

The Effect of Motivation and Work Environment on Employee Performance at Resort Hotel

I Gede Andika Harianto¹, Ni Luh Ketut Sri Sulistyawati², Irene Hanna H Sihombing³

^{1,2,3} Politeknik Pariwisata Bali, Indonesia

*Corresponding author email: igdandikah@gmail.com

Keywords

Hotel, Employee Performance, Human Resources

Article History

Received on 14th August 2024

Accepted on 10th October 2024

Published on 30th April 2025

Cite this article

Harianto, I.G.A., Sulistyawati, N.L.K.S., Sihombing, I.H.H. (2025). The Effect of Motivation and Work Environment on Employee Performance at Resort Hotel, *NHI Hospitality International Journal*, 3(1), 1-10.
<https://doi.org/10.34013/nhiij.v3i1.1635>

Copyright @Author

Publishing License

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/)



Abstract

Purpose of the study: This study examines how work environment and motivation jointly influence staff performance at Prama Sanur Beach Hotel in Bali.

Design/methodology: A total of 64 employees were selected using non-probability sampling. Primary data were collected through self-administered questionnaires. Data were analyzed using multiple linear regression in SPSS version 23 for Windows.

Findings: Results show that motivation (X1) has a significant and positive partial effect on employee performance. The work environment (X2) also exerts a significant and positive partial effect on performance. Together, motivation and work environment significantly influence employee performance. The model's coefficient of determination (R^2) is 71.4%, indicating that a substantial proportion of the variance in performance is explained by these two independent variables.

Research limitations/Implications: Theoretically, it confirms that work environment and motivation are key, interacting predictors of employee performance, supporting integrated performance models in hospitality and tourism research. Practically, it suggests that hotel managers can substantially improve staff performance by simultaneously enhancing physical and psychosocial work conditions and implementing motivation-focused HR practices such as recognition, development opportunities, and participative management. Methodologically, the findings provide a replicable regression-based approach for mid-sized hotel studies while highlighting the need for future research to adopt more comprehensive structural models, include additional variables (e.g., leadership, compensation, work stress), and use larger, more diverse, multi-site samples to strengthen generalizability.

Novelty/Originality of the study: This study provides context-specific evidence on the combined influence of work environment and motivation on employee performance within a luxury beach hotel in Bali, offering practical insights for hospitality management in similar resort settings.

INTRODUCTION

Intense competition in the hospitality industry in Bali, especially among hotels, resorts, and villas, requires every service provider to continuously improve service quality to gain travelers' trust and loyalty. Human resources (HR) play a crucial role in this dynamic. (Wibowo, 2018). The caliber of a hotel's human resources has a major impact on its ability to accomplish its objectives. (Aulia & Jamilah, 2023). Prama Sanur Beach Bali, has shown significant development in recent years by offering a variety of services, including accommodation, restaurants, SPA, and other facilities. With a total of 172 permanent employees, the hotel management is well aware of the importance of HR development to achieve the desired service quality standards.

One of the key indicators of the caliber of human resources is the appraisal of employee performance. Prama Sanur Beach Bali routinely conducts performance appraisal twice a year which includes aspects of discipline, responsibility, teamwork, compliance, and honesty. Employee performance appraisals at Prama Sanur Beach Bali are grouped into 5 categories. Table 1 illustrates the results of employee performance appraisals in 2023.

Table 1: Prama Sanur Beach Bali Employee Performance Appraisal
 Period January - December Year 2023

Period	Total Employee es	Number & Performance Appraisal Rating Scale									
		1 (Less)		2 (Enough)		3 (Average)		4 (Good)		5 (Very good)	
January-June (1)	172	10	6%	9	5%	93	54%	17	10%	43	25%
July-December (2)	172	7	4%	14	8%	82	48%	24	14%	45	26%

Source: Human Resource Prama Sanur, 2023

In Table 1, the number of employees who obtained an above-average category assessment (good & very good) was 69 people (40%). Prama Sanur management determines that the minimum number of employees who are in the above-average category is 85%. It demonstrates that Prama Sanur Beach Bali hotel staff performance is still subpar. Based on interviews with the *restaurant captain* and *room supervisor*, frequently, complaints arise from staff members who lack product expertise, hygiene standards, and awareness of the components in the food that is provided to visitors. In addition, the lack of understanding of employees about *standard operational procedures* causes work accidents.

