



Factors Affecting Employee's Work Performance in the Hospitality Industry in Cebu, Philippines

DOI 10.5281/zenodo.14051327

Mario Ramil R. Pepito, PhD

Dean, College of Hotel and Restaurant Management, University of Cebu-Main Campus
ORCID: 0000-0001-7716-5776 | pepitomarioramil68@gmail.com

Abstract

This study examined the impact of empowerment, transformational leadership, teamwork, and work environment on employee work performance in Cebu's hospitality industry. Data were gathered through surveys with respondents, including hotel staff and tour operators. Empowerment, characterized by autonomy, decision-making, collaboration, and trust, showed a moderate influence on work performance. Transformational leadership also had a moderate effect, underlining the role of shared values, beliefs, and missions between supervisors and employees. Teamwork contributed moderately to performance, emphasizing team goals, role clarity, and sensitivity to team needs. The work environment, especially for tour operators, was perceived as moderately influential on performance. No significant relationships were found between demographic variables (age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, length of service) and empowerment, transformational leadership, and work environment. However, length of service correlated with teamwork's impact. Certain demographic factors—such as educational attainment, length of service, and age—showed significant relationships with empowerment, transformational leadership, teamwork, and work environment dimensions. Generally, no significant differences were observed among empowerment, transformational leadership, teamwork, and work environment factors, supporting the null hypothesis. Nevertheless, respondents' perceptions of empowerment, transformational leadership, and teamwork differed significantly, leading to partial rejection of the null hypothesis. The findings highlight the varying influence of these factors on work performance and their relationship with demographic profiles, revealing nuanced perceptions across different work-related dimensions.

Keyword: *Work engagement, Work performance, Hotel engagement, Cebu City, Philippines*

Introduction

The study focused on critically examining the factors influencing employee work performance within Cebu's hospitality industry in the Philippines. The selection of companies was based on accreditation from DOT Region VII, encompassing hotels, resorts, and tour operators. Work performance encompasses the job-related activities expected of employees and the proficient execution of these tasks. It constitutes the ability to perform effectively within one's job role, comprehending job descriptions, and meeting performance standards. The importance of excellent work performance cannot be overstated in achieving organizational success; failure to meet performance goals can result in setbacks. From the researcher's perspective, employees not only require the capacity but also the motivation to fulfill their tasks effectively.

The central issue lies in the lack of motivation among employees, stemming from various sources. This includes limitations in decision-making authority within their work patterns, external barriers like leadership styles, lack of recognition for hard work, deficiencies in teamwork and work environment, and job monotony. Such factors detrimentally impact employee motivation and, consequently, their work performance, directly influencing an organization's success. Despite the evident importance of work performance for organizational success, some hospitality establishments struggle to discern the factors influencing their employees' performance. This lack of understanding leads to ineffective problem-solving, potentially causing employee attrition or reduced productivity within the company. Although the hospitality industry in Cebu City initially appears to prioritize improving employee work performance, a closer inspection reveals challenges impeding these efforts. The issue of contractualization, highlighted by President Rodrigo Duterte's concerns about the unfair treatment of employees, particularly affects their motivation and dedication to their roles.

Theoretical Background

This study is grounded in various motivational and performance theories. Frederick Taylor's Classical Theory of Motivation emphasizes that financial incentives tied to performance drive productivity, with structured tasks and close supervision ensuring efficiency. Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory and McGregor's Theory X and Y also relate to the motivation of employees, stressing that intrinsic satisfaction and a supportive management style lead to enhanced performance. Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs underscores that fulfilling employee needs fosters motivation.



Transformational leadership theory, as proposed by Bass, indicates that leaders who engage in charismatic and inspirational actions, individualized support, and intellectual stimulation improve team performance and organizational commitment. Adair's Action-Centered Leadership reinforces the value of leaders in structuring tasks, supporting individuals, and fostering teamwork.

