfied with their jobs. This could be explained by the notion that jobs in the industry are usually low paid jobs and again, the Ghanaian worker is one of the least paid in Sub-Saharan Africa. However, it is generally noted that the hotel industry has lower paid jobs. This may reflect in poor service delivery by the employees. Though, salaries are generally low in the country, it behooves hotel managers to pay their employees competitive salaries for work done in order to get the best out of them and have a competitive edge over other hotels.

In relation to supervision, employees want their supervisors to be cordial, always available to provide direction, and who understand and know the job. This finding strengthens Wech's (2002) and Basset's (1994) assertion that supervisors' behavior influences employees' satisfaction or dissatisfaction with their jobs. This then shows that the supervisors in hotels in Accra may not be well trained. They need to understand the kind of job they supervise and deal with the interpersonal relationships with subordinates, which are needed to boost job satisfaction and quality service delivery. Supervisors in the hotel industry should therefore be trained on good interpersonal skills, such as supervisor–subordinate interactions and good communication skills.

The study has established that training and development is one of the factors that influence employee job satisfaction in hotels in Accra. Employees specifically are satisfied with their jobs when there are proper promotions. Employees hope to receive equal treatment with respect to promotion. Fairness in promotion at the workplace influences employee satisfaction. Opportunities for promotions simply do not exist in most departments in most hotels. However where they do exist, managers should create avenues for those who qualify for promotion, as well as establishing better employee review policies or evaluation policies which will set benchmarks for employee promotion. This may include transparent replacement and succession charts to motivate employees to stay and work hard in the hotel.



Four factors related to job satisfaction: pay, supervision, training and development, and promotion were found to explain employee job satisfaction in the hotel industry in Accra, Ghana. This suggests that employees consider at least one variable or item under each of these four factors as accounting for employee satisfaction with their jobs. Among these four factors (pay and supervision and promotion best predict employees job satisfaction). Three factors happened to be extrinsic factors whose absence, according to Ruthankoon and Ogunlana (2003), could cause job dissatisfaction among employees in general. Therefore, managers and owners of hotels in Accra must give special attention to the four factors of job satisfaction of employees so as to increase their level of satisfaction and surmount the problem of dissatisfaction.

### **Limitations and future research**

There are some limitations to the current study and suggestions for future research. First, the data were collected from hotels in only the capital city of Ghana, Accra, which hosts the largest proportion of hotels in the country. Adding to that, the sample size for the study was small and use of the convenience sampling technique limits generalizability of the result from the study. Again, it would be interesting to duplicate the study in other segments of the industry or other areas to see if results differ. This approach could help reconfirm the validity of the research instrument to measure hotel employee satisfaction in the country. Future studies should assess how personal and organizational factors influence job satisfaction.

### **References**

- Aksu, A. A., & Aktas, A. (2005). Job satisfaction of managers in tourism: Cases in the Antalya region of Turkey. *Managerial Auditing Journal*, 20(5), 479–488.
- Akyeampong, O. A. (2007). *Tourism in Ghana: The accommodation sub-sector*. Accra, Ghana: Janel.
- Andresen, M., Domsch, M., & Cascorbi, A. (2007). Working unusual hours and its relationship to job satisfaction: A study of European maritime pilots. *Journal of Labor Research*, 28(4), 714–734. doi:10.1007/s12122-007-9010-5
- Armstrong, J. S., & Overton, T. S. (1977). Estimating nonresponse bias in mail surveys'. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 14, 396–402.
- Arnolds, C. A., & Boshoff, C. (2004). The management of the early stages of restructuring in a tertiary education institution: An organizational commitment perspective. *South African Journal of Business Management*, 35(2), 1–13.
- Aslam, R., Shumiala, S., Azhar, M., & Sadaqat, S. (2011). Work–family conflicts: Relationship between work-life conflict and employee retention—a comparative study of public and private sector employees. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research in Business*, 1(2), 18–29.
- Bai, B., Brewer, P. K., Sammons, G., & Swerdlow, S. (2006). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and internal service quality. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 5(2), 37–54. doi:10.1300/J171v05n02\_03
- Bassett, G. (1994). The case against job satisfaction [electronic version]. *Business Source Premier*, 37(3), 61–68.

