The Effect of Work Environment, Rewards, and Punishment on Employee Loyalty at Novotel Pekanbaru Hotel

Eka Cahya Antika[1], Tengkoe Irawan[2]
[1,2]Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi (STIE) Dharma Putra Pekanbaru, Indonesia
Email: irawantengkoe@gmail.com

Abstract

Employee loyalty is an important factor in supporting organizational stability and achieving company objectives, particularly in the hospitality industry. This study aims to examine the effect of work environment, reward, and punishment on employee loyalty at Novotel Pekanbaru Hotel, both partially and simultaneously. This research employed a quantitative approach involving 97 employees as respondents, selected using a saturated sampling method. Data were collected through questionnaires, interviews, and documentation, and analyzed using IBM SPSS. The analytical methods included descriptive statistics, validity and reliability tests, classical assumption tests, multiple linear regression, t-tests, F-tests, and the coefficient of determination. The results indicate that the work environment has a positive and significant effect on employee loyalty (t = 2.183; sig. = 0.032). Reward also has a positive and significant effect (t = 6.163; sig. = 0.000). However, punishment does not have a statistically significant effect on employee loyalty (t = 1.412; sig. = 0.161). Simultaneously, work environment, reward, and punishment have a significant effect on employee loyalty (sig. = 0.000). These findings highlight the importance of a supportive work environment and an effective reward system in improving employee loyalty.

Keywords: *Work Environment, Reward, Punishment, Employee Loyalty, Novotel Pekanbaru Hotel.*

A. INTRODUCTION

Employee loyalty is an important aspect of human resource management, particularly in the hospitality industry, where service quality and operational consistency depend heavily on employees. Employees who demonstrate loyalty are more likely to maintain commitment, comply with organizational regulations, cooperate with colleagues, and contribute to the achievement of organizational objectives. Employee loyalty is closely associated with psychological attachment to the organization, which is reflected in employees' willingness to remain committed and contribute positively to the company (Robbins & Judge, 2018; Siswanto, 2021). Therefore, maintaining employee loyalty is essential for organizations seeking to establish workforce stability and improve operational performance.

One of the factors that may influence employee loyalty is the work environment. The work environment encompasses various aspects surrounding employees, including working conditions, facilities, work methods, atmosphere, and interpersonal relationships within the organization. (Sedarmayanti, 2020) explains that the work environment includes the tools, working methods, atmosphere, and relationships among individuals within an organization. A supportive work

environment can provide employees with comfort and facilitate the completion of their responsibilities. In the hospitality industry, a conducive work environment, harmonious relationships among employees, effective communication between supervisors and subordinates, and adequate facilities are important considerations in supporting employee loyalty (Sedarmayanti, 2020).

A supportive work environment is particularly important in the hospitality industry because comfortable and supportive working conditions can help employees feel secure and reduce work-related pressure, thereby encouraging them to remain in the organization(Huang, 2024).

In addition to the work environment, reward is another factor associated with employee loyalty. Reward refers to compensation and recognition provided by an organization in return for employees' contributions and performance. Reward may include salary, wages, incentives, benefits, and interpersonal recognition (Kadarisman, 2017). An appropriate reward system can serve as a means of recognizing employees' contributions and encouraging their commitment to the organization. In the context of Hotel Novotel Pekanbaru, the availability and distribution of rewards are relevant to employee loyalty, particularly when employees perceive that compensation, incentives, and appreciation are fair and appropriate to their responsibilities (Kadarisman, 2017).

Punishment also represents an important element of human resource management, particularly in maintaining discipline and organizational compliance. Punishment is generally implemented to address violations, correct inappropriate behavior, and maintain organizational regulations. (Rivai, 2018) states that punishment aims to correct employee violations, maintain applicable rules, and provide lessons to employees who commit violations. However, punishment must be implemented appropriately and consistently to support organizational discipline. In the hospitality industry, excessive or rigid punishment may create additional pressure on employees, particularly when work demands and operational workloads are high. Therefore, the relationship between punishment and employee loyalty requires further empirical investigation (Rivai, 2018).

