



The determinants of administrative staff performance at Muyang Kute Regional General Hospital

Dilla Lefiana¹, Masryna Siagian^{2*}, Hartono²

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the factors influencing the performance of administrative staff at Muyang Kute Regional General Hospital, a government-owned healthcare facility in Bener Meriah, Indonesia. Utilizing an analytical survey with a cross-sectional design, data were collected from 89 permanent administrative staff members through questionnaires and hospital documents. Bivariate analysis, using the chi-square test, revealed a significant relationship between incentive provision and employee performance ($p < 0.001$), with adequate incentives correlating with good performance. Similarly, effective employee development significantly impacted performance ($p < 0.001$), with effective development programs leading to better performance. However, work facility provision did not significantly influence performance ($p = 0.475$). The findings highlight the critical role of incentives and employee development in enhancing administrative staff performance, suggesting that targeted interventions in these areas could improve service quality and patient satisfaction.

Keywords: hospital administration, employee performance, incentives, employee development

Introduction

Hospitals serve as multifaceted healthcare institutions, offering inpatient, outpatient, and emergency services. Administrative staff are integral to hospital operations, ensuring the smooth delivery of healthcare services through efficient management of patient registration, treatment coordination, and billing processes. Their strategic role in managing patient data is critical, encompassing tasks like data entry, medical record management, and billing information handling. Errors in these areas can lead to severe consequences, such as misdiagnoses or delays in treatment delivery.^{1,2} Hospital administrative staff also play a role in planning infrastructure requirements and presenting work output for performance evaluation. Studies show that healthcare administrators must possess strong competencies to ensure that healthcare organisations function effectively and meet patient needs optimally.³ Furthermore, the accurate management of data and information by administrative staff can reduce the risk of medical errors that could seriously impact patient safety.⁴ Moreover, administrative services often serve as the initial point of contact between patients and the hospital. The friendly and professional interactions of administrative staff at the registration and information desks significantly contribute to building trust and enhancing patient satisfaction.⁵ Consequently, the role of

Affiliation

¹Undergraduate in Public Health Science, Universitas Prima Indonesia, Medan, Indonesia

²Department of Public Health, Universitas Prima Indonesia, Medan, Indonesia

*Correspondence:

rynasiagian@yahoo.co.id

administrative staff in hospitals not only supports daily operations but also contributes to the overall improvement of healthcare service quality.

However, despite their crucial role, hospital administrative staff face a range of significant challenges. High workloads can lead to fatigue, potentially increasing the risk of human error. Research indicates that stressful working conditions, such as managing high patient volumes during pandemics, can result in mental exhaustion among healthcare staff.⁶ The demand to maintain data accuracy is paramount, particularly in emergency situations. Data entry processes under high-pressure conditions, such as handling complex BPJS (Indonesian National Health Insurance) claims, require a balance between speed and precision. Studies have found that a lack of healthcare worker training in information technology is a major obstacle to achieving this accuracy.^{7,8} The dynamic hospital environment, with its changing policies and technological advancements, demands rapid adaptability from administrative staff. Frequent changes in health policies can make it difficult for administrators to adjust to new regulations.⁸ Furthermore, the adoption of new technologies poses a challenge, given limitations in digital infrastructure and healthcare worker skills in using such technology.⁹ Emotional interactions with patients or their families in stressful situations require emotional intelligence and exceptional patience. Research demonstrates that the ability to communicate effectively and empathetically is crucial for providing quality service in hospitals.⁶

Administrative staff performance within the healthcare sector is often suboptimal due to a confluence of internal and external factors. Employee motivation is a critical determinant of performance. Research consistently demonstrates that highly motivated staff exhibit superior performance. Competence, encompassing knowledge and skills, significantly impacts an employee's ability to execute their duties. For instance, a study conducted at the Mariat District Inpatient Health Centre in Sorong Regency revealed that employee discipline and adaptation to the working environment substantially influence performance.¹⁰ A supportive work environment and effective leadership can enhance employee performance. Research undertaken at the Biru Health Centre in Tanete Riattang District indicated a positive correlation between employee work quality and public service delivery, with effective leadership fostering a conducive work atmosphere.¹¹ Previous studies have documented variations in administrative staff performance within the healthcare sector. For example, at Ratatotok Buyat Regional Public Hospital, administrative staff performance declined during the COVID-19 pandemic but subsequently recovered in the post-pandemic "new normal" period.¹² Another study, at the Kawatuna Health Centre in Palu City, found that while overall employee performance was rated favourably, improvements were still needed in specific aspects of work quality.¹³

