

## Synergistic Effects of Transformational Leadership and Work Environment on Employee Performance in the Hospitality Industry in Manado

Helni Desty Yanice Lagarens<sup>1\*</sup>, Merinda Pandowo<sup>2</sup>, Genita Lumintang<sup>3</sup>, Irvan Trang<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1\*</sup> Management Study Program, Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Pariwisata Manado, Manado City, North Sulawesi Province, Indonesia

<sup>2,3,4</sup> Management Study Program, Postgraduate Faculty, Universitas Sam Ratulangi, Manado City, North Sulawesi Province, Indonesia

Email: [helnidesty@gmail.com](mailto:helnidesty@gmail.com)<sup>1\*</sup>, [merindapandowo@unsrat.ac.id](mailto:merindapandowo@unsrat.ac.id)<sup>2</sup>, [genitalumintang@unsrat.ac.id](mailto:genitalumintang@unsrat.ac.id)<sup>3</sup>, [trang\\_irvan@unsrat.ac.id](mailto:trang_irvan@unsrat.ac.id)<sup>4</sup>

Article history:

Received April 27, 2026

Revised June 5, 2026

Accepted June 7, 2026

### Abstract

This study examines the synergistic effect of transformational leadership and work environment on employee performance in the hospitality industry in Manado City, focusing on Aston Manado Hotel and Roger Hotel Manado. A quantitative approach was employed using a purposive sampling technique, involving 77 permanent employees (42 from Aston Manado Hotel and 35 from Roger Hotel Manado) as respondents. Data were analyzed using multiple linear regression with SPSS 26. The findings reveal that transformational leadership has a positive and significant effect on employee performance ( $\beta = 0.451$ ;  $t = 7.431$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ), while the work environment also exerts a positive and significant effect on employee performance ( $\beta = 0.343$ ;  $t = 6.103$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ). Simultaneously, both variables explain 64.1% of the variance in employee performance ( $R^2 = 0.641$ ;  $F = 66.03$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ). These results confirm a synergistic relationship between transformational leadership and the work environment, indicating that their combined influence on employee performance is stronger than their individual effects. The study provides practical implications for hotel management by highlighting the importance of strengthening transformational leadership competencies, particularly in inspirational motivation, individualized consideration, and employee empowerment, as transformational leadership emerged as the strongest predictor of employee performance. Hotel managers are encouraged to implement structured leadership development programs, regular coaching sessions, and performance feedback mechanisms to enhance employee engagement and productivity. Furthermore, organizations should invest in improving both the physical work environment, including workplace facilities, safety standards, and employee comfort, and the psychological work environment through effective communication, teamwork, and organizational support. Given that transformational leadership and work environment jointly explain 64.1% of employee performance variance, hotel management should adopt an integrated human resource strategy that simultaneously develops leadership quality and workplace conditions. Such initiatives can improve employee productivity, service quality, guest satisfaction, and overall organizational performance in the hospitality industry.

### Keywords:

Transformational leadership; Work environment; Employee performance; Hospitality industry; Hotel management.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The hospitality industry is highly dependent on the quality and performance of human resources because service delivery is largely shaped by employee interactions with guests. In the post-pandemic era, the recovery of the tourism sector has accelerated the growth of hospitality businesses worldwide, creating increasing demands for service quality, operational efficiency, and employee productivity (World Travel & Tourism Council, 2024). In Indonesia, particularly in Manado City as the economic and tourism center of North Sulawesi, the hospitality sector has experienced significant growth following the resurgence of domestic and international tourism activities. According to data from the Central Bureau of Statistics of North Sulawesi (2024), the occupancy rate of star-rated hotels in Manado has increased steadily since 2022, indicating a stronger need for hotels to maintain high employee performance in a more competitive business environment.

Employee performance is recognized as a critical determinant of organizational success because it directly influences service quality, customer satisfaction, and organizational effectiveness. Previous empirical studies have consistently shown that employee competence and emotional intelligence significantly contribute to employee performance, both individually and simultaneously (Ardiansyah & Sulistiyowati, 2018). Their findings indicate that organizations seeking sustainable performance improvement must pay attention not only to employee capabilities but also to organizational factors that facilitate optimal work behavior. Therefore, hotel management needs to identify organizational variables capable of enhancing employee performance in service-oriented environments. Among these variables, transformational leadership and work environment have received increasing attention in hospitality management research.

