

The Influence of Work Environment, Communication Between Staff, and Motivation on the Performance of Management Staff at Aayan Hotel

Kardianus Manfour¹, Ronald Suryaputra¹, Ike Kusdyah¹

¹Asian Institute of Technology and Business Malang, Indonesia

Email: kardianusmanfour@gmail.com

Abstract. *This study aims to analyze the influence of the work environment, communication between staff, and motivation on the performance of management staff at Hotel Aayan, Bali. The study used a quantitative approach with path analysis techniques processed using SmartPLS software version 4.0. The sample in this study was all 40 management staff, spread across five operational villa units of Hotel Aayan. The results of the analysis showed that communication between staff had a positive and significant effect on employee performance with a p-value of 0.040. In contrast, the work environment and motivation variables did not have a significant effect on staff performance because they had p-values of 0.087 and 0.296, respectively. These findings indicate that effective internal communication is a key factor in improving the performance of management staff, while the work environment and motivation have not been statistically proven as the main determinants in the context of this study. The implications of this study emphasize the importance of strategies to strengthen communication between staff in human resource management in the hospitality sector.*

Keywords: *Work Environment, Communication Between Staff, Work Motivation, Hospitality, SmartPLS*

Received: August 4, 2025

Received in Revised: September 18, 2025

Accepted: November 5, 2025

INTRODUCTION

The hotel industry is a crucial sector in driving economic growth, particularly in prime tourism destinations like Bali (Wijaya et al., 2019; Iswardhani et al., 2025). According to data from the Bali Province Statistics Agency (BPS), the room occupancy rate (TPK) of star-rated hotels reached 65.32% in 2024, an increase from 59.78% the previous year, with 5.2 million overnight guests in the first quarter alone, comprising 3.4 million international tourists and 1.8 million domestic tourists (BPS Bali, 2024). This surge reflects the recovery of the hotel industry post-pandemic and the increasing intensity of competition in providing quality services (Rifka et al., 2025).

In practice, the quality of these services is heavily influenced by the effectiveness of the management and performance of the human resources involved in hotel operations (Haynes & Fryer, 2000; Tsaur & Lin, 2004; Sun et al., 2007). With increasing customer expectations and the dynamics of tourism trends, human resource management is a strategic key to maintaining hotel competitiveness. According to Mubarok et al. (2020), human resources are the most important

competitive factor in the tourism and hotel industry, as they directly influence a company's survival.

Furthermore, a 2024 report from the World Economic Forum shows that Indonesia has risen to 22nd place globally in the Human Resources and Labor Market category from 30th, indicating improvements in the quality of the tourism sector workforce. However, this dynamic also presents new challenges, requiring hotel management to consider various factors that influence staff productivity, including the work environment, communication between staff, and work motivation (Ishak et al., 2025). The work environment is one aspect that significantly impacts staff performance, both physically and psychologically. Research by Briner (2000) and Nanda et al. (2020) shows that a positive work environment can increase motivation and job satisfaction, and directly impact staff productivity.

Meanwhile, data from the Indonesian Central Statistics Agency (BPS) (2024) noted that 32.5% of employees in the accommodation and food services sector consider the work environment a major factor in their job satisfaction. Specifically in Bali, a 2024 survey by the Department of Manpower and Transmigration (Disnakertrans) showed that 68% of hotel workers considered the quality of the work environment a key determinant of their work performance. In addition to environmental factors, communication between staff also plays a strategic role in ensuring operational effectiveness (Daily & Huang, 2001; Jorfi & Jorfi, 2011; Fayyaz et al., 2025). According to Sari et al. (2021), good communication supports a comfortable and productive work environment.

In the hospitality industry, which relies on interdepartmental coordination, miscommunication can lead to service errors and decreased guest satisfaction. Research by De et al. (2006) concluded that effective communication is positively correlated with job satisfaction and team effectiveness. Furthermore, in the context of hotels consisting of multiple operational units, such as villas or resorts, the challenges of cross-location coordination become even more complex. Work motivation is another equally important factor. According to Abbas et al. (2023), motivation is a driving force that influences an individual's willingness to work optimally to achieve organizational goals.

