

Original Article

Emotional Competence and Job Resilience: Impact on Work Performance in the Hospitality Industry in Cagayan de Oro City

June Floy C. Bongcawil-Lanaja 

Author Information:

Department of Hospitality Management,
Mindanao State University-Maigo College of
Education, Science and Technology, Maigo,
Lanao del Norte, Philippines

Corresponding Author:

jfcbongcawil@gmail.com

Article History:

Date received: December 2, 2024

Date revised: June 22, 2026

Date accepted: July 2, 2026

Recommended citation:

Bongcawil-Lanaja, J.F. (2026). Emotional competence and job resilience: Impact on work performance in the hospitality industry in Cagayan de Oro City. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 4(8), 40-54. <https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2024.648>

Abstract. This study examines how emotional competence and job resilience influence work performance among hospitality industry employees, providing insights into employee retention and performance strategies in the post-pandemic recovery era. Using a quantitative descriptive-correlational design, the research involved 75 employees from hotels and restaurants in Cagayan de Oro City. Purposive and convenience sampling methods ensured participant relevance and accessibility. Findings revealed that higher emotional competence and job resilience are associated with improved work performance. Emotional stability and adaptability emerged as key predictors of success in stressful work environments, provided proper management support exists. These results align with Emotional Intelligence Theory, highlighting the role of emotional awareness and regulation in enhancing job outcomes. Additionally, the findings support the Constructivist Self-Determination Theory, illustrating how resilience helps employees maintain performance by enabling them to navigate workplace challenges. This study underscores the importance of fostering emotional intelligence and resilience in hospitality employees to build a sustainable workforce and improve organizational outcomes during challenging times.

Keywords: *Emotional competence; Job resilience; Work performance; Hospitality industry; Cagayan de Oro City*

The hospitality industry is pivotal in satisfying many human needs, including food, beverages, and accommodations. This sector is characterized by frequent guest-host interactions, where hospitality organizations must cater to diverse populations (Teng, 2013). Faldetta, Fasone, and Provenzano (2013) noted that the industry encompasses both production and service dimensions, with the quality of service delivery heavily reliant on employee contributions. Consequently, the recruitment, management, and retention of skilled employees are crucial to its success. In response to the challenges posed by a dynamic and competitive environment, companies must prioritize improving employee performance by equipping them with the necessary skills and resources (Batarlien et al., 2017).

Employees in the hospitality industry are often referred to as "emotional laborers" because their roles involve sustained direct customer interactions that demand adherence to organizational display rules, such as

demonstrating friendliness and enthusiasm (Moreo et al., 2019; Shani et al., 2014). While essential to delivering positive customer experiences, this emotional labor contributes to occupational stress and can impact employee performance and well-being. Despite growing recognition of these challenges, limited research has examined the relationship between emotional competence and job resilience, as well as their collective impact on work performance in the hospitality sector.

Emotional competence, the ability to perceive, understand, regulate, and apply emotions effectively in the workplace, plays a vital role in coping with occupational stress. Schneider et al. (2013) emphasized that emotional competence fosters positive affect and mitigates stress responses, which are critical for resilience. Resilience, adapting, and thriving under adversity are equally crucial in a labor-intensive and stress-prone environment like hospitality (Delahaij & Kamphuis, 2014). Studies suggest that emotionally competent individuals are better equipped to build resilience, enabling them to recover from setbacks, maintain high levels of performance, and sustain mental and physical well-being (Magnano et al., 2016; Brennan, 2017; Meintjes & Hofmeyr, 2018)—emotional competence and resilience fuel positive engagement, enhancing vigor, dedication, and overall work performance.

The hospitality industry is a typical and critical service industry. It refers to labor services and relies on manpower and, ultimately, on employees' performance in the workplace. Mubbsher M. Khan & Maryam Jabbar (2013) posited that employee productivity and efficiency at work might be referred to as employee job performance. A company's effectiveness is directly affected by employee performance. Employees are productive when they perform their duties effectively and efficiently. Hence, good employees will help achieve both personal and organizational objectives. According to Rani & Mayasari (2016), employee performance shows the quality and quantity of work achieved by employees in carrying out tasks according to their responsibilities. As cited by Komnenić, Bazdan, and Agušaj (2016), the highest level of reported employee satisfaction comes from "Role Clarity" provided by leadership in the organization. Furthermore, Sonnetag and Frese (2002) argued that an organization needs individuals with high work performance to achieve goals, increase productivity, and increase competitiveness. As defined by Campbell and Wiernik (2015), job performance is a construct that comprises behaviors under workers' control that contribute to organizational goals.

However, the hospitality industry presents unique stressors. Employees often navigate high-pressure environments where they must manage both their emotions and their customers. Such demands may adversely affect their resilience and, consequently, their work performance. Compounding these challenges is the lingering impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, which led to widespread layoffs and business closures. These disruptions have intensified the need to understand the factors that support employee retention and performance in the industry. Despite these pressing issues, there remains a paucity of research exploring the intersection of emotional competence, job resilience, and work performance within the hospitality sector. Existing literature has highlighted the independent significance of these factors but has yet to establish their interrelated effects or practical implications. Addressing this gap is critical for identifying strategies to enhance employee well-being and organizational outcomes.

The present study aims to examine the implications of emotional competence and job resilience on the work performance of hospitality industry employees. By investigating these relationships, the study seeks to provide insights that will enrich the existing body of knowledge and inform strategies for employee retention and performance enhancement. This research is particularly significant in the context of the post-pandemic recovery, offering potential pathways to support a sustainable and resilient workforce in the hospitality sector.

Methodology

This study used a descriptive correlational research design that provided quantitative summaries of the sample data, including frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations. The participants in the study were 75 employees, both from middle and lower-level management, from selected hotels and restaurants in Cagayan de Oro City. The participants in middle-level management were managers and supervisors, while those in lower-level management were entry-level employees who had all worked in the industry for at least 10 years. The researcher utilized and modified the following instruments for data collection: the ECI 2.0 (Emotional Competency Inventory) Questionnaire based on the emotional competencies identified by Daniel Goleman in *Working with Emotional Intelligence* (1998) and on competencies from Hay/McBer's *Generic Competency Dictionary* (1996) as

well as Dr. Richard Boyatzis' Self-Assessment Questionnaire (SAQ), the Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire (COPSOQ), a questionnaire on psychosocial working conditions, health, and well-being, to measure the level of job resilience among the staff in the hospitality industry (Kristensen et al., 2003). Likewise, an Individual Work Performance Questionnaire version 0.1 was used in measuring the level of work performance (Koopmans et al., 2012).