Team dynamics are explored through Belbin's Team Role Theory, which posits that diverse roles within teams lead to better performance, and Tajfel's Social Identity Theory, which explains how group identity impacts interactions. Carl Jung's Color Work Theory and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator suggest that personality diversity within teams enhances collaboration.

The work environment, as explained by Person-Environment Fit Theory, encompasses both physical and social aspects, contributing significantly to employee satisfaction, organizational commitment, and performance. Factors like team cohesion, adequate resources, and alignment with personal preferences enhance workplace efficiency and productivity.

Research Objectives

This study investigates factors influencing employee work performance within Cebu's hospitality industry during the fiscal year 2016-2017. It aims to assess these factors to form recommendations. The study specifically explores: (1) respondents' demographic profiles (age, sex, civil status, education level, years in the industry, and industry sector); (2) perceptions of the extent to which empowerment, transformational leadership, teamwork, and work environment affect work performance among three respondent groups; (3) the relationship between demographic profiles and work performance factors; and (4) the variance in responses among the groups regarding the identified factors. The study is guided by null hypotheses stating no significant relationship between profiles and performance factors, and no significant variance in responses or factors affecting performance across the groups. Findings will inform recommendations based on the analyzed data.

Methodology

The researchers used a descriptive-correlational survey method to examine factors influencing employees' work performance in selected sectors of Cebu City's hospitality industry. This approach, as supported by Estela G. Adanza, Pedrito Jose V. Bermudo, and Marietta B. Rasonabe (2009), enables gathering information about current conditions, status, or trends, and assessing correlations between variables, including the magnitude and direction of these relationships.

The study was conducted in Cebu City, the oldest city in the Philippines and known as the "Mother of all Cities." Cebu City features notable attractions like Colon Street, the country's oldest school, and various tourist destinations, including islands, beaches, resorts, diving spots, heritage sites, and hotels. It is also a major hub for hospitality, commerce, and trade in the Visayas, and ranks as the fifth most populous city in the Philippines.

For respondents, universal purposive sampling was employed to select employees from various departments within selected hotels. This approach ensured that participants possessed characteristics relevant to answering the research questions.

Data were gathered through a researcher-developed survey, validated and structured into two sections: (1) The Demographic Profile Questionnaire, capturing details such as age, gender, civil status, education level, years of employment, and employment status, and (2) The Employees' Work Performance Questionnaire, assessing empowerment, transformational leadership, teamwork, and work environment through a four-point Likert scale.

The data collection spanned from June to October 2016, following a structured process: obtaining permissions from the Department of Tourism and hotel HR departments, explaining the study to HR managers, securing employee consent, and administering the survey. Ethical considerations included transparency about the study's purpose, confidentiality assurances, and emphasis on voluntary participation.

Collected data were analyzed using statistical methods: frequency (to summarize sample distribution), simple percentage (to assess demographic proportions), weighted mean (for ranking dominant factors), rank (for organizing responses), chi-square (to test relationships between demographic variables and performance factors), and ANOVA (to determine significant differences among respondent groups and factors).

Results and Discussions

Profile of the Respondents



In this study, the profile of the respondents includes age, gender, civil status, highest educational attainment, number of years employed, and employment status.

