
The Effect of Motivation, Work Discipline, and Work Environment on Employee Job Satisfaction at Platinum Hotel & Convention Hall Balikpapan

Nur Luthfiyyah Tony*, Imam Arrywibowo, Marlindawaty

Universitas Balikpapan, Indonesia

Email: nur.luthfiyyah24@gmail.com*, imam@uniba-bpn.ac.id, marlinda@uniba-bpn.ac.id

Abstract

Keywords:

motivation; work discipline; work environment; job satisfaction

The hospitality industry in Balikpapan is experiencing significant growth due to the development of the Nusantara Capital City (IKN), leading to intense competition among four-star hotels. Platinum Hotel & Convention Hall Balikpapan faces challenges in maintaining service quality and employee performance, making job satisfaction a crucial factor in organizational success. Job satisfaction is influenced by various factors, including motivation, work discipline, and the work environment. This study aims to analyze the influence of motivation, work discipline, and work environment on employee job satisfaction at Platinum Hotel & Convention Hall Balikpapan. This study uses a quantitative approach with a survey method. Data were obtained through the distribution of questionnaires to 98 employees who were designated as research samples, with the selection criteria being employees who had worked for more than two years. The data analysis method used is Partial Least Squares (PLS), with the help of SmartPLS software. The results of the study show that motivation has a positive and significant effect on employee job satisfaction. Work discipline also has a positive and significant effect on employee job satisfaction. In addition, the work environment has a positive and significant effect on employee job satisfaction. These findings indicate that increasing work motivation, applying work discipline consistently, and creating a conducive work environment can improve employee job satisfaction at Platinum Hotel & Convention Hall Balikpapan.

INTRODUCTION

The tourism and hospitality sector is one of the strategic areas in supporting Indonesia's economic growth. In the era of the development of the Nusantara Capital City (IKN), this dynamic is increasingly prominent due to the increase in business mobility, government activities, visits between regions, and the need to provide professional accommodation facilities. The presence of the IKN in East Kalimantan directly triggered a surge in demand for hospitality services, especially those that provide complete facilities for meetings, conferences, and business activities on large and small scales. This condition makes the hotel industry a rapidly growing sector and plays an important role in supporting regional economic activities (Serve) *et al.*, 2025).

Among the various hotels operating in East Kalimantan, Hotel Platinum Balikpapan is one of the four-star accommodation service providers that has a strategic position. Platinum Hotel & Convention Hall Balikpapan offers professional support facilities, such as meeting rooms, ballrooms, and convention services that are able to accommodate various formal

activities. With the increasing intensity of visits and the complexity of guest needs, strengthening the quality of human resources is an important factor to maintain and increase visitor satisfaction levels in a sustainable manner (Siregar *et al.*, 2025).

Despite having complete facilities and services, Platinum Hotel & Convention Hall Balikpapan faces the challenge of stiff competition from other four-star hotels in Balikpapan City, such as Swiss-Belhotel Balikpapan, Four Points by Sheraton Balikpapan, Astara Hotel Balikpapan, Blue Sky Hotel Balikpapan, Grand Jatra Hotel, and Golden Tulip Balikpapan Hotel & Suites. This condition requires Platinum Hotel & Convention Hall Balikpapan to continue to improve the quality of services and maintain its reputation in the midst of significant growth in the hospitality industry. This condition is increasingly important to pay attention to considering the development of the performance of the hotel sector in Balikpapan showing a significant increase.

The success of a company's performance is highly determined by the quality of human resources owned by the company. This is done to answer the challenges of the times that always require high-quality human resources (Student) *et al.*, 2022). Human Resource Management (HRDM) is an recognition of the importance of the organization's workforce as a resource that contributes to the goals of the organization, in its management and use it can be ensured that these human resources can be managed effectively and fairly for the benefit of individuals, organizations and society (Babullah, 2024).

Job satisfaction is one of the important aspects of human resource management, as it reflects the extent to which employees feel comfortable, appreciated, and met in the work environment (Galu & Fahrul, 2025). Employees who have high job satisfaction tend to show better performance, have stable motivation, and contribute positively to the organization's image and reputation (Praditya) *et al.*, 2025). Job satisfaction is a worker's assessment of how well the overall job meets their needs. Job satisfaction is also a common attitude that is the result of some specific attitudes towards work factors, self-adjustment and individual social relationships outside of work (Munandar, 2021). Employee job satisfaction is influenced by various factors such as motivation, work discipline, and work environment (Dzulhaq & Firdaus, 2024)

One of the factors that affect job satisfaction is motivation, (Sri) *et al.*, 2024). Employee motivation has an important role for the company because it can be a driver for individuals to carry out an activity optimally. (Esisuarni *et al.*, 2024) Motivation is a potential force that exists in a person, which can develop on its own or be influenced by various external factors, both material and non-material, which can affect their performance positively or negatively depending on the situation and conditions faced. Research results (Gunawan & Heryanda, 2021) Stating motivation has a positive and significant effect on employee job satisfaction. However, in the study (Student) *et al.*, 2022) stating that motivation has no significant effect on employee job satisfaction.

In addition to motivation, work discipline is a factor that can affect employee job satisfaction (Safрила & Oktiani, 2024). (Ariesni & Asnur, 2023) Work discipline is an act carried out by employees in accordance with both written and unwritten regulations. (Farikhah & Prayekti, 2024) stating that work discipline has a significant effect on employee job satisfaction. However, research (Adipura & Puspitasari, 2022) stating that work discipline does not have a

significant effect on employee job satisfaction. Work Discipline regulates how employees comply with established rules, rules, and work standards.