In addition, purposive sampling was used to select the hotels and restaurants, and convenience sampling was used to select the participants due to the limited schedule the establishments allowed the researcher. The study was also conducted face-to-face. The items in the instruments had appropriate Cronbach's alpha coefficient values, indicating that they were reliable. The data were also organized using multiple regression analysis and descriptive statistics. These data demonstrate the internal consistency of the items across all aspects examined, indicating their high reliability. The following values indicate the overall result of each construct:

Variables	Cronbach's Alpha
Emotional Competence	.953
Job Resilience	.909
Work Performance	.910

These data demonstrate the internal consistency of the items across all aspects examined, indicating their high reliability.

Results and Discussion

Emotional Competence

In terms of Self-Awareness

Table 1 presents the frequency, percentage, and mean distribution of participants' levels of emotional competence with respect to self-awareness. The results reveal their self-awareness was high, as indicated by their overall mean of 4.37. This means that the employee-participants had a high ability to read and understand their emotions and to recognize their impact on others while working in the industry. This is further confirmed by more than 50 percent (50.67%) of participants reporting very high self-awareness and 40 percent (40.0%) reporting high self-awareness.

Table 1. *Emotional Competence in Terms of Self-Awareness*

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
I am aware of my strengths and limits.	4.48	High
I understand the implications of my emotions.	4.39	High
I am open to feedback.	4.39	High
I am confident in my job capability.	4.39	High
I am aware of my feelings.	4.37	High
I have a sense of humor about myself.	4.36	High
I have emotional insight.	4.35	High
I am aware of triggers/emotional reactions.	4.33	High
I believe in myself.	4.29	High
Overall	4.37	High

Legends.

Range	Description	Interpretation
4.51-5.00	Always	Very High
3.51-4.50	Often	High
2.51-3.50	Sometimes	Moderate
1.51-2.50	Seldom	Low
1.00-1.50	Never	Very Low

The researcher believes that employees in the hospitality industry can work out their feelings and emotions and control their effects on others in the workplace. This is a positive result, given that evidence suggests that greater awareness helps people and organizations operate more smoothly, with fewer needless misunderstandings or interpersonal conflicts. Salomaa (2014) says it lessens egoism, ruining workplace well-being and productivity.

In terms of Self-Management

Table 2 presents the frequency, percentage, and mean distribution of participants' levels of emotional competence in self-management. The results reveal their self-management was high, as shown by their overall mean of 4.35.

This means that the employee-participants had a high ability to draw on their own emotions, the emotions of others, and context to manage social interactions successfully.

Table 2. *Emotional Competence in Terms of Self-Management*

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
I am open to new ideas.	4.45	High
I improve my performance.	4.45	High
I stay composed and positive.	4.41	High
I set challenging goals.	4.41	High
I respond calmly.	4.40	High
I adapt to situations.	4.40	High
I handle unexpected demands.	4.40	High
I keep promises.	4.39	High
I bring up ethical concerns.	4.39	High
I publicly admit mistakes.	4.39	High
I adapt or change strategy/techniques.	4.39	High
I anticipate difficulties.	4.35	High
I have patience.	4.32	High
I act on values.	4.32	High
I am optimistic about the future.	4.32	High
I learn from setbacks/mistakes.	4.32	High
I seek information.	4.31	High
I make extra efforts.	4.29	High
I initiate actions for the future.	4.29	High
I show restraint.	4.28	High
I address current opportunities.	4.27	High
I have positive expectations.	4.27	High
I take calculated risks.	4.24	High
I am resilient.	4.24	High
Overall	4.35	High

Moreover, the finding is further supported by more than 54 percent (54.67%) who assessed themselves as having high self-management, and more than 41 percent (41.33%) who reported having very high self-management. The finding further indicates that employees in the hospitality industry can understand others' feelings and emotions, thereby promoting healthy working relationships. This figure shows a positive result, as Goleman (2002) defined self-management as the ability to flexibly manage one's actions, thoughts, and feelings to achieve desired results. In addition, employees who use self-management can develop techniques to improve their performance without interference from their bosses, as Unsworth and Mason (2016) pointed out.

In terms of Social Awareness

Table 3 presents the frequency, percentage, and mean distribution of participants' levels of emotional competence with respect to social awareness. The results reveal a high level of social awareness, with an overall mean of 4.36. This means the employee participants had a high ability to recognize and empathize with people from different backgrounds and cultures. The finding is further supported by more than 49 percent (49.33%) reporting a high level of social awareness and 41 percent (41.33%) reporting a very high level of social awareness. The finding further indicates that employees in the hospitality industry have the tenacity to sympathize with and empathize with their diverse co-workers and know how to adapt to any circumstances.

Table 3. *Emotional Competence in Terms of Social Awareness*

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
I listen.	4.41	High
I understand climate and culture.	4.41	High
I am open to diversity.	4.40	High
I see others' perspectives.	4.40	High
I monitor satisfaction.	4.39	High
I understand organizational politics.	4.36	High
I understand informal relationships.	4.35	High
I take personal responsibility.	4.35	High
I read non-verbal gestures.	4.33	High
I match customer needs.	4.33	High
I make it self-available.	4.29	High
I understand the underlying issues.	4.27	High
Overall	4.36	High

In terms of Relationship Management

Table 4 presents the frequency, percentage, and mean distribution of participants' levels of emotional competence in relationship management. The results reveal that their relationship management was high, as indicated by their overall mean of 4.31. This means that the employee participants had a high level of relationship management with the employer and the manager, aimed at fostering good morale, trust, and a productive, conducive work environment. Moreover, the study is further supported by more than 54 percent (54.67%) who reported having high relationship management, and 36 percent (36%) who reported having very high relationship management. Findings further reveal that more than nine percent (9.33%) reported having moderate relationship management. The outcome suggests the participants can operate in a supportive environment alongside their employer or management. These findings align with Jing (2013), who noted that relationship management adopts different control methods and regulatory frameworks to manage relationships among the company, management staff, and employees to achieve organizational objectives.

