Escalate: Economics and Business Journal
https://journal.takaza.id/index.php/escalate

Vol. 4, No.4, 2026, pp. 1476-1488
E-ISSN: 3025-4213

E-mail:escalate@takaza.id



The Effect of Work Motivation and Work Environment on Employee Performance at Karangreja Community Health Center, Bekasi Regency

Uun Uliyah[1], Yuni Pratikno[2]
[1-2] Universitas Mitra Bangsa
Corresponding Author e-mail :uunajin@gmail.com,yunipratikno@umiba.ac.id

Article History:
Received : 10-10-2026
Revised : 21-11-2026
Accepted : 22-11-2026

Keywords: ***Motivation, Work Environment, Performance***

Abstract: *This study aims to determine the extent of influence of motivation and work environment on employee performance at the Karangreja Community Health Center, Bekasi Regency. Motivation and a good work environment are predicted to be variables that can continuously improve employee performance. The author's purpose in conducting this study was to determine and analyze employee motivation, work environment, and performance, as well as the extent of influence of motivation and work environment on employee performance at the Karangreja Community Health Center, Bekasi Regency, both simultaneously and partially. The method used in this study is a quantitative descriptive approach. The sample in this study were 30 employees of the Karangreja Community Health Center, Bekasi Regency. The data in this study are primary data, where the data is obtained from respondents' answers to the questionnaire distributed by the author. The results of the data analysis that the author has conducted, the results show that there is an influence of motivation and work environment on employee performance at the Karangreja Community Health Center, Bekasi Regency, both partially and simultaneously. Employee performance is influenced by motivation and work environment variables by 82.7%, and the remaining 17.3% is influenced by other factors not examined in this study.*

How to Cite: Uun Uliyah, Yuni Pratikno. (2026). *The Effect of Work Motivation and Work Environment on Employee Performance at Karangreja Community Health Center, Bekasi Regency*. *4*(4). pp.1475-1488. https://doi.org/10.61536/escalate.v4i4.941

https://doi.org/10.61536/escalate.v4i4.941

This is an open-access article under theCC-BY-SA License.

Introduction

Human resource management plays a fundamental role in enabling organizations to achieve their goals effectively and sustainably. Human resources should not be viewed solely as operational assets, but also as individuals whose competencies, motivation, and work-related behavior contribute to the overall quality of organizational performance. Hasibuan (2012:10) defines human resource management as the science and art of managing employee relationships and roles effectively and efficiently to accomplish organizational, individual, and societal objectives. Accordingly,

organizations need to manage their employees appropriately by ensuring the availability of sufficient support, resources, and conducive working conditions. This responsibility is particularly significant in public healthcare institutions, where employee performance contributes directly to the quality and continuity of healthcare services provided to the community. Gile et al. (2018) emphasize that human resource management practices, including those aimed at improving employee motivation, skills, and empowerment, are closely related to performance outcomes in healthcare organizations. In addition, Krijgsheld et al. (2022) highlight the importance of understanding and improving employee job performance to support the effectiveness of healthcare organizations.

Employee performance can be understood as the process and outcomes of the work accomplished by individuals in fulfilling their assigned responsibilities. Wibowo (2014:70) explains that performance relates to how work activities are carried out to produce the results expected by an organization. In healthcare institutions, employee performance is essential because personnel are required to complete administrative and healthcare-related duties in accordance with established standards and organizational objectives. Achieving effective performance requires not only adequate knowledge and skills but also organizational support, particularly in relation to work motivation and the work environment. Therefore, efforts to improve employee performance need to consider both individual characteristics and organizational conditions. This is consistent with Krijgsheld et al. (2022), who identify job performance as an important component of healthcare organizational effectiveness and discuss the various dimensions that contribute to performance in healthcare settings.