The work environment also plays a big role in influencing employee job satisfaction levels (Jumani & Rianto, 2023). (Qurbi & Saroyo, 2023) The work environment is a physical and non-physical state that can affect employees both directly and indirectly. One of the factors that affect the success rate of a company or organization is the work environment. (Amanda & Adrian, 2024) stating that the work environment has a significant effect on employee job satisfaction. However, in the study (Lestari *et al.*, 2024) stating that the work environment does not have a significant effect on employee job satisfaction. With a conducive work environment, employees can feel safe and work optimally. In addition to a supportive work environment, it can encourage good interpersonal relationships, collaboration, and a sense of attachment to the company.

Based on the differences in the results of the studies mentioned above, the researcher became interested in writing “The Influence of Motivation, Work Discipline, and Work Environment on Employee Job Satisfaction at Platinum Hotel & Convention Hall Balikpapan.” In line with the problem formulation, this study aims to achieve the following objectives: to determine the effect of motivation on employee job satisfaction at Platinum Hotel & Convention Hall Balikpapan, to determine the effect of work discipline on employee job satisfaction at Platinum Hotel & Convention Hall Balikpapan, and to determine the effect of the work environment on employee job satisfaction at Platinum Hotel & Convention Hall Balikpapan.

This research is expected to provide both theoretical and practical benefits. Theoretically, it contributes to human resource management literature by enriching the understanding of how motivation, work discipline, and work environment influence employee job satisfaction in the hospitality industry, serving as a reference for future researchers. Practically, the findings offer valuable insights for Platinum Hotel & Convention Hall Balikpapan management to formulate HR policies, including improving motivation through incentive programs, strengthening work discipline, and creating a conducive work environment to enhance job satisfaction. Ultimately, these efforts can improve employee performance, reduce turnover, and strengthen the hotel’s competitiveness amid the growing hospitality industry in Balikpapan alongside the development of the Nusantara Capital City (IKN).

RESEARCH METHODS

Types of Research

The type of research used in this study is quantitative method research. (Sugiyono, 2019, p. 15) Quantitative methods are research methods based on the philosophy of positivism, used to research on certain populations or samples, data collection using research instruments. Data analysis is quantitative, namely to describe and test the hypothesis that has been determined. In this context, the researcher chooses the quantitative research method because it is systematic and structured in the research process.

Population and Sample

Population

According to (Sugiyono, 2019, p. 130) Population is an area consisting of objects or subjects that have certain qualities and characteristics that the researcher sets to study and draw

conclusions. The population in this study is 200 employees of Platinum Hotel & Convention Hall Balikpapan. Consists of 5 permanent employees of the A&G division and *Housekeeping*, 120 contract employees of A&G DIVISION, BOD, *Engineering*, F&B, *Front Office*, *Housekeeping*, *Human Resource* And the joy, *Sales & Marketing*, and *Room Division* consisting of 98 contract employees with a service period of more than two years and 22 contract employees with a service period of less than 2 years and 75 *Daily Worker* A&G division, *Engineering*, F&B, *Front Office*, *Housekeeping*, and *Human Resource*.

Sample

(Sugiyono, 2019, p. 127) In quantitative research, a sample is a part of the number and characteristics that the population has. If the population is large, and it is impossible for researchers to study everything in a population, for example due to limited resources, manpower and time, then researchers can use samples taken from that population. What is learned from the sample, the conclusion will be applicable to the population. For this reason, the samples taken from the population must be truly representative. The sampling techniques that will be used in this study are *Purposive Sampling*.

Purposive sampling is one of the sampling techniques *Nonprobability Sampling* Where the researcher determines sampling with certain considerations and chooses special characteristics according to the researcher's goals so that it is hoped that this will help answer the researcher's problems (Sugiyono, 2019, p. 133). The criteria set are contract employees who have worked for more than 2 (two) years, a total of 98 contract employees consisting of 16 F&Bs *Service*, 16 F&B *Product*, 11 *Front Office*, 12 *House Keeping*, 4 *House Laundry*, 7 *Engineering*, 1 *Board of Directors* (BOD), 12 A&G, 3 *Kalimaya Spa Coordinator*, 2 *Room Division*, and 7 *Sales & Marketing*.

Data Analysis Methods

The data analysis method of this study is a quantitative method, in this study it uses multiple linear regression analysis with the PLS (*Partial Least Square*) method which processing and presentation are carried out using Smart-PLS Software. *Partial Least Squares* is a powerful method of analysis and is often called OLS (*Ordinary Least Squares*). Basically, *Partial Least Square* (PLS) was developed to test weak theories and data.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Characteristics of Respondent Data

This respondent characteristic section describes the identity of respondents based on gender, age, length of service, and educational background. The respondents in this study totaled 98 people. The data derived from the number of samples corresponded to the number of questionnaires returned by the respondents that could be processed, resulting in the same total of 98. Thus, based on the completed questionnaires from 98 respondents, data on gender, age, working period, and education level were obtained to describe the general profile of the respondents.

Of the 98 respondents (100%), 12 respondents (12.24%) worked in the A&G Division, 1 respondent (1.02%) worked in the BOD Division, 7 respondents (7.14%) worked in the Engineering Division, 32 respondents (32.65%) worked in the F&B Division, 11 respondents (11.22%) worked in the Front Office Division, 16 respondents (16.33%) worked in the Housekeeping Division, 7 respondents (7.14%) worked in the Human Resource Division, 3

respondents (3.06%) worked in the Kalimaya Division, 2 respondents (2.04%) worked in the Room Division, and 7 respondents (7.14%) worked in the Sales & Marketing Division. Thus, the majority of respondents were from the F&B Division, followed by the Housekeeping Division, A&G Division, and Front Office Division. Other divisions such as Engineering, Human Resource, and Sales & Marketing had fewer respondents, while the Kalimaya Division and Room Division had smaller proportions, and the BOD Division had the fewest respondents overall. Of the total 98 respondents (100%), there were 53 male respondents (54.1%) and 45 female respondents (45.9%).