A study by Mao et al. (2025) indicates that providing incentives, recognition, and career development opportunities have a significant impact on hotel staff morale. In addition to external motivations such as salary and promotion, intrinsic motivation stemming from a sense of pride and personal satisfaction in providing excellent service to guests also contributes to staff work commitment (Daskin et al., 2015; Norbu & Wetprasit, 2021; Kim et al., 2009). This aligns with Amni's findings (2023), which state that a work environment that considers psychological and physical aspects will result in more motivated staff.

This research examines the unique characteristics of Hotel Aayan Bali, which comprises five operational villas spread across various tourist locations: Uluwatu, Canggu, Sanur, and Tanah Lot. With a total of 40 staff, each villa has different operational requirements, both in terms of staff size and service types. Hotel Aayan routinely evaluates employee performance based on four key indicators: achievement of work targets, quality of work output, adherence to procedures, and punctuality of task completion. Furthermore, the physical and psychological work environment, the effectiveness of internal communication, and work motivation are the focus of hotel management evaluations to improve overall staff performance (Kusuma, 2021; Ginting et al., 2024).

While previous studies have highlighted the influence of work environment, communication, and motivation separately on staff performance, a research gap remains in the context of a mid-scale hotel with a multi-villa operational system like Hotel Aayan. This hotel's complex organizational structure and high cross-location coordination requirements have not been widely explored in the hospitality management literature. Therefore, this study is significant

because it offers a more comprehensive analysis of the relationship between these three factors and the performance of local hotel staff in Bali.

Against this background, this study aims to analyze the influence of the work environment, communication between staff, and motivation on the performance of management staff at Hotel Aayan, Bali. The results of this study are expected to not only contribute to the development of academic literature in the field of hotel human resource management but also provide practical recommendations that can be directly implemented by hotel management to improve service quality and competitiveness in the Balinese tourism industry.

METHODS

This study used a quantitative approach with an explanatory approach. The quantitative approach was chosen because the study aimed to objectively examine the influence of the work environment, communication between staff, and motivation on the performance of management staff at Hotel Aayan, Bali, through numerical measurements and statistical analysis. The explanatory approach was chosen because the study not only describes phenomena but also explains the causal relationships between the variables studied. The study was conducted at Hotel Aayan, Bali, which consists of five operational villas: Villa Padi, Kokomo, Kahuna, Evara, and Poco-Poco, spread across the Uluwatu, Canggu, Sanur, and Tanah Lot areas. The study was conducted during the first quarter of 2025. The population in this study was all management staff working in the five operational villas at Hotel Aayan, with a total population of 40. Because the population size was relatively small and still within the maximum limit for a census, the sampling technique used was saturated sampling or total sampling. Therefore, all members of the population were included as respondents in this study. This study involves four main variables, namely Work Environment (X_1), Communication Between Staff (X_2), Work Motivation (X_3), and Staff Performance (Y) with the indicators used in this study as follows.

Table 1. Research Variable Indicators

No	Research Variable	Indicator	Indicator Item
1	Work Environment (X_1) (Surajiyo in Mauliansyah, 2023)	Employee relations	Harmonious relationships among employees in the workplace.
		Workplace cleanliness	Level of cleanliness in the work area.
		Work regulations	Availability and clarity of workplace regulations.
		Safety	The level of safety felt while performing tasks.
		Workspace arrangement	Comfort and orderliness of workspace layout.
2	Staff Communication (X_2) (Agung, 2023; Suharto, 2024)	Message comprehension	Ability to understand messages received from superiors/colleagues.
		Communication climate	Openness and mutual trust in workplace communication.
		Communication satisfaction	Satisfaction with the communication process among staff.
		Accuracy and consistency of messages	Level of accuracy and consistency of messages received.
		Communicator credibility	Level of trust in the message sender.

3	Motivation (X3) (Herzberg, 1959; Satria, 2021)	Physiological needs	Fulfillment of basic needs such as food, rest, and health in the workplace.
		Social needs	Involvement in social relationships in the workplace.
		Esteem needs	Recognition of achievements and contributions in the workplace.
		Self-actualization needs	Opportunities to grow and realize one's potential in the workplace.
4	Staff Performance (Y) (Akhsan & Pedrian, 2024)	Achievement of work targets	Level of achievement of predetermined work targets.
		Quality of work results	Degree of conformity of work results to established standards.
		Compliance with procedures	Discipline in following work rules and procedures.
		Timeliness	Ability to complete work within established deadlines.

