
Managerial Resilience and Organizational Performance of Hotels in Rivers State, Nigeria

Taiye Eletu Issa¹ and B. Chima Onuoha²

¹Doctoral Student, Department of Management, University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria | Email: Taiyeelet4@gmail.com

²Professor of Management, University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria | Email: chimaonuo2005@yahoo.co.uk

Abstract: *This study empirically investigated the relationship between managerial resilience and organizational performance of hotels in Rivers state, Nigeria. The quasi experimental design was employed in the study. Specifically, the cross sectional survey which is a form of the quasi experimental research design was adopted. The population of this study was 206 managers and supervisors in 45 selected hotels in Rivers state. A sample size of 136 respondents was drawn from the population and simple random sampling technique was adopted. Questionnaire was used as a method for collecting data from respondent and it was personally administered to respondents. Data analysis was conducted via spearman rank order correlation coefficient. Based on the analysis, the result revealed that the dimensions of proactive posture have a significant relationship with innovativeness. However, proactive posture had no significant relationship with productivity. Furthermore, adaptive capacity has positive relationship with innovativeness and productivity. It was thus concluded that organizations with high managerial resilience, will outperform those with low resilience ability because the higher a firms' managerial resilience, the higher their performance in the industry. Hence the study recommended that the managers of the hotels in Rivers state should be proactive enough to identify probable threat that could impede the performance of the organization and then develop strategies to tackle the threat which will then help enhance their performance.*

Keywords: *Adaptive Capacity, Innovativeness, Managerial Resilience, Organizational Performance, Proactive Posture, Productivity*

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The rate at which organisations fail these days is so alarming. Within five years of establishment, a huge number of business organizations find it difficult to remain sustainable. Harcourt and Ateke (2018) noted that that while some organizations pace the business environment for some few years; others fail in less than no time. Changes in technology and globalized frameworks have altered business environment and its activities (Iskanius, Haapasalo, & Page, 2006). Recently, entrepreneurs and business organisation struggle for survival as the general environment of the entrepreneurial activities is characterised by some noticeable setbacks. Yet, reactions to failure differs, while some bounce back after a brief period, others resort to blame and regret. The aptitude of bouncing back from adversity is what is known as resilience (Fredrick, 2009). In entrepreneurial management, resilience is the expertise and the skill to remain robust irrespective of the unpleasant conditions, be it change or enormous stress (Coutu, 2012). Resilience was defined by Cooper, Flint and Pearn (2013) as bouncing back from

setbacks coupled with staying effective in the midst of turbulent circumstances and growing stronger thereof. It is observed that resilient individuals with high positive feelings and are capable of managing negative feelings, also can find meaning and overcome stressful situations which could thus enhance the performance of the institution (Tugade & Fredrickson 2004; Cooper 2013).

Further, resilience has been viewed as the ability of an employee to “bounce back” from difficulties and challenging activities (Linnenluecke, 2017) and staying focused and cheerful about future happenings (Cope, Jones & Hendricks, 2016). Resilience at the administrative level has been found to make businesses better when it comes to dealing with sudden events within the business context (Bardoel, Pettit, De Cieri & McMillan, 2014). Furthermore, managerial resilience ability to remain robust and to stay agile irrespective of the turbulence scenario may be helpful in enhancing the performance of the organization. Organizational performance is the “life blood” of an institution as a non performing institution is bound to fizzle out in a short while. Organizations are goals oriented entities, thus, their performance is based on the degree at which firms meet their set goals and objectives. Many hotels in rivers state, has encountered tempestuous moment over the years which have led to many packing out of business. The low level of performance of organization affect their profitability, competitiveness and survival. Although numerous studies have been done by scholars on how to ensure consistent organizational performance, the high mortality rate of hotels still persist. Furthermore, there is a dearth of empirical work by previous scholars on how managerial resilience relates with organizational performance of hotels. It is against this drawback that this study thus seeks to examine the relationship between managerial resilience and organizational performance of hotels in River state, Nigeria.

Objectives of the Study

The objectives of this study are;

- I. To examine the relationship between proactive posture and innovativeness of hotels in Rives state, Nigeria.
- II. To examine the relationship between proactive posture and productivity of hotels in Rives state, Nigeria.
- III. To examine the relationship between adaptive capacity and innovativeness of hotels in Rives state, Nigeria.
- IV. To examine the relationship between adaptive capacity and productivity of hotels in Rives state, Nigeria.