Based on age, out of the 98 respondents, 21 respondents (21.4%) were under 21 years old, 72 respondents (73.5%) were between 21–30 years old, 3 respondents (3.1%) were between 30–40 years old, and 2 respondents (2.0%) were over 40 years old. Therefore, most respondents were in the 21–30 age group.

Regarding work period, of 98 respondents (100%), 86 respondents (87.8%) had worked for 2 years, 6 respondents (6.1%) had worked for 3–4 years, 2 respondents (2.0%) had worked for 4–5 years, and 4 respondents (4.1%) had worked for more than 5 years. Thus, the majority of respondents had a working period of 2 years.

At Platinum Hotel & Convention Hall Balikpapan, 59 respondents (60.2%) had completed high school or vocational education, 14 respondents (14.3%) held a Diploma (D3) degree, and 25 respondents (25.5%) had an undergraduate (S1) degree, while none had a postgraduate (S2) qualification. Therefore, the majority of respondents had completed high school or vocational education.

Description of Motivation Variables (X₁)

The results of respondents' responses to the Motivation variable (X₁) measured through indicators, can be seen in the table below:

Table 1. Response of Motivational Variable Respondent Frequency (X₁)

Indicator	Answer	Quantity	Percentage
Physiological Needs (X1.1)	Strongly agree	39	39,8%
	Agree	35	35,7%
	Hesitation	18	18,4%
	Disagree	6	6,1%
	Strongly Disagree	0	0%
	Total		98
Sense of Security (X1.2)	Strongly agree	44	44,9%
	Agree	33	33,7%
	Hesitation	15	15,3%
	Disagree	5	5,1%
	Strongly Disagree	1	1,0%
	Total		98
Social Needs (X1.3)	Strongly agree	40	40,8%
	Agree	31	31,6%
	Hesitation	21	21,4%
	Disagree	6	6,1%
	Strongly Disagree	0	0%
	Total		98
Award Requirements (X1.4)	Strongly agree	43	43,9%
	Agree	30	30,6%

Indicator	Answer	Quantity	Percentage
Self-Actualization Needs (X1.5)	Hesitation	18	18,4%
	Disagree	6	6,1%
	Strongly Disagree	1	1,0%
	Total	98	100%
	Strongly agree	42	42,9%
	Agree	34	34,7%
	Hesitation	15	15,3%
	Disagree	7	7,1%
	Strongly Disagree	0	0%
	Total	98	100%

Source: *SmartPLS Output* and Processed Data (2026)

The respondents' responses to the motivation variable (X1) in the first indicator, namely physiological needs (X1.1), showed that as many as 39 people (39.8%) expressed strongly agreement and 35 people (35.7%) expressed agreement. In addition, 18 people (18.4%) expressed hesitation and 6 people (6.1%) expressed disagreement and no one gave a very disagreeable response (0%).

The respondents' response to the motivation variable (X1) in the second indicator, namely the need for a sense of security (X1.2), showed that as many as 44 people (44.9%) expressed strongly agree and 33 people (33.7%) expressed agreement. In addition, 15 people (15.3%) expressed hesitation, 5 people (5.1%) expressed disagreement and 1 person (1.0%) expressed strongly disagree.

Respondents' responses to the motivation variable (X1) in the third indicator, namely social needs (X1.3), showed that as many as 40 people (40.8%) expressed strongly agree and 31 people (31.6%) expressed agreement. In addition, 21 people (21.4%) expressed hesitation and 6 people (6.1%) expressed disagreement and no one gave a very disagreeable response (0%).

Respondents' responses to the motivation variable (X1) in the fourth indicator, namely the need for an award (X1.4), showed that as many as 43 people (43.9%) expressed strongly agreement and 30 people (30.6%) expressed agreement. In addition, 18 people (18.4%) expressed hesitation, 6 people (6.1%) expressed disagreement and 1 person (1.0%) expressed strongly disagree.

People's responses to the motivation variable (X1) in the fifth indicator, namely self-actualization needs (X1.5), showed that as many as 42 people (42.9%) expressed strongly agree and 34 people (34.7%) expressed agreement. In addition, 15 people (15.3%) expressed hesitation and 7 people (7.1%) expressed disagreement and no one gave a very disagreeable response (0%).

Based on the summary of the overall response results, an overview of the respondents' responses to the motivation variable (X1) can be seen in the table below:

Table 2. Response to the Average Frequency of the Motivation Variable (x1)

Average Interval	Respondent's Response	Score	Quantity	Percentage
4,20-5,00	Strongly agree	5	45	45,92%
3,40-4,20	Agree	4	33	34%
2,60-3,40	Hesitation	3	14	14,29%

1,80-2,60	Disagree	2	6	6,12%
1,00-1,80	Strongly Disagree	1	0	0%
Total			98	100%

Source: Data processed by the author (2026)

Based on the results of respondents' responses to the motivation variable (X1) as shown in table 2, it is known that respondents who strongly agreed with the average score interval of 4.20-5.00 amounted to 45 people or (45.92%), as many as 33 people or (34%) were in the average score of 3.40-4.20 with the agree category, as many as 14 people or (14.29%) were in the average score interval of 2.60-3.40 with the hesitant category and as many as 6 people or as many as (6.12%) was in the score interval of 1.80-2.60 with the category of disagree, there were no respondents who gave a very disagreeable response. This shows that in general, respondents have a high level of work motivation.