Table 4. *Emotional Competence in Terms of Relationship Management*

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
I lead by example.	4.44	High
I encourage others.	4.43	High
I give constructive feedback.	4.41	High
I communicate vision.	4.37	High
I define the general need for change.	4.37	High
I act as a mentor.	4.37	High
I inspire others.	4.36	High
I recognize strengths.	4.35	High
I cooperate.	4.35	High
I build relationships.	4.35	High
I provide support.	4.32	High
I stimulate enthusiasm.	4.32	High
I anticipate the impact of actions or words.	4.32	High
I use indirect influence.	4.30	High
I lead change.	4.29	High
I act to support change.	4.28	High
I champion change.	4.25	High
I develop behind-the-scenes support.	4.25	High
I engage with the audience.	4.24	High
I maintain objectivity.	4.24	High
I orchestrate win-win solutions.	4.24	High
I address conflict.	4.20	High
I solicit inputs.	4.19	High
I air disagreements.	4.17	High
Overall	4.31	High

This is further supported by Tabrizi's study (2013), which states that responsibility falls to middle management. The manager is expected to support organizational development and policy, direct staff activities, interact with other organizational leaders, clarify higher management policies, and inspire confidence and continuous performance improvement.

Table 5 shows a high level of emotional competence among the staff in the hospitality industry, as indicated in the overall mean of 4.35. This means that the leaders and subordinates have cultivated a sense of how they control their feelings and emotions in the workplace and how these emotions can impact their workplace relationships. The highest among the dimensions is self-awareness, indicating the participants' high awareness of their emotions, and the lowest, yet still described as high, was the relationship dimension. Although all dimensions were high, these areas could still be further enhanced to optimal levels.

Table 5. *Summary Table for Emotional Competence*

Variables	Overall Mean	Interpretation
Self-Awareness	4.37	High
Self-management	4.35	High
Social Awareness	4.36	High
Relationship Management	4.31	High

Job Resilience in the Workplace

In terms of the Type of Production and Tasks

Table 6 presents the frequency, percentage, and mean distribution of participants' levels of job resilience in the workplace, by type of production and tasks. The results reveal that their job resilience in the workplace, pointing to the type of products and tasks, is high, as indicated by the overall mean of 3.73. This means that the employee-participants had a high level of job resilience with respect to the type of production and tasks, implying higher productivity.

Table 6. *Job Resilience in the Workplace in Terms of the Type of Production and Tasks*

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
I have to work very fast.	4.27	High
I have to keep my eyes on lots of things while I work.	4.09	High
I have to remember many things.	4.01	High
I have to do overtime.	3.99	High
My work demands me to have constant attention.	3.99	High
My work requires me to have a high level of precision.	3.95	High
I have to be good at coming up with new ideas.	3.89	High
My work requires me to have very clear and precise eyesight.	3.79	High
My workload is unevenly distributed so it piles up.	3.76	High
I do get emotionally involved in my work.	3.73	High
I have to make difficult decisions.	3.59	High
I often do not have time to complete all my work tasks.	3.55	High
I have to put myself in emotionally disturbing situations.	3.39	High
My work requires me not to state my opinion.	3.39	High
My work is emotionally demanding.	3.36	High
My work requires me to hide my feelings.	3.33	High
My work requires me to have control over my movements, e.g., my arms and hands consciously.	3.32	High
Overall	3.73	High

Furthermore, the finding is supported by more than 41 percent (41.33%) who reported having high job resilience in the workplace, given the type of production and tasks. However, this is followed by more than 37 percent (37.33%) who reported a moderate level of job resilience in the workplace regarding production and tasks. The number of participants who asserted that they had a very high level of job resilience in the workplace regarding the type of production and tasks is only 17 percent (17.33%). It is also worth mentioning that at least 4 percent (4.00%) expressed low job resilience in the workplace regarding the type of production and tasks. The preceding findings indicate that employees in the hospitality industry exhibit varying job resilience in the workplace in terms of the number of jobs they perform, which is influenced by factors involving quantity, cognition, controlling emotions, and sensory body movements.

In terms of Work Organization and Job Content

Table 7 presents the frequency, percentage, and mean distribution of the participants' level of job resilience in the workplace, considering work organization and job content. The results reveal that their job resilience in the workplace points to the work organization, and job content is high, as indicated by the overall mean of 3.95. This means that the employee-participants had a high level of job resilience regarding work organization and job content, implying that they have the knowledge and skills to organize their work in accordance with job specifications.

Moreover, the finding is further supported by more than 50 percent (50.67%) who claimed that they have a high level of job resilience in terms of the work organization and job content, followed by 20 percent (20.00%) of the participants who asserted that they had a very high level of job resilience in the workplace in terms of the work organization and job content. It is also relevant to mention that at least 29 percent (29.33%) also claimed that they have moderate job resilience in the workplace regarding the work organization and job content. The finding further indicates that workers in the hospitality sector are highly committed to the tasks at hand and perform them successfully, either individually or as part of a team, under the supervision of a manager or supervisor, and that they differ in their perspectives on job requirements. This finding aligns with the study by Jegede and Ola-

Olorun (2017), which states that the success of a productivity improvement strategy depends on employee commitment, job satisfaction, skills, and motivation. In addition, Karatepe, O.M. (2015) pointed out that employees receiving adequate support in their work environment can boost their resources, such as self-efficacy and positive affectivity, and, in turn, decrease turnover intentions and encourage employees to devote themselves to clients and to solving their problems.