Transformational leadership refers to a leadership style that inspires employees to exceed expected performance through vision, motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. In the hospitality industry, transformational leaders play an important role in fostering employee commitment and encouraging service excellence. Tamengkel and Rumawas (2022), in their study of five-star hotel employees in Manado, found that transformational leadership has a positive and significant effect on employee performance and organizational commitment. Their findings suggest that effective transformational leadership can strengthen employees' willingness to contribute beyond formal job requirements, thereby improving organizational performance in highly competitive hotel environments.

In addition to leadership, the work environment plays a crucial role in determining employee performance. The work environment encompasses physical conditions, workplace facilities, safety, interpersonal relationships, communication quality, and organizational support systems that influence employees' ability to perform effectively. Research conducted by Arjun et al. (2022) at Ulun Ubud Resort & Spa demonstrated that the work environment significantly influences employee performance, both individually and together with work motivation. Similarly, Gunawan et al. (2024) found that the work environment positively and significantly affects employee performance at Fairfield by Marriott Bali South Kuta, explaining approximately 70 percent of performance variation among employees. These findings indicate that supportive workplace conditions can enhance productivity, motivation, and service quality in hospitality organizations.

Although numerous studies have investigated the individual effects of transformational leadership and work environment on employee performance, empirical evidence regarding their combined or synergistic effects remains limited, particularly in the hospitality industry of emerging tourism destinations. Most previous studies have examined these variables independently, making it difficult to understand how leadership and workplace conditions interact to influence employee performance simultaneously. Furthermore, limited research has compared these relationships across hotels with different market positioning and service classifications within the same regional context. Therefore, examining the combined influence of transformational leadership and work environment may provide a more comprehensive explanation of employee performance in hospitality organizations.

Aston Hotel Manado, a four-star hotel, and Roger Hotel Manado, a three-star hotel, provide an appropriate context for investigating these relationships because both hotels operate in the same tourism market while serving different customer segments. Preliminary observations indicate variations in employee performance, leadership practices, and workplace conditions across departments, suggesting the need for a more systematic examination of the factors affecting employee performance. Based on the identified research gap, this study addresses the following research questions: (1) Does transformational leadership significantly affect employee performance at Aston Hotel and Roger Hotel Manado? (2) Does the work environment significantly affect employee performance at Aston Hotel and Roger Hotel Manado? and (3) Do transformational leadership and work environment jointly create a synergistic effect on employee performance that exceeds their individual contributions?

## 2. RESEARCH METHOD

This study employs a descriptive-associative quantitative approach with a comparative case study design (Yin, 2018). This approach is selected because it enables the testing of causal relationships among variables while allowing an in-depth comparison between two hotels of different star classifications. A positivist paradigm is applied, with primary data collected through a structured questionnaire instrument. The population of this study consists of all permanent employees actively registered at Aston Hotel Manado ( $N_1 = 215$ ) and Roger Hotel Manado ( $N_2 = 178$ ) during the data collection period (October–December 2025). The sampling technique used is purposive sampling with the following inclusion criteria: (1) permanent employees with a minimum tenure of one year; (2) employees working in operational departments such as Front Office, Housekeeping, Food and Beverage, and Engineering; and (3) willingness to complete the questionnaire fully. Purposive sampling was chosen because the study seeks to obtain information from employees who possess sufficient experience and direct exposure to leadership practices, workplace conditions, and performance evaluation systems within the hotels. Employees with shorter tenure may not have adequate understanding of organizational leadership and work environment characteristics, potentially reducing the accuracy of their responses. Therefore, selecting respondents who meet specific criteria enhances the relevance and quality of the data collected. However, since purposive sampling is a non-probability sampling technique, the findings should be interpreted with caution, as they may limit the generalizability of the results beyond employees with similar characteristics in comparable hospitality organizations.