The data utilized in this study included primary data obtained through questionnaires distributed to all respondents. The questionnaire was structured on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree," to measure respondents' perceptions of each question item within each variable. Additionally, secondary data was obtained through documentation and literature review related to HR management in the hotel industry, staff performance reports, and internal evaluation documents from Hotel Aayan management. The data analysis technique in this study employed a path analysis approach processed with SmartPLS software version 4.0. This analysis aimed to examine the causal relationships between work environment variables, inter-staff communication, and work motivation on employee performance, while also answering the research problem formulation and testing the research hypotheses. The analysis process included convergent validity testing using outer loadings (>0.6) and Average Variance Extracted (AVE >0.5), as well as discriminant validity testing by comparing outer loadings and cross-loadings. Reliability testing was conducted by calculating composite reliability (>0.70) and Cronbach's Alpha to ensure internal consistency between indicators within each construct. Hypothesis testing was conducted by examining the t-statistic and p-value, where the relationship between variables was declared significant if the p-value was <0.05. Furthermore, the coefficient of determination (R^2) was used to measure the contribution of the independent variables in explaining the dependent variable, namely employee performance. Through this approach, the research provides a comprehensive understanding of the strength and direction of the direct influence between variables in the developed structural model.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Outer Model Measurement

Table 2. Validity Test Results

Variable	Average Variance Extracted (AVE)
Work Environment (WE)	0.748
Work Communication (WC)	0.651
Work Motivation (M)	0.744
Employee Performance (Y)	0.643

Source: Processed Primary Data (2025)

Based on the table above, the AVE values for each variable are as follows: (1) Staff Communication (DK) has an AVE value of 0.680 (>0.5), indicating that the research instrument used to measure this variable is convergently valid; (2) Work Environment (LK) has an AVE value

of 0.739 (>0.5), so this variable also meets the convergent validity criteria and is declared valid; (3) Work Motivation (MK) shows an AVE value of 0.752 (>0.5), indicating that this variable has adequate convergent validity and is categorized as valid; (4) Employee Performance (Y) has an AVE value of 0.706 (>0.5), indicating that this variable is valid in measuring employee performance based on the indicators used.

Table 3. Reliability Test Results

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability (rho_A)	Composite Reliability (rho_C)
KK (Work Communication)	0.915	0.916	0.937
L (Work Environment)	0.821	0.823	0.881
M (Work Motivation)	0.914	0.915	0.936
Y (Employee Performance)	0.814	0.829	0.877

Source: Processed Primary Data (2025)

The reliability test results based on SmartPLS 4 output indicate that all constructs in this study meet the criteria for good reliability. The Communication (KK) variable has a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.915, well above the minimum threshold of 0.7. The Rho_A value for this variable was recorded at 0.916, and the Composite Reliability value was 0.937. These three values indicate that the instrument used to measure Communication has excellent internal consistency and is reliable in measurement. Meanwhile, the Work Environment (L) variable also showed adequate results, with a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.821, a Rho_A value of 0.823, and a Composite Reliability value of 0.881. All three exceed the recommended minimum standards, thus concluding that the measurement instrument for this variable is able to consistently and accurately reflect the Work Environment construct.

For the Motivation (M) variable, the Cronbach's Alpha value was recorded at 0.914, indicating a high level of reliability. This is supported by the Rho_A value of 0.915 and Composite Reliability of 0.936, which overall confirms that the Motivation construct has very strong internal reliability and the instrument used has been tested for consistency. The last variable, namely Employee Performance (Y), recorded a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.814, which is also above the 0.7 limit. The Rho_A value of 0.829 and Composite Reliability of 0.877 strengthen that this construct has good stability and reliability in measuring performance.

Inner Model Measurement

Table 4. Results of the Determination Coefficient Test

Variable	R Square	R Square Adjusted
Y (Employee performance)	0.714	0.690

Source: Processed Primary Data (2025)

Based on the results in the R-Square Table, the R² value for the Employee Performance (Y) variable is 0.714. This indicates that 71.4% of the variation in the Employee Performance variable can be explained by independent constructs in the model, such as Communication, Work Environment, and Motivation. Meanwhile, the remaining 28.6% is explained by factors outside the research model, which were not included in the analysis. The Adjusted R² value of 0.690 indicates that after adjusting for the number of predictors in the model, the proportion of explained variance remains high and fairly stable. This indicates that the model does not experience overfitting and still maintains its predictive ability.