Research Questions

The following research questions served as a guild in this study;

- I. What is the relationship between proactive posture and innovativeness of hotels in Rives state, Nigeria?
- II. What is the relationship between proactive posture and productivity of hotels in Rives state, Nigeria?
- III. What is the relationship between adaptive capacity and innovativeness of hotels in Rives state, Nigeria?
- IV. What is the relationship between adaptive capacity and productivity of hotels in Rives state, Nigeria?

Research Hypotheses

The null hypotheses below were formulated for this study.

HO1: There is no significant relationship between proactive posture and innovativeness of hotels in Rives state, Nigeria.

HO2: There is no significant relationship between proactive posture and productivity of hotels in Rives state, Nigeria.

HO3: There is no significant relationship between adaptive capacity and innovativeness of hotels in Rives state, Nigeria.

HO4: There is no significant relationship between adaptive capacity and productivity of hotels in Rives state, Nigeria.

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

This study is hinged on the resource base theory. The resource based theory (RBT) lays emphasis on organizations' internal resources, and capabilities as determinant for profit and value of the organization. The resource based theory posits that the difference between organizations' performance is as a result of imbalanced distribution of organizational resources (Wernerfelt, 1984 cited in Sauerhoff, 2014). Similarly, the theory argues that where all organizations have the same stock of resources; the available strategy to an organization would also be available to all organizations in the industry (Cool, Almeida Costa & Dierickx, 2002). The theory emphasizes on firm's resources as the major determinants of competitive advantage and performance (Barney, 1991). Similarly, Nwachukwu, Chlandkova, Fadeyi (2017) opined that resource based theory shows that the effective use of resources during strategy formulation could enhance the firm's ability to create new products, services, process and market expansion.

Further, the theory holds that a organizations' performance is influenced by firm-specific resources and capabilities and resources are allocated heterogeneously within an industry. Hence, organizations need to be aware of their strengths and weaknesses, as they have to develop strategies on how to outperform competitors with the given resources bundles and capabilities at their disposition (Wernerfelt, 1984 cited in Sauerhoff, 2014). The RBT recognizes firms as unique entities that compete for every available resource to achieve set objectives and a comparative advantage in the industry. It holds that continuous enhancement of performance is identified as a function of firm's comparative advantage in resource utilization which becomes a method to gain competitive advantage over competitors (Hunt & Morgan, 1997). In relation to managerial resilient, resource based theory exposes managers on the need to build up capacities to create unique products and strategies that will be difficult to imitate. In the same vein, hotel managers ought to adopt resilient characteristics which could enable them keep moving on in difficult times and achieve organizational goals in a tasking business environment.

Concept of Managerial Resilient

The concept of managerial resilient is the ability of managers to move on when faced with hard times and the stress resulting from it, recovering from impediments by adjusting to change in a positive context, and also showing high level of creativity in difficult times (David, & Bartz, 2017). Also, McManus, Seville, Brunson, and Vargo (2007) noted that the concept of resilient has been studied by various studies an across ranges of academic disciplines yet there is little agreement on what exactly the concept is all about. The same study defined resilient in a managerial perspective as the functions of organization's awareness of about a situation and

adaptability capacity in a dynamic interconnected business condition. In addition, Coutu (2017) noted that resilience is a feature you realize you have after the reality of life as manager's level of resilient characteristics determines if they will fail or succeed in the organization settings. Similarly, (Ovan (2015) stated that managerial resilience is the ability of a manager to recover from difficulty and setbacks, adapt to prompt issues that may pop up and manage ongoing hectic and demanding work conditions. This implies that managerial resilience is a concept that denotes employee or managers' capability in being persistent to achieve organizational goals despite discouraging factors. For a hotel management to be seen as being resilient, they should be able to find means of getting off work stress and manage their approaches in handling hotel work activities especially when their pressures. Observably, hotels operational in Port Harcourt city of Rivers State usually experience influx of clients or customers for night lodges during huge political programs, carnival activities and other occasions that brings in more visitors into the state. Supportively, Achor and Gielan (2016) noted that to managing hectic work situation requires a plan side aside to battle with stress known as "recovery periods." The authors noted that the recovery periods are used to gain energy after hectic, drawbacks as it enables managers to relax and return back to handle other problems previously encountered.

