

Effect of Physical Work Environment, Workload, and Compensation on Employee Loyalty at Visesa Ubud Resort

Tjokorda Bagus Wirata Sukawati¹, I Gusti Made Suwandana²

¹Faculty of Economics and Business, Udayana University, Bali, Indonesia

²Faculty of Economics and Business, Udayana University, Bali, Indonesia

ABSTRACT:The purpose of this study was to determine the effect of physical work environment, workload, and compensation on employee loyalty at Visesa Ubud Resort. Visesa Ubud Resort is a company that provides services to the general public with five-star lodging facilities in the Ubud area. This research is located in Visesa Ubud Resort which is located at Jl. Suweta, Bentuyung Sakti, Ubud District, Gianyar Regency, Bali, Indonesia. The population in this study were 196 employees of the Visesa Ubud Resort. The sample was selected using the Slovin formula and obtained 131 employees as respondents. The analysis technique used is multiple linear regression analysis, classical assumption test, and model feasibility test. Based on the results of the analysis, it shows that the physical work environment has a positive and significant effect on employee loyalty, this shows that if the physical work environment is getting better, employee loyalty will increase, the workload has a negative and significant effect on employee loyalty, this shows that if the workload is given to employees the higher the employee loyalty will decrease, and compensation has a positive and significant effect on employee loyalty, this shows that if the compensation is higher, the employee loyalty will increase.

KEYWORDS : *work environment, work load, compensation, employee loyalty*

I. INTRODUCTION

Employees are a very important asset in an organization. Organizations need to maintain their employees properly so that employees can be comfortable working and have good work performance. Martiwi, et al. (2012) stated that, in terms of work, one of the important aspects needed by employees is job loyalty. Soegandhi, et al. (2013) stated that the turnover rate can determine employee loyalty and job satisfaction in the company. Employee loyalty is very important and has a positive effect on company growth (Antonicic and Bostjan, 2015).

A company must be able to manage its employees well in order to have high employee loyalty. The amount of loyalty possessed by employees is very important for the company, because the organization consists of employees who are part of the life-driving force of a company (Mishra et. Al (2019). A company must be able to understand how much loyalty an employee has towards their work. This is very important to do to know how the responsibility of an employee for the duties assigned to him every day. A company must know about the consequences of treating each employee. A loyalty that each individual / employee has should be maintained and enhanced by the organization / company (Auda, 2016) Employees who are loyal to the company are more likely to help the company achieve its goals (Chi & Yi-Jian, 2019).

Visesa Ubud Resort is one of the hotels located in Ubud, Gianyar. Visesa Ubud Resort is located not far from central ubud which only takes 10 minutes from central ubud. Visesa Ubud Resort, which was built in 2016, features an array of utmost facilities to pamper its guests. The hotel has 46 suite rooms and 60 pool villas. Warm and sincere smiles will greet every guest in a lobby with 24 hour reception and check-out service, hotel security is very well maintained. Other facilities include a bar, restaurant, Internet access, room and laundry services at additional charges. Guests arriving by car can park their vehicles in the nearby car park. In addition, the hotel is also equipped with buggy cars ready to take guests around Visesa Village. In Visesa Village, Ubud, visitors can feel the sensation of farming. In general, the programs offered are getting to know the daily activities of rural people in Bali, such as raising ducks etc.

Every company must be responsive to indications of problems that arise related to employee loyalty so that they can be resolved immediately. Sopiah (2008: 166) states that employees who have high loyalty to the company will cause high organizational performance and low turnover rates. Based on this explanation, there is an indication of low employee loyalty at Visesa Ubud Resort, namely a high turnover rate.

The turnover rate that occurs at Visesa Ubud Resort is considered quite high because if you calculate the turnover rate you get a result of 27.5 percent. This is as stated by Gillis (2014) that employee turnover is said to be normal if it is between 5-10 percent per year and can be said to be high if it exceeds 10%. A situation where there are still many employees in and out of high turnover indicates low employee loyalty to the company (Ajimat, 2019). Sudarmanto (2015) argues that low loyalty to the organization / company causes high turnover, and also causes employees to be discouraged at work. Prasetya (2017) states that a good work environment for employees can increase employee loyalty at work, therefore the work environment has a positive and significant effect on employee loyalty.

The results of an interview with the General Manager of Visesa Ubud Resort named Tjokorda Gede Dharmayudha Sukawati explained that every month in 2019-2020 there is an employee turnover that occurs. This happened because of various reasons, one of which was the COVID-19 pandemic which significantly reduced the company's turnover, so like it or not the company had to lay off some employees to reduce costs for a while until the COVID-19 pandemic ended. The COVID-19 pandemic certainly has an impact on Visesa Ubud Resort, including tourists who come less so that the turnover they get decreases than usual and there are some employees whose shifts are short to reduce costs.

Based on the results of the pre-survey with ten employees of Visesa Ubud Resort, it can be concluded that there are symptoms of problems related to the physical work environment, workload, and compensation that cause employee loyalty to decline. They feel that the workload provided exceeds the work standard. Furthermore, for compensation such as wages that are considered insufficient by some employees and the safety of the physical work environment for employees is deemed less conditional by some employees.

One of the things that can affect employee loyalty is the physical work environment. Sarwoto (2017: 31) states that the work environment is a place where an employee works including physical and non-physical environments that can affect morale in carrying out work. The work environment is one of the things closest to a person in carrying out his job. The work environment around employees needs to be considered in order to have a good impact on one's performance (James 2015). A sense of comfort and safety will be created because of an adequate work environment. Fjer (2016) states that a safe and healthy physical work environment will have a positive impact on the people who are in it. a place where an employee works includes physical and non-physical environments that can affect morale in carrying out work. The benefits of a safe and healthy physical work environment will increase productivity due to decreased number of days lost, increase loyalty and quality of more committed workers, reduce costs - health and insurance costs, lower levels of workers' compensation and direct payments due to reduced claims, greater flexibility and adaptability as a result of increased participation and a sense of ownership, a safe and healthy physical work environment will increase productivity due to decreased number of days spent missing and a better labor selection ratio due to an increase in the company's image, this is stated by Rivai (2005: 793).