Work motivation is one of the factors that encourages employees to carry out their responsibilities effectively. Robbins (2017:206–234) explains motivation in terms of an individual's potential energy and the factors that influence the direction and intensity of its use. Similarly, Wibowo (2014:322) defines motivation as a process that determines the intensity, direction, and persistence of individual efforts toward achieving particular goals. Griffin (2003:38) also underlines the importance of motivation in shaping employee performance. Employees with strong work motivation are more likely to demonstrate responsibility, initiative, persistence, and commitment when completing their assigned duties. In contrast, insufficient motivation may weaken employees' enthusiasm and willingness to achieve organizational targets. Wursanto (2005:301) further relates motivation to internal drives, desires, and encouragement that stimulate individuals to take action. Empirical evidence also supports the relevance of motivation to employee performance. Wang et al. (2024), through a meta-analytic review of longitudinal studies, found that work motivation positively predicts subsequent job performance. Similarly, Agung (2022) reported that work motivation was significantly associated with the performance of medical employees at public health centers in Palembang.

In addition to work motivation, the work environment represents an important organizational factor that may influence employee performance. Sedarmayanti (2001:122) explains that the physical work environment includes conditions such as lighting and air temperature, which contribute to creating a conducive atmosphere and influencing employees' enthusiasm for work. The work environment also includes non-physical conditions, such as communication, relationships among colleagues, and interactions between employees and supervisors. Mangkunegara (2006:233) identifies job descriptions, authority, work targets, communication patterns, harmonious working relationships, organizational climate, career opportunities, and work facilities as elements associated with the work environment. A supportive work environment can enhance employees' comfort, concentration, and productivity, whereas inadequate working conditions may diminish their enthusiasm and productivity (Ahyari, 1986:45). Consequently, physical facilities and interpersonal relationships need to receive appropriate attention in efforts to improve employee performance. Maassen et al. (2020) demonstrate

https://doi.org/10.61536/escalate.v4i4.941
This open-access article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY-SA) 4.0 license

that the healthcare work environment comprises various dimensions that need to be considered when assessing the conditions experienced by healthcare professionals. Furthermore, Haraldsson et al. (2024) explain that workplace interventions tailored to organizational needs can contribute to better working conditions, employee health, and well-being in hospital settings.

Although work motivation and the work environment are widely recognized as relevant factors in employee performance, their contributions need to be examined within the particular organizational settings in which employees perform their duties. The relationship between these variables cannot be fully explained through general theoretical perspectives alone, because workplace conditions, organizational characteristics, and employee needs may vary from one institution to another. Public healthcare institutions, in particular, require employees to maintain consistent performance while responding to service demands and fulfilling organizational responsibilities. Previous research has also demonstrated the importance of examining these factors in specific healthcare settings. For example, Ibrahim et al. (2025) investigated the relationship between motivation, work environment, and the performance of healthcare workers at a hospital in Semarang. Gile et al. (2018) likewise indicate that the relationship between human resource management practices and performance may depend on the characteristics and context of healthcare organizations. These findings reinforce the need for an institution-specific assessment to determine whether work motivation and the work environment are associated with employee performance and how these factors contribute individually and simultaneously.

This issue is relevant to Karangreja Community Health Center, located in Karangreja Village, Pebayuran District, Bekasi Regency. As a public healthcare institution, the health center requires employees who are capable of carrying out their responsibilities effectively to support organizational objectives and the delivery of healthcare services. Nevertheless, preliminary observations conducted by the researchers indicate several workplace problems. Some employees experience difficulties in completing tasks assigned by their supervisors appropriately and within the required time. Interactions between supervisors and subordinates, particularly in providing guidance, encouragement, and work-related motivation, are considered insufficient. Employees also appear to demonstrate limited enthusiasm and seriousness in carrying out their responsibilities, which may result in delays and an accumulation of unfinished work. In addition, the physical work environment remains less than optimal, particularly in terms of air-conditioning facilities and inadequate lighting in certain rooms, potentially causing discomfort during working activities. These conditions suggest that motivational and environmental factors require further attention in relation to employee performance. Similar concerns regarding the importance of non-physical work conditions and employee motivation have also been examined by Kusumawati et al. (2022) in their study of employees at Loa Janan Community Health Center. Moreover, Rahmawati et al. (2020) examined the contribution of work motivation and the work environment to performance in a public health center context.