Previous research has also examined the relationship between reward, punishment, and employee loyalty by considering job satisfaction as an intervening variable. This provides additional support for examining reward and punishment as factors associated with employee loyalty(Pratama & Srimulyani, 2023).

The importance of employee loyalty is reflected in the employment conditions at Hotel Novotel Pekanbaru. Based on the hotel's employee turnover data, the labor turnover rate increased from 3.77% in 2021 to 5.53% in 2022, 5.83% in 2023, 9.78% in 2024, and 11.76% in 2025. During the same period, the number of employees declined from 135 in 2021 to 97 in 2025. This trend indicates an increasing workforce turnover problem and raises concerns regarding employee retention and organizational stability. The data provided by Hotel Novotel Pekanbaru indicate that employee turnover has become a significant issue requiring attention from management (Hotel Novotel Pekanbaru, 2026).

Previous studies have examined the relationship between reward, punishment, and employee loyalty. (Imaniyah et al., 2022) investigated the relationship between reward and punishment and employee loyalty, while (Putri et al., 2024) contributed to the discussion of employee loyalty in organizational settings. (Sari & Wijaya, 2025) emphasized the importance of reward and punishment in relation to employee loyalty and retention. Research in the hospitality industry has also specifically examined the relationship between reward and employee loyalty, highlighting the relevance of reward practices in hotel human resource management(Budiartini et al., 2024). However, the thesis identifies a research gap concerning the simultaneous examination of work environment, reward, and punishment within the hospitality industry, particularly in an international-standard four-star hotel in Pekanbaru. This research gap highlights the need to examine these three variables together in the specific context of Hotel Novotel Pekanbaru (Imaniyah et al., 2022; Putri et al., 2024; Sari & Wijaya, 2025).

Based on these conditions, this study aims to examine and analyze the influence of work environment, reward, and punishment on employee loyalty at Hotel Novotel Pekanbaru. Specifically, this study investigates the partial influence of each independent variable on employee loyalty and the simultaneous influence of work environment, reward, and punishment. The findings are expected to provide empirical insights and practical recommendations for hotel management in improving human resource management practices, strengthening employee loyalty, and addressing employee turnover challenges at Hotel Novotel Pekanbaru.

B. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Employee Loyalty

Employee loyalty refers to an employee's commitment, attachment, and willingness to remain part of an organization while contributing to its goals. (Robbins & Judge, 2018) explain organizational commitment as the extent to which employees identify with an organization and its objectives and wish to maintain membership in it. (Siswanto, 2021) similarly describes work loyalty as a psychological condition characterized by faithfulness, obedience, and dedication to the organization. (Hasibuan, 2019) emphasizes loyalty to one's work, position, and organization, including the willingness to protect the organization's interests and reputation.

(Siswanto, 2021) identifies several manifestations of employee loyalty, including compliance with organizational rules, responsibility for work, willingness to cooperate, a sense of ownership, interpersonal relationships, and enjoyment of the job. (Agustini, 2019) notes that loyalty can be supported by attention to employees, career development, positive workplace relationships, and a comfortable work environment. These perspectives suggest that loyalty is shaped not only by employees' individual attitudes but also by organizational conditions and management practices.

2. Work Environment, Reward, and Punishment

The work environment encompasses the physical and social conditions surrounding employees while they perform their duties. (Nitisemito, 2020) defines it as everything around employees that may influence their work, while (Afandi, 2018) includes factors such as temperature, ventilation, lighting, cleanliness, noise, and work equipment. (Sedarmayanti, 2020) distinguishes between the physical work environment—facilities and other physical conditions—and the non-physical environment, which includes relationships with supervisors and coworkers, communication, and cooperation. (Nitisemito, 2020) indicators include the work atmosphere, relationships among coworkers, relationships between employees and supervisors, and the availability of work facilities. A supportive work environment may promote comfort, work enthusiasm, and employees' willingness to remain with an organization.