Further, Fernandez (2016) described and explained that the concept of resilient by stating that it involves failing, learning and thriving in the cause of challenges facing the business or organizational environment. The author identified factors that contributes to managerial resilient to include: strong social support, sense of belonging and security, optimistic attitude and control of the work environment. Also, same author identified other aspect of resilient to include mindfulness, mental agility and passion as mindfulness entails active awareness of happenings. In addition, Seligman (2002) asserted that mindfulness could be as an aspect of managerial resilient could be related to mindlessness which entails that managers are not mindful to access and process current situations around their business environments. Further, Seppala (2017) suggested that managerial resilient should be combined with compassion and empathy to increase their level of understanding and to enable them engage in cooperative and collaborative management activities. Empathy aids managerial resilient to understand peoples' pain point and being able to be in the shoes of others, understand ones' self, and carry out managerial duties compassionately. Also, Coutu (2017) identified three characteristics of resilient managers to include (1) a steadfast in acceptance of reality (2) a profound belief in values and meaningfulness; and (3) and mysterious ability to make up things.

Proactive Posture

Proactive posture in organizational context entails that the organization is referred to as "die-hard organization" given the organization actively influence situations instead merely being reactive to happenings (Wobodo, Asawo & Asawo, 2018). Rotter (1966) summed that proactive characteristics of an organization entails possessing an internal level of control where they believe that they have the aptitude and the responsibility to control their outcomes. Robbin, David, and Mary (2011) noted that proactive posture entails proactiveness which is a quality that denotes people or organizations who are prone to take actions, to act on their environment. Similarly, Frankl (2013) opined that proactive posture allows organization to successfully preserve their strength and confidence when faced with challenges and difficulties regardless of how staid it is.

Adaptive Capacity

Adaptive capacity can be defined as part of resilience that indicates learning, flexibility to tryout and adopt innovative solutions, and the development of generalized responses dynamic business environment (Walker, Carpenter, Anderies, Abel, Cumming, Janssen, Lebel, Norberg, Peterson, & Pritchard, 2002). Folke, Colding, and Berkes (2003) noted that adaptive capacity has four basic dimensions which are learning to cope with uncertainties, readiness for diversity and reorganization, knowledge combination and creation of self-organizational opportunities. Dalziell and McManus (2004) define adaptive capacity as the engagement and involvement of organizational employee so in order to be responsible, accountable and focused on developing the organization's resilience through their work. Armitage (2005) in Folke et al (2003) opined that adaptive capacity is the zeal to learn from mistakes, engage in collaborative decision-making arrangements, and promote organizational innovativeness.

Concept of Organizational Performance

The term performance entails a set of financial and nonfinancial indicators which provide evidence on the extent to which achievement of objectives and results are obtained (Lebens & Euske 2006; Kaplan & Norton, 1992). Richard, Devinney, Yip, and Johnson (2009) noted that organizational performance refers to the measure of different activities of an organization ranging from market competition, customers, inputs and capitals which are critical to organizational success. The authors noted that organizational performance is among the most important independent variable in management research and an interesting area of management concern. Further, Kotter and Heskett (1992) revealed that organizational performance is likened to employee performance as they both refer to the accomplishment of a given task measured against present known standards of accuracy, completeness, cost, and speed. Both organizational performance and employee performance is directed towards meeting the needs, goals and objectives of a specific organization. For example, in a hotel; employees who wake up as early as 7am in the morning to attend to customers' complaints and organization itself that spends thousands in salary and purchase of high equipment to enhance customers' satisfaction in the hotel are all geared towards same goal. Similarly, Cascio (2006) noted that organizational performance could be regarded employee performance as it implies the extent to which an employee reaches setting achievement and the degree at which employee accomplishes the organizational mission at workplace.

In addition, Richard, Devinney, Yip, and Johnson (2009) identified three distinct area of organizational performance to include: (i) financial performance (profitability, return on assets, return on investment, etc.); (ii) product market performance (sales volume, market share, etc.); and (iii) shareholder returns (total shareholder return, economic value added, etc.). Hult, Ketchen Jr, Griffith, Chabowski, Hamman, Dykes, Pollitte and Cavusgil (2008) noted that organizational performance is hinged on the center of a firm's survival. The study asserted that managerial research perceives organizational performance as a central outcome variable of interest that covers various aspects like human resources (HRs), marketing management, operations management, international business, strategy and information system studies. Similarly, Richard, Devinney, Yip and Johnson (2009) affirmed that the concept of organizational performance covers wide range business perspectives and indicators such as operations effectiveness, customer satisfaction, corporate social responsibility and other outcomes that goes beyond financial variables. Further, the same study pointed out that organizational performance

following the studies of Kaplan and Norton (1992) seems to be a multidimensional construct in management research as it covers financial indicators, customer-related, innovation and internal organizational perspective which also covers employees' outcome such as productivity, effectiveness and efficiency.