The sample size determination refers to three approaches: (a) the Slovin formula with a margin of error of 10%, resulting in a minimum sample size of 79; (b) the rule of thumb by Hair et al. (2019), which requires at least 50 observations or five times the number of indicators ( $5 \times 14 = 70$ ); and (c) statistical power analysis with power = 0.80,  $\alpha = 0.05$ , and a medium effect size ( $f^2 = 0.15$ ), resulting in a minimum sample size of 68 (Cohen, 1988). Based on these considerations, the final sample consists of 77 respondents, including 42 from Aston Hotel and 35 from Roger Hotel, meeting all minimum requirements. The research instrument is developed based on the theories of Bass and Avolio (1994) for transformational leadership, Sedarmayanti (2017) for the work environment, and Bernardin and Russell (1993) as well as Mangkunegara (2009) for employee performance. Transformational leadership (X1) is measured using five items representing the dimensions of idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, and vision commitment. The work environment (X2) is measured using four items covering physical working conditions, interpersonal relationships, organizational psychological support, and the availability of supporting facilities. Employee performance (Y) is measured using five items, including service quality, work efficiency, initiative and creativity, procedural compliance, and guest satisfaction level. All items are measured using a five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree).

Data analysis is conducted in stages using SPSS version 26. The first stage involves instrument testing, including validity testing using Pearson Product Moment correlation ( $r\text{-calculated} > r\text{-table} = 0.224$  for  $n = 77$ ,  $\alpha = 5\%$ ) and reliability testing using Cronbach's Alpha ( $\alpha > 0.70$ ). The second stage involves classical assumption tests, including normality (Kolmogorov-Smirnov), multicollinearity ( $VIF < 10$  and  $Tolerance > 0.10$ ), heteroscedasticity (Glejser test), and autocorrelation (Durbin-Watson). The third stage involves multiple linear regression analysis using the equation  $Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + e$ , followed by partial hypothesis testing (t-test,  $\alpha = 5\%$ ) and simultaneous testing (F-test,  $\alpha = 5\%$ ). The final stage involves the analysis of the coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) to measure the combined contribution of the independent variables.

## 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 3.1. Respondent Profile

Table 1 presents the demographic profile of the 77 respondents. The majority of respondents are from Aston Hotel Manado (54.5%), male (57.1%), aged 31–40 years (40.3%), hold a bachelor's degree (37.7%), and have 2–5 years of work experience (42.9%). This composition reflects the general characteristics of employees in star-rated hotels in Indonesia, which are predominantly composed of productive young workers with vocational and undergraduate educational backgrounds.

Table 1. Respondent Profile

Characteristic	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Hotel	Hotel Aston Manado	42	54,5
	Hotel Roger Manado	35	45,5
Gender	Male	44	57,1
	Female	33	42,9
Age	20–30 years	28	36,4
	31–40 years	31	40,3
	41–50 years	13	16,9
	> 50 years	5	6,5
Education	SMA/SMK	18	23,4
	Diploma (D3)	26	33,8
	Bachelor's Degree (S1)	29	37,7
	Postgraduate	4	5,2
Work Tenure	< 2 years	14	18,2
	2–5 years	33	42,9
	6–10 years	22	28,6
	> 10 years	8	10,4
Total		77	100,0

### 3.2. Descriptive Statistics

Based on Table 2, all research variables show mean values above 3.50 on a 1–5 Likert scale, which are categorized as “Good” according to the score interpretation criteria (Sugiyono, 2022). Transformational leadership has a mean of 3.84 (Std. Dev. = 0.537), the work environment has a mean of 3.77 (Std. Dev. = 0.498), and employee performance shows the highest mean of 3.91 (Std. Dev. = 0.513). The relatively low standard deviations (below 0.60) indicate a high level of response consistency among respondents.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Research Variables

Variable	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Dev.	Category
Transformational Leadership (X1)	77	2,60	5,00	3,84	0,537	Good
Work Environment (X2)	77	2,40	5,00	3,77	0,498	Good
Employee Performance (Y)	77	2,80	5,00	3,91	0,513	Good

### 3.3. Validity and Reliability Tests

Table 3 presents the results of the validity test. All 14 instrument items have correlation coefficients ranging from 0.697 to 0.769, all exceeding the critical value of  $r\text{-table} = 0.224$  ( $\alpha = 5\%$ ;  $n = 77$ ). Therefore, all items are considered valid and capable of measuring the intended constructs.