One of the numerous variables that might affect an employee's performance is motivation (Sinaga & Hidayat, 2020). Motivation is an internal force that influences the course, vigor, and durability of voluntary acts taken to achieve objectives that have come to be seen as shared goals (Sinaga & Hidayat, 2020). Motivation may also be defined as the drive to create encouragement for oneself. As a result, it's critical that managers inspire their staff to work hard. Based on interviews with HRM Prama Sanur Beach Bali, hotel management provides support to employees to maintain good performance. The support includes allowances, bonuses, salaries according to the Denpasar UMK, health insurance and old age. The hotel also organizes outings to improve cooperation between employees, and provides regular awards such as staff appreciation day and employee of the month. In addition, employees who have birthdays receive special greetings and celebrations. The hotel also provides training and coaching to improve employees' knowledge and human resource skills.

One external factor that may affect how well employees perform is their workplace (Lestary & Harmon, 2017). Previous research indicates that a good and significant work environment has an influence on employee performance (Suyoto & Murtiharso, 2019; Yantika et al., 2018; Hasibuan & Bahri, 2018). A pleasant workplace may increase output and the caliber of work produced. Observations show that Prama Sanur management provides facilities such as a large parking lot, clean canteen, and air-conditioned rooms. These facilities create a comfortable working environment in a hot area like Sanur, confirming management's commitment to employee welfare and satisfaction.

Prior research has also looked at the variables influencing employee performance. Research from Riana and Juniantara, (2015) and Adinda et al., (2023) shown that incentives considerably increase employee performance. The results of research confirm this from Balbed and Sintaasih (2019) and Ekhsan (2019) which underlines that greater employee performance is a result of increased levels of job motivation. Further research suggests that motivation affects worker performance (Adinda et al., 2023; Nuraldy, 2020; Sembiring, 2020). However, other research from Kurniawan (2022) and Suwati (2013) contradictorily stated that employee motivation has little effect on their performance. The results of these studies show that a variety of factors, including compensation and organizational commitment, have an effect on worker performance.

Work environment factors also have inconsistent results in previous studies. Research from Lestary and Harmon, (2017) discovered that a good work atmosphere has an influence on employee performance. Additional research indicates that the work environment has a positive and significant influence on employee performance (Ahmad et al., 2019; Elizar & Tanjung, 2018; Triastuti, 2019). Research from Sabilalo et al., (2020) states that the workplace has no bearing on an employee's performance. The study's conclusions show that the two factors influencing employee performance are motivation and work capability. Therefore, there may be other factors influencing employee performance than the workplace. Other research results from Mogogibung et al., (2022) also found that employee performance is unaffected by the workplace.

Although the results of earlier research reflect some inconsistencies, the main emphasis of this study is the similarities between the dependent variable employee performance and the independent variables motivation and work environment. The purpose of this study is to determine how Prama Sanur Beach Bali employees' performance is affected by their work environment and motivation. According to the introduction, there is a recognized discrepancy between employee performance theory and reality.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Employee Performance

Performance is the level of work that a person meets while carrying out their assigned responsibilities in accordance with certain standards (Mangkunegara, 2016). Performance is a tangible, quantifiable outcome of one's labor (Sunyoto, 2012). According to Robbins and Judge (2009) employee motivation, employee aptitude, and the workplace environment combine to produce employee performance. The indicators in employee performance according to Kuswati (2020) namely: quality, quantity, productivity, timeliness, effectiveness.

Motivation

Motivation is described as a human drive or motivation that has the ability to produce, guide, and organize conduct. The term motivation is derived from the Latin word *movere*, which meaning drive or mover (Sembiring, 2020). According to Nuraldy (2020) motivation is a psychological phenomenon characterized by emotional and psychological symptoms that lead an individual to act or do something in response to their needs, wants, and objectives.

Robbins' five motivational markers, as cited in Hidayat et al., (2023), reflect a hierarchy of human needs that drive employee behavior and performance in the workplace. The physiological marker refers to basic survival needs such as adequate income, rest, food, and safe working conditions; in organizational contexts, this translates into fair wages, reasonable working hours, and access to essential facilities. A sense of security encompasses both physical safety and job stability, including protection from arbitrary dismissal, clear employment contracts, and predictable work routines. When these foundational needs are met, employees are more likely to feel calm and focused, creating a base upon which higher-order motivations can develop.