Table 1
Profile of the Respondents

	Resorts (n = 76)		Hotels (n = 46)		Tour Operators (n = 47)		Combined (n = 169)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Age (in years)								
20-24	30	39.47	11	26.83	15	31.91	56	33.14
25-29	25	32.89	16	39.02	18	38.30	59	34.91
30-34	15	19.74	5	12.20	8	17.02	28	16.57
35-39	5	6.58	4	9.76	4	8.51	13	7.69
40 and above	1	1.32	5	12.20	2	4.25	8	4.73
Gender								
Male	47	61.84	14	30.43	12	25.53	73	43.20
Female	29	38.16	32	69.57	35	74.47	96	56.80
Civil Status								
Single	50	65.79	30	66.67	26	55.32	106	62.72
Married	26	34.21	14	31.11	21	44.68	61	36.09
Widowed	0	0.00	1	2.22	0	0.00	1	0.59
Highest Educational Attainment								
High School Graduate	4	5.26	4	8.70	1	2.12	9	5.33
College Level	29	38.16	0	0.00	14	29.78	43	25.44
College Graduate	43	56.58	41	89.13	30	63.83	114	67.46
Masters Degree	0	0.00	1	2.17	2	4.26	3	1.78
Number of Years Employed								
Less than a year	15	19.74	14	30.44	6	12.77	35	20.71
1 – 2 years	30	39.47	16	34.78	28	59.57	74	43.79
3 – 4 years	31	40.39	10	21.74	6	12.77	47	27.81
More than 4 years	0	0.00	6	13.04	7	14.89	13	7.69
Employment Status								
Probationary	2	2.63	3	6.52	5	10.64	10	5.92
Contractual	6	7.89	3	6.52	19	40.43	28	16.57
Regular	68	89.47	40	86.96	23	48.94	131	77.51

Table 1 shows that the majority of the respondents from the resorts were 20 to 24 years old (39.47%), male (61.84%), single (65.79%), college graduates (56.58%), regular employees (89.47%), and had been working with the resorts for not more than four years (100%). Additionally, the table shows that the majority of the hotel staff respondents were 25 to 29 years old (39.02%), female (69.57%), single (66.67%), college graduates (89.13%), regular employees (86.96%), and had been working in the hotel for 1 to 2 years (34.78%). Furthermore, the table indicates that the majority of the tour operators were aged 25 to 29 years old (38.30%), female (74.47%), single (55.32%), college graduates (68.83%), regular employees (48.94%), and had been working for 1 to 2 years (59.57%). This supports Carl Jung's study that those who believed in teamwork could help an organization develop groups by matching team members with assignments that allow them to capitalize on their preferences and by helping employees understand how the different preferences of team members can lead to useful problem-solving. In relation to work performance, having a group of members in a team with the same attitude and desires will lead to a good relationship among co-employees, resulting in good teamwork and eventually unity in making decisions.



Indicators			Resorts (n = 76)		Hotels (n = 46)		Tour Operators (n = 47)		Combined (n = 169)	
			Mean	Int	Mean	Int	Mean	Int	Mean	Int
1.	My supervisor gives more freedom and authority which can make my job easier, faster and effective	3.13	MA	3.20	MA	2.93	MA	3.09	MA	
2.	The great autonomy and ability to make decisions can make my job more convenient especially for clients.	3.16	MA	3.26	HA	3.27	HA	3.23	MA	
3.	The power sharing among employee will help to reduce work related stress.	3.20	MA	3.35	HA	3.25	HA	3.27	HA	
4.	Lack of top management support will handicap to give power and authority for the employees.	3.14	MA	3.09	MA	3.17	MA	3.13	MA	
5.	Mutual trust among employees will enhance the power and authority toward the decision making.	3.22	MA	3.37	HA	3.44	HA	3.34	HA	
Aggregate Mean			3.17	MA	3.23	MA	3.21	MA	3.20	MA

Scale	Rating	Interpretation
4	3.25 – 4.00	Highly Affecting (HA)
3	2.50 – 3.24	Moderately Affecting (MA)
2	1.75 – 2.49	Less Affecting (LA)
1	1.00 – 1.74	Not Affecting (NA)



In terms of transformational leadership, in Table 3, the respondents' perception is moderately affecting, with a general weighted mean of 3.15. Unanimously, respondents from different groups perceived that shared values, beliefs, and missions among supervisors and subordinates are highly affecting to work performance of the employees, as indicated by the weighted mean values of 3.29 (resort employees), 3.17 (hotel staff), and 3.36 (tour operators). In addition, according to the hotel staff, supervisors giving careful attention to working conditions is moderately affecting (mean of 3.07) to the employees' work performance. This supports Bass's (1985) theory of transformational leaders that leaders adopt many behaviors such as idealized influence, individual consideration, inspirational motivation, and intellectual stimulation. Leaders who adapt a transformational manner have a long-term perspective, focus on the customer, and promote a shared vision and values, work to stimulate their organizations intellectually, invest in training, take some risks, and treat employees as individuals.