The conditions identified through preliminary observations provide the contextual foundation for examining the relationship between work motivation, the work environment, and employee performance at Karangreja Community Health Center. Although previous theories have established the relevance of these factors to organizational performance, the specific contribution of each variable within this healthcare institution has not yet been established through the present study. Accordingly, this research addresses a contextual research gap by examining the partial and simultaneous effects of work motivation and the work environment on employee performance among the employees of Karangreja Community Health Center. The importance of examining these relationships is also supported by Wang et al. (2024), whose meta-analytic findings demonstrate the relevance of work motivation to subsequent job performance, as well as by Haraldsson et al. (2024), who emphasize the need to address workplace conditions through interventions that reflect the specific needs of an

https://doi.org/10.61536/escalate.v4i4.941
This open-access article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY-SA) 4.0 license

organization. The findings of this study are expected to provide empirical information that can support human resource management practices in public healthcare institutions, particularly in identifying areas that need improvement to strengthen employee performance.

Based on this background, this study aims to analyze the effect of work motivation on employee performance, examine the effect of the work environment on employee performance, and determine the simultaneous effect of work motivation and the work environment on employee performance at Karangreja Community Health Center, Bekasi Regency. The findings are expected to provide practical recommendations for health center management in developing appropriate motivational strategies, improving workplace conditions, and strengthening employee relationships and organizational communication. From an academic perspective, this research is expected to contribute institution-specific empirical evidence to the field of human resource management, particularly regarding the role of work motivation and the work environment in supporting employee performance in public healthcare institutions.

Theoretical Review

Motivation is an individual who has a potential energy reserve, how this energy is released and developed depends on the strength or motivational drive of the individual and the situation and opportunities available.

Robbins (2017: 206-234)

The work environment is the entirety of the tools and materials encountered, the surrounding environment in which a person works, their work methods, and their work arrangements both as individuals and as a group.

(Sedarmayanti:2019:1)

Performance is the work results in terms of quality and quantity achieved by an employee in carrying out his duties in accordance with the responsibilities given to him.

TR. Mitchell (2018:51)

Hypothesis

Hypothesis according to Sugiyono (2019:99), is a temporary answer to the formulation of research problems and is based on empirical facts obtained through data collection. Based on the main problem that has been stated in chapter I, and the theoretical basis that supports this research (shown in chapter II), the following working hypothesis can be proposed: It is suspected that there is work motivation on employee performance; It is suspected that there is an influence of the work environment on employee performance; It is suspected that there is a simultaneous influence of work motivation and work environment on employee performance.

Methodology

The method used in this research is descriptive and verification method. According to Sugiyono (2012: 53) descriptive method is a problem formulation that concerns the question of the existence of independent variables, either in only one variable or more (independent variables are variables that stand alone, not independent variables because independent variables are always paired with dependent variables).

https://doi.org/10.61536/escalate.v4i4.941
This open-access article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY-SA) 4.0 license

Research Results And Discussion

Discussion

Table 1 Work Motivation Recapitulation (X1)

Descriptive Statistics			
	Mean	**N**	**Category**
Salary can provide encouragement to work harder	3.67	30	Good
Old age security allowance to bind employees	4.07	30	Good
The work given really challenges my abilities.	3.87	30	Good
I want to develop my skills while working in the company	4.13	30	Good
I feel the current working environment is very conducive	3.93	30	Good
Every time I achieve a target, I always get an award or reward.	3.80	30	Good
Every work that has been carried out deserves an award	3.73	30	Good
Every work that has been carried out deserves an award	3.93	30	Good
I want to develop my career in this company	3.67	30	Good
I want to get rewards in this company	4.07	30	Good
Motivation	**3.89**	**30**	**Good**

Based on the table above, it can be described that the recapitulation of the Work Motivation variable obtained an average result of 3.89, which is included in the Good category.