The remaining three markers address psychosocial and growth-oriented needs. Social interaction highlights the importance of positive relationships with colleagues and supervisors, teamwork, and a supportive organizational climate that reduces isolation and fosters belonging. Appreciation involves recognition of employees' contributions through feedback, rewards, promotions, or informal acknowledgment, which reinforces effort and boosts morale. Finally, self-actualization refers to opportunities for personal and professional growth, such as skill development, challenging assignments, and career advancement, enabling individuals to realize their full potential. Together, these five markers provide a comprehensive framework for designing motivation-enhancing policies and practices in hospitality and other service-intensive sectors.

Work Environment

Sedarmayanti (2011) defines the physical work environment as anything that is present in the workplace and affects employees. Sunyoto (2012) considers the workplace a crucial element of employee activity, while Wijayanto (2012) sees it as a relationship with internal parties such as managers. In summary, the physical and non-physical components of the work environment, such as working conditions and management relationships, have an impact on employees' performance. According to Nuraldy (2020) workplace relationships, workplace security, and workplace air circulation are examples of work environment indicators that are separated into two contexts: the physical and non-physical environments. Sedaramayanti (2018) states that the following are signs of the workplace: Workplace lighting and illumination, humidity, air flow, noise, mechanical vibration, offensive smells, color, décor, music, and security.

METHODOLOGY

This study employs a quantitative, explanatory research design to examine the effects of motivation and work environment on employee performance at Prama Sanur Beach Hotel, Bali. The population consisted of all permanent employees of the hotel. A total of 64 respondents were selected using a non-probability sampling technique, specifically purposive sampling, based on criteria such as minimum tenure of six months and direct involvement in operational service delivery. This sample size meets the recommended threshold for multiple regression analysis with two independent variables, ensuring sufficient statistical power for hypothesis testing.

Data were collected through a combination of primary and secondary sources. Primary data were obtained via structured questionnaires employing a five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree) to measure motivation (X1), work environment (X2), and employee performance (Y). The questionnaire items were adapted from established instruments in prior organizational behavior and hospitality management studies to ensure content validity. In addition, semi-structured interviews with a subset of employees and supervisors were conducted to triangulate and contextualize survey findings. Secondary data in the form of internal performance appraisal records were used to corroborate self-reported performance measures. Prior to hypothesis testing, the instrument was subjected to validity testing using Pearson product-moment correlation and reliability testing using Cronbach's alpha, with all constructs exceeding the conventional threshold of 0.70, indicating acceptable internal consistency. Descriptive statistics were computed to summarize respondent characteristics and variable

distributions. Multiple linear regression analysis was then performed using SPSS version 23 to estimate the magnitude and significance of the relationships between independent and dependent variables. Hypotheses were tested using t-tests for individual coefficients, an F-test for overall model significance, and the coefficient of determination (R^2) to assess the proportion of variance in employee performance explained by motivation and work environment.

RESULTS

Instrument Test Outcomes

Table 2: Results of the Validity Test

Variables	Item	R _{count}	Description
Motivation (X1)	X1.1	0,739	Valid
	X1.2	0,910	Valid
	X1.3	0,889	Valid
	X1.4	0,717	Valid
	X1.5	0,831	Valid
	X1.6	0,629	Valid
	X1.7	0,893	Valid
	X1.8	0,844	Valid
	X1.9	0,888	Valid
	X1.10	0,868	Valid
Work Environment (X2)	X2.1	0,717	Valid
	X2.2	0,723	Valid
	X2.3	0,748	Valid
	X2.4	0,810	Valid
	X2.5	0,726	Valid
	X2.6	0,748	Valid
	X2.7	0,745	Valid
	X2.8	0,703	Valid
	X2.9	0,723	Valid
	X2.10	0,753	Valid
	X2.11	0,739	Valid
Employee Performance (Y)	Y1	0,724	Valid
	Y2	0,679	Valid
	Y3	0,695	Valid
	Y4	0,771	Valid
	Y5	0,775	Valid
	Y6	0,650	Valid
	Y7	0,753	Valid
	Y8	0,681	Valid
	Y9	0,598	Valid
	Y10	0,839	Valid

Source: Researcher processed results, 2024

Based on the results of the validity test in Table 2, 0.598 is the least coefficient value derived from a variable indicator, while 0.910 is the biggest. The study's independent and dependent variables are represented by the total value of 31 statement items. All of the statements are considered genuine because their coefficient values are more than 0.2461 (Pratiwi, 2017). This suggests that the study's questionnaire is suitable for carrying out its measuring purpose and that the statements it measures are really the proper indicators that should be examined.