Table 3. Instrument Validity Test Results

Variable	Item	r-calculated	r-table (n=77)	Remark
Transformational Leadership (X1)	KT1	0,724	0,224	Valid
	KT2	0,761	0,224	Valid
	KT3	0,738	0,224	Valid
	KT4	0,703	0,224	Valid
	KT5	0,746	0,224	Valid
Work Environment (X2)	LK1	0,697	0,224	Valid
	LK2	0,718	0,224	Valid
	LK3	0,711	0,224	Valid
	LK4	0,733	0,224	Valid
Employee Performance (Y)	KK1	0,745	0,224	Valid
	KK2	0,769	0,224	Valid
	KK3	0,723	0,224	Valid
	KK4	0,751	0,224	Valid
	KK5	0,738	0,224	Valid

The reliability test results in Table 4 show that Cronbach's Alpha values range from 0.819 to 0.856 for all variables, exceeding the minimum threshold of 0.70 (Hair et al., 2019). These values also surpass the “very good” criterion ( $\alpha > 0.80$ ), indicating high internal consistency of the research instrument.

Table 4. Instrument Reliability Test Results

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	Standar	Remark
Transformational Leadership (X1)	0,841	> 0,70	Reliabel
Lingkungan Kerja (X2)	0,819	> 0,70	Reliabel
Kinerja Karyawan (Y)	0,856	> 0,70	Reliabel

### 3.4. Classical Assumption Tests

Table 5 summarizes the results of the classical assumption tests. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test yields a significance value of 0.092 ( $p > 0.05$ ), indicating that the residuals are normally distributed. The multicollinearity test shows VIF values of 2.148 and tolerance values of 0.465 for both predictors, well within acceptable thresholds (VIF < 10; Tolerance > 0.10), confirming the absence of multicollinearity. The Glejser test for heteroscedasticity produces significance values of 0.231 (X1) and 0.198 (X2), both greater than 0.05, indicating homoscedasticity. The Durbin-Watson value of 1.974 falls within the no-autocorrelation range (1.55–2.46 for  $n = 77$ ,  $k = 2$ ). Overall, all classical assumptions are satisfied.

Table 5. Summary of Classical Assumption Test Results

Uji	Statistik	Nilai	Syarat	Keterangan
Normality	K-S Sig.	0,092	$p > 0,05$	Normal
Multicollinearity	VIF (X1)	2,148	< 10	No multicollinearity
	VIF (X2)	2,148	< 10	No multicollinearity
	Tolerance (X1)	0,465	> 0,10	No multicollinearity
	Tolerance (X2)	0,465	> 0,10	No multicollinearity
Heteroscedasticity	Glejser Sig. X1	0,231	$p > 0,05$	No multicollinearity
	Glejser Sig. X2	0,198	$p > 0,05$	No multicollinearity
Autocorrelation	Durbin-Watson	1,974	1,55–2,46	No multicollinearity

### 3.5. Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Results

Table 6 presents the coefficients of the multiple linear regression analysis. The resulting regression equation is  $Y = 0.584 + 0.431X_1 + 0.354X_2$ . The constant value of 0.584 indicates that when both independent variables are zero, employee performance remains at a baseline value of 0.584. The positive coefficients for  $X_1$  (0.431) and  $X_2$  (0.354) confirm the direction of influence in line with the proposed hypotheses.

Table 6. Results of Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Model	B	Std. Error	Beta ( $\beta$ )	t-value	Sig.
Constant	0,584	0,182	—	3,208	0,002
Transformational Leadership (X1)	0,431	0,058	0,451	7,431	0,000
Work Environment (X2)	0,354	0,058	0,343	6,103	0,000

The partial hypothesis testing (t-test) shows that for transformational leadership (X1),  $t\text{-value} = 7.431 > t\text{-table} = 1.992$  ( $df = 74$ ;  $\alpha = 5\%$ ) with  $p = 0.000 < 0.05$ . Thus, H1 is accepted, indicating that transformational leadership has a positive and significant effect on employee performance, with a standardized beta coefficient ( $\beta$ ) of 0.451. This implies that a one standard deviation increase in transformational leadership leads to a 0.451 standard deviation increase in employee performance, ceteris paribus. For the work environment (X2),  $t\text{-value} = 6.103 > t\text{-table} = 1.992$  with  $p = 0.000 < 0.05$ . Therefore, H2 is accepted, indicating that the work environment has a positive and significant effect on employee performance ( $\beta = 0.343$ ).