- Brainard, J. (2005). Postdoctoral researchers value structured training over pay, survey says [Electronic version]. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 51(32), 21–32.
- Brewer, A. M., & Hensher, D. A. (1998). The importance of organizational commitment in managing change: Experience of the NSW private bus industry. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 38, 117–130.
- Chang, S. C., & Lee, M. S. (2007). A study on relationship among leadership, organizational culture, the operation of learning organization and employees' job satisfaction. *The Learning Organization*, 14(2), 155–185.
- Charles, K., & Marshall, L. (1992). Motivational preferences of Caribbean hotel workers: An explanatory study. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 4(3), 25–29.
- Cherrington, D. J. (1994). *Organizational behavior* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Chun-Fang, C., Ki-Joon, B., & Deborah, D. C. (2005). The impact of employee training on job satisfaction and intention to stay in the hotel. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 4(2), 99–118. doi:10.1300/J171v04n02\_06
- Conrade, G., & Woods, R. N. (1994). Training in the U.S. lodging industry: Perception and reality. *Cornell Hotel & Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 35(5), 16–21.
- Ellickson, M. C., & Logsdon, K. (2002). Determinants of job satisfaction of municipal government employees. *Public Personnel Management*, 31(3), 343–358.
- Feldman, D. C. (1998). Careers in organizations: Recent trends and future directions. *Journal of Management*, 15, 135–156.
- Gallardo, E., Sanchez-Canizares, S. M., Lopez-Guzeman, T., & Jesus, M. M. (2010). Employee satisfaction in the Iberian hotel industry: The case of Andalusia (Spain) and the Algarve (Portugal). *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 22(32), 321–334.
- Gamor, E., Amissah, E. F., & Boakye, K. A. (2014). Work-family conflict among hotel employees in sekondi-takoradi metropolis, ghana. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 12, 1–8.
- Ghana Tourism Authority. (2011). *List of licensed accommodation in Ghana*. Accra, Ghana: Government of Ghana.
- Graham, M. W., & Messner, P. E. (1998). Principals and job satisfaction. *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 12(5), 196–202.
- Greenberg, J., & Baron, R. A. (1995). *Behaviour in organisations: Understanding and managing the human side of work* (5th ed.). Trenton, NJ: Prentice-Hall International, Inc.
- Gu, Z., & Siu, R. C. (2009). Drivers of job satisfaction as related to work performance in Macao casino hotels: An investigation based on employee survey. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 21, 561–578.
- Hair, J., Anderson, R., Tatham, R., & Black, W. (1995). *Multivariate data analysis* (4th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Harpaz, I. (1983). *Job satisfaction: Theoretical perspectives and a longitudinal analysis*. New York: Libra Publishers, Inc.
- Hiamey, S. E. (2012). Challenges of hotel outsourcing in Ghana: A transaction cost perspective. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 2(2), 1–10.
- Johns, G. (1996). *Organizational behavior: Understanding and managing life at work* (4th ed.). Kansas City: Harper Collins College Publishers.
- Kim, K., & Jogaratnam, G. (2010). Effects of individual and organizational factors on job satisfaction and intent to stay in the hotel and restaurant industry. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 9, 318–339. doi:10.1080/15332845.2010.487
- Kreitner, R., & Kinicki, A. (2001). *Organizational behavior* (5th ed.). New York: Mc Graw-Hill Inc.

- Lacey, M. Y. (1994). Rewards can cost nothing? Yes they can...really. *The Journal for Quality and Participation*, 17(3), 6–9.
- Lam, T., Zhang, H., & Baum, T. (2001). An investigation of employees' job satisfaction: The case of hotels in Hong Kong. *Tourism Management*, 15(3), 157–165.
- Lashley, C., & Morrison, A. (Eds.). (2000). *In search of hospitality: Theoretical perspectives and debates*. Oxford, UK: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Lee, C., & Way, K. (2010). Individual employment characteristics of hotel employees that play a role in employee satisfaction and work retention. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29(3), 344–353.
- Lee, Y. K., Nam, F. H., Park, D. H., & Lee, K. A. (2006). What factors influence customer-oriented prosocial behavior of customer-contact employees? *Journal of Service Marketing*, 20(4), 251–264.
- Locke, E. A. (1995). Commentary: The micro-analysis of job satisfaction: Comments on Taber and Alliger. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16(2), 123–126.
- Mason, C., & Griffin, M. (2005). Group task satisfaction: The group's shared attitude to its task and work environment. *Group & Organization Management*, 30(6), 625–652. doi:10.1177/105960110426952
- McNamara, C. (1999). *Job satisfaction*. Retrieved from <http://managementhelp.org/personal-wellness/job-satisfaction.htm>
- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1982). *Organizational linkages: The psychology of commitment, absentees, and turnover*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Mensah, I. (2009). *Management of hospitality services*. Accra, Ghana: Woeli Publishing Services.
- Mensah, I. (2012). *Environmental management performance of hotels on Accra* (PhD thesis). University of Cape Coast, Cape Coast, Ghana.
- Mount, D. J., & Bartlett, A. (2002). Development of a job satisfaction factor model for the lodging industry. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 1, 17–39.
- Nazim, A. (2008). Factors affecting overall job satisfaction and turnover intention. *Journal of Managerial Sciences*, 2(2), 242–252.
- Nel, P. S., Van Dyk, P. S., Haasbroek, H. D., Schultz, H. B., Sono, T., & Werner, A. (2004). *Human resources management* (6th ed.). Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Nicole, E. A. (2003). The difficulty of leaving work inside the prison walls: An exploratory analysis of female correlational officer identity. *Presentation at annual meeting of American society of criminology*. Chicago.
- Oppenheim, A. N. (1992). *Questionnaire design, interviewing and attitude management*. New York: Continuum International Publishing.
- Oshagbemi, T. (1997). Job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in higher education. *Education and Training*, 39(8), 354–359.
- Oshagbemi, T. (2000). Satisfaction with co-workers behaviour. *Journal of Employee Relations*, 22(1), 88–106.
- Packard, S. H., & Kauppi, D. R. (1999). Rehabilitation agency leadership style. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, 43(1), 5–7.
- Parvin, M. M., & Kabir, M. M. (2011). Factors affecting employee job satisfaction in pharmaceutical sector. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*, 1(9), 113–123.
- Pavesic, D. V., & Brymer, R. A. (1990). Job satisfaction: What's happening to the young managers? *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 30(4), 90–96.
- Pergamit, M. R., & Veum, J. R. (1999). What is a promotion? *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, 52(4), 21–32.
- Peterson, D. K., Puia, G. M., & Suess, F. R. (2003). “Yo Tengo La Camiseta (I have the shirt on)”: An exploration of job satisfaction and commitment among workers in Mexico. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 10(2), 73–88.