Overall, the R² value for the Employee Performance variable is in the strong category, indicating that the relationships between variables in the model have high explanatory power. Thus, these results support the structural validity of the research model and provide a solid foundation for further effect analysis and prediction.

Table 5. F Square Test Results

Source: Processed Primary Data (2025)

	KK (Work Communication)	L (Work Environment)	M (Work Motivation)	Y (Employee Performance)
KK (Work Communication)				0.142
L (Work Environment)				0.094
M (Work Motivation)				0.033
Y (Employee Performance)				

Based on the results in the f-square table, it can be seen that the f^2 value for the Communication (KK) variable on Employee Performance (Y) is 0.142, which is close to the threshold of 0.15, so it can be categorized as having an almost sufficient or moderate influence. Meanwhile, the Work Environment (L) on Employee Performance (Y) has an f^2 value of 0.094, which is in the weak influence category, because its value is still below 0.15. Furthermore, the Motivation (M) variable on Employee Performance (Y) shows an f^2 value of 0.033, which is also included in the weak influence category. Nevertheless, the contribution of each variable to Performance still provides important information in forming a comprehensive model. Overall, the f^2 values in this model indicate that Communication has the greatest influence on Employee Performance compared to other variables, although it does not yet fall into the moderate influence category. These results illustrate that each variable makes a different contribution to Performance, and needs further study in the context of improving performance in the organizational environment. Inner model testing in the SEM-PLS approach is conducted to assess the model's predictive relevance using the Q^2 value. This value is calculated using the formula:

$$Q^2 = 1 - (1 - R_1^2) (1 - R_2^2) \dots (1 - R_p^2) \quad Q^2 = 1 - (1 - R_1^2) (1 - R_2^2) \dots (1 - R_p^2)$$

In this study, there is only one main endogenous construct, namely Employee Performance (Y), with an R^2 value of 0.714. Therefore, the Q^2 calculation is carried out as follows:

$$Q^2 = 1 - (1 - 0,714) = 1 - 0,286 = 0,714 \quad Q^2 = 1 - (1 - 0,714) = 1 - 0,286 = 0,714$$

These results indicate that approximately 71.4% of the variance in the Employee Performance construct can be explained by the independent variables in the model, namely Communication, Work Environment, and Motivation. Thus, this model has strong predictive ability and supports the conclusion that the relationships between the analyzed constructs are able to explain most of the variation in employee performance. The Q^2 value of 0.714 indicates an excellent level of predictive relevance, making the model suitable for further analysis.

Table 6. Goodness of Fit (GoF) Test Results

Variable	GoF
Communication (KK)	0.731
Work Environment (L)	0.682
Motivation (M)	0.729
Performance (Y)	0.678

Source: Processed Primary Data (2025)

The results of the Goodness of Fit (GoF) calculation show that all variables in the research model have GoF values above 0.67, namely: Communication (0.731), Work Environment (0.682), Motivation (0.729), and Performance (0.678). These values exceed the minimum limit of 0.38 set by Tenenhaus (2004) as a large GoF category. Based on these criteria (small GoF = 0.10; medium = 0.25; large = 0.38), it can be concluded that the model has a high level of overall suitability. Thus, the structural model in this study can be accepted and declared feasible, because it has shown

good compatibility between the empirical data and the model structure built. This reflects that the model is able to describe the real conditions that occur in the field representatively.

Hypothesis Testing

Table 6. Hypothesis Test Results

Connection	Original Sample (O)	Sample Mean (M)	STDEV	T Statistik	P-Value
KK → Y	0.431	0.429	0.210	2.054	0.040
L → Y	0.259	0.269	0.152	1.712	0.087
M → Y	0.216	0.216	0.206	1.046	0.296

Source: Processed Primary Data (2025)

Based on the test results presented in Table 6, these results indicate the extent to which each independent variable (Work Environment, Inter-Staff Communication, and Work Motivation) directly influences Employee Performance, as explained below.

