

The Affecting Productivity of Work Staff at Sub Health Ministry Sub Province Supiory

Bernadet Sarapung Parande¹, A.L. Rantetampang², Bernard Sandjaja³, Anwar Mallongi⁴

¹ Concentration of Health Policy Administration, Master Program in Public Health Faculty of Public Health, Cenderawasih University, Jayapura

^{2,3} Master Program in Public Health Faculty of Public Health, Cenderawasih University, Jayapura

⁴ Environmental Health Department, Faculty of Public Health, Hasanuddin University, Makassar

Abstract: Background: A staff expected can and seriously, out for to run its duty better. One of the constraint in health development in Sub-Province Supiory is not maximal to giving service. **Target of research:** To knowing factor the affecting productivity of work staff at sub health ministry sub province supiory.

Method Research : Analytic observasional with approach crosssectional study in October 2017 with amount of sampel asmuch 48 people with totally population. Data approach used questionnaire and analyzed by chi square and regresi binari logistics.

Result of research : The factor affect on to staff work productivity in subn duty health minisrtry Sub-Province Supiory is motivation ($p\text{-value} = 0,000 < 0,05$; $RP = 20,444$; $CI95\% = 4,446-94,013$), discipline ($p\text{-value} = 0,001 < 0,05$; $RP = 11,074$; $CI95\% = 2,538-48,310$), leadership ($p\text{-value} = 0,001 < 0,05$; $RP = 11,074$; $CI95\% = 2,538-48,310$). While variable not have corelation to staff work productivity in sub health ministry of Sub-Province Supiory is age ($p\text{-value} = 1,000 > 0,05$; $RP = 1,094$; $CI95\% = 0,338-3,539$), gender ($p\text{-value} = 0,981 > 0,05$; $RP = 0,833$; $CI95\% = 0,267-2,601$), education ($p\text{-value} = 0,902 > 0,05$; $RP = 0,779$; $CI95\% = 0,243-2,501$), staff status ($p\text{-value} = 0,609 > 0,05$; $RP = 0,600$; $CI95\% = 0,176-2,046$), year of service ($p\text{-value} = 1,000 > 0,05$; $RP = 0,980$; $CI95\% = 0,254-3,787$), organizational culture ($p\text{-value} = 0,078 > 0,05$; $RP = 3,429$; $CI95\% = 1,037-11,332$), reward ($p\text{-value} = 0,052 > 0,05$; $RP = 4,200$; $CI95\% = 1,163-15,172$), punishment ($p\text{-value} = 0,068 > 0,05$; $RP = 3,636$; $CI95\% = 1,075-12,303$). The factor dominant to effect on produtivity work staff in sub helath ministry Sub-Province Supiory is motivation, discipline work and highest variable motivation.

Keywords: Productivity of Work, Employee, Sub Health Ministry

I. INTRODUCTION

The effectiveness of the organization is influenced by the effectiveness of the individual, so that the low performance of employees influences the low performance of the health service as a whole. Performance is influenced by individual characteristics (abilities and skills, personality, perceptions, attitudes, experience, gender, age, race, characteristics, and learning capacity) and work environment (organizational structure, job design, policy, rules, rewards and sanctions as well as resources) ¹

Each individual has a distinct identity and has at least eight biographical factors including age, sex, marital status, amount of insured and years of service; personality which includes heredity, experience and situation, perception covering self concerned, target, perception and situation, willingness to learn, values adopted include the source of parent, source of community around, source of friends and source itself; attitudes that include the source of the parents, the source of the teacher and friends; job satisfaction that includes challenging work, the implementation of a fair reward system, favorable conditions and a worker's attitude; as well as physical and mental abilities ²

Work productivity is influenced by the factors of individual characteristic, demography covering age, gender, ethnicity, and work experience, ability and skill, psychology covering personality, perception, attitude, characteristic and learning capacity, environment in the form of (a) work environment including work design, organizational structure, policies and rules, leadership, rewards and sanctions as well as resources, and (b) non-working environment including family, economy, fun and hobbies ^{3,4}