Muyang Kute Regional General Hospital, as a government-owned hospital in Bener Meriah, is expected to provide adequate and satisfactory healthcare services to the community. However, public complaints regarding service quality, particularly for BPJS users, frequently arise. Outpatient visit data at RSUD Muyang Kute indicate a decline from 2020 to 2022. This is suspected to be related to the lack of courtesy among administrative staff and the uncomfortable hospital environment. Preliminary surveys have revealed issues contributing to low administrative staff performance, including mismatches between staff and supervisors, and inadequate work facilities. These conditions result in diminished employee morale and patient dissatisfaction. Based on the aforementioned discussion, this research aims to identify the factors influencing the performance of administrative staff at Muyang Kute Regional General Hospital.

Method

This study employed an analytical survey approach with a cross-sectional research design. An analytical survey was chosen to explore the factors influencing the performance of administrative staff. The cross-sectional design allowed for the analysis of relationships between the studied variables at a single point in time. The research was conducted at Muyang Kute Regional General Hospital in September 2025. The target population for this study comprised all 89 permanent administrative staff members at Muyang Kute Regional General Hospital. Given the relatively small population size, the entire population (89 individuals) was included as the sample.

Data collection was carried out using two methods: primary and secondary data. Primary data were obtained directly from respondents through interviews using questionnaires. Meanwhile, secondary data were gathered from documents and reports available at Muyang Kute Regional General Hospital, including hospital profiles and administrative staff data.

The independent variables in this study included the provision of incentives, work facilities, and job coaching for administrative staff. The provision of incentives was measured through five question items. Respondents who answered 'yes' to 3-5 items were categorised as 'sufficient' (code 1), while those who answered 'yes' to 0-2 items were categorised as 'insufficient' (code 2). The provision of work facilities was measured with five question items. Respondents who answered 'yes' to 3-5 items were deemed 'available' (code 1), and those who answered 'yes' to 0-2 items were deemed 'unavailable' (code 2). Job coaching was also measured using five question items. Respondents who answered 'yes' to 3-5 items were categorised as 'good' (code 1), and those who answered 'yes' to 0-2 items were categorised as 'poor' (code 2). The dependent variable in this study was the performance of administrative staff, measured through ten question items. Respondents who answered 'yes' to 6-10 items were categorised as 'good' (code 1), and those who answered 'yes' to 0-5 items were categorised as 'not good' (code 2).

The editing stage was conducted to ensure the accuracy and completeness of the data. If incomplete data were found, the questionnaire was returned to the respondents. The coding stage involved assigning codes to each respondent's answer to facilitate data processing and prevent data duplication. Subsequently, the coded data were entered into a computer for processing using the SPSS program. The cleaning stage aimed to re-examine the data that had been entered into SPSS to ensure there were no errors.

Univariate analysis was used to describe the characteristics of each variable separately. Bivariate analysis was conducted to test the relationship between independent and dependent variables using the chi-square (X^2) test at a 95% confidence level ($\alpha = 0.05$).

Results

Table 1 presents an overview of the characteristics of the 89 administrative employees who were the subjects of this research, focusing on four key variables: incentive provision, provision of work facilities, employee development, and administrative employee performance. The results indicate that the majority of employees (83.0%) perceived the incentive provision at their workplace as adequate, while a small minority (17.0%) felt the incentives provided were insufficient.

Table 1. Administrative employee characteristics (n=89)

Variable	n	%
Incentive provision		
Sufficient	74	83,0
Insufficient	15	17,0
Work facility provision		
Available	84	94,0
Unavailable	5	6,0
Employee development		
Effective	82	92,0
Ineffective	7	8,0
Administrative employee performance		
Good	77	86,0
Not good	12	14,0

Regarding work facilities, most employees (94.0%) stated that the facilities provided were available, with only 6.0% reporting otherwise. In terms of employee development, 92.0% of employees rated the existing development programmes as effective, while 8.0% held the opposite view. In terms of performance, the majority of employees (86.0%) demonstrated good performance, while 14.0% exhibited underperformance.