Description of Work Discipline Variables (X2)

The results of respondents' responses to the variable (X2) measured through the indicator, can be seen in the table below:

Table 3. Response to Respondent Frequency of Work Discipline Variables (X2)

Indicator	Answer	Quantity	Percentage
Attendance Rate (X2.1)	Strongly agree	45	45,9
	Agree	35	35,7
	Hesitation	13	13,3
	Disagree	5	5,1
	Strongly Disagree	0	0%
	Total		98
Procedure (X2.2)	Strongly agree	41	41,8
	Agree	44	44,9
	Hesitation	7	7,1
	Disagree	6	6,1
	Strongly Disagree	0	0%
	Total		98
Obedience to Superiors (x2.3)	Strongly agree	50	51,0
	Agree	33	33,7
	Hesitation	10	10,2
	Disagree	5	5,1
	Strongly Disagree	0	0%
	Total		98
Working Awareness (X2.4)	Strongly agree	44	44,9
	Agree	36	36,7
	Hesitation	9	9,2
	Disagree	9	9,2
	Strongly Disagree	0	0%
	Total		98
Responsibilities (X2.5)	Strongly agree	49	50,0
	Agree	35	35,7
	Hesitation	11	11,2
	Disagree	3	3,1
	Strongly Disagree	0	0%
	Total		98

Total	98	100%
--------------	-----------	-------------

Source: *SmartPLS Output* and Processed Data (2026)

Respondents' responses to the work discipline variable (X2) on the attendance rate indicator (X2.1) showed that as many as 45 people (45.9%) said they strongly agreed and 35 people (35.7%) said they agreed. In addition, 13 people (13.3%) expressed hesitation and 5 people (5.1%) expressed disagreement and no one gave a strongly disagreeable response (0%).

Respondents' responses to the work discipline variable (X2) on the work etiquette indicator (X2.2) showed that as many as 41 people (41.8%) expressed strongly agreement and 44 people (44.9%) expressed agreement. In addition, 7 people (7.1%) expressed hesitation and 6 people (6.1%) expressed disagreement and agree and no one gave a strongly disagree response (0%).

Respondents' responses to the work discipline variable (X2) on the employer compliance indicator (X2.3) showed that 50 people (51.0%) strongly agreed and 33 people (33.7%) agreed with it. In addition, 10 people (10.2%) expressed hesitation and 5 people (5.1%) expressed disagreement and no one gave a very disagreeable response (0%).

Respondents' responses to the work discipline variable (X2) on the work awareness indicator (X2.4) showed that as many as 44 people (44.9%) said they strongly agreed and 36 people (36.7%) said they agreed. In addition, 9 people (9.2%) expressed hesitation and 9 people (9.2%) expressed disagreement and no one gave a strongly disagreeable response (0%).

Respondents' responses to the work discipline variable (X2) on the responsibility indicator (X2.5) showed that as many as 49 people (50.0%) said they strongly agreed and 35 people (35.7%) said they agreed. In addition, 11 people (11.2%) expressed hesitation and 3 people (3.1%) expressed disagreement and no one gave a very disagreeable response (0%).

Table 4. Response to the Average Frequency of the Work Discipline Variable (X2)

Average Interval	Respondent's Response	Score	Quantity	Percentage
4,20-5,00	Strongly agree	5	54	55,10%
3,40-4,20	Agree	4	29	30%
2,60-3,40	Hesitation	3	10	10,20%
1,80-2,60	Disagree	2	5	5,10%
1,00-1,80	Strongly Disagree	1	0	0%
Total			98	100%

Source: Data processed by the author (2026)

Based on the results of the respondents' responses to the work discipline variable (X2) as shown in table 4, it is known that the respondents who gave the responses strongly agreed at the average score interval of 4.20-5.00 amounting to 54 people or (55.10%), as many as 29 people or (30%) were at an average score of 3.40-4.20 with the category of agree, as many as 10 people or (10.20%) were at the average score interval of 2.60-3.40 with the hesitant category and as many as 5 people or (5.10%) were in the score range of 1.80-2.60 with the category of disagree, there were no respondents who gave a very disagreeable response. This shows that in general, respondents have a high level of work discipline.

4. Description of Work Environment Variables (X3)

The results of respondents' responses to the variable (X3) which are measured through the following indicators:

Table 5. Response to the Frequency of Respondents of the Work Environment Variable (X3)

Indicator	Answer	Quantity	Percentage
Peer Relations at the Same Level (X3.1)	Strongly agree	36	36,7
	Agree	36	36,7
	Hesitation	20	20,4
	Disagree	6	6,1
	Strongly Disagree	0	0%
	Total		98
Employer-employee relationship (x3.2)	Strongly agree	42	42,9
	Agree	33	33,7
	Hesitation	17	17,3
	Disagree	5	5,1
	Strongly Disagree	1	1,0
	Total		98
Collaboration Between Employees (x3,3)	Strongly agree	43	43,9
	Agree	32	32,7
	Hesitation	18	18,4
	Disagree	5	5,1
	Strongly Disagree	0	0%
	Total		98

Source: *SmartPLS Output* and Processed Data (2026)

Respondents' responses to the work environment variable (X3) on the peer relationship indicator (X3.1) showed that 36 people (36.7%) strongly agreed and 36 people (36.7%) said they agreed. In addition, 20 people (20.4%) expressed hesitation and 6 people (6.1%) expressed disagreement and no one gave a very disagreeable response (0%).

Respondents' responses to the work environment variable (X3) on the employer-employee relationship indicator (X3.2) showed that as many as 42 people (42.9%) expressed strongly agreement and 33 people (33.7%) expressed agreement. Furthermore, 17 people (17.3%) expressed hesitation, 5 people (5.1%) expressed disagreement, and 1 person (1.0%) expressed strongly disagree.

Respondents' responses to the work environment variable (X3) on the employee cooperation indicator (X3.3) showed that as many as 43 people (43.9%) expressed strongly agreement and 32 people (32.7%) expressed agreement. In addition, 18 people (18.4%) expressed hesitation and 5 people (5.1%) expressed disagreement and no one gave a very disagreeable response (0%).