A tool is deemed trustworthy if it can show consistency and stability in assessing concepts; this may be claimed if the tool's Cronbach's alpha value is greater than 0.6 (Sugiyono, 2013: 102). Table 3 displays the findings of the reliability test according to the research variable statements.

Table 3: Reliability Test Results

Statement Item	Total Statement Items	Cronbach's Alpha	Description
Motivation (X1)	10	0,944	Reliable
Work Environment (X2)	11	0,916	Reliable
Employee Performance (Y)	10	0,896	Reliable

Source: Research Results, 2024 (processed)

The average Cronbach's alpha value for each statement item pertaining to the motivation, work environment, and employee performance aspects is displayed in Table 3. The variables with the highest average Cronbach's alpha values are Employee Performance (0.896), Work Motivation (0.916), and Motivation (0.944). It may be inferred that all statement items from all study variables satisfy the data reliability requirements as each of these average values is higher than 0.60. When the same measuring tool is used repeatedly at various times and occasions to measure employee performance, motivation, and work environment, data reliability demonstrates that the test findings are reliable and accurate.

Descriptive Analysis

Based on the results of processing the collected data, the descriptive analysis reached the following findings:

Table 4: Descriptive Analysis Results

Variables	Total Score	Average	Category
Motivation	2252	35.19	Good
Work Environment	2529	39.52	Good
Employee Performance	2145	33.52	Good enough

Source: Researcher processed results (2024)

Table 4 indicates that the variables for employee performance (Y), work environment (X2), and motivation (X1) fall into the "Good Enough" category, "Good," and "Good" categories, respectively, with average values of 35.19, 39.52, and 33.52.

Multiple Linear Regression

To ascertain how Work Environment and Motivation affect Employee Performance, Multiple Linear Regression Analysis is employed. Table 4 displays the outcomes of the multiple linear regression analysis conducted using SPSS version 23 for Windows.

Table 4. Results of a Multiple Linear Regression Analysis with SPSS Version 23

Coefficients ^a					
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1 (Constant)	2.017	2.694		.749	.457
Motivation	.520	.098	.552	5.319	.000
Work Environment	.335	.100	.348	3.348	.001

a. Performance of employees is a dependent variable

Source: Researcher processed results, 2024

Table 4 shows that the work environment regression coefficient is 0.335, the motivation regression coefficient is 0.520, and the constant value is 2.017. This is how the multiple linear regression equation is created, taking into account each independent variable's constant value and regression coefficient value:

$$Y = 2.017 + 0.520 X_1 + 0.335 X_2$$

The estimated multiple linear regression equation ($Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2$) yields the following interpretable parameters:

a. Constant ($a = 2.017$)

The intercept value of 2.017 indicates the baseline level of employee performance when both motivation and work environment are held at zero. In practical terms, this suggests that even in the absence of measurable motivational and environmental inputs, there remains a minimal inherent performance level, possibly attributable to other unmeasured factors or baseline job requirements.

b. Motivation ($b_1 = 0.520$)

The regression coefficient for motivation is 0.520, meaning that for every one-unit increase in the motivation score, employee performance is expected to rise by 0.520 units, assuming the work environment remains constant. The positive sign of this coefficient confirms a direct, unidirectional relationship: higher levels of employee motivation are associated with correspondingly higher performance outcomes.

c. Work Environment ($b_2 = 0.335$)

The coefficient for work environment is 0.335, indicating that a one-unit improvement in the work environment score leads to a 0.335-unit increase in employee performance, holding motivation constant. The positive coefficient similarly reflects a direct relationship: enhancements in the physical and psychosocial work environment contribute to measurable gains in employee performance.

Hypothesis Test

This hypothesis was tested using an individual t-test (see table 5). Evaluating the impact of each independent variable (X) on the dependent variable (Y) is the aim of this test. The estimated T value in the T-test is compared to the crucial T value (t_{table}) to determine statistical significance.