Innovativeness

The concept of innovativeness can be defined as the will to acceptance changes within the business environment (Hurt, Joseph, & Cook, 1977). Hult, Hurley, and Knight (2004) noted that innovativeness implies a firm's ability to introduce new processes, goods, services, or ideas in a given organizational context. Menguc and Auch (2006) stated that innovativeness as companies' proclivity, openness, and inclination to make use of ideas that are unique and distinct from the usual business approach. Lynch, Walsh, Horington (2010) identified five key dimensions that emerged from several reviews of literature related to innovativeness such as namely, creativity, openness to new thoughts, intention to create unique items, risk-taking, and technological capacity to create new things. Innovativeness of organizations is seen as part of the determinants for organizational success; it has been recognized in the management studies as critical factor for organizational survival (Quinn, 2000). In addition, Zaltman et al., 1973 noted that innovativeness of organization could be perceived or visible in different dimensions such as incremental innovation which serves a just a minor change, radical innovativeness which calls for a more serious change, administrative or technological innovativeness which implies how organizations adjust to technological devices that are new to the market.

Productivity

Productivity is a ratio used to measure how well an organization converts input resources (labor, materials, machines, money) into outputs (goods and services) and to achieve various organizational goals (Tokar íková, 2013). Productivity is a measure of organizations function which cover indicators such as return on investment, return on assets, appraisal of salary structure, job assignment, word load analysis, etc. (Zigon, 1998). Rolloos (1997) noted that the productivity is about what people can produce with the least effort made in putting the resources together. Nda and Fard (2013) defined productivity as the measure of output per unit of input based on economic analysis. This implies that productivity is the measure of what a worker or company produces giving some amount of inputs over a period of time. Parker, Waller and Xu (2013) begins by identified three difference aspect of measurement in productivity such as manufacturing products, private commercial services, and public services. Consequently, measurement of productivity in terms of commercial services could include hotels who render service for profit making, owned and operated by a private groups or individuals.

Empirical Review

In a study conducted by Paul, Bamel, and Garg (2016) on "Employee resilience and OCB: Mediating effects of organizational commitment" with sample of 345 employees of manufacturing industries of Uttarakhand and Himachal Pradesh in India. Data was collected via the aid of self-administered questionnaires through a systematic random sampling method; analyzed and hypotheses tested using hierarchical multiple regression and for testing the mediating effects, bootstrapping in SPSS. Findings show that there is a positive relationship resilience and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) with a partial mediation which also

implies that there is a direct relationship between OCB and organizational commitment/performance. Further, the study summarized that employee outcomes which also means productivity in organizations can be enhanced via building resilience among its workers. This also implies that managerial resilient has a positive relationship with organizational performance in terms of productivity and innovativeness in handling organizational matters. In a contrary, McManus, Seville, Vargo, and Brunson (2008) conducted study on “Facilitated process for improving organizational resilience.” The study asserted that resilience is often seen as a crisis or emergency management concern; the relationship between a resilient workforce and its influence on organizational outcomes is still not clear within the organizational context. Similarly, Paul and Garg (2012) in a study of “Mutualistic perspective of individual resilience and organizational commitment”, asserted that there seems to be lots of empirical evidence and arguments on the influence of managerial resilient yet, empirical evidence particularly relating to resilience and OCB in the Indian context is at a minimum.

Further, Maslach, Jackson and Leiter (2001) revealed that resilient of managers is significantly connected with organizational performance in relation to innovativeness and productivity holding that the business environment is turbulent and unstable. Same study asserted that resilient is stands as a strength used by managers to overcome negative situations at the workplace which could lead to poor employee outcomes or productivity. Also, Benard and Barbosa (2012) conducted a study on “Resilience and entrepreneurship: A dynamic and biographical approach to the entrepreneurial act” using qualitative and longitudinal method with a biographic method of analysis. Findings show that resilience dynamic assets a basic role in motivating the decision to become an entrepreneur and in the whole journey leading up to that decision. That is managerial resilient characteristics found in individuals influences their decision to become entrepreneurs and establish business like Hotels, Pharmaceuticals, Super stores, Restaurants etc.

Also, Ahiauzu and Eketu (2015) empirically examined the concept of managerial resilient in relationship to educational sectors in Nigeria in a study of “Product Innovation and Organizational Resilience in Public Universities in South-South Nigeria.” Data was collected from selected public universities located in south-south of Nigeria and analyzed using Spearman rank order correlation coefficient. Findings show that organizations product innovation is significantly associated with resilient dimensions of organizations such as situational awareness, vulnerability and adaptive capacity of university institutions. Further, the study asserted that organizations like hotels need to remain resilient and apply implementation of innovativeness in the products they offer which could lead to organization performance. In addition, Onwughalu, and Amah (2017) conducted a study on “Antecedents of Ambidexterity and Their Relationship with Organizational Resilience of Telecommunication Firms in Port Harcourt, Rivers State” in cross sectional survey of four telecommunication firms in Rivers State. Findings show that indicators of ambidexterity such as leadership based characteristics, organizational designs and dynamic capabilities are strongly related to organizational resilience.