Table 6. Response to the Average Frequency of the Work Environment Variable (x3)

Average Interval	Respondent's Response	Score	Quantity	Percentage
4,20-5,00	Strongly agree	5	50	51,02%
3,40-4,20	Agree	4	26	27%
2,60-3,40	Hesitation	3	17	17,35%
1,80-2,60	Disagree	2	5	5,10%

1,00-1,80	Strongly Disagree	1	0	0%
Total			98	100%

Source: Data processed by the author (2026)

Based on the results of respondents' responses to the work environment variable (X3) as shown in table 4.14, it is known that respondents who strongly agreed with the average score interval of 4.20-5.00 amounted to 50 people or (51.02%), as many as 26 people or (27%) were at an average score of 3.40-4.20 with the agree category, as many as 17 people or (17.35%) were at the average score interval of 2.60-3.40 with the hesitant category and as many as 5 people or (5.10%) were in the score range of 1.80-2.60 with the category of disagree, there were no respondents who gave a very disagreeable response. This shows that in general, respondents have a high level of work environment.

Research Instruments

Outer Measurement Model Construct Reflection Indicator

The analysis of construct measurement models with reflective indicators wants to see the validity of each indicator and test the reliability of the construct. The indicator validity criteria are measured by *convergent validity* and *discriminant validity*. The *loading factor* and AVE values were obtained from *convergent validity* testing, *cross loading* and *fornell-lacker* values were obtained from *discriminant validity testing*. Meanwhile, construct reliability is measured by *composite reliability* and *Cronbach"s alpha*.

Validity Test

Convergent Validity

The *convergent validity* of the indicator reflection measurement model is assessed based on the correlation between *the component score item and the construct score* calculated with PLS. The size of the individual reflection is said to be high if it correlates more than 0.07 with the contrast to be measured. However, for the initial stage of research from the development of the measurement scale of the loading value of 0.5 to 0.6, it is considered sufficient. The output value *of outer loading* must be above 0.5 so that it can be said to be valid.

Table 7. Value Outer Loading

Indicator	Motivation (X1)	Work Discipline (X2)	Work Environment (X3)	Job Satisfaction (Y)
X1.1	0,876			
X1.2	0,885			
X1.3	0,906			
X1.4	0,860			
X1.5	0,893			
X2.1		0,948		
X2.2		0,906		
X2.3		0,929		
X2.4		0,838		
X2.5		0,799		
X3.1			0,887	
X3.2			0,910	
X3.3			0,903	

Indicator	Motivation (X1)	Work Discipline (X2)	Work Environment (X3)	Job Satisfaction (Y)
Y1				0,905
Y2				0,928
Y3				0,912
Y4				0,889
Y5				0,868
Y6				0,845

Source: *SmartPLS Output* and Processed Data (2026)

Based on the test results in table 7, it shows that all indicators have a *loading factor* value of >0.07 , so *the loading* value has met the requirements and it can be said that all indicators are valid.

In addition to *the loading factor*, the convergent validity test can be seen from the *Average Variance Extracted (AVE)* value. The AVE value criteria must be >0.50 .

Table 8. Value Average Variance Extraceted (AVE)

	<i>Average Variance Extraceted (AVE)</i>
Motivation _X1	0,782
Work Discipline _X2	0,785
_X3 Work Environment	0,810
Job Satisfaction _Y	0,795

Source : *SmartPLS Output* and Processed Data (2026)

Based on the test results in table 8, the AVE value for each of the above construct variables is >0.5 , so the construct has good validity and can be said to be valid.

Diacriminant Validity

The Convergent Validity in the reflective measurement model is assessed through the correlation between the indicator's score and its construct score. The validity of the convergence can be seen from the value of *the loading factor* or *outer loading*. An indicator is said to meet convergent validity if it has a loading factor value of more than 0.70 to the constructed being measured. However, in the early stages of scale development research, loading values between 0.50 to 0.60 are still acceptable. In general, an outer loading value above 0.50 is considered valid.

Table 9. Value Cross Loading

Variable	Motivation X1	Discipline Work X2	X3 Work Environment	Job Satisfaction _Y
X1.1	0,876	0,559	0,642	0,611
X1.2	0,885	0,468	0,589	0,612
X1.3	0,906	0,442	0,587	0,662
X1.4	0,860	0,435	0,565	0,597
X1.5	0,893	0,473	0,525	0,579
X2.1	0,551	0,948	0,528	0,640
X2.2	0,550	0,906	0,536	0,617

X2.3	0,524	0,929	0,495	0,575
X2.4	0,386	0,838	0,479	0,479
X2.5	0,285	0,799	0,308	0,344
X3.1	0,563	0,482	0,887	0,587
X3.2	0,577	0,515	0,910	0,630
X3.3	0,640	0,465	0,903	0,597
Y1	0,635	0,574	0,580	0,905
Y2	0,647	0,555	0,584	0,928
Y3	0,663	0,632	0,591	0,912
Y4	0,584	0,588	0,623	0,889
Y5	0,582	0,496	0,611	0,868
Y6	0,596	0,449	0,613	0,845

Source: *SmartPLS Output* and Processed Data (2026)

Based on the test results from table 9, it can be seen that the construct indicator has a higher correlation compared to other indicators. So it can be said that all indicators in the discriminatory test are valid.

Table 10. Discriminant Validity Value *Fornel-Lercker Crietion*

Variable	Motivation (X1)	Work Discipline (X2)	Work Environment (X3)	Job Satisfaction (Y)
Motivation (X1)	0,884			
Work Discipline (X2)	0,537	0,886		
Work Environment (X3)	0,659	0,542	0,900	
Job Satisfaction (Y)	0,694	0,618	0,672	0,892

Source: *SmartPLS Output* and Processed Data (2026)

The results of table 4.18 show that the square value of the root of AVE is more than other constructs so it can be said that all constructs are valid or contracts already have good *discriminant validity*.