Table 2 Recapitulation of Work Environment Variables (X2)

Descriptive Statistics			
	Mean	**N**	**Category**
The lighting in my workplace makes me feel comfortable.	3.73	30	Good
Having music makes me more enthusiastic about working	3.93	30	Good
The cleanliness of the toilets for personnel at the workplace is well maintained.	3.97	30	Good
The existence of health facilities including doctors and care assistance can maintain my condition.	3.80	30	Good
The color of the walls around the work area does not disturb my work concentration	4.07	30	Good
Noise at work does not disturb my work concentration.	3.97	30	Good
I don't feel hot at work because there is good air circulation in the workplace.	3.87	30	Good
I feel that the agency has provided good job security so that I can work in peace.	3.93	30	Good

https://doi.org/10.61536/escalate.v4i4.941
This open-access article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY-SA) 4.0 license

The space where I work allows me to work freely.	3.73	30	Good
I prefer eating out for lunch rather than having a catered lunch.	3.93	30	Good
Every employee has a good relationship with other employees.	3.67	30	Good
At work, employees have good relationships with their superiors.	4.07	30	Good
Work environment	**3.89**	**30**	**Good**

Based on the table above, it can be described that the recapitulation of the work environment variables obtained an average result of 3.89, which is included in the Good category.

Table 3 Recapitulation of Performance Variables (Y)

Descriptive Statistics			
	Mean	**N**	**Category**
The work done can be assessed for quality	3.97	30	Good
The work done is in accordance with targets or expectations	4.00	30	Good
The work done is very satisfactory	3.90	30	Good
The work carried out can be completed within the specified time target.	3.93	30	Good
When working, I don't like to delay completing work	4.07	30	Good
In working, have high initiative	4.10	30	Good
Have creative ideas and thoughts in improving the quality of work	3.80	30	Good
Provide input to management on what to do	3.93	30	Good
In working, have your own way to achieve targets	4.07	30	Good
In working, always exceed the targets that have been set	3.67	30	Good
In working, be a role model and example for other employees	4.07	30	Good
Always communicate well with the leadership	3.73	30	Good
Always communicate well with fellow coworkers	3.97	30	Good
In terms of problem solving, able to be a mediator in resolving the problem	4.00	30	Good
Performance	**3.94**	**30**	**Good**

Based on the table above, it can be described that the recapitulation of the Performance variable obtained an average result of 3.94, which is included in the Good category.

Validity Test

Table 4 Validity Test of Work Motivation Variable (X1)

Correlations			
		Motivation	**Validity**
Salary can provide encouragement to work harder	Pearson Correlation	,652**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000	Valid
	N	30	
Old age security allowance to bind	Pearson Correlation	,572**	

https://doi.org/10.61536/escalate.v4i4.941
This open-access article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY-SA) 4.0 license

Correlations			
		Motivation	**Validity**
employees	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.001	Valid
	N	30	
The work given really challenges my abilities.	Pearson Correlation	,597**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000	Valid
	N	30	
I want to develop my skills while working in the company	Pearson Correlation	,749**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000	Valid
	N	30	
I feel the current working environment is very conducive	Pearson Correlation	,657**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000	Valid
	N	30	
Every time I achieve a target, I always get an award or reward.	Pearson Correlation	,646**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000	Valid
	N	30	
Every work that has been carried out deserves an award	Pearson Correlation	,652**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000	Valid
	N	30	
Every work that has been carried out deserves an award	Pearson Correlation	,652**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000	Valid
	N	30	
I want to develop my career in this company	Pearson Correlation	,652**	Valid
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000	
	N	30	
I want to get rewards in this company	Pearson Correlation	,572**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.001	Valid
	N	30	
Motivation	Pearson Correlation	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)		
	N	30	
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).			
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			

Based on the table above, the results of the validity test of the question items in the questionnaire for the work motivation variable with a critical r < 0.025 show that all items have a smaller significance value and are declared valid.

