

Original Research

Received 21 May 2026

Revised 30 June 2026

Accepted 23 July 2026

Natural Resources for Human Health 2026, Vol. 6 (10s): 285–293

KEYWORDS:

work culture; HR health characteristics; work motivation; employee performance; public sector; SEM-PLS

Work Motivation as a Mediating Mechanism Linking Work Culture and Human Resource Health Characteristics to Employee Performance: Evidence from the Regional House of Representatives Secretariat of North Luwu Regency

Astie Trisnawati¹, Sudirman Zaid², Juharsah³, Sri Wiyati Mahrani⁴

Doctoral Program in Management Science, Halu Oleo University, Kendari, Indonesia

ABSTRACT: This study examines whether work motivation mediates the effects of work culture and human resource (HR) health characteristics on employee performance at the Regional House of Representatives Secretariat of North Luwu Regency, Indonesia. A quantitative explanatory, cross-sectional design was applied to all 185 civil-servant and non-civil-servant employees using total sampling. Data were collected through a five-point Likert questionnaire and analyzed with structural equation modeling-partial least squares (SEM-PLS) using SmartPLS. The measurement model satisfied validity and reliability criteria. The structural model explained 69.6% of employee performance and 68.8% of work motivation. Work culture did not significantly affect performance ($\beta=0.068$, $p=0.519$), but significantly increased work motivation ($\beta=0.326$, $p=0.007$). HR health characteristics had strong positive effects on performance ($\beta=0.712$, $p<0.001$) and work motivation ($\beta=0.564$, $p<0.001$). Work motivation did not significantly affect performance ($\beta=0.087$, $p=0.578$) and did not mediate either the work culture-performance relationship ($\beta=0.028$, $p=0.602$) or the HR health-performance relationship ($\beta=0.049$, $p=0.596$). The findings reposition employee health as a direct strategic resource for public-sector performance and show that high motivation alone may be insufficient when performance is governed by formal procedures, work capacity, and operational demands.

1. INTRODUCTION

Employee performance is central to public-sector effectiveness because administrative quality, legislative support, service continuity, and accountability depend on employees who can produce accurate, timely, and efficient outputs. Contemporary human resource management therefore treats performance not only as an outcome of competence and formal systems but also as a consequence of organizational context and employee well-being (Mathis & Jackson, 2019). Job performance is multidimensional and reflects the behaviors and results through which individuals contribute to organizational goals (Campbell & Wiernik, 2015), while classic performance measurement emphasizes quality, quantity, timeliness, cost effectiveness, and independence in carrying out assigned work (Bernardin & Russell, 1993).

Public organizations face a particular challenge because employee behavior is embedded in rules, hierarchy, standard operating procedures, and public accountability. Work culture can create shared expectations regarding discipline, responsibility, cooperation, integrity, and service orientation. Organizational culture supplies assumptions and meanings that guide behavior (Schein, 2010), and a strong culture can shape identity, commitment, and behavioral consistency (Robbins & Judge, 2022). Positive organizational environments can also strengthen psychological resources and work attitudes (Luthans, 2021). Empirical research nevertheless shows that culture-performance effects are context dependent: some studies identify positive effects

(Maulana & Yahya, 2022), whereas others find that leadership, discipline, or work environment can be more influential (Darmawan, 2022).

Work motivation is often proposed as the psychological mechanism that converts organizational conditions into effort. Herzberg distinguishes intrinsic motivators such as achievement, recognition, responsibility, the work itself, and advancement from hygiene factors such as policy, interpersonal relations, working conditions, security, and compensation (Herzberg, 1959). Need-based and expectancy perspectives similarly suggest that effort depends on valued needs and expected outcomes (Maslow, 1943) (Vroom, 1964). Recent studies have linked work culture to motivation (Djarmiko et al., 2023) and have examined motivation as a pathway between culture and performance (Tarjono, 2023). However, motivation does not always translate directly into performance, particularly where standardized procedures and resource constraints shape output (Syaharuddin & Fachrunaufal, 2024).