Reliability Test

The measurement of the reliability test was carried out by looking at *Cronbach's Alpha* and Composite *Reliability* values. The data is said to have high reliability if it has a *Composite Reliability* value of > 0.60. *Cronbach's Alpha* value is used to reinforce the results of *Composite Reliability*. *Cronbach's Alpha* value is declared reliable if the value is > 0.70. The results of *Composite Reliability* and *Cronbach's alpha* can be seen in table 4.19

All variables have good reliability, according to the data in Table 4.19 which shows that *the Composite Reliability* has exceeded 0.06. In addition, *Cronbach's alpha* value higher than 0.70 indicates that all indications have met the dependency requirements.

Inner Measurement Construct Model Reflective Indicator

Multicollegiate Test

The Multicollinearity test aims to test the minifest in blocks whether there is a multicol between these variables. The technique used to test this is the *Inflation Factor* (VIF) variance

value. The value of < 5 is stated that there is no multicoll between constructs and the VIF value > 10 is stated to be multicoll between constructs

Table 11. Value Variance Inflation Factor (VIVID)

Motivati on _X1	Work Discipline _X2	_X3 Work Environment	Job Satisfacti on _Y
Motivation _X1			1,923
Work Discipline X2			1,541
_X3 Work Environment			1,937
Job Satisfaction Y			

Source: *SmartPLS Output* and Processed Data (2026)

Based on table 11 above, the results of *the multicollinearity test of Collinearity Statistics* (VIF) show that *the inner VIF values* of the motivation variable are 1.923, the inner value of the work discipline variable is 1.541 and the inner value of the work environment variable is 1.937. From the value of each variable in table 4.20, it is known that the VIF value is < 10 , so it is stated that there is no multicollinear.

Data Analysis

R-Square (R2)

The influence of independent latent (exogenous) variables on dependent (endogenous) variables can be assessed using R-square values. A score of 0.67 indicates a very good model, a value of 0.33 indicates a moderate influence and a value of 0.19 indicates a weak influence, in accordance with the requirements of the R-Square value of the dependent variable (oxygen)

Table 12. R-Square Value

	R Square	R Square Adjusted
Job Satisfaction _Y	0,609	0,597

Source: *SmartPLS Output* and Processed Data (2026)

Based on table 12 above, it shows that the R square value is 0.609 or 60.9% and the R-Square Adjusted value is 0.597 or 59.7%. Therefore, the R-Square Adjusted value shows that the work satisfaction variable that can be explained by the variables of motivation, work discipline and work environment is 59.7% while 40.3% is explained by other variables that are not studied in this study, so it can be said that the R-Square value in the work satisfaction variable is good.

Effect Size (F2)

The *Effect Size* (F2) value can be used to measure how much a latent variable affects a structural model. Very small influence is shown with an *Effect Size* F2 value of 0.02, moderate influence is shown with a value of 0.15 and a very significant influence is shown with a value of 0.35. The magnitude of the relationship between the latent variable and the other variables in the model with the other variables in the model is thus quantitatively described through the *Effect Size* (F2) value.

Table 13. Effect Size (F2)

X1 Motivation	Work Discipline X2	X3 Work Environment	Job Satisfaction Y
X1 Motivation			0,170
Work Discipline X2			0,119
X3 Work Environment			0,112
Job Satisfaction Y			

Source: *SmartPLS Output* and Processed Data (2026)

Based on table 13 above, it shows that the F2 value of each variable has the following criterion values: The F2 value of the motivation variable on job satisfaction is 0.170 which means that the latent variable has a medium influence, the F2 value of the work discipline variable on job satisfaction is 0.119 which means that the latent variable has a medium influence and the F2 value of the work environment variable on employee job satisfaction is 0.112 which means that the latent variable has a medium effect on the work environment weak influence.

Model FIT

The FIT model is seen at the *Standardized Root Mean Square Residual* (SRMR) value and the *Normal Fit Index* (NFI) value. A good NFI value must be above 0.09 and an SRMR value above 0.8, then the model is considered to have good criteria. The results of the FIT model can be described in table 14 below.

Table 14. Fit Model Value

	Saturated Model	Estimated Model
SRMR	0,065	0,065
d_ ULS	0,806	0,806
d_ G	0,807	0,807
Chi-Square	419,024	419,024
NFI	0,796	0,796

Source: *SmartPLS Output* and Processed Data (2026)

Based on table 14, it shows an SRMR value of 0.065 which means that the SRMR value has not met the >0.08 value criteria, so it is said to be marginal. Meanwhile, the NFI value shows a value of 0.796 which means that the value is below the NFI criterion >0.90 so it can be said to be less fit.

Equation Model

The equation model can be explained that the magnitude of the coefficient of motivation parameters is 0.358, the coefficient of the work discipline path is 0.268 and the coefficient of the work environment is 0.29. So the equation model is as follows.

$$Y = 0.358 X1 + 0.268 X2 + 0.291 X3$$

The equation has meanings, namely:

- a. The motivation coefficient (X1) of 0.358 means that the motivation (X1) has the ability to explain job satisfaction (Y) of 0.358 or 35.8%.

- b. The training coefficient (X2) of 0.268 means that the work discipline (X2) has the ability to explain job satisfaction (Y) of 0.268 or 26.8%.
- c. The coefficient of the work environment (X3) of 0.291 means that the work environment (X3) has the ability to explain job satisfaction (Y) of 0.291 or 29.1%.