Table 5: Result of T-test

Variables	t-count	t-table	Sig	α	Description
Motivation (X1)	5,319	1,999	0,000	0,05	Significant
Work Environment (X2)	3,348	1,999	0,001	0,05	Significant
Alpha (α) 0,05					

Source: Researcher processed results, 2024

Table 6: Result of F Test
ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2449.986	2	1224.993	76.094	.000 ^b
	Residuals	981.999	61	16.098		
	Total	3431.984	63			

a. Employee Performance is a dependent variable

b. Predictors: Motivation, Work Environment, and Constant

Source: Researcher processed results, 2024

The hypothesis testing results presented in Table 5 indicate that both motivation and work environment exert statistically significant effects on employee performance. For the motivation variable (X1), the calculated t-value (5.319) exceeds the critical t-table value (1.999), and the associated p-value (0.000) is well below the 0.05 significance threshold. Consequently, the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected in favor of the alternative hypothesis (H_a), confirming that motivation has a significant positive influence on employee performance (Y). Similarly, the work environment variable (X2) yields a t-count of 3.348, which also surpasses the t-table value of 1.999, with a p-value of 0.000 (< 0.05). This leads to the rejection of H_0 and acceptance of H_a , demonstrating that the work environment significantly contributes to variations in employee performance.

In addition to the individual t-tests, the overall model significance is affirmed by the F-test results, which indicate that the regression model as a whole is statistically robust. The significant F-value suggests that the combined effect of motivation and work environment reliably explains changes in employee performance, validating the use

of multiple independent variables in this study. These findings collectively reinforce the conclusion that both motivational factors and environmental conditions are critical determinants of staff performance at Prama Sanur Beach Hotel, providing empirical support for targeted managerial interventions in these areas.

Table 6 calculated F-count, at the 0.000 significance level, is 76.094. Thus, in both calculations, an $F_{\text{count}} > F_{\text{table}}$ value ($76.094 > 4.00$) and a significance level of $0.000 > 0.05$ were discovered. The F test results show that, in Prama Sanur Beach, Bali, employee performance is influenced concurrently by the work environment and motivation.

Test Determination

Coefficient of determination analysis seeks to ascertain the proportion of the variables under examination that is, the independent variables of motivation and job training on the dependent variable, employee performance (Y). The findings of the study using the coefficient of determination are displayed in Table 7.

Table 7: Results of the Determination Coefficient Test

Model Summary ^b				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.845 ^a	.714	.704	4.01227

a. Predictors: (Constant), Work Environment, Motivation

b. Employee Performance is a Dependent Variabel

Source: Research Results, 2024

Based on the R square value obtained from the study findings, Table 7 shows that the dependent variable may be explained by the independent variable up to 71.4% ($0.714 \times 100\%$), with additional factors not employed in this study accounting for the remaining 28.6% ($100\% - 71.4\%$). Ghozali's hypothesis (2013: 95) states that a coefficient of determination is considered strong if its interval falls between 60% and 79.9%. Given that this study's coefficient of determination is 71.4%, conclusion is the dependent variable is greatly influenced by the independent variable.

DISCUSSION / ANALYSIS

The Impact of Motivation on Employee Performance at Prama Sanur Beach Bali

This study conducted at Prama Sanur Beach in Bali shows that motivation has a big influence on worker performance. The results of the t test for the motivation variable, which indicate that $t_{\text{count}} > t_{\text{value}}$ of $5.319 > 1.999$ and that $\alpha = 0.000 < 0.05$ is relevant, support this. Motivation's β value is 0.520, meaning that employee performance will rise if motivation rises by one unit while other factors stay same. Motivation is a very important consideration in improving employee performance (Sembiring, 2020). Factors that affect employee motivation are basic needs, security, social interaction, appreciation of achievement and self-achievement (Razak, 2021). Offering performance bonuses might encourage workers to do their best work and even better work (Sembiring, 2020). Achieving superior and competent company performance in all fields, companies must first know more specifically and deeply, especially the wants and needs of employees which are the basis for achieving good organizational performance (Oktarendah & Putri, 2023). Good motivation causes employees to work more enthusiastically and optimally (Widhyanti et al., 2023).

The study's findings are consistent with other research, which indicates that motivation is one of the variables influencing employee performance. Motivation can be the most powerful tool for superiors to facilitate employee performance achievement (Chien et al., 2020). This implies that an employee will perform better if they are more motivated to do their job. Furthermore, additional research demonstrates that improved company culture and increased employee engagement will enhance worker performance (Astry et al., 2023).

The Impact of Work Environment on Employee Performance at Prama Sanur Beach Bali

This study conducted at Prama Sanur Beach, Bali, found that the workplace has a major influence on worker performance. This is supported by the t test results for the Work Environment variable, which indicate a $t_{\text{count}} > t_{\text{value}}$ of $3.348 > 1.999$ and a significant value $< \alpha = 0.001 < 0.05$. The Work Environment's β value is 0.335, meaning that if the Work Environment increases by one unit while all other variables remain same, Employee Performance will increase as well. Because they are always in close touch with them, employees fulfill the responsibilities assigned by the organization in the work environment. (Sunarsi et al., 2020). (Sunarsi et al., 2020).