Table 5 Validity Test of Work Environment Variable (X2)

Correlations			
		Work environment	**Validity**
The lighting in my workplace makes me feel comfortable.	Pearson Correlation	,731**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000	Valid
	N	30	
Having music makes me more enthusiastic about working	Pearson Correlation	,859**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000	Valid
	N	30	
The cleanliness of the toilets	Pearson Correlation	,806**	

https://doi.org/10.61536/escalate.v4i4.941
This open-access article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY-SA) 4.0 license

Correlations			
		Work environment	**Validity**
for personnel at the workplace is well maintained.	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000	Valid
	N	30	
The existence of health facilities including doctors and care assistance can maintain my condition.	Pearson Correlation	,850**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000	Valid
	N	30	
The color of the walls around the work area does not disturb my work concentration	Pearson Correlation	,814**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000	Valid
	N	30	
Noise at work does not disturb my work concentration.	Pearson Correlation	,686**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000	Valid
	N	30	
I don't feel hot at work because there is good air circulation in the workplace.	Pearson Correlation	,806**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000	Valid
	N	30	
I feel that the agency has provided good job security so that I can work in peace.	Pearson Correlation	,806**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000	Valid
	N	30	
The space where I work allows me to work freely.	Pearson Correlation	,731**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000	Valid
	N	30	
I prefer eating out for lunch rather than having a catered lunch.	Pearson Correlation	,859**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000	Valid
	N	30	
Every employee has a good relationship with other employees.	Pearson Correlation	,616**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000	Valid
	N	30	
At work, employees have good relationships with their superiors.	Pearson Correlation	,806**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000	Valid
	N	30	
Work environment	Pearson Correlation	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)		
	N	30	
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).			

Based on the table above, the results of the validity test of the question items in the questionnaire for the work environment variable with a critical r < 0.025 show that all items have a smaller significance value and are declared valid.

https://doi.org/10.61536/escalate.v4i4.941
This open-access article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY-SA) 4.0 license

Table 6 Performance Variable Validity Test (Y)

Correlations			
		Performance	**Validity**
The work done can be assessed for quality	Pearson Correlation	,764**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000	Valid
	N	30	
The work done is in accordance with targets or expectations	Pearson Correlation	,781**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000	Valid
	N	30	
The work done is very satisfactory	Pearson Correlation	,846**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000	Valid
	N	30	
The work carried out can be completed within the specified time target.	Pearson Correlation	,600**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000	Valid
	N	30	
When working, I don't like to delay completing work	Pearson Correlation	,909**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000	Valid
	N	30	
In working, have high initiative	Pearson Correlation	,764**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000	Valid
	N	30	
Have creative ideas and thoughts in improving the quality of work	Pearson Correlation	,754**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000	Valid
	N	30	
Provide input to management on what to do	Pearson Correlation	,488**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.006	Valid
	N	30	
In working, have your own way to achieve targets	Pearson Correlation	,478**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.007	Valid
	N	30	
In working, always exceed the targets that have been set	Pearson Correlation	,597**	

https://doi.org/10.61536/escalate.v4i4.941
This open-access article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY-SA) 4.0 license

Correlations			
		Performance	**Validity**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000	Valid
	N	30	
In working, be a role model and example for other employees	Pearson Correlation	,478**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.007	Valid
	N	30	
Always communicate well with the leadership	Pearson Correlation	,642**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000	Valid
	N	30	
Always communicate well with fellow coworkers	Pearson Correlation	,764**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000	Valid
	N	30	
In terms of problem solving, able to be a mediator in resolving the problem	Pearson Correlation	,781**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000	Valid
	N	30	
Performance	Pearson Correlation	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)		
	N	30	
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).			

Based on the table above, the results of the validity test of the question items in the questionnaire for the performance variable with a critical r < 0.025 show that all items have a smaller significance value and are declared valid.