Reward refers to financial and non-financial returns given to employees in recognition of their contribution, effort, or achievement. (Kadarisman, 2017) describes reward as the returns employees receive for services provided to an organization, while (Sutrisno, 2019) emphasizes compensation for employees' time, energy, and thought. (Fahmi, 2017) categorizes rewards into direct financial rewards such as salary, bonuses, and overtime; financial benefits such as insurance and health support; and non-financial rewards such as a comfortable workplace. (Kadarisman, 2017) identifies salary, wages, incentives, benefits, and interpersonal recognition as reward indicators. Properly designed rewards can help attract and retain employees and encourage higher performance.

Punishment is a sanction applied when employees violate organizational rules or fail to meet established work standards. (Rivai, 2018) states that punishment is intended to correct violations, maintain rules, and provide a lesson to employees. (Fahmi, 2017) also associates punishment with failure to comply with organizational instructions or performance standards. Punishment may be preventive, intended to discourage violations, or corrective/disciplinary, imposed after a violation has occurred (Purwanto, 2018). (Rivai, 2018) groups punishment into light sanctions, such as verbal or written warnings; moderate sanctions, such as salary or promotion delays; and severe sanctions, such as demotion or termination. In practice, punishment is expected to maintain discipline, although its relationship with loyalty may depend on fairness, consistency, and how sanctions are implemented.

3. Previous Studies and Research Hypotheses

Previous studies have examined the relationship between reward, punishment, work environment, and employee loyalty in different organizational settings. (Imaniyah et al., 2022) found that reward and punishment jointly had a significant effect on employee loyalty at PT Anugrah Mitra Investa. (Kee et al., 2023), studying employees at Swiss-Belhotel Harbour Bay in Batam, also investigated reward and punishment in the hospitality sector and reported that both variables significantly affected loyalty. (Putri et al., 2024) reported significant relationships

between work environment, reward, and employee loyalty, although the study was conducted outside the hotel sector. (Mustika & Hastini, 2025) found that work-life balance, reward, and punishment jointly influenced employee loyalty at CV Sido Harind.

Although these studies provide relevant evidence, the present research focuses on the Novotel Pekanbaru Hotel and considers work environment, reward, and punishment together. This combination is relevant to hospitality operations, where employee loyalty may be influenced by workplace conditions, recognition of employee contributions, and disciplinary practices. Based on the theoretical arguments and previous findings, the following hypotheses are proposed:

H_1: Work environment has a positive and significant effect on employee loyalty at Novotel Pekanbaru Hotel.

H_2: Reward has a positive and significant effect on employee loyalty at Novotel Pekanbaru Hotel.

H_3: Punishment has a significant effect on employee loyalty at Novotel Pekanbaru Hotel.

H_4: Work environment, reward, and punishment simultaneously have a significant effect on employee loyalty at Novotel Pekanbaru Hotel.

C. METHOD

This study employed a quantitative approach to examine the influence of work environment, reward, and punishment on employee loyalty at Novotel Pekanbaru. The research variables consisted of work environment (X1), reward (X2), and punishment (X3) as independent variables, and employee loyalty (Y) as the dependent variable. The research was conducted at Novotel Pekanbaru, located at Jalan Riau No. 59, Pekanbaru, Indonesia.

The population consisted of 97 employees of Novotel Pekanbaru. A saturated sampling technique was applied, meaning that all members of the population were included as respondents. Therefore, the research sample comprised 97 employees. Primary data were collected using a questionnaire containing statements related to the research variables. Responses were measured using a five-point Likert scale.