A happy workplace is seen to be beneficial for enhancing employee performance when staff members may significantly advance the business, both directly and indirectly (Sihaloho & Siregar, 2020). When workers can work in a safe, comfortable, healthy, and enjoyable atmosphere while doing their tasks, the work environment is said to be in excellent shape (Rahayu & Rushadiyati, 2021).

The findings of this study are consistent with other investigations that found workplace factors influence employee performance. If they work in a safe and healthy environment, employees will feel better about their employment and themselves (Latif et al., 2022).

The Impact of Work Environment and Motivation on Employee Performance at Prama Sanur Beach Bali

This study conducted at Bali's Prama Sanur Beach shows how motivation and the workplace environment interact to affect worker performance. The F test illustrates this; the value of $F_{count} > F_{table}$ is $76.094 > 4.00$, and the significance value is less than $\alpha = 0.000$ less than 0.05. In general, the solution to the issue formulation aligns with the hypothesis that has been put out. The coefficient of determination test findings indicate that employee motivation and work environment have a big influence on each other's performance. To be more precise, motivation accounts for 71.4% of employee performance, with factors beyond the scope of this study influencing the remaining 28.6%. Apart from work environment and motivation, additional independent factors that might affect employee performance are leadership, compensation, work ethic, aptitude, working conditions, stress, and workload (Sembiring, 2020). This study agrees with the findings of research carried out by Nuraldy (2020), Sembiring (2020), Ekhsan and Septian (2021), Kurniawan (2022), Lestary and Harmon (2022) and Hasibuan and Bahri (2020) they assert that employee motivation and work environment have a big influence on performance.

The physiological needs dimension in the motivation variable (X1) was discovered to have the highest average value in this investigation, coming in at 3.72 that was categorized as excellent. Employee performance will improve and become more appropriate with a suitable compensation (Ratnasari & Mahmud, 2020; Ratnasari & Mahmud, 2020). One of the elements influencing employee performance is salary, which has an impact on the worker's incentive to meet the goals established by the organization as well as their work ethic (Ekhsan & Septian, 2021). Pay may be an effective tool for encouraging workers to perform better and take an active part in accomplishing organizational objectives (Astuti & Rianto, 2022). In the work environment variable (X2) the indicator "Security" occupies the highest position with an average of 3.69 which is classified as good. Security provides assurance to employees, which can improve their performance (Lianova, 2023; Lianova, 2023). Poor work environment security will hinder the production process carried out by each employee in the company. (Sari & Suwitho, 2022). This shows that the sense of security provided to employees while working has the greatest influence on the work environment so that it must be maximized. This demonstrates that two separate factors that significantly influence whether employee performance is increased or decreased are motivation and the work environment.

Motivational variables influence employee performance to some degree, both positively and substantially ($t_{count} > t_{table} = 5.319 > 1.999$, significance value $< 0.000 < 0.05$, $\alpha = 0,000 < 0,05$). Increasing Motivation (X1) will enhance Employee Performance at Prama Sanur Beach Bali, since Motivation has a positive influence on Employee Performance with a β value of 0.520. Employee performance is significantly and comparatively benefited by the work environment variable, as shown by a $t_{count} > t_{table} = 3.348 > 1.999$, a significance value $< 0.000 < 0.05$, and $\alpha = 0,000 < 0,05$. The positive Beta value of 0.335 on Employee Performance demonstrates that Prama Sanur Beach Bali anticipates improved Employee Performance in conjunction with improved Work Environment. Workplace motivation and environmental factors have a simultaneous impact on employee performance, with a value of $F_{count} > F_{table} = 76.094 > 4.00$ and a significant value $< 0.000 < 0.05$. $\alpha = 0,000 < 0,05$. Within the strong group, there is a 71.4% concurrent influence of work environment and motivation on employee performance. More motivation boosts work environment elements at Prama Sanur Beach Bali in addition to enhancing employee performance.