An increasingly important but less integrated determinant is employee health. HR health characteristics encompass physical and mental condition, stamina, perceived health, attendance-related functioning, healthy lifestyle practices, and the capacity to sustain work demands. Poor health can raise absenteeism and productivity loss (Burton et al., 2009), whereas organizational health and productivity management can support performance (Goetzel et al., 2010) (Loeppke et al., 2010). Evidence after the pandemic further emphasizes the organizational consequences of employee health and well-being (Alam et al., 2021). Workplace physical-activity and wellness interventions can improve health-related outcomes and productivity (Proper & van Mechelen, 2011) (Marin-Farrona et al., 2023).

This issue is especially relevant because overweight and obesity have become major public-health concerns. The World Health Organization identifies overweight and obesity as conditions associated with elevated risks of noncommunicable disease (WHO, 2024), while Indonesia's 2023 Health Survey documents a substantial burden of excess weight among adults (SKI, 2023). Health risks at work can also manifest through presenteeism, in which employees attend work but function below their potential; systematic evidence links mental-health problems and presenteeism (García-Iglesias et al., 2023). Occupational-health policy increasingly recognizes worker health as integral to sustainable work systems (ILO, 2024).

The empirical setting reinforces the need for an integrated model. The dissertation data report that the Secretariat's 2024 organizational performance realization reached 81% against a 100% target and declined from 84% in 2023. Preliminary interviews also indicated that some employees experienced fatigue, reduced focus, and lower initiative when physical fitness declined. At the same time, the organization operates under legislative schedules, administrative routines, fluctuating workloads, and formal accountability requirements. These characteristics make it plausible that culture affects motivation, health affects both motivation and work capacity, and performance may be more sensitive to direct health-related resources than to psychological motivation alone.

The theoretical gap lies in combining organizational, psychological, and health-related determinants within one public-sector model. The Job Demands-Resources perspective treats personal and job resources as mechanisms that help employees manage demands (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017), while the Ability-Motivation-Opportunity framework emphasizes that motivation is only one component of performance and must operate alongside ability and opportunity (Appelbaum et al., 2000). Prior studies have examined culture and motivation (Putra & Widodo, 2020), culture through motivational mechanisms (Putra & Nasution, 2022), health and work performance (Torp et al., 2021), and occupational health with performance (Simarmata et al., 2024), but their simultaneous operation in a regional legislative secretariat remains underexplored.

Accordingly, this study investigates the direct effects of work culture and HR health characteristics on employee performance and work motivation, the direct effect of work motivation on performance, and the mediating role of work motivation. Its contribution is twofold. First, it extends public-sector HRM by positioning employee health as a strategic performance resource rather than merely a medical concern (Kusuma, 2023). Second, it tests whether motivation actually functions as the expected psychological bridge in a highly formalized public organization, an issue on which recent evidence remains mixed (Siswanto & Nadia, 2024) (Riskiana & Surya, 2025).

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESES

2.1 Work Culture, Motivation, and Performance

Work culture represents the values, norms, routines, and behavioral expectations that employees repeatedly enact in the workplace. It can reduce ambiguity, coordinate behavior, and communicate what constitutes acceptable performance. Culture

is therefore expected to support performance when its values are internalized and reinforced by managerial systems (Schein, 2010) (Robbins & Judge, 2022). Empirical studies show that culture can improve performance (Nurhaeda et al., 2022), although the magnitude and significance of this relationship vary across organizational settings (Darmawan, 2022).

Culture can also influence motivation by providing recognition, social support, clarity, fairness, and a sense of belonging. These conditions correspond to both motivator and hygiene elements in Herzberg's framework (Herzberg, 1959). Evidence indicates that organizational culture can significantly increase work motivation (Diatmiko et al., 2023). Thus, a constructive work culture may operate more immediately on employees' psychological willingness to exert effort than on their final output.

H1: Work culture has a positive effect on employee performance.

H2: Work culture has a positive effect on work motivation.

2.2 HR Health Characteristics, Motivation, and Performance

Healthy employees possess greater functional capacity to sustain concentration, attendance, mobility, and effort. Health risks are associated with absenteeism and productivity losses (Burton et al., 2009), whereas healthier lifestyles and work ability are associated with stronger work functioning (Torp et al., 2021). Public-sector evidence also shows that mental health and the work environment can shape employee performance (Makhrisyafri et al., 2025). Occupational safety and health implementation has likewise been associated with improved performance (Simarmata et al., 2024).