Table 7. *Job Resilience in the Workplace in Terms of Work Organization and Job Content*

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
I do feel that the work I do is important.	4.44	High
I do have the possibility of learning new things through my work.	4.43	High
My work requires me to take the initiative.	4.41	High
My work is meaningful.	4.40	High
I can use my skills or expertise in my work.	4.29	High
I do feel motivated and involved in my work.	4.28	High
I feel that my workplace is of great personal importance to me.	4.03	High
I do enjoy telling others about my place of work.	4.01	High
My work is varied.	3.99	High
I do feel that the problems at my place of work are mine too.	3.89	High
I want to stay at my current place of work for the rest of my working life.	3.87	High
I can decide when to take a break.	3.85	High
I do not have any influence on what I do at work.	3.77	High
I can take more or fewer holidays when I wish.	3.73	High
I do have a large degree of influence concerning my work.	3.72	High
I can influence the amount of work assigned to me.	3.71	High
I do have a say in choosing who I work with.	3.56	High
If I have some private business, I can leave my place of work for half an hour without special permission.	2.79	Moderate
Overall	3.95	High

In terms of Interpersonal Relations and Leadership

Table 8 presents the frequency, percentage, and mean distribution of participants' levels of job resilience in the workplace, with respect to interpersonal relations and leadership. The results reveal high job resilience regarding interpersonal relations and leadership, as indicated by the overall mean of 4.10. This means that the employee-participants strongly believed they had a high level of interpersonal relations and leadership concerning work, as also cited by McElroy (2005), who states that strong and supportive leadership from administrators is imperative for the continuous enhancement of knowledge and skills and the improvement of their staff's performance.

Table 8. *Job Resilience in the Workplace in Terms of Interpersonal Relations and Leadership*

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
I know exactly which areas are my responsibility.	4.29	High
I know exactly what is expected of me at work.	4.29	High
My work has clear objectives.	4.25	High
I am informed well in my workplace concerning important decisions, changes, or plans.	4.24	High
I do receive all the information I need to do my work well.	4.24	High
Gives high priority to job satisfaction.	4.21	High
I do feel part of a community at my place of work.	4.20	High
I know exactly how much I have at work.	4.19	High
My immediate superior is willing to listen to my work-related problems.	4.17	High
Good at work planning.	4.16	High
Good at solving conflicts.	4.16	High
My superior talks with me about how well I carry out my work.	4.16	High
My colleagues are willing to listen to my work-related problems.	4.15	High
I often do get help and support from my immediate superior.	4.13	High
There is good co-operation between colleagues at work.	4.13	High
Make sure that the individual member of staff has good development opportunities.	4.12	High
I often do get help and support from my colleagues.	4.09	High
There is a good atmosphere between me and my colleagues.	4.09	High
My colleagues talk with me about how well I carry out my work.	4.03	High
I do things at work which some people accept but not others.	4.01	High
My work isolates me from my colleagues.	3.95	High
I can talk to my colleagues while I am working.	3.95	High
I sometimes must do things that ought to have been done differently.	3.87	High
I am placed with contradictory demands at work.	3.80	High

I sometimes must do things that seem unnecessary.

3.77

High

Overall

4.10

High

In addition, the finding is supported by more than 65 percent (65.33%) who claimed that they had a high level of job resilience in the workplace in terms of interpersonal relations and leadership, followed by 24 percent (24.00%) who reported that they had a very high level of job resilience in the workplace in terms of interpersonal relations and leadership. It is also worth noting that at least 11 percent (10.67%) reported a moderate level of job resilience in the workplace, particularly in interpersonal relations and leadership. The results show that the employees are self-motivated and capable of performing their jobs effectively. They also have supportive managers who want the best for them, contributing to a positive employer-employee connection. This finding is in line with Schreiner's (2019) study, which posits that an organization's success depends on the proper management of employer-employee relations, as positive working connections may increase employee engagement and even performance. This is significant because the employer-employee relationship is one of mutual dependence. To ensure the organization runs smoothly, the employer relies on the workers to carry out their duties.

In terms of the Work-Individual Interface

Table 9 presents the frequency, percentage, and mean distribution of the participants' level of job resilience in the workplace, considering the work-individual interface. The results reveal that their job resilience at the work-individual interface was high, with an overall mean of 3.92. This implies that the employee-participants strongly believed that they had a high level of job resilience in the workplace in terms of the work-individual interface, which shows that highly optimistic employees are more likely to link perceived job insecurity and job satisfaction to some positive-related factors such as tenacity in psychology, practical handling skills to negative stress, and so on as cited in the study of Gillham (2000).

Table 9. *Job Resilience in the Workplace in Terms of Work-Individual Interface*

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
I am pleased with the way my abilities are used.	4.16	High
I am pleased with my work prospects.	4.07	High
I am pleased with the physical working conditions.	4.05	High
It would be difficult to find another job if I became unemployed.	3.65	High
I am worried about being transferred to another job that is against my will.	3.65	High
Overall	3.92	High

Moreover, the finding is supported by more than 45 percent (45.33%) who articulated that they had a high level of job resilience in the workplace in terms of work-individual interface, followed by more than 30 percent (30.67%) who claimed that they had a moderate level of job resilience in the workplace in terms of work-individual interface and more than 22 percent (22.67%) who also asserted that they had a very high level of job resilience in the workplace in terms of work-individual interface. Therefore, based on the results presented, it can be inferred that employees at lower and middle management levels have varied perceptions of job insecurity and job satisfaction. However, the findings have shown that they value resilience and job satisfaction amid workplace problems.

This finding is in line with Yeh (2013), who argues that organizational commitment and employee involvement in the workplace have become increasingly popular in the tourism industry. Gleaning further into the table, the researcher pointed out that the three top indicators showing the participants' high level of job resilience in the workplace in terms of a work-individual interface are the participants' general feelings about the abilities they use at work (M=4.16), followed by their feelings on their work prospects (M=4.07), and their perceptions of their physical working conditions (M=4.05). The finding indicates that employees are pleased with their working conditions and the abilities they used to obtain their jobs in the first place. This finding aligns with the claims of Asif, F et al. (2018), Krekel, C et al. (2019), and Illies, R et al. (2015), who stated that employees' well-being at work may affect their behavior at work and their relationships with colleagues and supervisors, employees' productivity and performances, and turnover intentions, but it can also be critical to customer loyalty.

Nonetheless, the indicator with the lowest meaning yet still interpreted as high is the employee's concern about being transferred to another job against their will (M=3.65), implying that the transfer and placement of employees in the establishment according to their work performance will be communicated to employees by their superiors. It is made official through a written memorandum or special order.

In terms of Health and Well-Being

Table 10 presents the frequency, percentage, and mean distribution of participants' individual-level job resilience, considering health and well-being. The results reveal that their job resilience at the individual level regarding health and well-being was moderate, as reflected in the overall mean of 3.06. This means that employees-participants in the hospitality industry have reported fluctuations in their overall well-being, particularly in physical and mental health, as is expected in an industry where they must deal with various customers' and co-workers' attitudes, as well as personal dilemmas.