The collected data were processed and analyzed using IBM SPSS. The analysis included instrument validity and reliability testing, classical assumption testing, and multiple linear regression analysis. Validity was assessed using Pearson correlation, while reliability was evaluated using Cronbach's alpha. Classical assumption tests included normality, multicollinearity, and heteroscedasticity tests. The Kolmogorov–Smirnov test was used to assess normality; tolerance and variance inflation factor (VIF) values were examined for multicollinearity; and the Glejser test was used to assess heteroscedasticity.

Multiple linear regression was used to estimate the effect of work environment, reward, and punishment on employee loyalty. The individual effects of the independent variables were examined using t-tests, while their simultaneous effect was assessed using the F-test. The coefficient of determination (R^2) was used to

determine the proportion of variation in employee loyalty explained by the independent variables. Statistical decisions were based on a 5% significance level (α = 0.05).

The regression model was specified as follows:

$$\mathbf{Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3 + e}$$

where Y represents employee loyalty, a is the constant, b_1–b_3 are the regression coefficients, X_1 represents work environment, X_2 represents reward, X_3 represents punishment, and e is the error term.

D. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This study examined the effects of work environment (X1), reward (X2), and punishment (X3) on employee loyalty (Y) at Novotel Pekanbaru. The analysis used questionnaire data from 97 employees, representing the entire population through saturated sampling. The data were processed using IBM SPSS Statistics. All 97 responses were usable, with no missing data reported in the thesis.

1. Respondents' Perceptions of the Study Variables

The descriptive analysis in the thesis indicates generally positive responses to the work environment and employee loyalty variables. Work environment was measured using four statements, reward using five statements, punishment using three statements, and employee loyalty using six statements, all on a five-point Likert scale. The thesis reports an overall mean score of 3.85 for employee loyalty, interpreted as a generally positive level. However, the item measuring liking for one's work (Y6) received the lowest mean of 2.75 and was classified as neutral. This suggests that respondents' loyalty was more evident in obedience, responsibility, and cooperation than in their enjoyment of the work itself.

2. Validity and Reliability Tests

Pearson Product Moment correlations were used to assess item validity. With 97 respondents, the thesis used an r-table value of 0.1996. All 18 questionnaire items exceeded this threshold and were considered valid.

Table 1. Validity Test

Variable	Item	r-value(s)	r-table	Decision
Work Environment (X1)	X1.1–X1.4	0.901; 0.881; 0.879; 0.847	0.1996	All valid
Reward (X2)	X2.1–X2.5	0.819; 0.824; 0.787; 0.760; 0.806	0.1996	All valid
Punishment (X3)	X3.1–X3.3	0.863; 0.849; 0.909	0.1996	All valid
Employee Loyalty (Y)	Y1–Y6	0.710; 0.780; 0.744; 0.736; 0.792; 0.797	0.1996	All valid

Reliability was assessed using Cronbach's Alpha, with 0.60 as the minimum criterion. Each construct exceeded this threshold.

Table 2. Reliability Test

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	Number of items	Decision

Work Environment (X1)	0.899	4	Reliable
Reward (X2)	0.855	5	Reliable
Punishment (X3)	0.845	3	Reliable
Employee Loyalty (Y)	0.852	6	Reliable

3. Work Environment and Employee Loyalty

The normality test using the One-Sample Kolmogorov–Smirnov procedure produced a test statistic of 0.078 and an Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) value of 0.173 (N = 97). Since 0.173 > 0.05, the residuals were considered normally distributed. The thesis also reports that the points in the Normal P–P Plot follow the diagonal line.

Table 3. Normality Test

Normality statistic	Value
N	97
Residual mean	0
Residual standard deviation	3.67644713
K–S test statistic	0.078
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0.173

The multicollinearity test reported tolerance values above 0.10 and VIF values below 10 for all independent variables, indicating no multicollinearity according to the thesis's criteria.