Table 4
Factors Affecting Employees' Work Performance in the Context of Teamwork

Indicators		Resorts (n = 76)		Hotels (n = 46)		Tour Operators (n = 47)		Combined (n = 169)	
		Mean	Int	Mean	Int	Mean	Int	Mean	Int
1.	This team's overall goals and objectives are clean.	3.21	MA	3.33	HA	3.09	MA	3.21	MA
2.	On this team we understand each other's roles and are able to be flexible and creative with them.	3.20	MA	3.30	HA	2.95	MA	3.15	MA
3.	Everyone on this team knows what's needed to make the team work well.	3.13	MA	3.30	HA	3.07	MA	3.17	MA
4.	Although no one says it, sometimes it's hard to get help with things because people feel that "it's not my job".	3.08	MA	2.93	MA	3.09	MA	3.03	MA
5.	People on this team are always frank and open with each other.	3.16	MA	3.04	MA	3.32	HA	3.17	MA
Aggregate Mean		3.16	MA	3.18	MA	3.10	MA	3.15	MA

Scale	Rating	Interpretation
4	3.25 – 4.00	Highly Affecting (HA)
3	2.50 – 3.24	Moderately Affecting (MA)
2	1.75 – 2.49	Less Affecting (LA)
1	1.00 – 1.74	Not Affecting (NA)

In Table 4, teamwork was perceived as moderately affecting, with a combined weighted mean value of 3.15 among all respondents. Aspects such as team goals and objectives (mean value of 3.33), understanding team roles (3.30), and being sensitive to the needs of the team (3.30) are seen as highly affecting to employees' work performance according to hotel staff. Being frank and open in communication is considered highly affecting, with a mean of 3.32 as perceived by the tour operators. Getting help because people feel that "it's not my job" is seen as moderately affecting, with the least weighted mean value of 2.93 as per hotel staff. The result agrees with Tajfel's Social Identity Theory. Tajfel proposes in his self-identity theory that some factors predict one group's reaction to other competing groups in society. It depends on what may arise from identification with a social classification (membership in a social, political, racial, religious group, etc.). It does not say that once we identify with a group, we inevitably will discriminate against other groups. However, Social Identity Theory does lay out the conditions under which such discrimination may take place.



Table 5
Factors Affecting Employees' Work Performance in the Context of Work Environment

	Indicators	Resorts (n = 76)		Hotels (n = 46)		Tour Operators (n = 47)		Combined (n = 169)	
		Mean	Int	Mean	Int	Mean	Int	Mean	Int
1.	Reacts quickly to solve the problem when told about safety concerns.	3.14	MA	2.93	MA	3.51	HA	3.19	MA
2.	Invests a lot in safety training for workers.	3.11	MA	2.83	MA	3.14	MA	3.03	MA
3.	My workplace is provided with efficient lighting so that I can work easily without strain on my eyes.	3.21	MA	2.83	MA	3.14	MA	3.06	MA
4.	Number of windows in my work area complete my fresh air and lights need.	3.27	HA	2.52	MA	3.41	HA	3.07	MA
5.	My work area is sufficiently equipped for my typical needs.	3.24	MA	2.71	MA	3.46	HA	3.14	MA
Aggregate Mean		3.20	MA	2.76	MA	3.33	HA	3.10	MA

Scale	Rating	Interpretation
4	3.25 – 4.00	Highly Affecting (HA)
3	2.50 – 3.24	Moderately Affecting (MA)
2	1.75 – 2.49	Less Affecting (LA)
1	1.00 – 1.74	Not Affecting (NA)