Table 2 presents the results of a bivariate analysis examining the relationship between incentive provision, work facility provision, and employee development on the performance of administrative staff, categorised as "good" or "poor". The analysis aimed to identify factors that significantly influence employee performance.

The results of the analysis indicate a highly significant relationship between incentive provision and employee performance ($p < 0.001$). All employees (100%) who received adequate incentives demonstrated "good" performance, while the majority of employees (80%) who received inadequate incentives exhibited "poor" performance. This suggests that adequate incentive provision is positively correlated with good administrative staff performance.

Table 2. Bivariate analysis results

Variable	Administrative employee performance						p
	Good		Not good		Total		
	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Incentive provision							
Sufficient	74	100	0	0	74	100	0,000
Insufficient	3	20	12	80	15	100	
Work facility provision							
Available	72	85.7	12	14.3	84	100	0,475
Unavailable	5	100	0	0	5	100	
Employee development							
Effective	77	93.9	5	6.0	82	100	0,000
Ineffective	0	0	7	100	7	100	

Conversely, work facility provision did not show a significant relationship with employee performance ($p = 0.475$). Although the majority of employees with available work facilities demonstrated "good" performance (85.7%), all employees without available work facilities also demonstrated "good" performance. This indicates that, within the context of this study, the availability of work facilities did not significantly impact administrative staff performance.

Furthermore, employee development also demonstrated a highly significant relationship with employee performance ($p < 0.001$). The majority of employees (93.9%) who participated in effective employee development exhibited "good" performance, while all employees (100%) who participated in ineffective employee development exhibited "poor" performance. This suggests that effective employee development is positively correlated with good administrative staff performance, and vice versa.

Overall, the results of this bivariate analysis indicate that adequate incentive provision and effective employee development are factors that significantly influence administrative staff performance. In contrast, work facility provision did not demonstrate a significant relationship with employee performance within the context of this study.

Discussion

This study investigates the relationship between incentive provision, work facility provision, employee development, and the performance of 89 administrative staff. The results provide a clear overview of the factors influencing performance within this context. Data analysis revealed that incentive provision had a significant impact on employee performance ($p < 0.001$). Employees who perceived the incentives as adequate consistently demonstrated 'good' performance (100%), whereas those who considered the incentives inadequate tended to exhibit 'poor' performance (80%). This strong correlation suggests that adequate incentives play a crucial role in motivating administrative staff, aligning with motivational theories that emphasise the importance of rewards in reinforcing desired behaviours.

Similarly, employee development emerged as a critical factor influencing performance ($p < 0.001$). Employees who participated in effective development programmes predominantly displayed 'good' performance (93.9%), while those who experienced ineffective development programmes consistently demonstrated 'poor' performance (100%). These findings underscore the importance of investing in employee growth and skill enhancement. Effective development programmes likely equip employees with the necessary tools and knowledge to excel in their roles.

Interestingly, the availability of work facilities did not show a significant relationship with employee performance ($p = 0.475$). Although the majority of employees with available work facilities exhibited good performance (85.7%), all employees without available work facilities also performed well. This suggests that, within the specific context of this study, other factors may be more dominant than the impact of work facilities. It is possible that administrative staff are able to perform well even without ideal facilities, or that the measurement of work facilities was insufficiently sensitive. It is important to note that although not significant in this study, that does not mean that work facilities are not important.

Overall, the findings of this study emphasise the importance of focusing on incentive provision and employee development to enhance the performance of administrative staff. Organisations should prioritise the creation of equitable and motivating incentive structures and invest in effective development programmes. While work facilities did not show a significant relationship in this study, further research may be needed to explore the nuances of their impact. Future studies could investigate specific types of facilities and their influence on different aspects of performance. The results of this study are limited to the specific

employees surveyed. Therefore, further research is needed to see if these results are consistent among a larger population of administrative staff.

Conclusion

The research results indicate that the provision of incentives and employee development have a significant impact on staff performance. Specifically, employees who perceive the incentives provided as adequate demonstrate considerably better performance compared to those who find them inadequate. Furthermore, effective employee development programmes were shown to have a strong correlation with positive staff performance. Although the availability of work facilities was generally high, this study did not find a statistically significant relationship between work facilities and staff performance. Consequently, this research concludes that to enhance the performance of administrative staff at Muyang Kute Regional General Hospital, the primary focus should be on establishing a robust incentive structure and investing in effective employee development programmes. Further research is recommended to explore the nuances of the impact of work facilities and to validate these findings with a larger population.