Health can influence motivation because physical energy, psychological stability, and perceived capacity make it easier for employees to engage with challenging tasks. Occupational safety and health practices can improve motivation and productivity (Hakim & Aminuddin, 2024), and workplace health programs may support motivational processes for healthy behavior (Ishii et al., 2024). Safety and health programs have also been linked to employee work motivation (Putri et al., 2024). These findings suggest that health is both a work-capacity resource and a psychological resource.

H3: HR health characteristics have a positive effect on employee performance.

H4: HR health characteristics have a positive effect on work motivation.

2.3 Work Motivation and the Mediating Mechanism

Motivation directs the intensity and persistence of work effort. Nevertheless, motivation is not synonymous with performance. The JD-R framework suggests that motivation becomes effective when employees also possess adequate job and personal resources (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). The AMO framework similarly implies that motivation must be combined with ability and opportunity (Appelbaum et al., 2000). Empirical findings are mixed: some studies report a meaningful motivational role, whereas others find weak or nonsignificant direct effects in public organizations (Hamdan Syaoqi & Amalia, 2024) (Syaharuddin & Fachrunaufal, 2024).

As a mediator, motivation should transmit the effects of supportive organizational culture or favorable health conditions into greater effort and ultimately better performance. Some studies support motivation as a mediating mechanism between culture and performance (Riskiana & Surya, 2025) (Alfariz et al., 2025), while other public-sector findings indicate that the mechanism can fail when motivation does not significantly predict performance (Siswanto & Nadia, 2024). Similar context dependence is found in models where motivation mediates environmental effects on performance (Mahatani et al., 2025).

H5: Work motivation has a positive effect on employee performance.

H6: Work motivation mediates the effect of work culture on employee performance.

H7: Work motivation mediates the effect of HR health characteristics on employee performance.

3. MATERIALS AND METHODS

3.1 Research Design and Participants

This study used a quantitative explanatory design with a cross-sectional approach. The research was conducted at the Regional House of Representatives Secretariat of North Luwu Regency. The population comprised 185 civil-servant and non-civil-servant employees, and all 185 employees were included through total sampling. This census approach was selected to obtain comprehensive organizational evidence from the full accessible population.

3.2 Measures and Data Collection

Data were collected using a structured questionnaire with a five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). Work culture captured organizational values and routines including discipline, openness, mutual respect, cooperation, and related work norms. HR health characteristics captured physical and mental health, fitness and stamina, health-related work functioning, attendance/presenteeism, and healthy-lifestyle practices. Work motivation was operationalized using motivator and hygiene dimensions derived from Herzberg (Herzberg, 1959). Employee performance was assessed through quality, quantity, timeliness, cost effectiveness, and need for supervision, consistent with the performance framework used in the dissertation (Bernardin & Russell, 1993).

3.3 Statistical Analysis

SEM-PLS with SmartPLS was used to evaluate the measurement and structural models. Convergent validity was assessed using outer loadings and average variance extracted (AVE), while internal consistency was assessed through composite reliability and Cronbach's alpha. The structural model was evaluated using R-square and effect size (f^2). Direct and indirect effects were tested through bootstrapping; paths were considered statistically significant when $p < 0.05$ and $t > 1.96$.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Measurement Model

Table 1. Measurement Model Evaluation

Construct	Indicator(s)	Loading range	CR	AVE	Cronbach's α
Work culture	BK_10, BK_13, BK_2, BK_9	0.850-0.924	0.934	0.780	0.906
HR health characteristics	KKS_11, KKS_13, KKS_2, KKS_8	0.587-0.901	0.881	0.655	0.817
Work motivation	MK_5, MK_6, MK_8	0.867-0.943	0.931	0.818	0.888
Employee performance	KK_1, KK_11, KK_15, KK_2, KK_4, KK_5, KK_8	0.739-0.880	0.939	0.687	0.923

Source: Primary data processed with SmartPLS, 2026.