Table 10. *Job Resilience in the Workplace in Terms of Health and Well-being*

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
My health, in general, is excellent	4.32	High
I am as healthy as anybody I know	4.16	High
I do have a lot of energy	4.15	High
I have been a happy person	4.12	High
I felt calm and peaceful	3.92	High
I have a tight chest or chest pain*	3.29	Moderate*
I have lacked initiative*	3.15	Moderate*
I have a stomachache or stomach problems*	3.15	Moderate*
I have been dizzying*	3.09	Moderate*
I expect my health to get worse*	3.07	Moderate*
I have been a bit touchy*	3.03	Moderate*
I have tension in various muscles	3.03	Moderate*
I cannot deal with other people*	2.96	Moderate*
I do not have time to relax or enjoy myself*	2.81	Moderate*
I have difficulty remembering*	2.76	Moderate*
I have problems concentrating*	2.75	Moderate*
I find it difficult to think clearly*	2.68	Moderate*
I have difficulty in making decisions*	2.67	Moderate*
I felt so down in the dumps that nothing could cheer me up*	2.56	Moderate*
Have you been a very nervous person? *	2.47	High*
I do get sick easier than other people*	2.40	High*
I do feel tired*	2.35	High*
I feel downhearted and blue*	2.33	High*
I do feel worn out*	2.24	High*
Overall	3.06	High

*Reversely scored items

Furthermore, the finding is supported by more than 42 percent (42.67%) who claimed to have a moderate level of job resilience at the individual level, considering health and well-being, and followed by more than 29 percent (29.33%) who asserted to have a high level of job resilience at the individual level, considering health and well-being. While the percentage shows that the participants claimed to have a very high level of job resilience at the individual level, considering health and well-being is only more than 1 percent (1.33%), it is worth considering in the study that the hospitality industry has created an impression that work is stressful and that it can greatly affect the physical and mental health of the employees as shown in the findings where participants who asserted that they had a low level of job resilience at the individual level considering health and wellbeing is more than 26 percent (26.67%). With this, the researcher surmises that the hospitality industry might want to organize and implement intervention programs that equip lower- to middle-level management with strong physical and mental health so they can attend well to customers, their co-workers, and their problems. This aligns with the study, which found that employees with a strong sense of resilience, optimism, hope, and self-efficacy are more vigorous when doing their jobs and can develop positive feelings toward their workplaces, according to Shahpouri et al. (2016).

In terms of Personality

Table 11 presents the frequency, percentage, and mean distribution of participants' job resilience at the individual level in terms of personality. The results reveal that their job resilience at the individual level, in terms of personality, is high, as indicated by an overall mean of 3.71. This means that the employee-participants had a high regard that they can cope and find ways to survive in the industry they have chosen, concerning the stressful and strenuous job in their daily operation, as further supported by the study of Patwary, Roy, Hoque, & Khandakar (2019), who postulated that personality qualities of employees are regarded as a significant individual predictor of intention to leave. Most recent studies have shown how personality affects the circumstances in which individuals live and is a key factor in the conditions people choose to remain in. Research has found that it is

directly related to workers' output and turnover levels in a firm.

Table 11. *Job Resilience in the Workplace in Terms of Personality*

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
I try to find out what I can do to solve the problem.	4.35	High
I will do anything to solve the problem.	4.25	High
I speak with one of my colleagues about my feelings.	4.13	High
I feel that what I do in my daily life is meaningful.	4.12	High
I feel that I have a great deal to live for.	4.12	High
I try to think of something else or do something I like.	4.12	High
I concentrate on aspects of my work where there are no problems.	4.12	High
I accept the situation because there is nothing to do about it anyway.	4.09	High
I can cope with most situations in life.	4.05	High
I refer to a person whom I think can solve the problem.	4.05	High
I understand most of what is happening in my everyday life.	3.95	High
Often, things happen around me that I do not understand.	3.79	High
So far, I have no clear direction or purpose in life*.	2.44	Moderate*
It is difficult for me to see how different pieces in my life are connected*.	2.11	Moderate*
I try to see the funny side of the situation.	1.91	Low
Overall	3.71	High

*Reversely scored items

Moreover, the finding is supported by more than 73 percent (73.33%) who claimed that they have a high level of job resilience at the individual level in terms of personality, and 27 percent (26.67%) who asserted that they have a moderate level of job resilience at the individual level in terms of personality. Both results show that employees in the hospitality industry are resilient in coping with various challenges, including stress, issues with guests, co-workers, and superiors, as well as personal issues. Moreover, employees with a strong sense of resilience, optimism, hope, and self-efficacy are more vigorous when doing their jobs. They can develop positive feelings toward their workplaces, as Shahpouri et al. (2016) postulated.

Table 12 shows a high level of resilience among the hospitality industry staff, indicating an overall mean of 3.75. It is also worth noting that the variable with a moderate mean of 3.06, health and well-being, suggests that employees' workplace wellness may change over time due to the stressful environment they face in day-to-day operations. The ability to become resilient in maintaining good health and well-being is through discipline and control.

Table 12. *Summary Table for Job Resilience*

Variables	Overall Mean	Interpretation
Type of production and tasks	3.73	High
Work organization and job content	3.95	High
Interpersonal Relations and Leadership	4.10	High
Work-individual interface	3.92	High
Health and wellbeing	3.06	Moderate
Personality	3.71	High
Overall Mean	3.75	High

Work Performance

In terms of Task Performance

Table 13 presents the frequency, percentage, and mean distribution of participants' level of work performance in terms of task performance. The results reveal that their task performance was very high, as indicated by their overall mean of 4.65. This means that the employees-participants demonstrate a high level of work quantity and quality, job skills, and knowledge. It is further explained in the studies mentioned by He et al. (2019), where evidence shows that employee well-being, characterized as the assessment of employee experiences based on their perceptions of life and work, is positively related to job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and individual task performance (Cooper et al., 2019; Huang et al., 2016; Su & Swanson, 2019; Ulus & Hatipoglu, 2016).