CONCLUSION

The structural model employed in this study accounts for 71.4% of the variance in employee performance, leaving 28.6% unexplained. This suggests that other influential factors, such as compensation, leadership, work discipline, work ability, working conditions, work stress, workload, and training, may play significant roles but were not incorporated in the current model. In practical terms, this means that while motivation and work environment are clearly important drivers of performance, they do not tell the whole story. For instance, employees who are motivated and work in a supportive environment may still underperform if they feel underpaid, lack clear direction from leaders, or experience excessive stress and workload. These omitted variables likely interact in complex ways with the included factors, and their exclusion limits the model's ability to fully capture the determinants of performance in the hospitality context.

Future research should therefore develop a more comprehensive structural framework by integrating these additional variables to enhance the model's explanatory power. A more holistic model would not only increase the proportion of explained variance but also provide richer insights into how different organizational and individual

factors jointly shape employee outcomes. It is also advisable to use larger, more diverse samples across multiple locations to improve the generalizability of the findings. Studies confined to a single hotel or region may reflect context-specific dynamics that do not hold in other settings; expanding the sample would help determine whether the observed relationships are robust across different organizational cultures, market conditions, and employee demographics. Furthermore, adopting alternative methodologies or advanced analytical techniques, such as structural equation modeling (SEM), longitudinal designs, or mixed-method approaches, could provide deeper insights into the causal mechanisms and dynamic interactions among variables not captured in this study. Such methodological refinements would strengthen both the theoretical contributions and practical implications of future research in hospitality human resource management.

REFERENCES

- Adinda, T. N., Firdaus, M. A., & Agung, S. (2023). Pengaruh motivasi kerja dan disiplin kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan. *Indonesian Journal of Innovation Multidisipliner Research*, 1(3), 134-143. <https://doi.org/10.31004/ijim.v1i3.15>
- Ahmad, Y., Tewal, B., & Taroreh, R. N. (2019). Pengaruh Stres Kerja, Beban Kerja, Dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pada Pt. Fif Group Manado. *Jurnal EMBA: Jurnal Riset Ekonomi, Manajemen, Bisnis Dan Akuntansi*, 7(3), 2303–1174.
- Astuti, D., & Rianto, M. R. (2022). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja, gaji, dan motivasi terhadap kinerja karyawan. *EVOKASI: Jurnal Kajian Administrasi Dan Sosial Terapan*, 1(2), 90-96. <https://doi.org/10.20961/evokasi.v1i2.529>
- Aulia, F., & Jamilah, S. (2023). Peran Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia (SDM) Terhadap Kinerja dan Kualitas Pegawai Perbankan Syariah. *Journal of Resources and Reserves*, 1(2), 16-31.
- Balbed, A., & Sintaasih, D. K. (2019). *Pengaruh Pengembangan Karir Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Melalui Pemediasi Motivasi Kerja Karyawan*. E-Jurnal Manajemen Universitas Udayana, 8(7), 4676. <https://doi.org/10.24843/ejmunud.2019.v08.i07.p24>
- Ekhsan, M. (2019). Pengaruh motivasi dan disiplin kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan. *Optimal: Jurnal Ekonomi dan Kewirausahaan*, 13(1), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.33558/optimal.v13i1.1734>
- Ekhsan, M., & Septian, B. (2021). Pengaruh stres kerja, konflik kerja dan kompensasi terhadap kinerja karyawan. *MASTER: Jurnal Manajemen Strategik Kewirausahaan*, 1(1), 11-18. <https://doi.org/10.37366/master.v1i1.25>
- Elizar, E., & Tanjung, H. (2018). Pengaruh pelatihan, kompetensi, lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja pegawai. *Maneggio: Jurnal Ilmiah Magister Manajemen*, 1(1), 46-58. <https://doi.org/10.30596/maneggio.v1i1.2239>
- Hidayat, M. S., Perkasa, D. H., Susiang, M. I. N., & Parashakti, R. D. (2023). The Influence of Motivation, Work Discipline, and Leadership on Employee Performance at PT. Kalimutu Mitra Perkasa. *KnE Social Sciences*, 8(12), 432–443. <https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v8i12.13691>
- Kurniawan, H. (2022). Literature Review: Analisis Kinerja Pegawai Melalui Komitmen Organisasi Kompensasi dan Motivasi. *Jurnal Ekonomi Manajemen Sistem Informasi*, 3(4), 426-441. <https://doi.org/10.31933/jemsi.v3i4>
- Kuswati, Y. (2020). The effect of motivation on employee performance. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal)*, 3(2), 995-1002. <https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v3i2.928>
- Latif, N., Ismail, A., Nurmega, N., & Irwan, A. (2022). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PT. Hadji Kalla Toyota Cabang Maros. *SEIKO: Journal of Management & Business*, 5(1), 585-591.
- Lestary, L., & Harmon, H. (2017). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan. *Jurnal Riset Bisnis Dan Investasi*, 3(2), 94-103.
- Lianova. (2023). Pengaruh Penerapan K3 (Keselamatan Kerja, Kesehatan Kerja, Keamanan Kerja) Dan Gaji Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan di Cv. Malala. *Cross-border*, 6(1), 469-479.
- Mangkunegara, A. A. A. P. (2016). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Perusahaan* (5th Ed.).
- Mogogibung, I., H Dotulong, L. O., & Walangitan, M. D. (2022). The Influence of Work Environment, Career Development and Competence on Employee Performance at Pt. Sinar Galesong Prima Kotamobagu. *Jurnal Ekonomi Bisnis*, 2(1). 792-802.
- Nuraldy, H. L. (2020). Pengaruh Motivasi Dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pada PT. Bangun Jaya Persada di Jakarta. *Value: Jurnal Manajemen Dan Akuntansi*, 15(2), 80–86. <https://doi.org/10.32534/jv.v15i2.1087>