Furthermore, in a study conducted by Jaja and Amah (2014) on “Mentoring and organizational resilience. a study of manufacturing companies in Rivers State” with a total of 140 employees and random sampling of 31 manufacturing companies in Port Harcourt. Data collected was analyzed using spearman rank order correlation coefficient and findings mentoring has a significant relationship with organizational resilience. Most of empirical studies like Ahiauzu and Eketu (2015); Benard and Barbosa (2012) agreed that managerial resilient is

positively related to organizational performance or employees' output. In contrary, Momeni et al (1394) study on resilience capacity as an influencer to prevent and decrease job burnout due to workplace pressures showed a negative result. The study revealed that today's, employees needs optimistic minded approach to enhance individuals' ability to face to problems instead of focus on solving problem which is among the troubling issues in resilience research. The results showed that there is a negative correlation between nurses' resilience and general job burnout and resilience and fatigue. Despite, the negative result, another notable positive result was found in Ghazanfari, Shafie nejad, Yasemi, and Vahedi (2017) studied "Developing staff resilience capacity by strategic human research management" with a sample 60 respondents whose data were collated and analyzed using multiple regression. Findings revealed that strategic human resource management lead to the development of employees' resilience. Also, it shows that resilient characteristics could be built via training, effective employee-employer relationship, compensation etc.

3.0 METHODOLOGY

In an attempt to achieve the objectives of this study, the cross sectional survey which is a form of the quasi-experimental design was adopted. The cross sectional survey provides a snapshot of the outcome and the characteristics associated with it at a given point in time. The population of this study are two hundred and six (206) managers and supervisors in forty-five selected hotels in Rivers state. Krejcie and Morgan (1970) table for sample size determination was used to arrive at a sample size of 136 respondents. The simple random sampling techniques was used in this study in order to avoid bias in selection of sample case. Questionnaire was used in this study to collect relevant data from respondents. The instrument was subjected to face and content validity and the Cronbach alpha was used to determine the internal consistency of the instrument. The Cronbach alpha of Proactive posture, adaptive capacity, innovativeness and productivity were .921, .769, .936 and .794 respectively. The earlier formulated hypothesis was tested using the spearman rank order correlation coefficient with the aid of statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) version 21. This tool was deemed to be preferable because the variables were on ordinal scale and the study seeks to test relationship between variables.

4.0 RESULT

From the 136 questionnaire administered to respondent, 124 copies representing 91% were retrieved and used for the study. The decision rule for either accepting or rejecting the null hypothesis is given as

$P < 0.05$ = reject the null hypotheses

$P > 0.05$ = accept the null hypotheses

HO1: There is no significant relationship between proactive posture and innovativeness of hotels in Rives state, Nigeria.

Table 1 Proactive Posture and Innovativeness

			Proactive Posture	Innovativeness
Spearman's rho	Proactive Posture	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.421**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	124	124
	Innovativeness	Correlation Coefficient	.421**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	124	124

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The result in table 1 show the relationship between proactive posture and innovativeness. It was observed that there is a significant relationship between proactive posture and innovativeness with a p-value of $0.000 < 0.05$ and a rho value of 0,421. This implies that a moderate positive relationship exists between proactive posture and innovativeness. The null hypothesis was rejected and the alternate hypothesis was accepted.

HO2: There is no significant relationship between proactive posture and productivity of hotels in Rives state, Nigeria.

Table 2 Proactive Posture and Productivity

			Proactive Posture	Productivity
Spearman's rho	Proactive Posture	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.021**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.064
		N	124	124
	Productivity	Correlation Coefficient	.021**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.064	.
		N	124	124

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The bivariate hypothesis in table 2 show that the relationship between proactive posture and innovativeness are not significantly correlated. This is because the P-value (0.064) was higher than the level of significant. Thus the null hypothesis was accepted.

HO3: There is no significant relationship between adaptive capacity and innovativeness of hotels in Rives state, Nigeria.