As presented in Table 5, the work environment is moderately affecting, with a combined mean value of 3.10. Among the three respondent groups, tour operators perceived that the work environment is important and highly affecting their work performance, with an aggregate mean of 3.33. Hotel staff, on the other hand, had the least weighted mean value of 2.76, although the result is interpreted as moderately affecting. The result of the study supports theories that employees are entitled to a work environment that is free from harassment. An unfriendly work environment exists when unwelcome sexual conduct interferes with an employee's work performance or creates a hostile, intimidating, or offensive work environment. The term "work environment" can also be associated with the physical condition of the establishment. Healthy work environments will be free from troubles accompanied by sick building syndrome, which is often due to poor ventilation or off-gassing of chemicals used during construction.
null hypothesis is rejected.

Table 6
Relationship Between Profile of the Respondents and Factors Affecting Employees' Work Performance for the Resort Respondents

Variables	Computed Chi-Square	df	Critical Value	Significance	Result
Empowerment and					
Age	5.030	6	12.592	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Sex	4.979	3	7.815	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Civil Status	4.253	3	7.815	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Educational Attainment	7.320	6	12.592	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Length of Service	13.174	12	21.026	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Employment Status	1.518	6	12.592	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Transformational Leadership and					
Age	2.177	6	12.592	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Sex	0.709	3	7.815	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Civil Status	2.202	3	7.815	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Educational Attainment	6.588	6	12.592	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Length of Service	7.107	12	21.026	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Employment Status	17.569	6	12.592	Significant	Reject Ho
Team Work and					
Age	4.181	6	12.592	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Sex	0.869	3	7.815	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Civil Status	1.274	3	7.815	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Educational Attainment	5.650	6	12.592	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Length of Service	13.718	12	21.026	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Employment Status	19.645	6	12.592	Significant	Reject Ho
Work Environment and					
Age	3.994	4	9.488	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Sex	0.324	2	5.991	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Civil Status	5.298	2	5.991	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Educational Attainment	1.421	4	9.488	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Length of Service	13.557	8	15.507	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Employment Status	7.669	4	9.488	Not Significant	Accept Ho



In Table 6, the significant relationship between the resort employees' profile and the factors affecting employees' work performance is shown. Chi-square was used to test the relationship at a 5% significance level. The results show that factors such as empowerment and work environment have no significant relationship with the respondents' profile; hence, the null hypothesis is accepted. Regarding transformational leadership and teamwork, it is evident that there is no significant relationship between these dimensions of work performance and the respondents' profile in terms of age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, and length of service. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

However, employment status has a significant relationship with factors like transformational leadership and teamwork, with the Chi-square values of 17.569 and 19.645, respectively, which are greater than the critical value of 12.592. It can be concluded that the null hypothesis is rejected.

Table 7
Relationship Between Profile of the Respondents and
Factors Affecting Employees' Work Performance
for the Hotel Respondents

Variables	Computed Chi-Square	df	Critical Value	Significance	Result
Empowerment and					
Age	13.502	15	24.996	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Sex	0.998	1	3.841	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Civil Status	0.913	2	5.991	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Educational Attainment	1.072	2	5.991	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Length of Service	5.282	3	7.815	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Employment Status	1.042	2	5.991	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Transformational Leadership and					
Age	32.979	30	43.773	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Sex	5.750	3	7.815	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Civil Status	4.446	6	12.592	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Educational Attainment	1.672	6	12.592	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Length of Service	11.998	6	12.592	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Employment Status	4.378	6	12.592	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Team Work and					
Age	22.634	30	43.773	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Sex	2.586	2	5.991	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Civil Status	2.800	4	9.488	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Educational Attainment	2.849	4	9.488	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Length of Service	12.949	6	12.592	Significant	Reject Ho
Employment Status	1.160	4	9.488	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Work Environment and					
Age	47.192	45	61.656	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Sex	4.243	3	7.815	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Civil Status	3.242	6	12.592	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Educational Attainment	1.968	6	12.592	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Length of Service	9.869	9	16.919	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Employment Status	14.468	6	12.592	Not Significant	Accept Ho