Table 13. *Work Performance in Terms of Task Performance*

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
I keep in mind the work result I need to achieve.	4.75	Very High
I can plan my work so that I will finish it on time.	4.67	Very High
I can set my priorities.	4.67	Very High

I can carry out my work efficiently.	4.65	Very High
I can manage my time well.	4.49	High
Overall	4.65	High

Moreover, the finding is further supported by 72 percent (72.00%) who emphasized that they have a very high level of work performance in terms of task performance, followed by 24 percent (24.00%) who reported a high level of work performance in terms of task performance, and 4 percent (4.00%) who also posited that they have a moderate level of work performance in terms of task performance. The finding further indicates that employees in the industry are well prepared to plan, organize, and implement various functions to achieve their goals. They are also knowledgeable and skilled, and they know how to prioritize work and produce high-quality outputs. This finding aligns with studies by Shantz et al. (2013), which found that engaged employees experience a high level of connectivity with their work tasks, leading to higher task performance.

In terms of Contextual Performance.

Table 14 presents the frequency, percentage, and mean distribution of participants' work performance levels in terms of contextual performance. The results reveal that their level of work performance in terms of contextual performance was high, as indicated by the overall mean of 4.48. This means that the employee-participants had a high regard for applying the behaviors that support the workplace's organizational, social, and psychological environment. They can also communicate effectively with their co-workers, work well in their respective departments, take customers' feedback into account with the utmost regard, and handle complaints or problems.

Table 14. *Work Performance in Terms of Contextual Performance*

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
I take the initiative when something must be organized.	4.60	Very High
I take on challenging work tasks when available.	4.57	Very High
I can collaborate with others well.	4.56	Very High
I try to learn from the feedback I get from others on my work.	4.56	Very High
I can fulfill my responsibilities.	4.53	Very High
My communication with others can lead to desired results.	4.53	Very High
I take the initiative when there is a problem to be solved.	4.51	Very High
I start new tasks myself when my old ones are finished.	4.51	Very High
I think customers/clients were satisfied with my work.	4.51	Very High
I can meet my appointments.	4.49	High
I consider the wishes of the customer/client in my work.	4.49	High
I can come up with creative ideas at work.	4.44	High
I ask for help when needed.	4.40	High
I am open to criticism of my work.	4.37	High
I can understand others well when they tell me something.	4.33	High
Others can understand me well when I tell them something.	4.24	High
Overall	4.48	High

Moreover, the finding is further supported by more than 50 percent (50.67%) who claimed that they have a high level of work performance in terms of contextual performance, and no more than 49 percent (49.33%) who asserted that they have a very high level of work performance in terms of contextual performance. This is consistent with the study, which finds that contextual performance actions typically correlate with employees' contributions to the company. According to Lee et al. (2015), when there is a reciprocal relationship between employees and hotels, employees who are influenced by organizational values and norms are more likely to act in ways that are expected and supported by the organizations, such as supporting organizational members, adhering to unwritten hotel rules, going above and beyond for guests, and displaying other discretionary behaviors. The researcher opines that if management can duly support their employees, they will perform well, producing positive results in engaging with the customers and properly dealing with problems and feedback.

In terms of Adaptive Performance

Table 15 presents the frequency, percentage, and mean distribution of participants' work performance levels in terms of adaptive performance. The results reveal that their level of work performance in terms of adaptive performance is high, as indicated by the overall mean of 4.47. This means that the employees-participants had a high ability to adjust to rapidly changing situations. Furthermore, the finding is supported by 48 percent (48.00%) who asserted that they have a very high level of work performance in terms of adaptive performance, followed by more than 45 percent (45.33%) who claimed that they have a high level of work performance in terms of adaptive performance, and more than 6 percent (6.67%) who also reported that they have a moderate level of work

performance in terms of adaptive performance.

Table 15. *Work Performance in Terms of Adaptive Performance*

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
I worked at keeping my job skills up to date.	4.67	Very High
I worked at keeping my job knowledge up to date.	4.63	Very High
I have demonstrated flexibility.	4.48	High
I was able to cope well with difficult situations and setbacks at work.	4.48	High
I was able to cope well with uncertain and unpredictable situations at work.	4.41	High
I easily adjusted to changes in my work.	4.41	High
I came up with creative solutions to new problems.	4.39	High
I recovered fast after difficult situations or setbacks at work.	4.32	High
Overall	4.47	High

Based on the results presented, the researcher is convinced that employees in the industry can handle the pressures and challenges that have become significant factors in their work performance. This agrees with the study of Huang et al. (2014), who posited that highly emotionally stable workers were more inclined to put up with and try potentially unpleasant workplace changes. In contrast, less emotionally stable workers avoided such stresses by putting them off or sticking with the status quo. Moreover, highly ambitious workers were more likely to take advantage of opportunities that arose during periods of transition. In contrast, less ambitious workers may not be driven by such opportunities.

Table 16 shows results indicating a very high level of work performance among hospitality industry staff, with an overall mean of 4.53. This means that the employees in the hospitality industry excelled in the workplace in terms of quantity, quality, and adaptation to change.

Table 16. *Summary Table for Work Performance*

Variables	Overall Mean	Interpretation
Task performance	4.65	Very High
Contextual Performance	4.48	High
Adaptive Performance	4.47	High
Overall Mean	4.53	Very High

Influence of Emotional Competence and Job Resilience on Work Performance

Table 17 shows the regression analysis of the influence of participants' emotional competence and job resilience on their work performance. The data reveal that the overall model is significant ($F = 31.09$, $p = .000$). Participants with higher emotional competence and job resilience also have higher work performance. This finding confirms the researcher's observation regarding the responses of middle- and lower-level employees on their general feelings and overall point of view about their work in the hospitality industry. This phenomenon is most likely to occur because emotional competence requires mastery of one's emotions and an understanding of other people's points of view. It is, therefore, possible that they will exert much effort to demonstrate their best performance in the workplace.