The work environment at the company will affect the performance and loyalty of employees while working at the company (Rofi, 2015). Nitisemito (2015: 169) argues that the work environment is something that is around workers and can influence him in completing all the tasks assigned to him. Barkus et al (2015) argue that a good work environment will be able to result in fellow colleagues who will be more supportive of each other to complete the work assigned to them, based on research conducted by Aljayi et al. (2016) That the work environment has a positive and significant effect on employee loyalty and this research is in line with research conducted by Jackson et al. (2016) stated that the physical work environment has a positive and significant effect on employee loyalty because it plays an important role in influencing employee loyalty, the comfort of Meshkati in Astianto et al (2015) defines workload as the difference between workers' abilities and job demands. If the worker's ability is higher than the job demands, a feeling of boredom will arise and employee loyalty will be low. On the other hand, if the ability of the workers is lower than the demands of the job, there will be more fatigue. Schultz in Agustina (2016: 59) states the workload is as follows: "Work overload is too much to perform in the time available or work that is too difficult for the employee to perform", which means that the workload is too much work to do. the time available or doing work that is too difficult for employees The heavy mental workload often leads to mistakes, misunderstandings, omissions and other mistakes, for example remembering to do something and the preparation and execution of an action plan.

Da Silva et al. (2015) a person's workload can affect employee loyalty because the heavier or more workloads are given or not in accordance with the existing job description, the lower the loyalty to all aspects related to their job or organization (Amanda and Agus, 2019). Mansoor (2011) states that workload has been measured by conflicts in the workplace. When the task demands are low, employees will be able to carry out tasks easily with a low workload and performance remains at optimal levels. If there is an error or error at work, it will cause a cognitive workload or a physical or mental burden. Workload is very important for an organization. By providing effective workload, the organization can find out the extent to which its employees can be given the maximum workload and the extent to which it affects the performance of the organization itself. The results of research conducted by Buzza et. al., (2017) which shows that workload has a negative effect on employee loyalty. Then, this statement is also supported by the results of research conducted by

Purbaningrat and Surya (2017) which states that workload has a negative effect on employee loyalty, or in other words, when workload increases, employee loyalty will decrease and vice versa.

What can encourage employees with high loyalty to the organization is compensation. Compensation is one of the factors that can foster employee loyalty in the company (Malik et al., 2019). Dr. Emron Edison et al (2017: 152) state that this compensation is a form of reward (both cash and natural) that employees / employees receive for the efforts they produce. Compensation is one of the goals a person wants to work with is to get compensation in the form of a salary at an amount he deems appropriate. Purnamasari and Sintaasih (2019) state that compensation is one of the factors that can foster employee loyalty in the company. Larbi (2014) says compensation is a concept that is not usually given attention in many organizations. Compensation is seen mostly like cash and hence other aspects are neglected. Viewing compensation as a holistic system in which to manage productivity is concerned with organizational development. Salary, of course, is not the sole objective of working people, but at least salary is a major factor. Compensation is everything that employees receive as remuneration for work given to the company (Kurniawan et al., 2013). Gaol (2016) defines compensation received by employees, either in the form of money or not as gifts given for employee contributions given to the organization. Compensation must be equal to the employee's position so that employees will remain loyal to the company (Adisti and Musadiq, 2016). The greater the compensation provided, the more loyal employees will be to the company (Baporikar, 2017). This is in line with research conducted by Aityan & Gupta (2011) that compensation has a positive and significant effect on employee loyalty. This shows that the higher the compensation for an employee, the higher the employee's loyalty to the organization, and vice versa. the work environment and the success of employees at work.

Every individual in the organization has a different loyalty, so employee self-awareness is shown by loyalty to the company even though the company is in the best and worst condition (Hermawan and Riana, 2016). Loyalty is being loyal to something with full of love, so that you don't expect anything in return for doing something for another person or the company where he puts his loyalty (Lavina et al, 2018). Many researchers consider that loyalty is very important and very influential on company productivity, for example research by Rachel et al. (2016) which has the result that loyalty has a positive influence on company growth. Antoncic and Bostjan (2015) also argue that employee loyalty has a positive impact on company growth. And also according to Suhendra (2017) that employee loyalty will be higher or positive if the compensation given is equal to the position. Every individual in the organization has different loyalties, so employee self-awareness is shown by loyalty to the company even though the company is in the best and worst condition. Ossy (2016) argues that employee loyalty will decrease if the workload given to employees is increasing. Physical Work Environment is also a determining factor for employee loyalty. Mary et al. (2016: 231) explain the importance of labor loyalty because if workers are loyal to the company, the company's operations will be more stable. If the loyalty of workers in the company is low, many workers will resign so that the worker's operational activities will be hampered.