Table 1 shows that the retained measurement model achieved acceptable construct reliability and convergent validity. Composite reliability and Cronbach's alpha exceeded 0.70 for all constructs, while AVE exceeded 0.50. Most outer loadings were above 0.70; the retained KKS_2 indicator loaded at 0.587 but remained within a construct whose AVE and reliability were adequate. The measurement model was therefore considered suitable for structural analysis.

4.2 Structural Model

Table 2. Coefficient of Determination (R^2)

Endogenous construct	R^2	Interpretation
Employee performance	0.696	Strong
Work motivation	0.688	Strong

Source: Primary data processed with SmartPLS, 2026.

The model explained 69.6% of the variance in employee performance and 68.8% of the variance in work motivation. These values indicate substantial explanatory capacity for a behavioral model in a public-sector setting.

Table 3. Effect Size (f^2)

Relationship	f^2	Magnitude
Work culture → Employee performance	0.006	Very small
Work culture → Work motivation	0.165	Medium
HR health characteristics → Employee performance	0.542	Large
HR health characteristics → Work motivation	0.495	Large
Work motivation → Employee performance	0.008	Very small

Source: Primary data processed with SmartPLS, 2026.

The effect-size pattern is theoretically important. HR health characteristics produced the largest contribution to employee performance ($f^2=0.542$) and a large contribution to work motivation ($f^2=0.495$). Work culture had a medium contribution to motivation ($f^2=0.165$) but a negligible contribution to performance. Motivation itself contributed very little to performance ($f^2=0.008$). This pattern anticipates the subsequent mediation results: health operates primarily as a direct work-capacity resource rather than through motivation.

Table 4. Direct Effect Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis	Relationship	β	t-statistic	p-value	Decision
H1	Work culture → Employee performance	0.068	0.644	0.519	Not supported
H2	Work culture → Work motivation	0.326	2.681	0.007	Supported
H3	HR health characteristics → Employee performance	0.712	5.252	<0.001	Supported
H4	HR health characteristics → Work motivation	0.564	4.704	<0.001	Supported
H5	Work motivation → Employee performance	0.087	0.556	0.578	Not supported

Source: Primary data processed with SmartPLS, 2026.

Table 5. Indirect Effect (Mediation) Testing

Hypothesis	Indirect relationship	β	t-statistic	p-value	Decision
H6	Work culture → Work motivation → Employee performance	0.028	0.522	0.602	Not supported
H7	HR health characteristics → Work motivation → Employee performance	0.049	0.531	0.596	Not supported

Source: Primary data processed with SmartPLS, 2026.

4.3 Discussion

4.3.1 Work Culture and Employee Performance

Work culture did not significantly affect employee performance ($\beta=0.068$, $p=0.519$), despite respondents describing the organizational culture positively. This result suggests that culture in the Secretariat may function primarily as a normative and administrative framework rather than as a direct differentiator of output. Schein's perspective helps explain this result: culture guides assumptions and behavior but does not guarantee immediate performance outcomes (Schein, 2010). Robbins and Judge

similarly emphasize that culture operates alongside reward systems, leadership, job design, and other organizational factors (Robbins & Judge, 2022). The finding is compatible with evidence showing that other managerial factors can dominate the culture-performance relationship (Darmawan, 2022), while contrasting with studies reporting a positive culture-performance effect (Maulana & Yahya, 2022). In a legislative secretariat, formal rules, fixed responsibilities, and administrative controls may reduce the marginal performance effect of shared cultural values.

4.3.2 Work Culture and Work Motivation

Work culture significantly increased work motivation ($\beta=0.326$, $p=0.007$). This is consistent with Herzberg's view that recognition, responsibility, organizational policy, relationships, and working conditions can shape motivational states (Herzberg, 1959). A culture characterized by discipline, cooperation, respect, and clarity can make employees feel supported and psychologically connected to the institution. The result is consistent with empirical evidence linking organizational culture to motivation (Djatmiko et al., 2023) and with research showing that culture can operate through motivational processes (Tarjono, 2023). Thus, the Secretariat's culture appears more effective in shaping employees' willingness and enthusiasm than in directly changing measurable performance.