Table 17. *Regression Analysis of the Influence of Emotional Competence and Job Resilience on Work Performance*

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	1.851	0.355		5.22	<.001
Emotional Competence	0.441	0.107	0.526	4.14**	<.001
Job Resilience	0.204	0.134	0.194	1.53	.132

Model Summary

$R = .681$ $R^2 = .463$ $Adjusted\ R^2 = .449$ $F = 31.09^{**}$ $p = .000$

***significant at 0.01 level*

The finding also aligns with the assertions of Coviello et al. (2017) and Owoseni (2015), who posit that employees' moods and emotions are pervasive and imperative for perceived job performance and that management should consider organizing emotional management programs for their staff to improve job satisfaction. On the other hand, gaining resilience requires having the confidence to "ride out the storm," manage fear, and endure difficulties. Leaders and subordinates who effectively regulate their emotions and produce the required emotional

expressions (display rules) without appearing insincere or experiencing increased stress are more likely to create a healthy organization and overcome adversity, according to Haver et al. (2013).

In addition, 44.9 percent of the variability in their work performance is explained by emotional competence and job resilience. The remaining 55.1 percent can be accounted for by other factors not covered in this study (Adjusted $R^2 = .449$). Considering each predictor variable, emotional competence emerged as having a significant influence on their work performance, with the result indicating that for every unit increase in their emotional competence, there is a corresponding .441 increase in their work performance ($B = .441$, $t = 4.14$, $p = .000$).

The result of the findings concurs with the studies that supported emotional competence as having a significant influence on work performance, as represented by the emotional intelligence of Miao et al. (2018b), according to them, the leader's emotional intelligence is positively related to subordinates' task performance and organizational citizenship behavior (contextual performance). Moreover, Han et al. (2017) reported that restaurant managers with high emotional intelligence increased employee satisfaction, resulting in higher service performance. In addition, Lopes (2016) highlighted the role of emotional intelligence in leader-employee interactions, which are emotional and lead to improved performance.

Furthermore, the finding reveals that, when taken in isolation, job resilience does not significantly influence the work performance of hospitality industry staff, as supported by the notion that workers are subjected to upsetting circumstances and are therefore expected to handle such workplace situations. The researcher, therefore, believes that they must manage situations involving overload, lack of resources and assistance, emotional and physical tiredness, and conflict between work and personal obligations. Likewise, the manager faces circumstances that require him to rely more on his psychological resources than on external assistance to anticipate troublesome situations, given the nature of his high-responsibility position.

Furthermore, Kuntz et al. (2016) noted that organizational practices such as facing difficulties and learning from mistakes, and a supportive organizational culture that provides the resources needed to accomplish the work and fosters resilient behaviors are all factors that enable and impact resilience. Middle-level management employees, who are regarded as the organization's leaders, may benefit from training and motivational programs that improve their ability to handle workplace pressures, as noted by Britt, Shen, Sinclair, Grossman, & Klieger (2016). It is further assumed that they will manage employees from the lower-level management. It has been noted that if managers or supervisors have low job resilience at work, they may also affect the employability of those employees.

Based on this definition, businesses are compelled to enhance their managers' psychological capital through incentives and training, thereby adopting a more positive and proactive approach to managing their human resources. In this situation, resilience can be viewed as a learning process that helps managers avoid repeating the same mistakes, thereby better equipping them to handle new problems.

Conclusion

This mixed study reinforced that emotional competence and job resilience together contribute to employees' work performance. They specifically point out that participants with higher emotional competence and job resilience also have higher work performance. Thus, the researcher strongly posits that emotional stability and the ability to adapt to and survive in a stressful environment can predict the overall performance of hospitality industry staff, provided they are also properly managed by their immediate heads.

In addition, the conditions reported in the results indicate that variables concerning emotional competence include the capacity to perceive emotions in oneself and others, to recognize emotions embodied in the environment, and to articulate those feelings. Furthermore, it has been demonstrated that employee resilience affects work performance, as well as the ability to control one's emotions, work quantity, work environment, job description, employer-employee relationship, health and wellness, and a decreased propensity for task desertion in an organizational context. Therefore, the study's findings confirm that the study's objective is achieved and that the theories used are likewise congruent with the purpose of this endeavor.

As portrayed in the daily lives of hospitality industry employees working in the field, they are more likely to show

increased productivity and commitment to their jobs when they work in a setting that supports open communication, recognizes their problems, and fosters motivation. In addition to fostering positive attitudes, a supportive work environment strengthens the employer-employee connection, which is crucial for maintaining mutual respect, trust, and cooperation within the company.

Employees' capacity to manage their emotions also helps with professional interactions and efficient service delivery, both of which are essential in the hospitality industry. Employees can better handle job stress and uphold high levels of customer service when organizational rules and a positive workplace culture encourage emotional regulation. Employees with clear job descriptions better understand their duties and expectations, increasing productivity and overall performance.

The focus on health and wellness is equally crucial, as employees in good physical and mental health are better equipped to maintain engagement and productivity. Businesses that make investments in their workers' well-being foster environments that encourage resilience, contentment, and sustained dedication. Because they make workers feel appreciated, inspired, and in line with the organization's objectives, these supportive behaviors can reduce the likelihood of job abandonment in an organizational setting.

Overall, employee performance in the hospitality sector can be greatly improved by cultivating a workplace culture that prioritizes emotional control, clear roles and responsibilities, supportive leadership, and employee well-being. In the end, these organizational initiatives result in a more stable workforce, higher-quality services, and a more efficient institutional framework that benefits both workers and the establishment overall.

Contributions of Authors

Author: conceptualization, writing of the paper, review and editing of the final manuscript.

Funding

The funding for this paper was solely provided by the author as part of her academic responsibilities.

Conflict of Interests

There is no conflict of interest among the contributors in the development and preparation of the paper.

Acknowledgment

The author sincerely acknowledges the invaluable contributions of the following individuals and groups: Dr. Judith C. Chavez, for her expert guidance, advisorship and unwavering support; Dr. Raquel J. Dael, for her insightful suggestions; Dr. Revina O. Mendoza, for her patience and expertise; Dr. Miguela B. Napiere, for her assistance with statistical analysis and encouragement; Dr. Cyril C. Chavez, for his constructive feedback; Ms. Doris Dee M. Maisa, for her kind assistance; Mr. Julius Rey B. Lanaja, the author's husband, for his moral support and help with data collection; Mrs. Christine Dawn N. Malacaste, for her aid in distributing questionnaires; the establishments and employees in Iligan City and Cagayan de Oro City for providing essential data; and the author's family, friends, and colleagues for their unwavering love and inspiration. Their collective support made this academic endeavor a success.