Reliability Test

Table 7 Reliability Test of Work Motivation Variable (X1)

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,797	10

Reliability testing on 30 respondents in the work motivation variable, obtained a Cronbach alpha reliability value of 0.797 for all statements so that it was declared reliable.

https://doi.org/10.61536/escalate.v4i4.941
This open-access article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY-SA) 4.0 license

Table 8 Reliability Test of Work Environment Variable (X2)

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,855	12

Reliability testing on 30 respondents in the work environment variable, obtained a Cronbach alpha reliability value of 0.855 for all statements so that it was declared reliable.

Table 9 Reliability Test of Performance Variable (Y)

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,886	14

Reliability testing on 30 respondents in the performance variable, obtained a Cronbach alpha reliability value of 0.886 for all statements so that it was declared reliable.

Table 10 Results of Simultaneous Analysis of Work Motivation Paths (X1) and Work Environment (X2)

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Standard Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	,909a	,827	,814	3,353	2,314

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

b. Dependent Variable: Performance

ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1447,259	2	723,629	64,367	,000b
	Residual	303,541	27	11,242		
	Total	1750,800	29			

a. Dependent Variable: Performance

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

Based on the ANOVA table, the calculated sig. 0.000 is obtained, which is smaller than the alpha significance of 0.05 (5%), meaning that statistically the hypothesis that there is a simultaneous influence of work motivation and work environment on employee performance is accepted, meaning that there is a significant influence of work motivation and work environment on employee performance at the Karangreja Community Health Center, Bekasi Regency, amounting to 82.7%. While the remaining 17.3% is influenced by other factors not studied. Next, the correlation value between the variables of Work Motivation, Work Environment, and Performance is calculated. The SPSS output results are as follows:

https://doi.org/10.61536/escalate.v4i4.941
This open-access article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY-SA) 4.0 license

Table 11 Results of Correlation Calculation of Work Motivation, Work Environment and Performance

Coefficientsa

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	1,538	4,780		,322	,750		
	Motivation	,695	,170	,480	4,080	,000	,463	2,158
	Work environment	,571	,135	,497	4,218	,000	,463	2,158

a. Dependent Variable: Performance

The results of the correlation calculation of the three variables (work motivation, work environment and performance) meet the requirements of p-value < 0.05.

For partial hypothesis testing, for the work motivation variable (X1) p-value 0.000 < 0.05, and for the work environment variable (X2) p-value 0.000 < 0.05 The decision of the partial hypothesis test is: First hypothesis: H0 is rejected and Ha is accepted, meaning that work motivation (X1) has a partial effect on Performance (Y); Second hypothesis: H0 is rejected and Ha is accepted, meaning that the work environment (X2) has a partial effect on Performance (Y).

Conclusion And Suggestions

Conclusion

In accordance with the results of the assessment and data processing that has been carried out quantitatively and the discussion regarding the influence of motivation and work environment on employee performance at the Karangreja Community Health Center, Bekasi Regency, the author obtained the following income:

1. Motivation influences employee performance at the Karangreja Community Health Center, Bekasi Regency by 71.2%, this result is taken from hypothesis test number 1.
2. The work environment influences employee performance at the Karangreja Community Health Center, Bekasi Regency by 72%, this result is taken from hypothesis test number 2.
3. Motivation and Work Environment simultaneously influence employee performance at the Karangreja Community Health Center, Bekasi Regency with a large influence of 82.7%, this result is taken from hypothesis test number 3.

Suggestion

As a suggestion in this research regarding motivation, work environment, and employee performance at the Karangreja Community Health Center, Bekasi Regency.

1. The Community Health Center is advised to increase employee work motivation by providing awards, recognition for performance, and career development opportunities to encourage improved employee performance.
2. The Community Health Center is expected to create a comfortable, safe, and conducive working environment, both physically and non-physically, so that employees can work optimally.
3. The Health Center leadership should pay more attention to working relationships between employees and organizational communication to create a harmonious working atmosphere.

https://doi.org/10.61536/escalate.v4i4.941
This open-access article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY-SA) 4.0 license

4. Employees are expected to be able to increase work motivation internally, such as by fostering a sense of responsibility and commitment to work.
5. Employees are advised to maintain good working relationships with coworkers to create a positive work environment.
6. Further researchers are advised to add other variables that can influence employee performance, such as job satisfaction, leadership, or workload.
7. It is hoped that further research can use more diverse research methods, such as qualitative methods or mixed methods approaches, so that the research results are more comprehensive.