### 3.6. F-Test and Coefficient of Determination ( $R^2$ )

Table 7 summarizes the results of the F-test and the coefficient of determination. The F-value of 66.03 exceeds the F-table value of 3.122 ( $df_1 = 2$ ;  $df_2 = 74$ ;  $\alpha = 5\%$ ) with a significance level of  $0.000 < 0.05$ . Thus, H3 is accepted, indicating that transformational leadership and the work environment simultaneously have a significant effect on employee performance.

Table 7. Results of F-Test and Coefficient of Determination ( $R^2$ )

Indicator	Value	Criterion	Remark
R (Multiple Correlation)	0,801	—	Very strong relationship
R Square ( $R^2$ )	0,641	—	64,1% variance explained
Adjusted R Square	0,631	—	Adjusted for predictors
Std. Error of Estimate	0,312	—	Model standard error
F-value	66,03	—	Significant
F-table ( $df_1=2$ ; $df_2=74$ )	3,122	—	Reference value
Sig. F	0,000	< 0,05	Model is significant

The  $R^2$  value of 0.641 indicates that 64.1% of the variation in employee performance can be explained jointly by transformational leadership and the work environment, while the remaining 35.9% is explained by other factors outside the model, such as intrinsic motivation, compensation, and demographic factors. The Adjusted  $R^2$  value of 0.631, which is very close to  $R^2$ , suggests that the model does not suffer from overfitting despite including two predictors.

### 3.7. Comparative Analysis: Aston Hotel and Roger Hotel

Table 8 compares the analysis results between the two hotels. Aston Hotel Manado consistently shows higher mean values across all variables compared to Roger Hotel Manado. These differences may be attributed to several structural factors, including a larger leadership training budget at Aston Hotel (an average of IDR 85 million per year compared to IDR 42 million at Roger Hotel based on budget records from 2022–2024), stricter managerial recruitment standards, and employee facility renovations carried out between 2022 and 2023.

Table 8. Comparison of Regression Analysis Results Between Hotels

Indicator	Hotel Aston Manado (n=42)	Hotel Roger Manado (n=35)
Mean X1 (Transformational Leadership)	3,92	3,74
Mean X2 (Work Environment)	3,85	3,68
Mean Y (Employee Performance)	3,98	3,82
R Square ( $R^2$ )	0,658	0,619
Beta ( $\beta$ ) Transformational Leadership	0,462	0,438
Beta ( $\beta$ ) Work Environment	0,354	0,329
F-value	37,08	27,89
Sig. F	0,000	0,000

Both hotels exhibit high  $R^2$  values (0.658 and 0.619), confirming the consistency of the model. The beta coefficient for transformational leadership is consistently higher than that of the work environment in both hotels, indicating that leadership has a more dominant influence in the context of the two hotels studied.

### 3.8. Discussion: Synergistic Effects from a Theoretical Perspective

The findings of this study provide empirical support for the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) framework, which suggests that organizational resources play a crucial role in enhancing employee motivation, engagement, and performance. In the hospitality industry, transformational leadership and a supportive work environment can be considered important organizational resources that help employees cope with job demands while improving service effectiveness. The coefficient of determination ( $R^2 = 64.1\%$ ) indicates that transformational leadership and work environment jointly explain a substantial proportion of employee performance, suggesting that these resources operate synergistically in influencing employee outcomes.

Transformational leadership emerged as the strongest predictor of employee performance ( $\beta = 0.451$ ). This finding confirms that leaders play a central role in shaping employee attitudes, motivation, and work behavior within hospitality organizations. The result is consistent with the study of Tamengkel and Rumawas (2022), who found that transformational leadership positively and significantly influences employee performance and organizational commitment among hotel employees in Manado. Transformational leaders inspire employees through vision, individualized support, intellectual stimulation, and motivational encouragement, enabling them to exceed expected performance standards. In service-intensive industries such as hospitality, where employee interactions directly influence guest experiences, transformational leadership contributes significantly to service quality, employee engagement, and organizational competitiveness.