In the life-oriented organization of the future, the effort of organizing office activities needs to be handled professionally, in the sense that the organization of office activities requires leaders and staff who understand the task, eager in pursuit of achievement. An employee is expected to be mampudan earnest, trying to carry out their duties properly ^{5,8}. Therefore, the role of leadership is to give attention and assessment, whether in the form of encouragement or motivation, giving rewards, punishment / punishment and organizational culture that can create a good working climate so that the productivity of employee work well done. Based on that in this research the researcher is interested to do research with title "Factors Affecting Work Productivity at Supiory District Health Office"

II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Introduction Types of research

This research is an observational analytic research. Observational analytic research is a research that aims to find the relationship between variables by doing analysis to the data that has been collected. This research uses cross sectional approach by doing independent variable measurement and dependent variable only once at the same time⁹

Population

The population in this study is all health workers in Supiori District Health Office as many as 48 people.

Sample

The sample is part of the generalization of the population under study¹⁰. The sampling technique uses a saturated sampling technique. Thus a large sample of 48 people.

1. Data Collection Technique

Technique of collecting data is done by collecting primary and secondary data then do recording according to variables needed based on questionnaire with steps as follows:

- a. After obtaining a research permit from the next Faculty addressed to the Head of Supiori District Health Office.

- b. Provide an explanation to the employee of the intent and purpose of the study. Employees who agree are given informed consent as the respondent's consent
- c. To test the validity and reliability of Supiori District Health Office as many as 16 respondents

A questionnaire is said to be valid, if the question on the questionnaire is able to reveal something that will be measured by the questionnaire. In this case we use a few questions that can accurately reveal the measured variable with the moment product correlation technique.

$$r_{count} = \frac{N(\sum XY) - ((\sum X)(\sum Y))}{\sqrt{[N\sum X^2 - (\sum X)^2][N\sum Y^2 - (\sum Y)^2]}}$$

r count : Correlation coefficient

$\sum Xi$: Number of item scores \sum

$\sum Yi$: Total number of scores (items) \sum

When r count (r pearson) > r table: it means the question is valid

When r count (r pearson) < r table: it means the question is invalid (Sugiyono, 2013).

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Independent and Dependent Variables

Table 1. Distribution of Independent and Dependent Variables in Supiori District Health Office 2017

No	Variables	(n)	(%)
1	Age		
	< 30 year	30	32,5
	≥ 30 year	18	37,5
2	Sex		
	male	23	47,9
	female	25	52,1
3	Education		
	Low	19	39,6
	High	29	60,4
4	Status		
	Honor	6	12,5
	ASN	42	87,5
5	Working period		
	New	11	22,9
	Old	37	77,1
6	Work Motivation		
	Low	19	39,6
	High	29	60,4
7	Work Discipline		
	less	16	33,3
	good	32	66,7
8	Leaderships		
	Less	16	33,3
	Good	32	66,7
9	Organization culture		
	Less	25	52,1

10	Good	23	47,9
	Reward		
11	Less	16	33,3
	Punishment		
12	Good	32	66,7
	Work Produktivity		
	Less	27	56,3
	Good	21	43,7
	Less	22	45,8
	Good	26	54,2
Number		48	100

Based on Table 1, it shows that most employees are less than 30 years old as many as 30 people (62.5%), female (25.51%), more than 29 (60,4%), the most employee status is ASNsebanyak 42 people (87,5%) and service time > 5 years counted 32 person (66,7%). Most employees have high work motivation as many as 29 people (60.4%), good work disipling as much as 32 people (66.7%). The response of most employees to direct leadership as much as 32 people (66.7%) and organizational culture responded

to less as many as 25 people (52.1%). Reward responded to most employees as well as 32 people (66,7%) and punishment responded by most employees with less than 27 people (56,3%) and good work productivity as many as 26 people (54,2%).