References

1. Mailintina Y, Sabarina Panjaitan R, Ludovikus L, Ellynia E, Wahdini R, Yari Y, et al. Efektivitas sistem administrasi rumah sakit dalam meningkatkan pelayanan kesehatan: Scoping review. *KOSALA J Ilmu Kesehat* [Internet]. 2024 Jun 14;12(1):53–69. Available from: <https://ejurnal.stikespantikosala.ac.id/index.php/kjik/article/view/330>
2. Susiloningtyas L, Cahyono AD, Wiseno B. Kualitas pelayanan prima tenaga administrasi kesehatan dalam memberikan pelayanan administrasi kesehatan di RSUD Kabupaten Kediri. *J Ilm Pamenang*. 2022 Dec 20;4(2):35–47.
3. Efri PMH, Amanda IA, Khairunnisa, Wasiyem. Analisis Kompetensi dan Peran Administrator Dalam Organisasi Kesehatan. *J Kolaboratif Sains*. 2025;8(1).
4. Rahayu S, Sabila W, Sitorus MU, Saptriana L, Azizah ZP, Wasiyem W. Peran Administrasi Kesehatan dalam Meningkatkan Kualitas Kepuasan Pasien di Puskesmas . *J Pendidik Tambusai* [Internet]. 2025 Jan 5;9(1 SE-Articles of Research):554–9. Available from: <http://jptam.org/index.php/jptam/article/view/24216>
5. Bentum-Micah G, Cai L, Atuahene SA, Ameyaw MA, Bondzie-Micah V, Adu-Yeboah SS. Health provider administration functions, patient satisfaction, and loyalty: Their mediation by patient healthcare service quality perceptions. *J Psychol Africa*. 2024 Jan 2;34(1):65–72.
6. Dwi Yanti S, Mayansara A, Liadin NA, Oktafiani V. Literature Review : Tantangan dan Tren Terkini dalam Manajemen Rumah Sakit. *J Ris Sains dan Kesehat Indones*. 2024 Apr 16;1(1):30–6.
7. Fauzi MR, Saimi S, Fathoni F. Tantangan dan Solusi Administrasi Kesehatan di Era Digital (Tinjauan Literature Review atas Implementasi Teknologi). *AL-MIKRAJ J Stud Islam dan Hum*. 2024 Oct 18;5(1):1093–103.
8. Noura V, Zuhra F El, Fardani SN, Siahaan DP. Tantangan dan antisipasi bagi administrator/manager kesehatan di masa kini. *J Kesehat Tambusai* [Internet]. 2024 Dec 29;5(4):12801–10. Available from: <https://journal.universitaspahlawan.ac.id/index.php/jkt/article/view/38260>
9. Putri DN, Purba SH, Layana K, Lubis K. Tantangan dan Solusi dalam Implementasi SIMRS di Rumah Sakit Pemerintah di Indonesia. *J Ris Ilmu Kesehat Umum Dan Farm*. 2025;3(1).
10. Lopulalan JE. Kinerja pelayanan kesehatan oleh tenaga administrasi dan tenaga medis pada Puskesmas Rawat Inap Distrik Mariat Kabupaten Sorong. *J Acad Praja*. 2019 Feb 19;2(1):65–88.
11. Saguni DS, Widyawati, Muhammad Hidayat Djabbari. Pengaruh Kinerja Pegawai Terhadap Kualitas Pelayanan di Puskesmas Biru Kecamatan Tanete Riattang Kabupaten Bone. *J Adm Publik*. 2023 Jun 30;19(1):146–64.
12. Manitik R, Rampengan SH, Wagey FW, Manampiring AE. Analisis kinerja pegawai bagian administrasi RSUP Ratatotok buyat di era sebelum pandemi COVID-19, saat pandemic, dan new normal. *Intisari Sains Medis*. 2022 Feb 7;13(1):25–9.
13. Rusdin RB, Kurniawan S. Kinerja Pegawai di Pusat Kesehatan Masyarakat Kota (PUSKESMAS) Kota Palu. *J Adm*. 2022 Jun 6;4(1):36–49.