Table 4. Multicollinearity Test

Variable	Tolerance	VIF (as shown in table)	Conclusion
Work environment (X1)	0.918	1.089	No multicollinearity
Reward (X2)	0.949	1.053	No multicollinearity
Punishment (X3)	0.956	1.046	No multicollinearity

For heteroscedasticity, the Glejser test showed significance values above 0.05 for all independent variables. The scatterplot was also described as showing randomly distributed points without a clear pattern.

Table 5. Heteroscedasticity Test

Variable	B	t	Sig.	Conclusion
Work Environment (X1)	0.054	0.858	0.393	No heteroscedasticity
Reward (X2)	0.029	0.536	0.593	No heteroscedasticity
Punishment (X3)	−0.034	−0.380	0.706	No heteroscedasticity

Taken together, the thesis concludes that the regression model met the normality, multicollinearity, and heteroscedasticity assumptions and could proceed to multiple regression analysis.

4. Multiple Linear Regression

The multiple linear regression analysis yielded the following equation: Y = 8.322 + 0.220X1 + 0.534X2 + 0.202X3 + e

Table 6. Multiple Linear Regression Test

Variable	B	Std. Error	Standardized Beta	t	Sig.
Constant	8.322	2.305	—	3.611	0.000
Work Environment (X1)	0.220	0.101	0.186	2.183	0.032

Reward (X2)	0.534	0.087	0.517	6.163	0.000
Punishment (X3)	0.202	0.143	0.118	1.412	0.161

The positive coefficients indicate that each independent variable has a positive estimated relationship with employee loyalty when the other variables are held constant. Reward has the largest standardized beta (0.517), making it the strongest predictor among the variables included in the model.

5. Hypothesis Testing

The partial effects were assessed using the t-test at the 5% significance level.

Table 7. Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis/Variable	t-value	t-table	Sig.	Decision
H1: Work environment → loyalty	2.183	1.986	0.032	Accepted; significant
H2: Reward → loyalty	6.163	1.986	0.000	Accepted; significant
H3: Punishment → loyalty	1.412	1.986	0.161	Rejected; not significant

Work environment had a positive and significant partial effect on employee loyalty ($t = 2.183$; $p = 0.032$). Reward also had a positive and significant effect ($t = 6.163$; $p = 0.000$). Punishment was not statistically significant ($t = 1.412$; $p = 0.161$), despite its positive regression coefficient.

The simultaneous effect was examined using the F-test. The thesis reports $F = 18.896$, with F-table = 2.70 and significance = 0.000. Since $18.896 > 2.70$ and $p < 0.05$, H4 was accepted: work environment, reward, and punishment jointly have a significant effect on employee loyalty.

Table 8. Correlation of Determination

Model statistic	Value
F	18.896
F-table	2.70
Significance	0.000
Decision	Jointly significant

Table 9. Coefficient of Determination

Statistic	Value	Interpretation
R	0.615	Multiple correlation reported in the thesis
R Square	0.379	The predictors explain 37.9% of loyalty variation
Adjusted R Square	0.359	Adjusted explanatory proportion: 35.9%

The R Square value of 0.379 indicates that work environment, reward, and punishment jointly explain 37.9% of the variation in employee loyalty. The remaining 62.1% is attributable to factors outside the model.

6. Summary of Findings

The results support H1, H2, and H4, while H3 is not supported. Work environment and reward are significant positive predictors of employee loyalty, with reward showing the strongest standardized effect. Punishment is not significant when assessed individually, although the three predictors are significant as a group. The findings are consistent with the thesis's conclusion that improving

the work environment and optimizing reward practices should be central to efforts to strengthen employee loyalty at Novotel Pekanbaru.

The findings indicate that employee loyalty at Novotel Pekanbaru Hotel is associated particularly with the work environment and reward system. The partial regression results show that both variables have positive and statistically significant effects, whereas punishment does not have a significant partial effect. Nevertheless, the overall regression model is statistically significant, suggesting that the three factors considered together provide a meaningful explanation of employee loyalty.