Bivariate Analysis

Effect of Age on Employee Work Productivity

Table 2. Effect of Age on Employee Work Productivity at Supiori District Health Office 2017

No	Age	Work Produktivity				Number	
		Less		Good		n	%
		n	%	n	%		
1	< 30 year	14	46,7	16	53,3	30	100
2	≥ 30 year	8	44,4	10	55,6	18	100
Total		22	45,8	26	54,2	48	100
<i>p-value = 1,000; RP = 1,094; CI95% = (0,338 – 3,539)</i>							

Table 2 shows that out of 30 employees <30 years old, 14 people (46.7%) had a good work productivity of 16 people (53.3%). Whereas from 18 people aged > 30 years as many as 8 people (44.4%) has a productivity of less and good work as many as 10 people (55.6%). Chi square test results

obtained $p\text{-value} = 1,000 > 0,05$. This means that there is no significant influence between age and productivity of the Supiori District Health Office staff.

Influence of Sex on Employee Work Productivity

Table 3. Influence of Sex on Employee Work Productivity at Supiori District Health Office 2017

No	Sex	Work Produktivity				Number	
		Less		Good		n	%
		n	%	n	%		
1	Male	10	43,5	13	56,5	23	100
2	Female	12	48	13	52	25	100
Total		22	45,8	26	54,2	48	100
<i>p-value = 0,981; RP = 0,833; CI95% = (0,267 – 2,601)</i>							

Table 3 shows that out of 23 male sex workers, 10 people (43.5%) have a good work productivity of less than 13 people (56.5%). Whereas from 25 people of female sex as many as 12 people (48%) have less and good working productivity as many as 13 people (52%). Chi square test

results obtained $p\text{-value} = 0,981 > 0,05$. This means that there is no significant effect between sexes on the productivity of the Supiori District Health Officer.

Effect of Education on Employee Work Productivity

Table 4. Effect of Education on Employee Productivity in Supiori District Health Office 2017

No	Education	Work Produktivity				Number	
		Less		Good			%
		n	%	n	%		
1	< D-III	8	42,1	11	57,9	19	100
2	≥ D-III	14	48,3	15	51,7	29	100
Total		22	45,8	26	54,2	48	100
<i>p-value = 0,902; RP = 0,779; CI95% = (0,243 – 2,501)</i>							

Table 4, shows that from 19 employees <D-III educated as many as 8 people (42.1%) have less and good work productivity as many as 11 people (57.9%). Whereas from 29 people who are educated > D-III as many as 14 people (48.3%) have a productivity of less and good work as many as 15 people (51.7%). Chi square test results

obtained $p\text{-value} = 0.902 > 0.05$. This means that there is no significant influence between education and the productivity of the employees of Supiori District Health Office.

a. Influence of Employee Status to Employee Work Productivity

Table 5. Influence of Employee Status to Employee Work Productivity at Supiori District Health Office 2017

No	Status	Work Produktivity				Number	
		Less		Good			%
		n	%	n	%		
1	Honor	2	33,3	4	66,7	6	100
2	ASN	20	47,6	22	52,4	42	100
Total		22	45,8	26	54,2	48	100
<i>p-value = 0,674 RP = 0,550; CI95% = (0,091 – 3,334)</i>							

Table 5 shows that of 6 employees with honorarium employee as much as 2 people (33,3%) have less work productivity and good as many as 4 people (66,7%). While from 42 people who have ASN employees status as many as 20 people (47,6%) have less work productivity and good as much 22 people (52,4%). Chi square test results

obtained $p\text{-value} = 0.674 > 0.05$. This means that there is no meaningful influence between employee status and the productivity productivity of Supiori District Health Office staff.