References

Agung, M. A. P. (2022). The effect of work communication, work motivation, and job satisfaction on the performance of medical employees at Public Health Center of Palembang City (Palembang Ilir Region). *International Journal of Business, Management and Economics, 3*(3), 271–281. https://doi.org/10.47747/ijbme.v3i3.773

Gile, P. P., Buljac-Samardzic, M., & van de Klundert, J. (2018). The effect of human resource management on performance in hospitals in Sub-Saharan Africa: A systematic literature review. *Human Resources for Health, 16*, Article 34. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12960-018-0298-4

Griffin, R. W. (2003). *Management* (7th ed.). Houghton Mifflin.

Haraldsson, P., Nylander, E., Jonker, D., Ros, A., & Areskoug Josefsson, K. (2024). Workplace interventions focusing on how to plan, organize and design the work environment in hospital settings: A systematic review. *Work, 78*(2), 331–348. https://doi.org/10.3233/WOR-230205

Hasibuan, M. S. P. (2012). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia* (Edisi revisi, cetakan ke-16). Bumi Aksara.

Ibrahim, N. P., Tamtomo, D. G., & Murti, B. (2025). The relationship between motivation, length of service, work environment, job satisfaction, and the performance of healthcare workers at National Hospital of Diponegoro, Semarang, Indonesia. *Journal of Health Policy and Management, 10*(3), 341–348. https://doi.org/10.26911/thejhpm.2025.10.03.07

Krijgsheld, M., Tummers, L. G., & Scheepers, F. E. (2022). Job performance in healthcare: A systematic review. *BMC Health Services Research, 22*, Article 149. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-021-07357-5

Kusumawati, R. M., Sukra, I. P., Helida, M., Wulandari, K., & Apriyani, A. (2022). The influence of job description, compensation, and non-physical work environment on work motivation of Loa Janan Public Health Center employees, Kutai Kartanegara Regency. *Jurnal Kesehatan Komunitas, 8*(2), 229–236. https://doi.org/10.25311/keskom.Vol8.Iss2.1042

Maassen, S. M., Weggelaar-Jansen, A. M. J. W., Brekelmans, G., Vermeulen, H., & van Oostveen, C. J. (2020). Psychometric evaluation of instruments measuring the work environment of healthcare professionals in hospitals: A systematic literature review. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care, 32*(8), 545–557. https://doi.org/10.1093/intqhc/mzaa072

Rahmawati, S. D., Astuti, J. P., Suprapti, S., Sa'adah, N., Astuti, R. Y., Sudargini, Y., & Khasanah, N. E. (2020). Effect of leadership, work environment, compensation and motivation toward public health center performance. *Journal of Industrial Engineering & Management Research, 1*(3), 16–31. https://doi.org/10.7777/jiemar.v1i3.54

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2017). *Organizational behavior* (17th ed.). Pearson.

Sedarmayanti. (2001). *Sumber daya manusia dan produktivitas kerja* (Cetakan ke-2). Mandar Maju.

Sugiyono. (2012). *Metode penelitian bisnis*. Alfabeta.

Sugiyono. (2019). *Metode penelitian bisnis*. Alfabeta.

Wang, N., Luan, Y., & Ma, R. (2024). Detecting causal relationships between work motivation and job performance: A meta-analytic review of cross-lagged studies. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 11*, Article 595. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-03038-w

Wibowo. (2014). *Manajemen kinerja* (Edisi ke-4). Rajawali Pers.

Wursanto. (2005). *Dasar-dasar ilmu organisasi*. Andi.

This open-access article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY-SA) 4.0 license