The work environment was also found to have a significant positive effect on employee performance ( $\beta = 0.343$ ). This finding supports previous hospitality studies conducted in Indonesia. Arjun et al. (2022) reported that the work environment significantly affects employee performance at Ulun Ubud Resort & Spa, while Gunawan et al. (2024) found that workplace conditions positively and significantly influence employee performance at Fairfield by Marriott Bali South Kuta. These findings indicate that employees perform more effectively when they work in environments characterized by adequate facilities, supportive interpersonal

relationships, effective communication, and organizational support. A positive work environment not only enhances employee productivity but also reduces stress and creates favorable conditions for delivering high-quality service to guests.

The results further reveal a complementary relationship between transformational leadership and the work environment. Transformational leadership becomes more effective when employees operate within a supportive workplace, while a positive work environment produces greater outcomes when reinforced by inspirational and empowering leadership. Employees who receive motivation, recognition, and guidance from their leaders while simultaneously experiencing favorable workplace conditions are more likely to demonstrate higher levels of commitment, initiative, and performance. This finding supports the central proposition of the JD-R framework that multiple organizational resources can interact and reinforce one another in generating positive work outcomes.

An important contribution of this study lies in its comparative examination of two hotels with different star classifications operating within the same tourism destination. According to Yin (2018), comparative case study designs enable researchers to investigate whether theoretical relationships remain consistent across different organizational settings. The significant influence of transformational leadership and work environment observed in both Aston Hotel Manado and Roger Hotel Manado suggests that these factors are fundamental determinants of employee performance regardless of hotel classification. Although four-star and three-star hotels differ in terms of facilities, organizational structure, and market positioning, employees in both contexts appear to respond similarly to leadership quality and workplace conditions. This finding indicates that organizational resources may be more influential than structural differences in determining employee performance.

The findings also extend previous hospitality research by integrating transformational leadership and work environment into a single explanatory model. While previous studies have generally examined transformational leadership (Tamengkel & Rumawas, 2022) or work environment (Arjun et al., 2022; Gunawan et al., 2024) separately, the present study demonstrates their simultaneous contribution to employee performance. The relatively high explanatory power of the model suggests that employee performance cannot be fully understood by examining leadership practices or workplace conditions independently. Instead, both factors should be managed simultaneously to maximize organizational effectiveness. From a managerial perspective, hotel managers should prioritize leadership development programs while continuously improving workplace quality, communication systems, and employee support mechanisms. Such integrated efforts are likely to enhance employee performance, strengthen service quality, and contribute to the long-term sustainability of hospitality organizations.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

This study produces three main conclusions. First, transformational leadership has a positive and significant effect on employee performance at Aston Hotel and Roger Hotel Manado ( $\beta = 0.451$ ;  $t = 7.431$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ), supporting H1. This finding indicates that leaders who are able to inspire employees, provide individual support, and encourage innovation can significantly improve employee performance. Second, the work environment has a positive and significant effect on employee performance ( $\beta = 0.343$ ;  $t = 6.103$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ), supporting H2. Supportive physical and psychological workplace conditions enable employees to perform their duties more effectively and efficiently. Third, transformational leadership and the work environment simultaneously have a significant effect on employee performance, explaining 64.1% of its variance ( $R^2 = 0.641$ ;  $F = 66.03$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ), thereby supporting H3. The findings confirm that employee performance is strengthened when effective leadership is accompanied by a supportive work environment. This pattern is consistently observed in both hotels, as reflected by the relatively high  $R^2$  values of 0.658 at Aston Hotel and 0.619 at Roger Hotel.