Table 7 shows the relationship between the profile of hotel respondents and the factors affecting employees' work performance. There is no significant relationship between the profile and dimensions such as empowerment,



transformational leadership, and work environment. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted. In the context of age, sex, civil status, and educational attainment of the respondents' profile and teamwork, a significant relationship is not manifested. Nonetheless, the length of service in employment significantly correlates with teamwork, with a computed Chi-square value of 12.949 at 6 degrees of freedom, greater than its critical value of 12.592. This results in the rejection of the null hypothesis.

Table 8
Relationship Between Profile of the Respondents and
Factors Affecting Employees' Work Performance
for the Tour Operator Respondents

Variables	Computed Chi-Square	df	Critical Value	Significance	Result
Empowerment and					
Age	5.800	10	18.307	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Sex	3.011	2	5.991	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Civil Status	0.754	2	5.991	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Educational Attainment	16.127	8	15.507	Significant	Reject Ho
Length of Service	6.189	6	12.592	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Employment Status	1.042	2	5.991	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Transformational Leadership and					
Age	11.429	10	18.307	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Sex	4.986	3	7.815	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Civil Status	3.118	3	7.815	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Educational Attainment	12.223	12	21.026	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Length of Service	19.749	9	16.919	Significant	Reject Ho
Employment Status	4.378	6	12.592	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Team Work and					
Age	6.909	10	18.307	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Sex	2.638	2	5.991	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Civil Status	3.001	2	5.991	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Educational Attainment	6.231	8	15.507	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Length of Service	16.937	6	12.592	Significant	Reject Ho
Employment Status	1.160	4	9.488	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Work Environment and					
Age	26.102	15	24.996	Significant	Reject Ho
Sex	7.260	3	7.815	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Civil Status	2.614	3	7.815	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Educational Attainment	4.529	12	21.026	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Length of Service	10.543	9	16.919	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Employment Status	14.468	6	12.592	Not Significant	Accept Ho

At a 5% significance level, table 8 shows a significant relationship between educational attainment (Chi-value 16.127 at 8 df) and empowerment, the length of service (Chi-value 19.749 at 9 df) and transformational leadership, the length of service (Chi-value 16.937 at 6 df) and teamwork, and age (Chi-value 26.102 at 15 df) and work environment. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected for these variables.



Table 9
Degree of Variance in Four Dimensions on the Factors Affecting Employees' Work Performance for the Resort Respondents

Variable	df	Sum square	Mean square	F-value	P-value	Significance	Result
Empowerment							
Between groups	4	0.447	0.112	0.31	0.874	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Within groups	375	137.434	0.366				
Total	379	137.882					
Transformational Leadership							
Between groups	4	2.342	0.586	1.68	0.153	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Within groups	375	130.342	0.348				
Total	379	132.684					
Team Work							
Between groups	4	0.853	0.213	0.48	0.747	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Within groups	375	164.987	0.440				
Total	379	165.839					
Work Environment							
Between groups	4	1.264	0.316	0.77	0.548	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Within groups	336	138.725	0.416				
Total	340	139.988					

Degree of variance was measured to test the extent of difference in four dimensions on the factors affecting employees' work performance as to resort respondents. In table 9, the study reveals that there was no significant difference among empowerment, transformational leadership, teamwork, and work environment. Furthermore, the results led to the acceptance of the null hypothesis.