Hypothesis Testing (*Resampling Bootscraping*)

Hypothesis testing was carried out by comparing t-statistic and t-table values to find out whether or not there was an influence between variables. The test is carried out through the t-test by looking at the path coefficient value in the inner model test. The significance value of p-value is 0.05 (5%), then t-statistic > table t-value (1.196). The t-statistic value was obtained from the results of *bootscraping* using the *SmartPLS program*. The criteria for the t-test are as follows:

- a. With a significant p-value of 0.05 (5%), if the t-statistical value > the table t-value (1.96), then the variables X1, X2 and X3 have a partial effect on Y.
- b. With a significant p-value of 0.05 (5%) if the value of t-Statistics < the value of the t table (1.96) then the variables X1, X2 and X3 does not have a direct effect on Y.

Table 15. Test Scores *Path Coefficients*

	Original Sample (O)	Sample Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (STDEV)	T Statistics (O/STDEV)	P Values
Motivation_X1 -> Job Satisfaction_Y	0,358	0,347	0,118	3.040	0,002
Work Discipline_X2 > Job Satisfaction_Y	0,268	0,272	0,089	3.001	0,003
_X3 Work Environment -> Job Satisfaction_Y	0,291	0,291	0,128	2,281	0,023

Source: *SmartPLS Output* and Processed Data (2026)

- Based on the data from the table above, the results of the hypothesis are explained as follows:
- a. The first hypothesis tests whether the Motivation variable (X1) has an effect on the work satisfaction variable (Y). The test results showed a p-value value of 0.002 or less than 0.05. As well as a statistical value of 3,040 or greater than 1.96. This proves that the motivation variable (X1) has influence and is partially significant so that it can be concluded that the first hypothesis is acceptable.
 - b. The second hypothesis tests whether the Work Discipline variable (X2) has an effect on the work satisfaction variable (Y). The test results showed a p-value value of 0.003 or less than 0.05. As well as a statistical value of 3,001 or greater than 1.96. This proves that the variable of work discipline (X2) has an influence and is partially significant so that it can be concluded that the second hypothesis is acceptable.
 - c. The third hypothesis tests whether the Work Environment variable (X3) has an effect on the work satisfaction variable (Y). The test results showed a *p-value* value of 0.023 or less than 0.05. As well as a statistical value of 2.281 or greater than 1.96. This proves that the work environment variable (X3) has a partial influence and significance so that it can be concluded that the third hypothesis is acceptable.

Discussion of Research Results

The results of this study present data obtained from the collection of questionnaires. Based on the results of data processing, it can be seen that the three hypotheses proposed are acceptable. This shows that there is a significant influence between independent variables and dependent variables. The following is a discussion related to the influence of variables according to the hypothesis proposed.

The Effect of Motivation (X1) on Employee Job Satisfaction (Y)

From the results of the hypothesis test, the results of the analysis were obtained, namely the motivation variable (X1) which affects the job satisfaction (Y) of employees at Platinum Hotel & Convention Hall Balikpapan. Thus, it can be concluded that motivation has an influence on job satisfaction. This is evidenced by the respondents' responses which show that in the motivation variable, the indicator of security needs with the highest level of agreement, the second indicator of appreciation needs, the third indicator of self-actualization needs, the fourth indicator of social needs and the physiological need indicator.

Thus, it can be concluded that motivation is everything that encourages a person's behavior to meet their needs. When employees have high motivation, they will be encouraged to carry out their duties well and optimally. This can ultimately increase their job satisfaction in achieving the needs they want to meet. The results of the research that have been carried out today are in line with the results of previous research that has been carried out by (Oktavian et al., 2025) and (Julita et al., 2025) Both studies state that motivation has a positive relationship and has a significant effect on job satisfaction. While the results of the study are contrary to the research conducted by (Qarismail & Prayekti, 2020) which states that motivation has no significant influence on job satisfaction.

The Effect of Work Discipline (X2) on Employee Job Satisfaction (Y)

From the results of the hypothesis testing, the results of the analysis were obtained, namely the work discipline variable (X2) affecting the job satisfaction (Y) of employees at Platinum Hotel & Convention Hall Balikpapan. Thus, it can be concluded that work discipline has an influence on job satisfaction. This is evidenced by the respondents' responses which showed that in the work discipline variable, the indicator of obedience to the boss with the highest level of agreement, the second indicator of responsibility, the third indicator of the level of attendance, the fourth indicator of work procedures and the last indicator of work awareness.

Thus, it can be concluded that work discipline is a person's behavior, both written and unwritten, as a form of obedience to company rules. Therefore, the higher the level of job satisfaction. The results of the research that have been carried out today are in line with the results of previous research that has been carried out by (Oktavian et al., 2025) and (Julita et al., 2025) Both studies state that work discipline has a positive relationship and has a significant effect on job satisfaction. While the results of the study are contrary to the research conducted by (Qarismail & Prayekti, 2020) which states that work discipline does not have a significant influence on job satisfaction.

Influence of Work Environment (X3) on Employee Job Satisfaction (Y)

From the results of the hypothesis test, the results of the analysis were obtained, namely the work environment (X2) affects the job satisfaction (Y) of employees at Platinum Hotel & Convention Hall Balikpapan. Thus, it can be concluded that the work environment has an influence on job satisfaction. This is evidenced by the respondents' responses which show that

in the work environment variable, the indicators of cooperation between employees with the highest level of very agree, the second indicator of the relationship between superiors and employees and the third indicator of the relationship between colleagues at the same level.