Influence of Work Period on Employee Work Productivity

Table 6. Influence of Work Period on Employee Work Productivity at Supiori District Health Office 2017

No	Work period	Work Produktivity				Number	
		Less		Good			%
		n	%	n	%		
1	New	5	45,5	6	54,5	11	100
2	Old	17	45,9	20	54,1	37	100
Total		22	45,8	26	54,2	48	100
<i>p-value = 1,000 RP = 0,980; CI95% = (0,254 – 3,787)</i>							

Tabel 6, menunjukkan bahwa dari 11 orang pegawai dengan masa kerja baru sebanyak 5 orang (45,5%) memiliki produktivitas kerja kurang dan baik sebanyak 6 orang (54,5%). Sedangkan dari 37 orang dengan masa kerja lama sebanyak 17 orang (45,9%) memiliki produktivitas kerja kurang dan baik sebanyak 20 orang

(54,1%). Hasil uji *chi square* diperoleh nilai $p\text{-value} = 1,000 > 0,05$. Hal ini berarti bahwa tidak ada pengaruh yang bermakna antara masa kerja terhadap produktivitas kerjapegawai Dinas Kesehatan Kabupaten Supiori.

Effect of Work Motivation on Employee Work Productivity

Table 7. Influence of Work Motivation on Employee Work Productivity at Supiori District Health Office 2017

No	Work Motivation	Work Produktivity				Number	
		Less		Good			%
		n	%	n	%		
1	low	16	84,2	3	15,8	19	100
2	high	6	20,7	23	79,3	29	100
Total		22	45,8	26	54,2	48	100
<i>p-value = 0,000 RP = 20,444; CI95% = (4,446 – 94,013)</i>							

Table 7 shows that from 19 employees with low work motivation as many as 16 people (84.2%) have less and good working productivity of 3 people (15.8%). Whereas from 29 people with high work motivation as many as 6 people (20,7%) have less work productivity and good as many as 23 people (79,3%). Chi square test results obtained $p\text{-value} = 0,000 < 0.05$. This means that there is a meaningful influence between work motivation to the productivity of the employees of Supiori District Health Office. The result of prevalence ratio test obtained $RP = 20,444$; $CI95\% = (4,446 - 94,013)$ interpreted that employee with low work motivation has a chance to work productivity less 20,444 times higher than employee with high work motivation.

Effect of Work Motivation on Employee Work Productivity

The results obtained that there is a meaningful influence between work motivation on work productivity Supiori District Health Office ($p\text{-value} = 0,000 < 0,05$).

The results of this study in line with research conducted Andri and Wardi (2010) in Padang city secretariat reveals that there is influence of leadership motivation on employee job satisfaction.

Motivation is the act of a group of factors that cause individuals to behave in certain ways.¹¹

The influence of work discipline on Employee Work Productivity

Table 8. The Effect of Work Discipline on Employee Work Productivity in Supiori District Health Office 2017

No	Work Discipline	Work Produktivity				Number	
		Less		Good			%
		n	%	n	%		
1	Less	13	81,3	3	18,8	16	100
2	Good	9	28,1	23	71,9	32	100
Total		22	45,8	26	54,2	48	100
<i>p-value = 0,001 RP = 11,074; CI95% = (2,538 – 48,310)</i>							

Table 8, shows that of 16 employees with less work discipline as many as 13 people (81.3%) have less and good working productivity of 3 people (18.8%). While from 32 people with good work discipline as much as 9 people (28,1%) have less work productivity and good as much 23 people (71,9%). Chi square test results obtained $p\text{-value} = 0.001 < 0.05$. This means that there is a meaningful influence between the work discipline to the productivity of the employees of Supiori District Health

Office. The result of prevalence ratio test obtained $RP = 11,074$; $CI95\% = (2,538 - 48,310)$ interpreted that employees who work discipline less work productivity opportunity less 11,074 times higher compared with employees who have good work discipline. The results of this study in line with research Anggorowati¹³ revealed that there is influence of work discipline to work productivity.