Table 10
Degree of Variance in Four Dimensions on the Factors Affecting Employees' Work Performance for the Hotel Respondents

Variable	df	Sum square	Mean square	F-value	P-value	Significance	Result
Empowerment							
Between groups	4	2.461	0.615	2.07	0.086	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Within groups	225	66.913	0.297				
Total	229	69.374					
Transformational Leadership							
Between groups	4	1.070	0.267	0.62	0.648	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Within groups	225	96.826	0.430				
Total	229	97.896					
Team Work							
Between groups	4	6.026	1.507	3.84	0.005	Significant	Reject Ho
Within groups	225	88.304	0.392				
Total	229	94.330					
Work Environment							
Between groups	4	4.496	1.124	1.57	0.183	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Within groups	225	160.826	0.715				
Total	229	165.322					

In the perspective of hotel respondents, table 10 illustrates that there is no considerable difference in the dimensions of empowerment, transformational leadership, and work environment. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted under these factors. However, with a computed F-value of 3.84, which is less than the p-value of 0.05 level of confidence,



the ANOVA result indicates a significant difference in the respondents' perceptions in the context of teamwork, hence the rejection of the null hypothesis.

Table 11
Degree of Variance in Four Dimensions on the Factors Affecting Employees' Work Performance for the Tour Operator Respondents

Variable	df	Sum square	Mean square	F-value	P-value	Significance	Result
Empowerment							
Between groups	6	9.963	1.660	3.38	0.003	Significant	Reject Ho
Within groups	404	198.329	0.491				
Total	410	208.292					
Transformational Leadership							
Between groups	6	15.322	2.554	3.91	0.001	Significant	Reject Ho
Within groups	406	265.085	0.653				
Total	412	280.407					
Team Work							
Between groups	6	5.752	0.959	2.57	0.019	Significant	Reject Ho
Within groups	403	150.446	0.373				
Total	409	156.198					
Work Environment							
Between groups	6	1.554	0.259	0.49	0.819	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Within groups	406	216.814	0.534				
Total	412	218.368					

The degree of difference in the perceptions of tour operators on the factors affecting employees' work performance is illustrated in table 11. There is no significant difference in the respondents' perception regarding the work environment, thus the null hypothesis is accepted. In contrast, significant differences are seen in the factors of empowerment (F-value of 3.38), transformational leadership (F-value of 3.91), and teamwork (F-value of 2.57) at a 5% significance level. Consequently, the null hypothesis is rejected in these dimensions.

Findings

Regarding the respondents' profile, most individuals working in resorts, hotels, and tour operators fell within specific age groups, genders, civil statuses, educational attainments, and lengths of service. For factors affecting work performance, empowerment was found to have a moderate impact overall, with autonomy, collaboration, and trust being perceived as highly influential. Transformational leadership also had a moderate effect, particularly through shared values, beliefs, and missions. Teamwork was moderately impactful, with team goals and open communication highlighted as especially influential factors. The work environment was also moderately impactful; however, tour operators rated it as highly impactful. In examining the relationship between respondents' profiles and factors affecting work performance, no significant relationship was found between the demographic profiles and empowerment, transformational leadership, or work environment. Nonetheless, employment status showed a significant relationship with transformational leadership and teamwork. When assessing the degree of variance among factors affecting work performance, no significant differences were observed among empowerment, transformational leadership, teamwork, and work environment for respondents from resorts. However, a significant difference was noted among hotel respondents regarding teamwork, and a significant difference was also found in the perceptions of factors affecting work performance among tour operators.

Conclusions

Based on the gathered data, the following conclusions are drawn regarding the factors affecting employees' work performance in the hospitality industry in Cebu City. The profile of respondents indicates that they vary widely in age, gender, civil status, educational attainment, and years of service. Factors such as empowerment, transformational leadership, teamwork, and work environment were found to have a moderate impact on employee performance, with certain elements like autonomy, collaboration, shared values, team goals, and open communication perceived as highly influential. Although no significant relationship was found between most demographic profiles and work performance factors, employment status was notably related to perceptions of transformational leadership and teamwork. Furthermore, while there were no significant differences in the perceptions of resort respondents across these factors, hotel respondents showed varying perceptions in relation to



teamwork, and tour operators demonstrated significant differences in their perceptions of work environment. These findings suggest that targeted strategies based on specific employee roles and employment statuses could enhance work performance in the hospitality sector.