4.3.3 HR Health Characteristics and Employee Performance

HR health characteristics were the strongest predictor of employee performance ($\beta=0.712$, $p<0.001$; $f^2=0.542$). The result supports the proposition that health is a productive resource because stamina, concentration, functional capacity, and psychological stability directly affect the ability to complete work. Prior evidence links health risks to absenteeism and productivity loss (Burton et al., 2009) and highlights the strategic value of health-productivity management (Goetzel et al., 2010). More recent occupational-health evidence also connects safe and healthy work conditions with employee performance (Simarmata et al., 2024). Importantly, the dissertation's health construct is broader than body mass index alone. Although overweight and obesity were present among respondents, employees could still perform well when overall fitness, perceived health, stamina, attendance, and work functioning remained adequate. This interpretation avoids reducing employee health to weight status and aligns with a multidimensional well-being perspective (Alam et al., 2021).

4.3.4 HR Health Characteristics and Work Motivation

HR health characteristics also significantly increased work motivation ($\beta=0.564$, $p<0.001$; $f^2=0.495$). Employees who feel physically capable and psychologically stable are more likely to approach work with energy and confidence. This result aligns with the JD-R perspective, in which personal resources help individuals manage demands and sustain motivational processes (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). Empirical studies show that occupational safety and health practices can support work motivation (Hakim & Aminuddin, 2024) (Putri et al., 2024), and health-promotion behavior is linked to motivational processes among workers (Ishii et al., 2024). The result implies that health programs may have dual value: they preserve work capacity while also strengthening employees' psychological readiness to work.

4.3.5 Work Motivation and Employee Performance

Work motivation did not significantly affect employee performance ($\beta=0.087$, $p=0.578$), and its effect size was very small. This does not imply that motivation is unimportant; rather, it indicates that variation in motivation did not explain meaningful variation in performance in this setting. Public employees operate under formal job descriptions, SOPs, deadlines, and administrative obligations that can sustain output even when individual motivation varies. The result is consistent with public-sector studies reporting nonsignificant or weak motivational effects (Hamdan Syaoqi & Amalia, 2024) (Syaharuddin & Fachrunaufal, 2024). It also fits the AMO argument that motivation alone cannot produce performance without adequate ability and opportunity (Appelbaum et al., 2000). By contrast, research in other contexts finds stronger motivational effects (Mahatani et al., 2025), demonstrating that the motivation-performance relationship is contingent on organizational design and employee resources.

4.3.6 The Mediating Role of Work Motivation

Neither indirect effect was significant. Work motivation did not mediate the effect of work culture on performance ($\beta=0.028$, $p=0.602$) or the effect of HR health characteristics on performance ($\beta=0.049$, $p=0.596$). The statistical reason is clear: although both work culture and health significantly predicted motivation, motivation itself did not significantly predict performance. The result is consistent with evidence that motivation may fail to mediate culture-performance relationships in public-sector contexts

(Siswanto & Nadia, 2024), although other studies report successful mediation (Riskiana & Surya, 2025) (Alfariz et al., 2025). The contrast suggests that mediation is not universal. In North Luwu, HR health characteristics had a strong direct path to performance, indicating that functional capacity and health-related resources bypassed the motivational mechanism. Theoretically, this supports a resource-complementarity interpretation: motivation is more likely to translate into performance when employees simultaneously possess the health, ability, systems, and opportunities required to act on that motivation (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017) (Appelbaum et al., 2000).

5. CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that HR health characteristics are the dominant determinant of employee performance at the Regional House of Representatives Secretariat of North Luwu Regency. Work culture significantly strengthens work motivation but does not directly improve performance. HR health characteristics significantly improve both motivation and performance. Work motivation, however, does not significantly predict performance and therefore does not mediate either the work culture-performance or HR health-performance relationship. The findings indicate that public-sector performance in this setting depends more strongly on direct work-capacity resources than on motivational mechanisms alone. Practically, the Secretariat should maintain positive work-culture practices while prioritizing employee-health policies such as periodic health screening, physical-activity programs, balanced-nutrition education, stress management, healthy-workplace initiatives, and early prevention of health risks. Future studies should test this model across multiple public institutions and incorporate longitudinal designs, objective health indicators, leadership, competence, job resources, and work engagement to clarify when motivation becomes an effective performance mechanism.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors acknowledge the Regional House of Representatives Secretariat of North Luwu Regency and all employees who participated in the study.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Astie Trisnawati: Conceptualization, investigation, data curation, formal analysis, and writing-original draft. Sudirman Zaid: Supervision, conceptualization, and writing-review and editing. Juharsah: Methodology, supervision, and writing-review and editing. Sri Wiyati Mahrani: Supervision, validation, and writing-review and editing.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