II. HYPOTHESES FORMULATION

Several studies have proven that the physical work environment affects employee loyalty. Research by Zanabazar and Jigjiddorj (2018) found that the physical work environment has a positive and significant effect on employee loyalty where in their research at Bank International Qatar, a conducive work environment will increase the employee's sense of loyalty to the company. The results of the research by Stephani and Wibawa (2019) are also supported by Mphil's research (2015) which states that there is a positive and significant influence between the physical work environment and employee loyalty because if an employee works in a conducive work environment, the employee will have more loyalty. high in companies .. The same results were found by Sari and Karnadi (2019) which stated that the work environment had a positive and significant effect on employee loyalty. According to research by Aljayi et. al., (2016) stated that the physical work environment has a positive and significant effect on employee loyalty. This is in line with research from Barkus et. al., (2015) and Jackson et. al., (2016) which states that the physical work environment has a positive and significant effect on employee loyalty. (Rofi, 2015; James, 2015; Fjer, 2016; Triningsih, 2015) On average, research results state that there is a relationship between the physical work environment and employee loyalty. Spradly et. al., (2016), and Munandar (2016) also have the same opinion that the physical work environment has a positive and significant effect on employee loyalty. A conducive work environment will increase employee loyalty Supardi (2015). So the better the physical work environment, the higher employee loyalty and vice versa, the worse the physical work environment, the lower employee loyalty. Therefore the first hypothesis of this study is:
H₁: Physical work environment has a positive and significant effect on employee loyalty.

Several studies have proven that workload is negative and significant towards employee loyalty. Research by Heryati (2016) shows that workload has a negative and significant effect on employee loyalty where in her research at PT. Pupuk Sriwidjaja Palembang said that the more workload an employee receives, the lower the employee's loyalty to the company. The results of research by Frempong and Agbenyo (2018), also supported by Agustina (2016), suggest that workload has a negative and significant effect on employee loyalty.

The same results were obtained in the Moekijat Research (2015) supported by the research of Astianto and Suprihadi (2015) which stated that workload had a negative and significant effect on employee loyalty. And research from Buzza et. al., (2017) stated that workload has a negative and significant effect on employee loyalty. This is in line with the research of Purbaningrat and Surya (2017) that excessive workload will have a negative and significant effect on employee loyalty. da Silva et. al., (2015), proving that workload has a negative and significant effect on employee loyalty, Amanda and Agus (2019) have the same opinion that workload has a negative and significant effect on employee loyalty. Mansoor (2011) proves that workload has a negative and significant effect on employee loyalty because high workload causes employees to feel bored so that their loyalty decreases. So the higher the workload felt by employees, the lower employee loyalty to the company and vice versa, the lower the workload felt by employees, the higher employee loyalty to the company. Therefore the second hypothesis of this study is

H₂: Workload has a negative and significant effect on employee loyalty.

Several studies have shown that compensation affects employee loyalty. Research by Manurung (2017) found that compensation has a positive and significant effect on employee loyalty where in his research at PT. Pos Indonesia employees who get sufficient compensation have a greater sense of loyalty to the company. The results of Palwasha's research (2017) which are also supported by Pratama and Suryoko's research (2016), state that compensation has a positive and significant effect on employee loyalty because the more compensation received by employees, the employees will be enthusiastic to work and become more loyal to the company. Research by Adisti and Musadiq (2016) supported by research by Putra and Sriathi (2019) found that the compensation provided by the company was able to increase employee loyalty. Research from Rachel et al. (2016) also get the same results where adequate compensation for employees will have a positive and significant effect on employee loyalty. The results show that compensation can increase employee loyalty (Antoncic and Bostjan, 2015). Malik et. al., (2019), and Larbi (2014) prove that compensation has a positive and significant effect on employee loyalty. This is supported by the research of Imamoglu et. al., (2019), and Suparyadi (2015), which state that compensation has a positive and significant effect on employee loyalty. Baporikar (2017) argues that compensation has a positive and significant effect on employee loyalty because fair compensation for employees will have a positive impact on employee loyalty. So the higher the compensation received by the employee, the higher the employee's loyalty. Therefore the third hypothesis of this study is:

H₃: Compensation has a positive and significant effect on employee loyalty.

III. RESEARCH METHOD

This research is located at Visesa Ubud Resort, Bentuyung Sakti, Ubud District, Gianyar Regency, Bali, Indonesia. The reason the researchers chose this location was because of the alleged problems regarding employee loyalty which tended to decline which was caused by the safety of the employee's physical work environment that was not conducive, the workload was overloaded, and finally compensation such as a salary that was felt to be lacking.

The physical work environment is defined as everything that is around the employees of Visesa Ubud Resort at work, which is physical and can affect themselves and their work when they work. The indicator used to measure the physical work environment was adopted from Septianto (2017) with several modifications to adjust the object of research, namely the work atmosphere including employees. Feeling that lighting conditions and air circulation in the work space make it better, the sound when working does not make work focus disappear, and safe while working. The second indicator is the availability of work facilities which include facilities that support smooth performance, current useful fingerprint facilities and complete facilities, although not new.

Workload is defined as the number of tasks that must be done by Visesa Ubud Resort employees at a certain time. The indicator used to measure workload was adopted from O'Donnell & Eggemeier (2008: 69) with several modifications to suit the research object, namely 1) Subjective Measurement, 2) Performance Measurement, 3) Physiological Measurement.

Compensation is defined as an award or reward received by Visesa Ubud Resort employees based on their contribution or better productive performance at Visesa Ubud Resort. The indicators used to measure compensation are adopted from Rivai (2005: 357) and Suparyadi (2015: 271) with several modifications to adjust the object of research, namely 1) direct financial compensation and 2) indirect compensation (fringe benefit).

Employee Loyalty is the willingness of Visesa Ubud Resort employees to obey orders, be responsible and defend the company inside and outside of work from irresponsible people. The indicator used to measure compensation is adopted from Siswanto (2015) with several modifications to adjust the object of research, namely: 1) Compliance with regulations, 2) Responsibility to the company, 3) Willingness to cooperate, 4) A sense of belonging to the company, 5) Interpersonal relationships, 6) Passion for work.