Recommendations

Hotel and tour operator managers are encouraged to grant employees full freedom and authority, which can enhance job efficiency, reduce work-related stress, and ultimately boost productivity and customer satisfaction. Providing comprehensive administrative support also minimizes work-related obstacles and fosters a harmonious, productive work environment. Additionally, managers should motivate employees to demonstrate their skills, knowledge, and well-being, helping to increase individual capacities, maximize potential, and improve overall work productivity. Setting clear organizational goals and job descriptions in the tourism and hospitality sectors can provide employees with clear direction, while promoting teamwork enhances job satisfaction and reduces conflicts. Furthermore, tourism managers should adopt a proactive approach to problem-solving by investing in office facilities, safety measures, and employee training. These efforts can reduce absences, prevent environment-related illnesses, and enhance overall work performance.

References

- Adour, J. (1973). *Action-centered leadership*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Andrews, S. (2008). *Introduction to tourism and hospitality industry*. New Delhi, India: Tata McGraw-Hill.
- Belbin, R. M. (1993). *Team roles at work*. Oxford, England: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Besterfield, D. H. (2004). *Quality control* (7th ed.). Singapore: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Biore, C. (2015). *Business organization and management with technopreneurship*. Cebu City, Philippines: University of Cebu.
- Brown, G. (2009). *The waiter's handbook* (4th ed.). Singapore: Pearson Education South Asia Pte Ltd.
- Cariño, C. E. (2008). *The hospitality industry: An introduction*. Manila, Philippines: Mindshapers Co.
- Medina, R. (2016). *Human behavior in organization*. Manila, Philippines: Rex Book Store.
- Evans, J., & Williams, L. (2015). *Total quality management*. Pasig City, Philippines: Cengage Learning Asia Pte Ltd.
- Noe, R. (2010). *Employee training and development*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- Ford, R., Sturman, M., & Heaton, C. (2012). *Managing quality service in hospitality*. New York, NY: Delmar Cengage Learning.
- Hughes, R., Ginnett, R., & Curphy, G. (2006). *Leadership: Enhancing the lesson of experience* (5th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- Hughes, R., Ginnett, R., & Curphy, G. (2001). *Leadership: Enhancing the lesson of experience* (4th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- Hughes, R., Ginnett, R., & Curphy, G. (2001). *Leadership: Enhancing the lesson of experience* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- Jung, C. (1921). *Psychologische Typen*. United Kingdom: Routledge.
- Kaufman, T. J. (2010). *Timeshare management: The key issues for hospitality managers*. Oxford, England: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Larkin, E. M. (2009). *How to run a great hotel: Everything you need to achieve excellence in the hotel industry*. United Kingdom: How To Books.
- Mayer, J. (1995). *Time management for dummies*. Foster City, CA: IDG Books Worldwide, Inc.
- Okumus, F. (2010). *Strategic management for hospitality and tourism*. United Kingdom: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Powers, T. (2012). *Introduction to management in the hospitality industry* (10th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Roberts, J. A. (1976). *A study of organizational leadership*. Harrisburg, PA: Stackpole Books.
- Rosenbach, W., & Taylor, R. (1989). *Contemporary issues in leadership*. United States: Westview Press, Inc.
- Santos, B. (2010). *Introduction to hotel and resort management*. Quezon City, Philippines: C&E Publishing, Inc.
- Szende, P. (2010). *Case scenarios in hospitality supervision*. Singapore: Cengage Learning.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). *An integrated theory of intergroup conflict*. England: University of Bristol.
- Walker, J. R. (2009). *Introduction to hospitality operations* (5th ed.). Singapore: Pearson Education South Asia.
- Wehrich, H., Cannice, M., & Koontz, H. (2009). *Management: A global and entrepreneurial perspective*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.