The work environment has a positive and significant effect on employee loyalty ($t = 2.183$; $p = 0.032$). This result supports the first hypothesis and is consistent with the premise in the thesis that a supportive physical and non-physical environment can foster employee comfort, security, and willingness to remain in an organization. At Novotel Pekanbaru Hotel, the documented workplace conditions include air-conditioned work areas, standard lighting, cleanliness, safety facilities, adequate work equipment, interdepartmental cooperation, professional communication between supervisors and subordinates, clear SOPs, and regular briefings. However, the thesis also describes operational pressures, night shifts, emotional labor, and workload challenges. The significant result therefore highlights the importance of maintaining a supportive work environment in the context of hotel operations.

Reward shows a positive and significant effect on employee loyalty ($t = 6.163$; $p < 0.001$), supporting the second hypothesis. Reward also has the largest standardized beta coefficient in the regression model ($\beta = 0.517$), making it the strongest partial predictor among the variables examined. This finding is consistent with the thesis discussion that recognition and appreciation can strengthen employees' motivation and attachment to the organization. Novotel Pekanbaru Hotel provides financial and non-financial rewards, including a financial incentive of IDR 500,000 for employees who achieve KPI and revenue targets for three consecutive months, career advancement, recognition, training, health benefits, and workplace facilities. The thesis notes, however, that fewer than 15% of employees achieve the financial incentive. This suggests a practical consideration for management: reward criteria and targets should be evaluated to ensure that incentives are attainable and perceived as fair, while continuing to recognize performance and development.

Punishment has a positive regression coefficient but does not have a statistically significant partial effect on employee loyalty ($t = 1.412$; $p = 0.161$). Thus, the third hypothesis is not supported. The finding does not establish that punishment has no role in hotel management; rather, it indicates that the study did not find sufficient evidence of an independent significant relationship with loyalty in this sample. The thesis describes disciplinary measures ranging from verbal warnings and written warnings to suspension and demotion. It also notes that some minor violations, such as lateness or uniform-related issues, may occur in the context of fatigue and demanding shift schedules. In this context, discipline may need to be

accompanied by fair procedures, communication, coaching, and attention to workload and scheduling, rather than relying only on punitive measures.

The F-test indicates that work environment, reward, and punishment jointly have a significant effect on employee loyalty ($p < 0.001$), supporting the fourth hypothesis. The coefficient of determination ($R^2 = 0.379$) shows that the model explains 37.9% of the variation in employee loyalty, while 62.1% is attributable to factors not included in the model. This result suggests that loyalty is multifaceted and may also be associated with other organizational or individual factors that were not examined in the present study.

From a managerial perspective, the results suggest prioritizing improvements to the work environment and the reward system because both variables show significant partial effects. Maintaining effective communication, cooperation across departments, and supportive working conditions is important in a high-pressure hospitality setting. Reward programs may be reviewed in terms of fairness, clarity, and accessibility. Punishment should continue to be applied consistently and proportionately to support discipline, while managers should also consider whether work fatigue, shift arrangements, or workload contribute to particular violations. These implications follow the results and recommendations stated in the thesis and should not be interpreted as causal conclusions beyond the study design.

E. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the results of the research on the influence of work environment, reward, and punishment on employee loyalty at Novotel Pekanbaru, several conclusions can be drawn. The study involved 97 employees and analyzed the data using multiple linear regression. First, the work environment has a positive and significant effect on employee loyalty. The t-test result ($t = 2.183$; significance = 0.032) indicates that a more supportive work environment is associated with higher employee loyalty. This suggests that working conditions and the organizational environment are important factors in supporting employees' commitment to the hotel. Reward has a positive and significant effect on employee loyalty and is the strongest predictor among the three independent variables in the regression model. The result ($t = 6.163$; significance = 0.000; standardized beta = 0.517) indicates that rewards—including incentives, recognition, promotion opportunities, training, and benefits—play an important role in strengthening employee loyalty. Punishment does not have a statistically significant effect on employee loyalty. The t-test result ($t = 1.412$; significance = 0.161) does not provide sufficient evidence of a significant relationship in this study. Therefore, punishment alone cannot be considered a significant determinant of employee loyalty at Novotel Pekanbaru. Finally, work environment, reward, and punishment jointly have a significant effect on employee loyalty, as indicated by the F-test ($F = 18.896$; significance = 0.000). The coefficient of determination ($R^2 = 0.379$) shows that the three variables explain 37.9% of the variation in employee loyalty, while the remaining 62.1% is explained by factors outside the scope of this research. Overall, the findings highlight the importance of