Table 3 Adaptive Capacity and Innovativeness

			Correlations	
			Adaptive Capacity	Innovativeness
Spearman's rho	Adaptive Capacity	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.227**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.002
		N	124	124
	Innovativeness	Correlation Coefficient	.227**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.
		N	124	124

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The result in table 3 revealed the correlation between adaptive capacity and innovativeness. The analysis show that the significant value of 0.002 was less than the level of significance (P-value= 0.002 < 0,05). And the rho value of 0.227 shown a weak positive relationship between adaptive capacity and innovativeness. Base on the decision rule, the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternate hypothesis was accepted.

HO4: There is no significant relationship between adaptive capacity and productivity of hotels in Rives state, Nigeria.

Table 4 Adaptive Capacity and Productivity

			Correlations	
			Adaptive Capacity	Productivity
Spearman's rho	Adaptive Capacity	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.392**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	124	124
	Productivity	Correlation Coefficient	.392**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	124	124

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The bivariate hypothesis in table presented the correlation between adaptive capacity and productivity. Given the P-value of 0.000, it was observed that the significant value was less than the level of significance (P= 0.000 < 0.05). the rho value of 0.392 revealed a moderate relationship between the variables. Hence the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternate hypothesis was accepted.

Discussion of findings

The managerial resilience ability in a turbulent time is of high relevance in enhancing the fortune of organization. based on the bivariate analysis, it is observed that resilience ability of management is of high importance in enhancing he performance of any organization. Detail discussions in line with the hypotheses are given as follows;

Proactive Posture and Innovativeness

The bivariate analysis revealed that proactive posture has a significant positive relationship with innovativeness of hotels in Rivers state. This significant relationship was based on the fact that the P-value of the 0.000 was less than the level of significance (0.05). thus the null hypothesis was reject and the alternate hypothesis was accepted. Furthermore, the rho (r) value was .421 which indicated that the relationship between proactive posture and innovativeness was positive to a moderate extent. This implies that when proactive posture increases in the organization, innovativeness also increases to a moderate extent. Furthermore, the coefficient of determination (r^2) was 0.177. This indicate that 18% variation in innovativeness of hotels in Rivers state, can be accounted for by the level of proactive posture. This finding align with the previous work of Paul, Bamel, and Garg (2016) which remarked that employee outcomes which also means productivity in organizations can be enhanced via building resilience among its workers. Hult, Hurley, and Knight (2004) noted that innovativeness implies a firms' ability to introduce new processes, goods, services, or ideas in a given organizational context. The proactive posture of an organization can thus enhance the innovative ability of the organization.

Proactive Posture and Productivity

The result of the analysis showing the relationship between proactive posture and productivity revealed that proactive posture has no significant relationship with productivity in hotels in River state given the P-value of .064 was higher than the level of significance. This implies that proactive posture does not have any relationship with productivity in any way. An increase or decrease in proactive posture of a firm do not affect their productivity. Hence the null hypothesis was accepted and sustained. This study disagrees with that of Benard and Barbosa (2012) which remarked that managerial resilient is positively related to organizational performance or employees' output.

Adaptive Capacity and Innovativeness

Based on the result of the analysis, it is clear that there is a significant relationship between adaptive capacity and innovativeness with a P-value of .002 which is less than the level of significance (P-value = .002 < 0.05). hence the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternate hypothesis was accepted. The correlational value (r) was 0.227 which implies that there is a weak positive relationship between proactive posture and innovativeness. When proactive posture increases, innovativeness also increases slightly. On the other hand, the coefficient of determination was 0.052. This shows that 5.2% variation in innovativeness can be accounted for by adaptive capacity of the managers. When the adaptive capacity of an organization increases, the innovativeness of the firm also increases slightly. This finding concord with that of Ahiauzu and Eketu (2015) which show that organizations product innovation is significantly associated with resilient dimensions of organizations such as situational awareness, vulnerability and adaptive capacity of university institutions.

Adaptive Capacity and Productivity

The bivariate analysis of the relationship between adaptive capacity and productivity revealed that there is a significant relationship between the two variables owing to the fact that the significant value of 0.000 was less than the level of significance (0.05). as such, the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternate hypothesis was accepted. Furthermore, the correlational

value of the relationship between adaptive capacity and productivity was 0.392 which implies that there is a positive moderate relationship between adaptive capacity and productivity of hotels. Furthermore, the coefficient of determination was 0.154. this implies that 15% total variation in productivity in the hotel can be accounted for by the adaptive capacity of the manager in the organization. this finding is in agreement with that of Maslach, Jackson and Leiter (2001) which revealed that resilient of managers is significantly connected with organizational performance in relation to innovativeness and productivity bearing in mind that the business environment is turbulent and unstable.