The population in this study were 196 employees at Visesa Ubud Resort The sample size in this study was determined using the Slovin formula which obtained 131 people. The sampling method used in this study is probability sampling. probability sampling technique used in this research is simple random sampling technique. Simple random sampling is the taking of sample members from the population which is carried out randomly without paying attention to the strata in the population Sugiyono (2018: 126). The data collection methods used were surveys and interviews. The survey was conducted using a questionnaire instrument with a five-point Likert scale.

Multiple linear regression method is used in this study to determine the effect of Physical Work Environment (X_1), Workload (X_2), Compensation (X_3) and Employee Loyalty (Y). This method was tested using a computer system in the form of SPSS version 2.3. The effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable was tested with a confidence level of 95% or $\alpha = 5\%$. The regression model used is as follows.

$$Y = \alpha + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + e \dots\dots\dots(1)$$

Information:

Y = Employee Loyalty

X_1 = Physical Work Environment

X_2 = Workload

X_3 = Compensation

α = Constant

β_1 = Physical Work Environment regression coefficient

β_2 = Workload regression coefficient

β_3 = Compensation regression coefficient

e = error

IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Sugiyono (2018: 203) states that the validity test is used to measure whether a questionnaire is valid or not. The questionnaire is said to be valid if the questionnaire questions are able to reveal what is measured by the questionnaire. The data collection instrument used in this study was a questionnaire, each instrument can be said to be valid if it has a correlation coefficient ≥ 0.30 .

Table 1. Instrument Validity Test Results

Variable	Indicator	R-test	R-table	Validity
Physical Environment (X_1)	$X_{1,1}$	0.558	0.30	Valid
	$X_{1,2}$	0.763	0.30	Valid
	$X_{1,3}$	0.648	0.30	Valid
	$X_{1,4}$	0.745	0.30	Valid
	$X_{1,5}$	0.682	0.30	Valid
	$X_{1,6}$	0.715	0.30	Valid
Workload (X_2)	$X_{2,1}$	0.808	0.30	Valid
	$X_{2,2}$	0.748	0.30	Valid
	$X_{2,3}$	0.716	0.30	Valid
	$X_{2,4}$	0.565	0.30	Valid
	$X_{2,5}$	0.728	0.30	Valid
	$X_{2,6}$	0.722	0.30	Valid
Compensation (X_3)	$X_{3,1}$	0.730	0.30	Valid
	$X_{3,2}$	0.834	0.30	Valid
	$X_{3,3}$	0.779	0.30	Valid
	$X_{3,4}$	0.857	0.30	Valid
	$X_{3,5}$	0.704	0.30	Valid
	$X_{3,6}$	0.678	0.30	Valid
	$X_{3,7}$	0.731	0.30	Valid
Employee loyalty (Y)	$Y_{,1}$	0,729	0,30	Valid
	$Y_{,2}$	0,777	0,30	Valid
	$Y_{,3}$	0,650	0,30	Valid
	$Y_{,4}$	0,874	0,30	Valid
	$Y_{,5}$	0,701	0,30	Valid
	$Y_{,6}$	0,816	0,30	Valid

All items of the instrument can be declared valid. This can be stated as such because all correlation coefficients are greater than 0.30. Thus all statement items are said to be valid and fit for use.

Reliability test is a tool for measuring a questionnaire which is an indicator of construct variables. Reliability testing is related to the problem of trust in the research instrument. The questionnaire is said to be reliable or reliable if the respondent's answer to the question is consistent or stable over time. Sugiyono (2018: 203) suggests that a reliable instrument is an instrument that, when used several times to measure the same object, will produce the same data. An instrument is said to be reliable, if the instrument has a Cronbach Alpha value for each variable greater than 0.6.

Table2. Instrument Reliability Test Results

No.	Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	Reliability
1	Physical Environment (X_1)	0.824	Reliabel
2	Workload (X_2)	0.800	Reliabel
3	Compensation (X_3)	0.874	Reliabel
4	Employee loyalty(Y)	0.855	Reliabel

All variables in the study had a Cronbach's alpha value above 0.6. Thus all variables are reliable and worthy of further analysis.

After the normality test was carried out, the significance value was found using the Asymp test. Sig. (2-tailed) of $0.651 > 0.05$, it can be concluded that the regression model used in this study is normally distributed.

Meanwhile for the multicollinearity test, the tolerance value for the physical work environment variable is 0.688 ($0.688 > 0.1$) with a VIF value of 1.453 ($1.453 < 10$), the tolerance value for the workload variable is 0.748 ($0.748 > 0.1$) with a VIF value. of 1.337 ($1.337 < 10$), and the tolerance value for the compensation variable is 0.908 ($0.908 > 0.1$) with a VIF value of 1.101 ($1.101 < 10$). All variables in the multiple regression model have a tolerance value greater than 0.1 and a VIF value less than 10, it can be concluded that the regression model used is multicollinear free.

The results of the heteroscedasticity test resulted in a significant value for the physical work environment variable of 0.128 ($0.128 > 0.05$), a significant value for the workload variable of 0.780 ($0.780 > 0.05$), and a significant value for the compensation variable of 0.629 ($0.629 > 0, 05$). All independent variables have a significance value > 0.05 for absolute residuals, so there is no heteroscedasticity in the regression model.

Table 2. Multiple Regression Test Results

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
1	(Constant)	6.779	1.989		3.409	0.001
	Physical Environment (X_1)	0.102	0.046	0.144	2.234	0.027
	Workload (X_2)	-0.255	0.074	-0.214	-3.462	0.001
	Compensation (X_3)	0.635	0.047	0.752	13.404	0.000
R Square		0.637				
Adjusted R Square		0.629				
Std. Error of the Estimate		1.624				

Based on the results of the t test the effect of the physical work environment on employee loyalty obtained a significance value of 0.027 with a regression coefficient value of 0.102 which is positive. A significance value of $0.027 < 0.05$ indicates that H1 is accepted. These results indicate that the physical work environment has a positive and significant effect on employee loyalty. This means that if the physical work environment is getting better, the employee loyalty will be higher, conversely, if the physical work environment gets worse, the employee loyalty will get worse. The results of this study are in line with research conducted by Aljayi et al. (2016), Jackson et al. (2016), Fjer (2016), Rofi (2015), Barkus et al (2015) which state that the physical work environment has a positive and significant effect on employee loyalty.