Thus, it can be concluded that the work environment shows that the attention and support given by the company's leaders can create a positive work atmosphere, increase the sense of security and respect by employees, and strengthen interpersonal relationships in the workplace. All of these factors contribute greatly to improving employee job satisfaction. The results of the research that have been carried out today are in line with the results of previous research that has been carried out by (Oktavian et al., 2025) and (Julita et al., 2025) Both studies state that the work environment has a positive relationship and has a significant effect on job satisfaction. While the results of the study are contrary to the research conducted by (Aulia et al., 2024) which states that the work environment does not have a significant influence on job satisfaction.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the analysis and discussion in this study, it can be concluded that all three hypotheses are acceptable. The Motivation variable (X1), Work Discipline variable (X2), and Work Environment variable (X3) each have a significant effect on the job satisfaction of employees at Platinum Hotel & Convention Hall Balikpapan, indicating that the first, second, and third hypotheses are all supported by the findings of this study. Based on these findings, several suggestions can be proposed. For Platinum Hotel & Convention Hall Balikpapan management, it is recommended to maintain and enhance employee motivation through fair incentive programs and career development opportunities, strengthen work discipline by consistently enforcing company regulations and providing constructive feedback, and improve the work environment by fostering positive interpersonal relationships and ensuring adequate facilities. These efforts will contribute to increasing employee job satisfaction, which in turn can improve performance and reduce turnover. For future researchers, it is recommended to explore other factors that may influence job satisfaction, such as compensation, leadership style, or organizational culture, and to consider using qualitative or mixed methods to gain deeper insights into employee perceptions and experiences.

REFERENCE

- Adipura, & Kakanita Ari Puspitasari. (2022). The Effect of Work Discipline, Work Motivation, and Work Stress on Employee Job Satisfaction with the Work Environment as a Moderation Variable. 1(3), 1–25.
- Amanda, S. P. G., & Adrian, A. (2024). The Influence of the Work Environment on Employee Loyalty with Job Satisfaction as a Mediation Variable at The Axana Hotel Padang The Axana Hotel is a four-star hotel (****) located in the city of Padang which is located at JL. Scott, 14-1. 2(3), 126–137.
- Ariesni, S., & Asnur, L. (2023). The Influence of Work Discipline on Hotel Employee Performance. *Journal of Research and Development of Science and Humanities*, 7, 306–312. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.23887/jppsh.v7i2.72957>
- Aulia, A. B., Hidayati, A., & Armi, M. N. (2024). The Influence of Work Environment, Training and Human Resource Empowerment on Employee Job Satisfaction at the Mercure Hotel Bengkulu City. *Journal of Management, Economics and Business Applications*, 9(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.51263/jameb.v9i1.216>
- Babullah, R. (2024). Getting to Know Human Resources (HR): Their Meaning and Function. *Arjuna Journal*, 2, 187–204. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.61132/arjuna.v2i4.1104>

- Dzulhaq, A. R., & Firdaus, V. (2024). The Impact of Motivation, Work Environment, and Discipline on Job Satisfaction in Indonesia. 2, 1–16.
- Esisuarni, Alqadri, H., & Nellitawati. (2024). The Importance of Work Motivation in Improving Employee Performance. *Journal of Neurology*, 17(2), 478–488.
- Farikhah, T. R., & Prayekti. (2024). The Influence of Work Competence, Work Culture, and Work Discipline on Job Satisfaction in Employees The ROS In Hotel Yogyakarta.
- Galu, A., & Fahrul, M. (2025). The Effect of Work Engagement, Job Suitability and Job Satisfaction on Employee Performance. 3(3), 909–926. <https://doi.org/10.60079/amfr.v3i3.620>
- Jumani, A., & Rianto, M. R. (2023). Literature Review: The Influence of Work Environment, Training and Motivation on CV Employee Job Satisfaction. We are committed to providing training, training and motivation. 4(1), 39–50. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.35912/simo.v4i1.1779>
- Lestari, N. K. Y. D., Merta, I. K., & Widhiantara, I. K. (2024). The Influence of Work Environment and Work- Life Balance on Employee Job Satisfaction through Organizational Culture at the Post Office of Bali. 12(5), 2017–2024. <https://doi.org/10.37641/jimkes.v12i5.2532>
- Munandar, A. (2021). Job Satisfaction of Educators in Islamic Education Institutions. *Journal of Tawadhu*, 5(1), 12–24.
- Oktavian, P. A. H., Hadiyatno, D., & Putri, R. C. (2025). The Influence of Work Environment, Motivation, and Work Discipline on Employee Satisfaction of Sevensix Hotel Balikpapan. 8.
- Praditya, R. A., Prayuda, R. Z., & Purwanto, A. (2025). Correlation of Job Satisfaction and Leadership to Employee Performance in SMEs. *International Journal of Social, Policy, and Law (IJOSPL)*, 6(4), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.8888/ijospl.v6i4.206>
- Qarismail, T., & Prayekti. (2020). The Influence of Transformational Leadership Style, Motivation and Work Discipline on Employee Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Business and Management*, 16(2). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.23960/jbm.v16i2.71>
- Qurbi, M. R., & Saroyo. (2023). The Influence of Non-Physical Work Environment on Employee Job Satisfaction in Regional Drinking Water Companies in North Hulu Sungai Regency. *Journal of Public Administration & Business Administration*, 6.
- Safri, A., & Oktiani, N. (2024). The Effect of Compensation and Work Discipline on Job Satisfaction. 2(1), 35–49. <https://doi.org/10.62421/jibema.v2i1.51A>
- Sari, R., Fauzan, A., & Bedi, F. (2024). Factors that affect the job satisfaction of teachers Ria Sari, Ahmad Fauzan, Fisman Bedi 1,2,3 Raden Intan University Lampung. 10(September), 866–876.
- Siregar, S. K., Harahap, S. Z., Mutiah, R., & Munthe, I. R. (2025). The predictive model of customer satisfaction at the Platinum Hotel uses the K-Means Clustering method. *Journal of Computer Science and Information Systems (JCoInS)*, 6, 266–273. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.36987/jcoins.v6i3.7935>
- Sugiyono, P. D. (2019). *Quantitative Research Methods*. Alfabeta.