The Influence of Communication on Staff Performance (KK → Y)

Based on the results of hypothesis testing using the Partial Least Squares (PLS) method, it was found that the Communication (KK) variable has a significant influence on the Staff Performance (Y) variable. This is indicated by a p-value of 0.040, which is below the 0.05 significance level. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H_0), which states that communication has no effect on staff performance, is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis (H_1) is accepted. This means that statistically, communication makes a significant contribution to improving staff performance. Furthermore, the path coefficient of 0.431 indicates that the effect of communication on staff performance is positive and quite strong. This means that the better the communication between individuals within the organization whether between staff, between superiors and subordinates, or between departments the higher the level of performance achieved by staff. Effective communication creates a clear understanding of tasks, goals, and job responsibilities, thereby reducing errors, increasing efficiency, and strengthening work coordination.

In an organizational context, communication plays a key role as a means of conveying information, instructions, and feedback, as well as building interpersonal relationships. Smooth and open communication will facilitate staff completion of work, boost morale, and create a conducive work environment. Conversely, poor communication can lead to misunderstandings, internal conflict, decreased motivation, and negatively impact productivity. This finding aligns with various previous studies that demonstrate the critical role of communication in achieving optimal employee performance. For example, a study by Robertson & Cooper (2010) found that effective communication within an organization serves as a coordination and control tool, as well as strengthening employee engagement in achieving shared goals.

The Influence of Work Environment on Staff Performance (L → Y)

The results of the second hypothesis test indicate that the Work Environment (L) variable does not have a significant effect on Staff Performance (Y). This is based on a p-value of 0.087, which is greater than the 0.05 significance level. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H_0) cannot be rejected, meaning there is insufficient statistical evidence to conclude that the work environment influences staff performance at the 95% confidence level. Although the path coefficient of 0.259 indicates a positive effect that is, a better work environment tends to improve staff performance this effect is not statistically strong enough to be categorized as significant. The t-statistic of 1.712 is also below the critical t-value of ± 1.96 for 5% significance, reinforcing the conclusion that this relationship is statistically weak.

The work environment in this context can encompass various aspects, such as physical conditions (lighting, cleanliness, layout), comfort, safety, and the social and psychological

atmosphere of the workplace. In human resource management theory, a conducive work environment is believed to increase staff morale, comfort, and work efficiency. However, the results obtained in this study indicate that work environment factors may not be the primary determinant of staff performance in the organizational context studied. Several possibilities could explain why the work environment did not have a significant effect on staff performance: first, Low Environmental Variation: It is possible that work environment conditions across respondents were relatively uniform or did not differ significantly, so there was not enough variation to influence differences in performance.

Second, Subjective Perception: Assessments of the work environment are subjective and can be influenced by personal factors such as expectations, past experiences, or individual preferences. Third, Dominance of Other Factors: There may be other factors that more dominantly influence staff performance (such as communication, intrinsic motivation, or work culture) so that the influence of the work environment is not as visible in this model. Although the results were not statistically significant, it is important to remember that the work environment still plays an important practical role in creating a healthy and productive work atmosphere. Much previous literature and studies confirm that a supportive work environment can strengthen loyalty, reduce work stress, and support the achievement of better performance, although these effects may appear indirectly or depend on the specific organizational context.

The Influence of Motivation on Staff Performance (M → Y)

The third hypothesis test showed that the Motivation (M) variable did not have a significant effect on the Staff Performance (Y) variable. This result is indicated by a p-value of 0.296, which is significantly greater than the 0.05 significance level. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H_0) is not rejected, and the alternative hypothesis (H_1) cannot be accepted. This means that statistically, there is insufficient evidence to state that motivation directly influences staff performance in this study. The path coefficient of 0.216 indicates that the direction of the effect is positive, but the effect is weak and not statistically significant. The t-statistic of 1.046 also indicates that this relationship does not reach the level of significance required to be categorized as a significant effect in the structural model.

Work motivation itself is an internal factor that drives a person to act and behave at work to achieve certain goals. Motivation can come from within (intrinsic motivation), such as the desire for development, or from outside (extrinsic motivation), such as incentives and recognition. Based on motivational theories such as Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory and Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, motivation is a crucial aspect believed to drive improved individual performance. However, in the context of this study, several possibilities explain why motivation does not significantly impact staff performance: First, High Motivation but Lack of System Support: Staff may be highly motivated, but not supported by work systems or organizational policies that enable them to perform optimally. This can result in high motivation not leading to actual performance improvements.