References

- Asif, F., Jameel, A., Hussain, A., Hwang, J., & Sahito, N. (2018). Linking transformational leadership with employee performance: The mediating role of employee engagement. *International Journal of Advanced and Applied Sciences*, 5(10), 76–82. <https://doi.org/10.21833/ijaas.2018.10.011>
- Brennan, E.J. (2017). Towards resilience and wellbeing in nurses. *British Journal of Nursing*, 26(1), 43–47. <https://doi.org/10.12968/bjon.2017.26.1.43>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2015.107>
- Campbell, J.P., & Wiernik, B.M. (2015). The modeling and assessment of work performance. In J.D. Wright (Ed.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences* (2nd ed., pp. 546–551). Elsevier.
- Cooper, C.L., Flint-Taylor, J., & Pearn, M. (2019). Building resilience for success: A resource for managers and organizations. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Coviello, N., Kano, L., & Liesch, P.W. (2017). Adapting the Uppsala model to a modern world. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 48(9), 1151–1164.
- Delahaij, R., & Kamphuis, W. (2014). Training for resilience: The role of positive emotions. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 22(2), 108–118. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5973.12046>
- Faldetta, G., Fasone, V., & Provenzano, C. (2013). The role of internal marketing in the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 35, 98–110. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2013.05.001>
- Gillham, J.E. (2000). The science of optimism and hope: Research essays in honor of Martin E. P. Seligman. Templeton Foundation Press.
- Han, S.J., Bonn, M.A., & Cho, M. (2017). The relationship between emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, and service performance. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 29(9), 2512–2532.
- Haver, A., Akerjordet, K., & Furunes, T. (2013). Emotional regulation and its implications for leadership. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 20(3), 287–303.
- Haver, A., Akerjordet, K., & Furunes, T. (2014). Wise emotion regulation and the power of resilience in experienced hospitality leaders. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 14(2), 152–169. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15022250.2014.899141>
- He, Y., Li, W., & Lai, K.K. (2019). Service climate, employee well-being, and customer satisfaction. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 77, 187–197. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2018.06.013>
- He, J., Morrison, A., & Zhang, H. (2019). Improving millennial employee well-being and task performance in the hospitality industry: The interactive effects of HRM and responsible leadership. *Sustainability*, 11(16), 4410. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11164410>
- Huang, J., Wang, Y., & You, X. (2014). The job demands-resources model and job satisfaction. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 42(4), 673–682. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2014.42.4.673>
- Huang, W.R., Su, C.H., & Swanson, S.R. (2016). The impact of emotional labor on job satisfaction and performance. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 25(4), 414–433.
- Illies, R., Aw, S.S.Y., & Plut, H. (2015). Intraindividual models of employee well-being. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 2, 365–393. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032414-111457>
- Jegede, O.O., & Ola-Olorun, J.O. (2017). Employee commitment and organizational productivity. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 12(4), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v12n4p1>
- Karatepe, O.M. (2015). The effects of high-performance work practices on employees' outcomes. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 27(6), 1243–1263.
- Krekel, C., Ward, G., & De Neve, J.E. (2019). Employee well-being and firm performance. World Happiness Report. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3356581>

- Kuntz, J.R.C., Malinen, S., & Näswall, K. (2016). Employee resilience: Development and validation of a measure. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 32(5), 1–15.
- Lappe, J.M. (2000). Taking the mystery out of research. *Descriptive correlational design*. *Orthopaedic Nursing*, 19(2), 81. <https://dspace2.creighton.edu/xmlui/handle/10504/72007>
- Lee, J.S., Back, K.J., & Chan, E.S.W. (2015). Quality of work life and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 51, 84–96. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2015.07.004>
- Lopes, P.N. (2016). Emotional intelligence in organizations. *Emotion Review*, 8(4), 316–321. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073916650495>
- Magnano, P., Paolillo, A., & Giacominelli, L. (2016). Emotional intelligence and resilience in the workplace: Implications for well-being. *International Journal of Psychology and Behavioral Sciences*, 6(3), 123–130.
- Meintjes, A., & Hofmeyr, K. (2018). The impact of resilience on employee well-being in the workplace. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 44(1), Article a1503. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v44i0.1503>
- Miao, C., Humphrey, R., & Qian, S. (2018). Emotional intelligence and work performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 39(6), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2217>
- Miao, C., Humphrey, R., & Qian, S. (2021). Emotional intelligence and job performance in the hospitality industry: A meta-analytic review. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 33(8), 2632–2652. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-04-2020-0323>
- Moreo, A., Cain, L., & Parnell, J.A. (2019). Hospitality employee engagement, emotional labor, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 18(1), 1–19.
- Owoseni, O.O. (2015). The influence of emotional intelligence on job performance. *Journal of Economics and Behavioral Studies*, 7(1), 34–42.
- Patwary, A.K., Roy, R., Hoque, R., & Khandakar, M.S.A. (2019). Factors influencing employee turnover intention. *International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research*, 8(12), 3580–3585.
- Salomaa, R. (2014). Emotional intelligence and workplace well-being.
- Schneider, T., Lyons, J., & Khazon, S. (2013). Emotional intelligence and resilience. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 55(8), 909–914. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2013.07.460>
- Shani, A., Uriely, N., Reichel, A., & Ginsburg, L. (2014). Emotional labor in the hospitality industry: The influence of contextual factors. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 38, 51–58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2013.12.005>
- Shahpour, S., Namdari, K., & Abedi, A. (2016). Mediating role of work engagement in relationship between job resources and performance. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 230, 211–219. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.09.027>
- Sonnentag, S., & Frese, M. (2002). Performance concepts and performance theory. In S. Sonnentag (Ed.), *Psychological Management of Individual Performance* (pp. 3–25). Wiley.
- Su, L., & Swanson, S.R. (2019). Perceived corporate social responsibility's impact on the well-being and supportive green behaviors. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 43(4), 1–22.
- Ulus, M., & Hatipoglu, B. (2016). Human aspect as a critical factor in hospitality. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 39, 466–471. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671\(16\)30351-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671(16)30351-3)
- Yeh, C. (2019). The relationship between tourism involvement, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behaviors in the hotel industry. *Tourism and Hospitality Management*, 25(1), 75–93. <https://doi.org/10.20867/thm.25.1.10>