- Rahman, M., & Sanzi, A. (1995). A comparison of organizational structure, job stress and satisfaction in audit and management advisory systems (MAS) in CPA firms. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 7(3), 290–305.
- Ramsey, R. D. (1997). Employee morale: Does it matter anymore? *Supervision*, 58(9), 6–8.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2007). *Organizational Behavior* (12th ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Robbins, S. P. (1993). *Organizational behavior* (6th ed.). NJ: Prentice-Hall International.
- Robbins, S. P., Odendaal, A., & Roodt, G. (2003). *Organizational behavior* (9th ed.). Cape Town, South Africa: Prentice-Hall International.
- Rue, L. W., & Byars, L. L. (1992). *Management skills and application* (6th ed.). NJ: Prentice-Hall International.
- Ruthankoon, R., & Ogunlana, S. O. (2003). Testing Herzberg's two-factor theory in the Thai construction industry. *International Journal of Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, 10(5), 333–341.
- Saks, A. M. (1996). The relationship between the amount and helpfulness of entry training resource management. *R&D Management*, 25(2), 129–140.
- Santa Cruz, F. G., López-Guzmán, T., & Cañizares, S. (2014). Analysis of job satisfaction in the hotel industry: A study of hotels in Spain. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 13(1), 63–80. doi:10.1080/15332845.2013.807394
- Schermerhorn, J. R. (1993). *Management for productivity* (4th ed.). Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Sempene, M. E., Rieger, H. S., & Roodt, G. (2002). Job satisfaction in relation to organisational culture. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 28(2), 23–30.
- Smucker, M. K., Whisenant, W. A., & Pedersen, P. M. (2003). An investigation of job satisfaction and female sports journalists. *International Sports Journal*, 49(7/8), 401–407.
- Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes and consequences*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Spinelli, M. A., & Canavos, G. C. (2000). Investigating the relationship between employee satisfaction and guest satisfaction. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly* 41, 29–33.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2001). *Using multivariate statistics* (4th ed.). New York: Harper Collins.
- Tannenbaum, S. I., Mathieu, J. E., Salas, E., & Cannon-Bowers, J. A. (1991). Meeting trainees' expectations: The influence of training fulfillment on the development of commitment, self-efficacy, and motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 759–769.
- Vitell, S. J., & Davis, D. L. (1990). The relationship between ethics and job satisfaction. Implications for Research. *Academy of Management Review*, 11, 55–70.
- Wech, B. A. (2002). Trust context: Effect on organizational citizenship behavior, fairness, and job satisfaction beyond the influence of leader-member exchange. *Business and Society*, 41(3), 353–360.
- Wesley, S. R., & Skip, S. (1999). Training and its impact on organizational commitment among lodging employees. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 23(2), 176–194.
- Wright, T. A. (2006). The emergence of job satisfaction in organizational behavior: A historical overview of the dawn of job attitude research. *Journal of Management History*, 12(3), 262–277.
- Young, B. S., Worchel, S., & Woehr, W. D. J. (1998). Organizational commitment among public service employees. *Personnel Journal*, 27(3), 339–348.