Based on the results of the t test the effect of workload on employee loyalty obtained a significance value of 0.001 with a regression coefficient of 0.255 which is negative. A significance value of $0.001 < 0.05$ indicates that H2 is accepted. These results indicate that workload has a negative and significant effect on employee loyalty. This means that if the workload is higher, employee loyalty will be lower, conversely, if the workload is lower, employee loyalty will be higher. The results of this study are in line with research conducted by Meshkati in Astianto et al. (2015), Imamoglu et al. (2019), da Silva et al. (2015), Amanda and Agus, (2019), Buzza et. al., (2017), Purbaningrat and Surya (2017) which state that workload has a negative and significant effect on employee loyalty.

Based on the results of the t test the effect of compensation on employee loyalty obtained a significance value of 0.000 with a regression coefficient value of 0.635 that is positive. A significance value of 0.000 < 0.05 indicates that H3 is accepted. These results indicate that compensation has a positive and significant effect on employee loyalty. This means that if the compensation is higher, the employee loyalty will be higher, conversely, if the compensation is lower, the employee loyalty will be lower. The results of this study are in line with research conducted by Malik et al., (2019), Kurniawan et al., (2013). Gaol (2016), Adisti and Musadiq, (2016), Baporikar (2017), Aityan & Gupta (2011) which state that compensation has a positive and significant effect on employee loyalty.

The theoretical implication of this research is that it can increase empirical evidence regarding the effect of physical work environment, workload, and compensation on employee loyalty. This study found that the physical work environment and compensation have a positive and significant effect on employee loyalty and workload has a negative and significant effect on employee loyalty.

The results of this study can be used as a basis for organizations in determining policy strategies to maintain and increase employee loyalty to their company. Associated with employee loyalty in this study can be influenced by the physical work environment, workload, and compensation. The better the physical work environment that is provided to employees such as improved security, it will trigger him to always think positively in activities in the company that give a feeling of sacrifice and employee loyalty is getting higher. Reducing the workload of employees and placing employees according to their expertise will also increase the sense of employee loyalty in the company. If the company is able to provide compensation such as a salary that is sufficient to meet the economic needs of each employee, this can trigger employees to work optimally and feel part of the company and this can make employees more loyal and have a sense of sacrifice and contribute to the company because they feel part of the company.

V. CONCLUSION

Physical work environment has a positive and significant effect on employee loyalty. This means that if the physical work environment is getting better, the employee loyalty will be getting better, conversely, if the physical work environment is getting worse, the employee loyalty will get worse. Workload has a negative and significant effect on employee loyalty. This means that if the workload decreases, employee loyalty will increase, on the other hand, if the workload increases, employee loyalty will decrease. Compensation has a positive and significant effect on employee loyalty. This means that if the compensation given is higher, then employee loyalty will increase, conversely, if the compensation is getting smaller, the employee loyalty will decrease.

The number of respondents is only 131 employees and only from the Visesa Ubud Resort environment, so the results of this study can only be applied to the Visesa Ubud Resort environment and cannot be generalized to other companies' environments. There are many other variables that can be employee loyalty outside the model described in this study such as leadership style, organizational culture, and others. This study only focuses on one company, so there is a possibility of differences in results and conclusions if the research is carried out on different subjects.

REFERENCES

- [1] Adisti, F., & Musadiq, M. A. (2016). Pengaruh Kompensasi Terhadap Motivasi Kerja dan Loyalitas (Studi Pada Karyawan PTBank Rakyat Indonesia (Persero) TBK Cabang Malang). *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis*, 50(1), 34 – 46.
- [2] Agustina, H. (2016) Pengaruh Beban Kerja dan Komepensasi terhadap Loyalitas Karyawan Stidi Kasus pada Café Galen Bogor. *E-Jurnal Universitas Pajajaran* 2(4). 22-27
- [3] Agustina, T. W. (2016). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Edisi 7*, Jakarta: Erlangga
- [4] Ajimat, A. (2019). Peran Komitmen Organisasi Dalam Pengaruh Negatif Turnover Intention Terhadap Loyalitas Karyawan (Studi Kasus di Universitas Pamulang), *E-Jurnal Universita Pamulang*, 2(1), 13-16
- [5] Aljayi, Y., & Fjer, A., Guennioui, M., Tamek, A. (2016). Multinational Companies' Human Resource Management Practices' and Their Work Enviroment Impact on Employees' Loyalty: Case of Japanese Multinational Company in Morocco. *Journal School of Business Administration*, 5(8), 204 – 211.
- [6] Amanda, M., Agus, T. (2019). The Effect of Compensation, Empowerment, and Job Satisfaction on Employee Loyalty. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Management*, 5(12), 7590 – 7599
- [7] Antoncic, Jasna Auer and Bostjan Antoncic. (2015). Employee Loyalty and Its Impact On Firm Growth. *International Journal of Management and Information System*. 15 (1), pp: 81.
- [8] Astianto, A., Suprihadi H. (2015). Pengaruh Stres Kerja dan Beban Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PDAM Surabaya. *E – Journal Stiesia Surabaya*, 5(2), 24 - 32.
- [9] Aityan, S. K., & Gupta. (2011). Challenges of Employee Loyalty in Corporate America. *Journal Research Article, Accepted Version*, 2(2), 47–54.