Based on these findings, several recommendations can be proposed. First, hotel management should prioritize the development of transformational leadership competencies among supervisors and department managers, as transformational leadership was found to be the strongest predictor of employee performance in this study ( $\beta = 0.451$ ). Leadership development initiatives should focus on enhancing communication, employee motivation, individual support, and empowerment practices. Second, management should continuously improve workplace conditions, particularly aspects related to employee comfort, workplace facilities, interpersonal relationships, and organizational support, given the significant contribution of the work environment to employee performance ( $\beta = 0.343$ ). Third, because both variables jointly explain a substantial proportion of employee performance (64.1%), management should adopt an integrated human resource strategy that simultaneously strengthens leadership quality and workplace conditions rather than focusing on only one factor. Finally, future studies are encouraged to investigate additional variables that may explain the remaining 35.9% of employee performance variance, such as work motivation, job satisfaction, employee engagement, compensation, and organizational culture. Expanding the research scope to other hotels and tourism-related organizations would also improve the generalizability of the findings.

Future research is encouraged to investigate additional mediating and moderating variables that may explain the remaining 35.9% of employee performance variance not captured by the current model. Potential mediating variables include work motivation, job satisfaction, and employee engagement, while organizational culture, employee tenure, and compensation may serve as moderating variables. Such investigations would contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of employee performance determinants in the hospitality industry and further validate the synergistic relationships identified in this study.

## REFERENCES

- Albrecht, S. L., Connaughton, S., Foster, K., & Quinn, E. (2021). Meaningful work, job resources, and employee engagement. *Sustainability*, 13(7), 4045. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13074045>
- Ardiansyah, Y., & Sulistiyowati, L. H. (2018). Pengaruh Kompetensi dan Kecerdasan Emosional Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai. *Jurnal Inspirasi Bisnis Dan Manajemen*, 2(1), 91–100. <https://doi.org/10.33603/jibm.v2i1.1064>
- Arjun, I. K. ., Pradana, G. Y. K. ., & Suarmana, I. W. R. . (2022). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja dan motivasi terhadap kinerja karyawan . *Jurnal Ilmiah Pariwisata Dan Bisnis*, 1(12), 3656–3673. <https://doi.org/10.22334/paris.v1i12.268>
- Badan Pusat Statistik Provinsi Sulawesi Utara. (2024). Statistik hotel dan tingkat penghunian kamar Provinsi Sulawesi Utara 2024. BPS Provinsi Sulawesi Utara.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309–328. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115>
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Sanz-Vergel, A. I. (2023). Job demands–resources theory: Ten years later. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 10, 25–53. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-120920-053933>
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Sage Publications.
- Bernardin, H. J., & Russell, J. E. A. (1993). *Human resource management: An experiential approach*. McGraw-Hill.
- Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Rows.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gunawan, P. D., Sukana, I. N., & Sihombing, I. H. (2024). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan Hotel Fairfield by Marriott Bali South Kuta. *Jurnal Sosial Teknologi*, 4(10), 816–825. <https://doi.org/10.59188/jurnalsostech.v4i10.1370>
- Hair, J. F., Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. *European Business Review*, 31(1), 2–24. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-11-2018-0203>
- Hobfoll, S. E., Halbesleben, J., Neveu, J. P., & Westman, M. (2018). Conservation of resources in the organizational context: The reality of resources and their consequences. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 5, 103–128. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032117-104640>
- Khusanova, R., Kang, S. W., & Choi, S. B. (2021). Work engagement among public employees: Antecedents and consequences. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 684495. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.684495>
- Mangkunegara, A. A. A. P. (2009). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia perusahaan*. PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Schaufeli, W. B. (2021). Engaging leadership: How to promote work engagement? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 754556. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.754556>

- Sedarmayanti. (2017). *Perencanaan dan pengembangan SDM untuk meningkatkan kompetensi, kinerja, dan produktivitas kerja*. PT Refika Aditama.
- Sugiyono. (2022). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D* (3rd ed.). Alfabeta.
- Tamengkel, L., & Rumawas, W. (2022). Pengaruh kepemimpinan transformasional terhadap kinerja dan keinginan keluar karyawan: Peran komitmen organisasional sebagai mediator. *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis (JAB)*, 12(1), 52–63. <https://doi.org/10.35797/jab.v12.i1.52-60>
- World Travel & Tourism Council. (2024). *Travel & tourism economic impact 2024: Global trends*. World Travel & Tourism Council.
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). Sage Publications.