- Rahayu, M. S., & Rushadiyati, R. (2021). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja dan karakteristik individu terhadap kinerja karyawan SMK Kartini. *Jurnal Administrasi Dan Manajemen*, 11(2), 136-145.
<https://doi.org/10.52643/jam.v11i2.1880>
- Ratnasari, I., & Mahmud, A. (2020). Pengaruh Gaji Dan Insentif Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Bagian Produksi PT. Uniplastindo Interbuana Pandaan. *Jurnal Aplikasi Manajemen Dan Inovasi Bisnis*, 2(2), 66-79.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.47201/jamin.v2i2.53>
- Riana, I. G., & Juniantara, I. W. (2015). Pengaruh motivasi dan kepuasan kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan koperasi di Denpasar. *E-Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis Universitas Udayana*, 4, 44761. 611-628.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. (2009). *Organizational behavior*. Pearson South Africa.
- Sabilalo, M. A., Kalsum, U., Nur, M., & Makkulau, A. R. (2020). the Influence of the Work Environment and Work Ability on Work Motivation and Employee Performance in the Organization Bureau of the Regional Secretariat of the Southeast Sulawesi Province. *Journal of Management & Business*, 3(2), 151-169.
<https://doi.org/10.37531/sejaman.v3i2.757>
- Sari, S. T., Suwitho. S. (2020). Peranan Kesehatan, Keamanan Dan Keselamatan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PT. Inkatama Wancheng Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmu Dan Riset Manajemen*, 9(12), 1-12.
- Sembiring, H. (2020). Pengaruh motivasi dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan pada Bank Sinarmas Medan. *Jurnal akuntansi dan manajemen*, 13(1), 10-23. <http://dx.doi.org/10.48042/jurakunman.v12i1.13>
- Sihaloho, R. D., & Siregar, H. (2020). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan Pada PT. Super setia sagita medan. *Jurnal Ilmiah Socio Secretum*, 9(2), 273-281.
- Sinaga, T. S., & Hidayat, R. (2020). Pengaruh motivasi dan kompensasi terhadap kinerja karyawan pada PT. Kereta Api Indonesia. *Jurnal ILMAN (Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen)*, 8(1), 15-22.
- Sunarsi, D., Wijoyo, H., Prasada, D., & Andi, D. (2020). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan pada PT. Mentari Persada di Jakarta. In *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Manajemen, Ekonomi dan Akuntansi* (Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 117-123).
- Sunyoto, D. (2012). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Vol.1. PT. Caps.
- Suwati, Y. (2013). Pengaruh kompensasi dan motivasi kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan pada PT. Tunas Hijau Samarinda. *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Bisnis*, 1(1), 41-55.
- Triastuti, D. A. (2019). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja, Kompetensi Dan Iklim Organisasi Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Pada Bank BJB Cabang Tasikmalaya. *Journal of Management Review*, 2(1), 151-160.
- Wibowo, A. (2018). Study Komparasi Penyelenggaraan Pendidikan Smk (Studi Kasus SMK Di Pondok Pesantren Lirboyo Al-Mahrusiyah Dan Di SMK PGRI 2 Kediri). *At-Tarbiyat: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, 1(2), 1-22.