- [10] Auda, A. E. (2016) Impact of Work Environment and Compensation On Employee Loyalty Study Case In Bank Ghana, *International Journal Managerial of Ghana*, 2(3), 43-47
- [11] Barkus, C. G., & James, A. J., (2015). Impact of Work Environment on Employee Loyalty Study Case On Food Departemen in India. *E-Jurnal University Of India*, 2(3) 57-61
- [12] Baporikar, S. (2017) Pengaruh Kompensasi dan Beban Kerja Terhadap Loyalitas Karyawan Pada Hotel Mulia. *E-Jurnal Manajemen*. 2(3), 22-27
- [13] Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange & power in social life*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- [14] Buzza, S. T., James, H. I., Alex, A. E. (2017). The Effect Of Workload And Leadership on Employee Loyalty Study Case in Bank Ghana. *International Journal of Ghana*, 2(3), 25-29
- [15] Chi, Pingping & Yi-Jian, Huang. (2019). A Study of Association Among Compensation, Work Environment and Workload of Private Colleges in China. *The International Journal of Organizational Innovation*, 12(2), 105-114.
- [16] Dessler, A., E. (2016). Factors Influencing Employee Loyalty Directly and Indirectly Through Job Satisfaction - A Study of Banking Sector in Ho Chi Minh City. *Internasional Journal Of Current Research and Academic Review*, 1(4), 81 – 95
- [17] Drever, D., E (2015). Impact of Compensation, Work Environment, Workload on Employee Loyalty (Empirical Evidence From Banking Sector of Pakistan). *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 5(2), 302-309.
- [18] Eastman (2015). *Work Environment in the Manhattan Management*. New York: California
- [19] Emron, E., Anwar, Y., Komariah, I. (2017) Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- [20] Evawati. (2015). Pengaruh Budaya Organisasi Terhadap Loyalitas Perawat Bagian Anak Rumah Sakit Umum Daerah Tangerang. *Jurnal Ilmu Ekonomi dan Sosial*, 1(3), 233 – 355.
- [21] Frederica *et al.*, (2016). A Study on Motivation and Its Relationship With Employee Loyalty and Commitment: A Case Study of Nama Group Sultanate Of Oman. *International Journal of Managerial Studies and Research*, 7(4), 112 - 122.
- [22] Frempong, L. N., Agbenyo, W., & Darko, P. A. (2018). The Impact of Workload on Employees' Loyalty and Commitment: A Comparative Study Among Some Selected Sectors in Ghana, *International Journal Of Ghana* 10(12), 95 - 105.
- [23] Fuanida (2016). Pengaruh Kompensasi Terhadap Loyalitas Karyawan Studi Kasus Pada Café Lebron Malang. *E- Jurnal Universitas Malang*. 3(4), 23-29
- [24] Gaol, S. P. (2016). The Effect of Direct and Indirect Compensation : Case Study at Directorate of Human Resources in PT Pos Indonesia. *Journal of Indonesian Applied Economics*, 6(1), 84-102.
- [25] George, R. (2014) *Theory of Exchange social life*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- [26] Ghozali, Imam. 2018. *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate dengan Program IBM SPSS 23*. Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro: Semarang
- [27] Gillis, E. (2014). Effect Turnover to The Employee Loyalty (Study Case on Vian Restaurant). *International Journal Of Pakasthan*. 3(2), 112-121
- [28] Hasibuan, Malayu. (2015). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Jakarta: PT. Bumi Aksara
- [29] Harold, S. L., Oman, H. K. (2015). Impact of Work Environment to Employee Loyalty Study Case In Leblac Café. *International Journal Of Europa*, 3(2), 12-19
- [30] Hermawan, Andy, I. K., dan Riana, I. G., (2016). Analisis Faktor-Faktor yang Menentukan Loyalitas Karyawan pada Pt. Inti Buana Permai Denpasar Bali. *E- Jurnal Manajemen Universitas Udayana* , h: 624-642.
- [31] Heryati, A. (2016). Pengaruh Kompensasi dan Beban Kerja Terhadap Loyalitas Karyawan di Departemen Operasi PT. Pupuk Sriwidjaja Palembang. *Jurnal Fasilkom UIGM Palembang*, 1(2), 435-567.
- [32] Imamoglu, E. O., (2019). Impact Of Workload to Employee Loyalty (Study Case On Lasangna Restaurant), *International Journal of England*, 2(4), 213-216
- [33] Jackson, Ardala R., Jennifer L. Alberti and Robin L. Snipes. (2016). An Examination of The Impact of Work Environment on Leadership Style and Employee Loyalty in The Modern Workplace. *Allied Academies International Conference*. 18 (2), 1-6.
- [34] Jusuf, P. (2010) Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Loyalitas Karyawan Studi Kasus Pada PT. Sinar Juara Depok. *E-Jurnal Manajemen Binus*. 4(3), 27-31
- [35] Kasmir (2016), *Manajemen Personalialia Dan Sumber Daya Manusia*. Yogyakarta BPFE, Pers
- [36] Kurniawan, S., Rahayu, & Vebriana, T. (2013). Pengaruh Kepemimpinan, Lingkungan Kerja Dan Kompensasi Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan di PT. PLN Cabang Madiun. *Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Manajemen Bisnis*, 1(1).
- [37] Larbi, A. (2014). Effect of Compensation Management on Employee Performance at The ST. Michael's Catholic Hospital, Pramso. *International Journal of Business*, 2(3):5.