Second, Other Factors Are More Dominant: Communication and leadership, for example, may be more important determinants of performance than personal motivation. When the organizational structure is not supportive or communication is ineffective, motivation is difficult to translate into productive performance. Third, Indirect Influence: Motivation may have an indirect influence on performance, for example through mediating variables such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, or employee engagement. Although the statistical analysis results did not show a significant effect, from a practical perspective, motivation remains an important aspect of human resource management. Organizations still need to consider factors that can increase staff work motivation, such as fair rewards, clear career paths, recognition for achievements, and creating a work environment that provides meaning and job satisfaction. These findings also open up opportunities for further research to examine the possibility of an indirect relationship or interaction between motivation and other variables that influence staff

performance. For example, whether motivation will have a significant effect when combined with other factors such as leadership style, organizational culture, or work engagement.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of data analysis using path analysis techniques with the help of SmartPLS software, it was found that only communication between staff has a positive and significant influence on staff performance, with a p-value of 0.040. This indicates that the effectiveness of internal communication plays an important role in supporting smooth operations and achieving performance in the hotel environment. Meanwhile, the variables of work environment and work motivation, although showing a positive relationship to performance, were not proven statistically significant because the p-values were 0.087 and 0.296, respectively. This means that in the context of the Aayan Hotel organization, improving the quality of communication between staff contributes more to improving performance compared to improving the work environment or increasing motivation separately.

SUGGESTION

Therefore, hotel management is advised to prioritize strengthening the internal communication system as a primary strategy in efforts to improve the performance of management staff, accompanied by further evaluation of the role of the work environment and motivation in a long-term context.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Thank you to all respondents at Hotel Aayan, Bali, who were willing to take the time and provide important information by completing the questionnaire, as well as to the management of Hotel Aayan for their cooperation and permission given during the data collection process.

REFERENCES

- Abbas, S. A., Kusumawardani, Z. N., Suprayitno, N. F., & Jafar, N. (2023). Driving Factors of Motivation and Its Contribution to Enhance Performance. *Innovative: Journal Of Social Science Research*, 3(2), 7266-7280.
- Amni, H. (2023). Analisis faktor internal yang mempengaruhi motivasi kerja karyawan pada Hotel "XY". *Assets Journal: Management, Administration, Economics, and Accounting*, 1(2), 7-13. <https://doi.org/10.59923/assets.v1i2.27>
- Briner, R. B. (2000). Relationships between work environments, psychological environments and psychological well-being. *Occupational medicine*, 50(5), 299-303. <https://doi.org/10.1093/occmed/50.5.299>
- Daily, B. F., & Huang, S. C. (2001). Achieving sustainability through attention to human resource factors in environmental management. *International Journal of operations & production management*, 21(12), 1539-1552. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01443570110410892>
- Daskin, M., Arasli, H., & Kasim, A. (2015). The impact of management commitment to service quality, intrinsic motivation and nepotism on front-line employees' affective work outcomes. *International Journal of Management Practice*, 8(4), 269-295. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJMP.2015.073492>
- De Vries, R. E., Van den Hooff, B., & De Ridder, J. A. (2006). Explaining knowledge sharing: The role of team communication styles, job satisfaction, and performance beliefs. *Communication research*, 33(2), 115-135. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650205285366>
- Fayyaz, A., Liu, C., Xu, Y., & Ramzan, S. (2025). Effects of green human resource management, internal environmental management and developmental culture between lean six sigma and operational performance. *International Journal of Lean Six Sigma*, 16(1), 109-140. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJLSS-04-2023-0065>