5.0 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Organizations nowadays are consistently striving for ways to enhance the performance of their organizations. The resilience ability of managers when faced with harsh and tempestuous moment will enable them to withstand the difficult moment. No organization can stay beyond the resilience ability of those piloting the affairs of the firm. When the resilience capacity of a firm diminishes, the organization is bound to fail out of business. Ensuring high performance in an unstable environment of business requires consistent resilience capacity of the manager in terms of proactive posture and adaptive capacity. The high proactive posture of an organization will help the firm take necessary advantages of opportunities and it will also help guild against eventualities that could have possibly affect the success story of the organization. Furthermore, the adaptive ability of a firm and its response to uncertainties is relevant in absorbing the shock from the business domain. A firm that possesses high managerial resilience ability will be able to resist the trauma posed by the imponderable business environment. Conclusively, organizations with high managerial resilience, will outperform those with low resilience ability because the higher a firms' managerial resilience the higher their performance in the industry. Owing to this fact, the following recommendations are proffered;

1. The managers of the hotels in Rivers state should be proactive enough to identify probable threat that could impede the performance of the organization and then develop strategies to tackle the threat which will then help enhance their performance.
2. The managers of the hotels should also develop high adaptive culture to resist and withstand any unforeseen eventuality and thus enhance their performance.
3. The managers of the hotels should continuously scan the business environment to easily track opportunities that can help enhance the performance of the organization.
4. The managers of hotels in Rivers state should also ensure that their service delivering are in line with global best practices as such will help enhance their adaptive capacity in turbulent moment and thus enhance their performance.

REFERENCES

- Accra, J., S & Amah, E (2014). Mentoring and organizational resilience. a study of manufacturing companies in Rivers State. *Journal of Business and Management*, 16 (10), 1-9.
- Achor, S & Gielan, M (2016). *Resilience is about how you recharge: Not how you endure*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Publishing Corporation. Arbinger.

- Ahiau, L.U & Eketu, A.C (2015). Product Innovation and Organizational Resilience in Public Universities in South-South Nigeria. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 7 (33), 82-91
- Barney, J. B (1991). Firm resources and sustainable competitive advantage. *Journal Of Management*, 17 (1), 99-120.
- Benard, M & Barbosa, S. D (2012). Resilience and entrepreneurship: A dynamic and biographical approach to the entrepreneurial act. *Management*, 19 (2), 98-123.
- Britt, T., Shen, W., Sinclair, R., Grossman, M., & Klieger, D. (2016). How much do we really know about employee resilience? *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 9(2), 378–404.
- Cascio, W. F (2006). *Managing human resources: productivity, quality of life, profits*. McGraw-Hill
- Cope, V., Jones, B., & Hendricks, J. (2016). Why nurses chose to remain in the workforce: Portraits of resilience. *Collegian (Royal College of Nursing, Australia)*, 23(1), 87–95.
- Coutu, D (2017). *How resilience works*. In *Resilience*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Publishing Corporation.
- Dalziel, E.P &McManus, S (2004). *Resilience, Vulnerability, and Adaptive Capacity: Implications for Systems Performance*. University of Canterbury. New Zealand.
- David, E.B & Bartz, C.E.A (2017). The resilient and focused manager. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 8 (9), 1-7.
- Folke, C., Colding, J., & Berkes, F (2003) *Synthesis: building resilience and adaptive capacity in social–ecological systems*. In: Berkes, F., Colding., Folke, C. (Eds.). *Navigating Social–Ecological Systems: Building Resilience for Complexity and Change*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 352-387.
- Ghazanfari, M., Shafie nejad, M., Yasemi, S., & Vahedi, M (2017). Developing staff resilience capacity by strategic human research management. *International Academic Journal of Accounting and Financial Management*, 4 (3), 9-22.
- Hildon, Z., Smith, G., Netuveli, G., & Blane, D. (2008). Understanding adversity and resilience at older ages. *Sociology of Health & Illness*, 30(5), 726–740.
- Hult, G.T.M., Ketchen, G. J., Griffith, D. A., Chabowski, B. R., Hamman, M. K., Dykes, B. J., Pollitte, W. A., & Cavusgil, S. T. (2008). An assessment of the measurement of performance in international business research. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 39, 1064–1080.
- Hurt, H. Y., Joseph, K., & Cook, C. D (1977). Scales for the measurement of innovativeness. *Human Communication Research*, 4 (1), 58–65.