- [38] Lavina, D. (2018). Pengaruh Kompensasi Terhadap Loyalitas Karyawan Melalui Motivasi Kerja Sebagai Variabel Intervening Pada PT. Ehya Purwa Raharjo Gresik. *E- Jurnal Manajemen Universitas Kristen Petra*, 6(1), 1 – 6
- [39] Lubis, A. (2015). Impact of Compensation to Employee Loyalty, *Journal Faculty of Economy and Business, Mahasaraswati Denpasar University*, 3(7), 11 – 15.
- [40] Manurung, S. P., & Kasenda, R. K. M. (2017). The Effect of Direct and Indirect Compensation to Employee Loyalty (Case Study at Directorate of Human Resources in PT. Pos Indonesia (Persero) Jalan Cilaki No. 73 Bandung). *Journal of Indonesian Applied Economics*, 6(1), 84 – 102
- [41] Martiwi, Tien, R., Triyono dan Mardalis, A. (2012). Faktor–Faktor Penentu Yang Mempengaruhi Loyalitas Kerja Karyawan. *Daya Saing Jurnal Ekonomi Manajemen Sumber Daya*. 13 (1), 44-52.
- [42] Malik, A. & Astu, D. (2019) Pengaruh Kompensasi Terhadap Loyalitas Karyawan Studi Kasus Pada JFC Cabang Denpasar. *E-jurnal Manajemen*. 2(5), 12-16
- [43] Mansoor, M. (2011). The Impact of Job Stress on Employee Job Satisfaction A Study on Telecommunication Sector of Pakistan. *Journal of Bussiness Studies Quarterly*, 1(3):50-56.
- [44] Meyer, D. & Herscovits, E. (2016). Job Satisfaction and Employee Loyalty: A Study of Ademicians. *Asian Journal Management*, 7(2), 105 - 109.
- [45] Moekijat R. D. (2015). Pengaruh Kompensasi dan Beban Kerja Terhadap Loyalitas Karyawan. *Jurnal Administrasi bisnis Universitas Pandanaran Semarang*, 2(2), 43-50.
- [46] Mowdey, Richard T. et. al., (2013). *Employee – Organizational Linkages: The Psychology Of Commitment Absentism And Turnover*. Academic Press Inc., New York.
- [47] Mishra, I. E. et. al., (2019) The Effect Compensation And Benefits To Employee Loyalty A Study of Banking Istanbul. *Internasional Journal Of Current Research and Academic Review*, 1(4), 81 - 95
- [48] Munandar (2016). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Fisik dan Beban Kerja Terhadap Loyalitas Karyawan Studi Kasus pada café cilong Bandung. *E- Jurnal Universitas Bandung*. 2(3)87-94
- [49] Mphil, A. H., (2015). Impact of Compensation, Work Environment, Workload on Employee Loyalty (Empirical Evidence from Banking Sector of Pakistan). *International Journal of Business and Social Science University of Bahawalpur*, 5(2), 323-234.
- [50] Nitisemito, A. S. (2015), *Manajemen Personalia*. Cetakan ke 9. Edisi ke 4. Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia.
- [51] Notoatmodjo, S. U. (2009) *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*, Jakarta: Indonesia
- [52] Octaviani, L. P., & Suana, I. W. (2019). Pengaruh Motivasi, Kompensasi, Dan Lingkungan Kerja Fisik Terhadap Semangat Kerja Karyawan Bello Desain Di Singaraja. *E-Jurnal Manajemen Universitas Udayana*, 8(12), 7115 – 7133
- [53] Ossy, A. A. M. S. (2016). Pengaruh Insentif Finansial dan Lingkungan Kerja Fisik Terhadap Loyalitas Karyawan Pada PT. Jasaraharja Putera Cabang Denpasar, *E-Jurnal Manajemen Universitas Udayana*. 4(3), 23-29
- [54] O'Donnell & Eggemeier. 2008. *Workload Assesment Methodology. Handbook and Human Performance*
- [55] Palwasha. (2017). The Impact of Compensation and Promotional Opportunities on Employee Retention in Academic Institutions: The Moderating Role of Work Environment. *International Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 1(1), 378– 391.
- [56] Pratama, A., Suryoko, S., Widiartono (2016) Pengaruh Kompensasi, Lingkungan Kerja, dan Beban Kerja Terhadap Loyalitas Karyawan Melalui Kepuasan Kerja (Studi Kasus Pada Karyawan PT. Kawasan Berikat Nusantara Persero Jakarta). *Internasional Journal Of Current Research and Academic Review*. 3(2) 12-20.A
- [57] Prasetya, A. K. (2017) Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja dan Beban Kerja Terhadap Loyalitas Karyawa Pada PT. Bima Sakti. *E- Jurnal Universitas Semarang*, 2(1) 13-17
- [58] Purbaningrat, B. K. & Surya, M. T. (2017). Pengaruh Kompensasi dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Loyalitas Karyawan (Studi Kasus PT. Capella Dinamika Nusantara Cab. Kandis). *E- Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik Universitas Riau*, 4(1), 54-60
- [59] Purnamasari, N. P. D., & Sintaasih, D. P. (2019). Pengaruh Pengembangan Karir Kompensasi, Dan Iklim Organisasi Terhadap Loyalitas Karyawan. *E-Jurnal Manajemen Universitas Udayana*, 8(9), 5762 - 5782
- [60] Putra, I. W. S., & Sriathi, A. A. A. (2019). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja, Stres Kerja dan Kompensasi Terhadap Loyalitas Karyawan. *E-Jurnal Manajemen Universitas Udayana*, 8(2), 7746 – 7774.
- [61] Robbins, Stephen P. and Mary Coulter. (2016). *Manajemen*, Jilid 1 Edisi 13, Alih Bahasa: Bob Sabran Dan Devri Bardani P, Erlangga, Jakarta.
- [62] Rachel W.Y. Yee., Andy C.L. Yeung and T.C. Edwin Cheng. 2016. An Empirical Study of Employee Loyalty, Service Quality and Firm Performance in The Service Industry. *Int. J. Production Economics*. 109–120.
- [63] Ranupandojo, H. & Husnan, H. (2015) *Manajemen Personalia*. (edisi 4). Yogyakarta: BPFE.