maintaining a supportive work environment and strengthening reward practices, while applying punishment fairly and consistently as part of employee management.

REFERENCES

1. Afandi, P. (2018). *Concept & Indicator Human Resource Management for Management Research*. Deepublish.
2. Agustini, F. (2019). *Strategi Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. UISU Press.
3. Budiartini, N. N., Lestari, M. N. D., & Sutrisna, I. P. E. (2024). Hubungan reward dengan loyalitas karyawan pada industri perhotelan. *Guna Sewaka Jurnal Pariwisata*, *2*(1).
4. Fahmi, I. (2017). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia: Teori dan Aplikasi*. Alfabeta.
5. Hasibuan, M. S. P. (2019). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia*. Bumi Aksara.
6. Huang, Y. (2024). Supportive Work Environment in the Hotel Industry. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, *6*(4).
7. Imaniyah, K., Firdaus, M. A., & Agung, S. (2022). Pengaruh reward dan punishment terhadap loyalitas karyawan PT Anugrah Mitra Investa. *Jurnal Ilmiah Wahana Pendidikan*, *8*(14), 643–652.
8. Kadarisman, M. (2017). *Manajemen Pengembangan Sumber Daya Manusia*. Rajawali Pers.
9. Kee, Y., Rahayu, A. N., & Setiawan, D. (2023). Pengaruh reward dan punishment terhadap loyalitas karyawan pada Swiss-Belhotel Harbour Bay, Batam. *Jurnal Ekonomi, Sosial & Humaniora*, *4*(12), 1–6.
10. Mustika, N. T., & Hastini, L. Y. (2025). Pengaruh work-life balance, reward dan punishment terhadap loyalitas karyawan pada CV Sido Harind Tabing Kecamatan Koto Tangah Kota Padang Sumatera Barat. *Journal of Business Economics and Management*, *1*(3).
11. Nitisemito, A. S. (2020). *Manajemen Personalia: Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia* (Edisi Revisi). Ghalia Indonesia.
12. Pratama, A. W., & Srimulyani, V. A. (2023). Pengaruh reward dan punishment terhadap loyalitas karyawan dengan kepuasan kerja sebagai variabel intervening. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Dan Bisnis*, *9*(2), 145–158.
13. Purwanto, N. (2018). *Ilmu Pendidikan Teoretis dan Praktis*. Remaja Rosdakarya.
14. Putri, N. E., Sutikno, B., & Laksmita, D. (2024). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja dan reward terhadap loyalitas karyawan PT Fahira Berkah Olindo. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Dan Bisnis*, *3*(3).
15. Rivai, V. (2018). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia untuk Perusahaan dari Teori ke Praktek*. Rajawali Pers.
16. Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2018). *Organizational Behavior*. Pearson Education.
17. Sari, D. P., & Wijaya, A. (2025). Pengaruh sistem reward dan punishment terhadap loyalitas serta retensi karyawan pada industri perhotelan. *Jurnal Manajemen Bisnis Dan Jasa*, *13*(1), 45–58.

18. Sedarmayanti. (2020). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia: Reformasi Birokrasi dan Manajemen Pegawai Negeri Sipil*. Refika Aditama.
19. Siswanto, B. (2021). *Manajemen Tenaga Kerja Indonesia*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
20. Sutrisno, E. (2019). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Prenada Media Group.