- Kaplan, R. S & Norton, D.P (1992). The balanced scorecard measures that drive performance. *Harvard Business Review*, 71–79.
- Kaplan, R.S., Norton, D.P. (1993). Putting the Balanced Scorecard to Work. *Harvard Business Review*, 134-147.
- Khodamorad, M., Mostafa, A., Forozan, A.S (1394). The relation between resilience and job burnout in nurses. *Medicine and Refinement*, 3 (75),29-36.
- Kotter, J. P & Heskett, J. L. (1992). *Corporate culture and performance*. New York: Free Press.
- Lebens, M., & Euske, K. (2006). *A conceptual and operational delineation of performance*. Business Performance Measurement, Cambridge University Press.
- Linnenluecke, M. K. (2017). Resilience in business and management research: A review of influential publications and a research agenda: Resilience in business and management research. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 19(1), 4–30.
- Lynch, P., Walsh, M., Horington, M (2010). Defining and dimensionalizing organizational innovativeness. CHRIE Conference in San Juan, Puerto Rico, USA.
- Lyons, S. T., Schweitzer, L., & Ng, E. S. W. (2015). Resilience in the modern career. *Career Development International*, 20(4), 363–383.
- Maslach, C., Jackson, S. E., & Leiter, M. P (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 397–422.
- McManus, S., Seville, E., Vargo, J., & Brunson, D. (2008). Facilitated process for improving organizational resilience. *Natural Hazards Review*, 9(2), 81–90.
- McManus, S., Seville, E., Brunson, D., & Vargo, J (2007). *Resilience management: A framework for assessing and improving the resilience of organizations*. Resilient Organizations Report, New Zealand.
- Nwachukwu, Chlandkova, & Fadeyi (2017). Strategy Formulation Process and Innovation Performance Nexus. *International Journal for Quality Research* 12(1), 147–164.
- Onwughalu, O.O & Amah, E (2017). Antecedents of Ambidexterity and Their Relationship with Organizational Resilience of Telecommunication Firms in Port Harcourt, Rivers State. *International Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing* 2, (6), 56-61.
- Ovan, A (2015). What resilience means, and why it matters. Harvard Business Review. Retrieved from <http://www/hbr.org/2015/01-what-resilience-means-and-why-it-matters>
- Paul, H & Garg, P (2012). Mutualistic perspective of individual resilience and organizational commitment: A path analysis model. *International Journal of Management and Behavioural Sciences*, 1, 107–119.
- Paul, H., Bamel, U.K., & Garg, P (2016). Employee resilience and OCB: Mediating effects of organizational commitment. *Journal of Decision Makers*, 41 (4), 308-324.
- Quinn, J. B (2000). Outsourcing innovation: The new engine of growth. *Sloan Management Review*, 41 (4), 13-28.
- Richard, P. J., T. M. Devinney, G. S. Yip & G. Johnson (2009). Measuring organizational performance: towards methodological best practice. *Journal of Management*, 35, 718–804.
- Robbin, S. P., David, A. D. & Mary, C. (2011). *Fundamentals of management* (7th ed.), New Jersey: Pearson Education.

- Rotter, J. B (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs*, 80 (1), 609-613.
- Sauerhoff, C (2014). Competitive Differentiation Within The Shipbuilding Industry: The Importance Of Competence In The Field Of Services. Illus Hardcover.
- Seligman, M.E.P (2002). *Authentic happiness: Using the new positive psychology to realize your potential for lasting fulfillment*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Seppala, E. (2017). *Why compassion is a better managerial tactic than toughness*. In *Empathy* Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Publishing Corporation.
- Tugade, M. M., & Fredrickson, B. L. (2004). Resilient individuals use positive emotions to bounce back from negative emotional experiences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86(2), 320–333.
- Turner, S. B. (2014). The resilient nurse: An emerging concept. *Nurse Leader*, 12(6), 71–90.
- Walker, B.H., Carpenter, S.R., Anderies, J.M., Abel, N., Cumming, G.S., Janssen, M.A., Lebel, L., Norberg, J., Peterson, G.D., & Pritchard, L (2002). Resilience management in social–ecological systems: a working hypothesis for a participatory approach. *Conservation Ecology*, 6(1), 67-81.
- Wobodo, C.C., Asawo, S.P., & Asawo, S.S (2018). Knowledge sharing and employee resilience. *Nigerian Business and Social Review*, 9(2), 1-16
- Zaltman, G., Duncan, R., & Holbek, J (1973). *Innovations and organisations*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Zigon, J (1998). Measuring the hard stuff: Teams and other hard-to-measure work. Retrieved from <http://www.zigonperf.com>