- Ginting, Y. M., Rismawati, R., & Aisyah, S. (2024). The Moderating Role of Work Environment in the Relationship Between Organisational Culture, Employee Motivation, Performance Appraisal, and Job Satisfaction in Bali's Hotel Industry. *The South East Asian Journal of Management*, 18(2), 6. <https://doi.org/10.21002/seam.v18i2.1775>
- Haynes, P., & Fryer, G. (2000). Human resources, service quality and performance: a case study. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 12(4), 240-248. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09596110010330813>
- Ishak, R. P., Ludijanto, L., Kalsum, E. U., & Yulianto, A. (2025). *Sumber Daya Manusia Industri Pariwisata dan Perhotelan*. Jambi: PT. Sonpedia Publishing Indonesia.
- Iswardhani, I., Macenning, A. R. A. D., Sandira, N. F. A., & Sarah, N. (2025). The Financial Impact of Domestic and International Tourist Visits on Bali's Regional Economy. *Journal of Financial Economics & Investment*, 5(2), 91-102.
- Jorfi, H., & Jorfi, S. (2011). Strategic operations management: Investigating the factors impacting communication effectiveness and job satisfaction. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 24, 1596-1605. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.09.003>
- Jumani, A., & Rianto, M. R. (2023). Literatur Review: Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja, Pelatihan Dan Motivasi Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Karyawan CV. Kita Sukses Mandiri. *Studi Ilmu Manajemen Dan Organisasi*, 4(1), 39-50. <https://doi.org/10.35912/simo.v4i1.1779>
- Kim, H. J., Tavitiyaman, P., & Kim, W. G. (2009). The effect of management commitment to service on employee service behaviors: The mediating role of job satisfaction. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 33(3), 369-390. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1096348009338530>
- Kusuma, A. A. (2021). The effect of motivation and work environment on the performance of hotel Employees, Muria Semarang. *Jurnal Ekonomi*, 10(02), 58-66. <https://doi.org/10.58471/ekonomi.v10i02.146>
- Mao, Q., Kaewnuch, K., & Fu, J. (2025). Staff Incentives and Career Development Expectations in Chinese Homegrown Hotels: Situational Overview, Determinant Analysis, Motivational Linkages, and Incentive Model Design. *International Journal of Environmental Sciences*, 184-195. <https://doi.org/10.64252/d4h0j264>
- Mubarok, N. W., Hidayatunisa, N. F., Rahayu, N., & Nurbayanti, N. L. (2020). Analisis sumber daya manusia (SDM) PT. Weha Transportasi Indonesia Tbk. *AKSELERASI: Jurnal Ilmiah Nasional*, 2(2), 114-122. <https://doi.org/10.15575/jim.v2i1.12474>
- Nanda, A., Soelton, M., Luiza, S., & Saratian, E. T. P. (2020, February). The effect of psychological work environment and work loads on turnover interest, work stress as an intervening variable. In *4th international conference on management, economics and business (ICMEB 2019)* (pp. 225-231). Atlantis Press. <https://doi.org/10.2991/aebmr.k.200205.040>
- Norbu, J., & Wetprasit, P. (2021). The study of job motivational factors and its influence on job satisfaction for hotel employees of Thimphu, Bhutan. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*, 22(2), 245-266. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1528008X.2020.1769524>
- Rifka, F. R., Harahap, N., Sari, R. P. E., Suwarno, S., & Widiyati, D. (2025). Analisis Komparatif Kinerja Keuangan Industri Perhotelan Di Indonesia: Sebelum, Saat, Dan Pasca Pandemi Covid-19. *Journal of Innovation Research and Knowledge*, 5(2), 1835-1848.
- Robertson, I. T., & Cooper, C. L. (2010). Full engagement: the integration of employee engagement and psychological well-being. *Leadership & organization development journal*, 31(4), 324-336. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437731011043348>

- Sari, K. A. O., Sunata, I. M., & Sumerta, I. K. E. (2021). Pengaruh Komunikasi Dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Semangat Kerja Karyawan Pada The Bene Hotel Kuta. *Journal Research of Management*, 3(1), 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.51713/jarma.v3i1.55>
- Sun, L. Y., Aryee, S., & Law, K. S. (2007). High-performance human resource practices, citizenship behavior, and organizational performance: A relational perspective. *Academy of management Journal*, 50(3), 558-577. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2007.25525821>
- Tsaur, S. H., & Lin, Y. C. (2004). Promoting service quality in tourist hotels: the role of HRM practices and service behavior. *Tourism management*, 25(4), 471-481. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177\(03\)00117-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(03)00117-1)
- Wijaya, N. S., Arcana, K. T. P., & Sudarmawan, I. W. E. (2019). The role of tourism destination and human resources in sustainable tourism implementation in Indonesia. *Journal of Business on Hospitality and Tourism*, 5(2), 228-237. <https://doi.org/10.22334/jbhost.v5i2.170>