ETHICS STATEMENT

Participation was voluntary and data were analyzed for academic research purposes. The manuscript is based on the dissertation research materials supplied by the authors.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Data supporting the findings are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request, subject to institutional and participant confidentiality requirements.

REFERENCES

- [1] Alam, S., Rahman, M., & Hossain, T. (2021). Employee health, wellbeing, and organizational performance: Post-pandemic perspectives. *Journal of Workplace Health Management*, 14(3), 210-225.
- [2] Alfariz, F., Rosidi, & Muda, N. (2025). Pengaruh budaya organisasi terhadap kinerja melalui motivasi kerja. *Buletin Studi Ekonomi*.
- [3] Alqawi, D., Ali, H., & Fauzi, A. (2024). Determinasi produktivitas kerja melalui motivasi: Analisis lingkungan kerja, disiplin, keselamatan dan kesehatan kerja (K3). *Jurnal Ekonomi Manajemen Sistem Informasi*.
- [4] Appelbaum, E., Bailey, T., Berg, P., & Kalleberg, A. L. (2000). *Manufacturing Advantage: Why High-Performance Work Systems Pay Off*. Cornell University Press.
- [5] Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job Demands-Resources Theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 273-285.

- [6] Bernardin, H. J., & Russell, J. E. A. (1993). *Human Resource Management: An experiential approach*. McGraw-Hill.
- [7] Burton, W. N., Chen, C. Y., Li, X., & Schultz, A. B. (2009). The association of employee health risks with absenteeism and productivity. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 51(7), 780-787.
- [8] Campbell, J. P., & Wiernik, B. M. (2015). The modeling and assessment of work performance. In *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences* (2nd ed., pp. 889-896). Elsevier.
- [9] Darmawan, A. (2022). Pengaruh budaya organisasi, kepemimpinan, lingkungan kerja dan disiplin kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan. *Journal of Applied Managerial Accounting*, 6(1), 21-32.
- [10] Djatmiko, A. H., Harsono, H., & Natsir, M. (2023). Pengaruh budaya organisasi terhadap motivasi kerja pegawai. *Jurnal Sosial Teknologi*.
- [11] García-Iglesias, J. J., Gómez-Salgado, J., et al. (2023). Presenteeism and mental health of workers during the COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 11, 1224332.
- [12] Goetzel, R. Z., Pei, X., Tabrizi, M., & Roemer, E. (2010). Health and productivity management in organizations: A comprehensive review. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 52(10), 1024-1036.
- [13] Hakim, & Aminuddin, R. A. (2024). The effect of occupational safety and health implementation on work motivation and productivity. *Journal of Vocational Health Studies*, 8(2), 84-90.
- [14] Hamdan Syaogi, & Amalia, M. R. (2024). Pengaruh etos kerja, disiplin kerja, dan motivasi kerja terhadap kinerja pegawai. *Konsentrasi: Jurnal Manajemen dan Bisnis*.
- [15] Herzberg, F. (1959). *The Motivation to Work*. John Wiley & Sons.
- [16] International Labour Organization. (2024). *Ensuring Safety and Health at Work in a Changing Climate*. ILO.
- [17] Ishii, K., Sumita, H., Nagamine, H., et al. (2024). Mixed-methods research of motivational processes in workers adoption of healthy behavior. *BMC Public Health*, 24, 537.
- [18] Kusuma, A. R. (2023). Kesehatan sumber daya manusia dan implikasinya terhadap kinerja organisasi di era pascapandemi. *Jurnal Manajemen Kesehatan Indonesia*, 11(1), 45-58.
- [19] Loeppke, R., Taitel, M., Richling, D., et al. (2010). Health and productivity as a business strategy: A multiemployer study. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 52(12), 1134-1140.