- [64] Rivai, Veithzal; Jauvani Sagala. 2005. Sumber Daya Manusia untuk Perusahaan dari Teori ke Praktik. Jakarta: PT. Raja Grafindo Persada.
- [65] Rofi, A. N. (2015). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja dan Pengalaman Kerja Terhadap Loyalitas Karyawan pada Departemen Produksi Pt. Leo Agung Raya Semarang. *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen dan Akuntansi Terapan*, 13 (1), 1-4.
- [66] Romkye D. G. (2016). The Effect of Workload and Compensation on Employee Loyalty Study Case On Service Industry in Taiwan, *Asian Journal Management*, 7(2), 105 - 109.
- [67] Sari, N., & Karnadi. (2019). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Loyalitas Karyawan Pada PT. Semen Baturaja (Persero) Site Baturaja. *Jurnal Adminika*, 5(1), 2442 - 3343.
- [68] Sarwoto, (2017), *Dasar-Dasar Organisasi dan Manajemen*, cetakan keenambelas, Penerbit : Ghalia Indonesia, Jakarta
- [69] Sedarmayanthi. (2009) *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia, Reformasi Birokrasi* (cetakan kelima). PT. Refika Aditama
- [70] Septianto, H. (2017). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Fisik Terhadap Loyalitas Karyawan Pada Restoran Josinda Denpasar, *E-Jurnal Manajemen Universitas Warmadewa*. 1(4), 323-325
- [71] Silva, D. & Gustav, S. (2015) Effect Of Wokload on The Employee Loyalty (Study Case on FIFA Restaurant), *International Journal Of Australia*. 2(3), 111-121
- [72] Siswanto (2015). Pengaruh Kompensasi Terhadap Loyalitas Karyawan PT. Putera Lautan Kumala Lines Samarinda. *E- jurnal Administrasi Publik Universitas Mulia*, 3(3), 650 - 660.
- [73] Sudarmanto, I. P. (2015). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Loyalitas Karyawan Studi Kasus Pada Café Antariksa Bandung, *E-Jurnal Manajemen Universitas Pajajaran*, 3(5) 34-38
- [74] Suhendra, K. W. D. (2017). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Fisik, Kepemimpinan, Dan Kompensasi Terhadap Loyalitas Karyawan Pada PT. Gino Valentino Bali. *E-Journal Managemen Universitas Udayana*. 2(3), 232-236
- [75] Stephani, T. & Wibawa, I. P. (2019). Pengaruh Beban Kerja dan Kompensasi Terhadap Loyalitas Karyawan Studi Kasus pada PT. Indah Bumi Bogor. *E- Jurnal Manajemen Binus*, 3(4), 35-39
- [76] Soegandhi, Marchelle, V., Eddy, M. Sutanto dan Setiawan, R. (2013). Pengaruh Kepuasan Kerja dan Loyalitas Kerja Terhadap Organizational Citizenship Behavior pada Karyawan PT. Surya Timur Sakti Jatim. *AGORA* 1(1).
- [77] Spradly, I. T., Michel, K. L., Jordan, A. I. (2016) The Effect Of Work Enviroment and Workload to Employee Loyalty, Study Case in Restaurant Broze. *International Journal Of Europa*. 2(3), 56-62
- [78] Sugiyono P.D., (2018) *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif dan Kualitatif dan R&DB* Bandung: Alfabeta.
- [79] Supardi. (2015). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Fisik dan Kompensasi terhadap Loyalitas Karyawan Pada Café Tulu Yogyakarta. *E- Jurna Universitasl Yogyakarta*. 45-50
- [80] Suparyadi (2015) Pengaruh Kompensasi dan Beban Kerja Terhadap Loyalitas Karyawan Studi Kasus pada PT. Pelita Jaya Bandung. *E- Jurnal Universitas Pajajaran*, 2(6), 45-49
- [81] Suwatno dan Donni Juni Priansa. (2016). *Manajemen SDM dalam Organisasi Publik dan Bisnis*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- [82] Tarwaka L. A. (2017) Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja dan Beban Kerja Pada Loyalitas Karyawan Berdasarkan Jenis Kelamin. *E-Jurnal Manajemen Universitas Udayana*, 3(10), 1545 - 1433.
- [83] Triningsih, A. E. (2015) Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Fisik dan Stres Kerja terhadap loyalitas Karyawan Studi Kasus Pada PT Cipta Kerja Surabaya. *E- Jurnal Manajemen Surabaya*, 2(3), 33-37
- [84] Ulfatin, N. & Triwiyanto, T. (2016) Pengaruh Kompensasi dan Motivasi Kerja Terhadap Loyalitas Karyawan Pada Café Nimo Cilacap. *E-Jurnal Manajemen Universitas Trisakti*. 3(2), 12-17
- [85] Veldhoven, V. & Dorenbosch, L. (2016). Effect of Work Enviroment and Compensation on Employee Loyalty and Performance in Asset Management Corporation of Nigerian (AMCON). *International Journal of Management and Development Studies*, 2(2), 49 – 60
- [86] Waluyo, N. M. Y.,(2015). Pengaruh komitmen terhadap kinerja karyawan studi kasus pada PT. Suci, *Jurnal Ekonomi Surabaya*, 1(2), 23-25
- [87] Zanabazar, A., & Jigjiddorj, S. (2018). Impact of Work Enviroment in Employee Loyalty, Retention and Organizational Performance Study Case On Bank International Qatar. *International Journal of Management and Applied Science*, 4(7), 51 - 55.