- [20] Luthans, F. (2021). *Organizational behavior: An evidence-based approach* (14th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- [21] Mahatani, C., Noch, M. Y., Mansur, M., & Pongtiku, A. (2025). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja pegawai melalui motivasi kerja sebagai variabel mediasi. *Advances in Management & Financial Reporting*.
- [22] Makhrisyafrial, M., Junengsih, J., & Dina, N. (2025). Mental health and work environment effects on employee performance in the public sector. *Jurnal Manajemen Terapan dan Keuangan*.
- [23] Marin-Farrona, M., Wipfli, B., Thosar, S. S., et al. (2023). Effectiveness of worksite wellness programs based on physical activity to improve workers health and productivity: A systematic review. *Systematic Reviews*, 12, 87.
- [24] Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370-396.
- [25] Mathis, R. L., & Jackson, J. H. (2019). *Human resource management* (15th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- [26] Maulana, Z., & Yahya, M. (2022). Pengaruh budaya organisasi dan kepemimpinan terhadap kinerja karyawan. *Jurnal AKTUAL*, 20(2).
- [27] Nurhaeda, Z., Maryadi, M., Idris, M., & Ardasanti, A. (2022). Efek motivasi, kompetensi, kompensasi dan budaya kerja terhadap kinerja pegawai. *SEIKO: Journal of Management & Business*.
- [28] Proper, K. I., & van Mechelen, W. (2011). Effectiveness and economic impact of worksite interventions to promote physical activity and healthy nutrition. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 53(7), 787-797.
- [29] Putra, D. M., & Nasution, N. (2022). The role of organizational culture on employee performance through job satisfaction and work motivation. *Journal of Entrepreneurship & Business*, 5(1), 45-60.
- [30] Putra, I. K., & Widodo, A. (2020). Pengaruh budaya kerja dan motivasi terhadap kinerja pegawai. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Organisasi*, 11(2), 134-145.
- [31] Putri, A. D., Bakti, D. K., & Subagja, G. (2024). Pengaruh program keselamatan dan kesehatan kerja terhadap motivasi kerja karyawan. *Jurnal Kompetitif Bisnis*, 2(4), 197-207.
- [32] Riskiana, I. G. Y. P., & Surya, I. B. K. (2025). Peran motivasi dalam memediasi pengaruh budaya kerja terhadap kinerja pegawai. *E-Jurnal Manajemen Universitas Udayana*.
- [33] Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2022). *Organizational Behavior* (19th ed.). Pearson Education.
- [34] Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. Jossey-Bass.

- [35] Simarmata, V. P. A., Marantuan, R. S., & Hutagalung, P. (2024). The relationship between work environment, occupational safety and health implementation, and employee performance: A cross-sectional study. *Journal of Applied Nursing and Health*.
- [36] Siswanto, A., & Nadia, F. N. D. (2024). Investigating the relationship among organizational culture, job motivation, organizational citizenship behaviour, and job performance: Indonesian public sector context. *RSF Conference Series*, 4(1), 220-227.
- [37] Survei Kesehatan Indonesia. (2023). Hasil Survei Kesehatan Indonesia 2023. Badan Kebijakan Pembangunan Kesehatan, Kementerian Kesehatan RI.
- [38] Syaharuddin, Y., & Fachrunaufal, M. (2024). Pengaruh motivasi dan kompetensi serta lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja pegawai. *Forum Ekonomi: Jurnal Ekonomi, Manajemen dan Akuntansi*.
- [39] Tarjono. (2023). The effect of organizational culture on employee performance mediated by work motivation at PT Permodalan Nasional Madani Cianjur Branch. *JIMI Journal*, 2(3), 120-136.
- [40] Torp, S., Grøgaard, J. B., Moen, B. E., & Bråtveit, M. (2021). Health, lifestyle, and work performance among employees in Norway. *International Journal of Workplace Health Management*, 14(2), 145-160.
- [41] Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and Motivation*. Wiley.
- [42] World Health Organization. (2024). Obesity and overweight (Fact sheet). WHO.