Effect of Leadership on Employee Employee Productivity

Table 9. The Effect of Leadership on Employee Productivity in Supiori District Health Office 2017

No	Leadership	Work Produktivity				Number	
		Less		Good			%
		n	%	n	%		
1	Less	13	81,3	3	18,8	16	100
2	Good	9	28,1	23	71,9	32	100
Total		22	45,8	26	54,2	48	100
<i>p-value = 0,001 RP = 11,074; CI95% = (2,538 – 48,310)</i>							

Table 9, shows that of 16 employees with less leadership as many as 13 people (81.3%) have less and good work productivity of 3 people (18.8%). Whereas from 32 people with good leadership as much 9 people (28,1%) have work productivity less and good counted 23 people (71,9%). Chi square test results obtained p-value = 0.001 <0.05. This means that there is a meaningful influence between the leadership and the productivity of the employees of Supiori District Health Office. The result of prevalence ratio

IV. CONCLUSION

The results of this study can be summarized as follows:

1. There is no influence of age to the productivity of Supremeisecara District Health Service staff meaning (p-value = 1,000 > 0,05; RP = 1.094; CI95% = 0,338 - 3,539).
2. There is no influence of sex to the productivity of Supiori District Health Officer significantly (p-value = 0,981 > 0,05; RP = 0,833; CI95% = 0,267 - 2,601).
3. There is no effect of education on the productivity of the employees of Supiori District Health Office (p-value = 0.902 > 0.05; RP = 0.779; CI95% = 0.243 - 2.501).
4. There is no influence on the status of employees to the productivity of the employees of the District Health Office Supiori significantly (p-value = 0.609 > 0.05; RP = 0.600; CI95% = 0.176 - 2.046).
5. There is no influence of working period to productivity of Supiori District Health Office staff (p-value = 1,000 > 0,05; RP = 0,980; CI95% = 0,254 - 3,787).
6. There is a significant effect of work motivation on work productivity of Supiori District Health Officer (p-value = 0,000 <0,05; RP = 20,444; CI95% = 4,446 - 94,013).
7. There is a significant influence between work discipline to the productivity of the employees of Supiori District Health Office (p-value = 0.001 <0.05; RP = 11.074; CI95% = 2,538 - 48,310).
8. There is a significant influence between leadership on the productivity of the employees of Supiori District Health Office (p-value = 0.001 <0.05; RP = 11.074; CI95% = 2.538 - 48.310).
9. There is no significant influence between organizational culture and the productivity of employees of Supiori District Health Office (p-value = 0.078 > 0.05; RP = 3.429; CI95% = 1.037 - 11.332).

V. SUGGESTIONS

1. Leadership can improve the mechanism of a better reward system so that it can improve the productivity of its subordinates work in a way
 - a. Taking into account the reward system for employees, especially making more specific, fair, mechanisms and mechanisms for employee incentives and promotion so that the power of incentives and employee promotion as a motivator for work productivity can be well maintained.
 - b. Synergize grading system as incentive level with system Increasing employee involvement in activities ranging from planning activities, organizing, personnel, direction and control for productivity of employees working well maintained.
 - c. Consider policies on human resource development in the form of formal and informal education development by allocating continuous education and training grants to support and provide opportunities for education to a higher level.

REFERENCES

- [1] Arikunto S (2010) *Prosedur Penelitian, Suatu Pendekatan Praktek*. Jakarta : PT Rineka Cipta.
- [2] Hasibuan Malayu S. P (2012). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia (Edisi Revisi)*. Jakarta : Bumi Aksara.
- [3] Sudarmanto, 2009. *Kinerja dan Pengembangan Kompetensi SDM*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar
- [4] Sugijati, Sajidah dan Dramawan (2013) *Proses Pembelajaran Dalam Pendidikan Kesehatan*. Jakarta: TIM.
- [5] Artana, I Wayan Arta. (2012). *Pengaruh Kepemimpinan, Kompensasi, dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Studi Kasus di Maya Ubud Resort & Spa*. *Jurnal Manajemen, Strategi Bisnis, dan Kewirausahaan, Vol. 2, No. 1*.
- [6] Astuti T. B (2013). *Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Produktivitas Kerja (Studi Pada Pegawai Bagian Produksi PT Mazuvo Indo)*. Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Widya Manggala.
- [7] Gibson. J. L (2003). *Organisasi Perilaku, Struktur, Proses*. Jilid 2, Erlangga, Jakarta.
- [8] Handoko, T. Hanny. (2006). *Manajemen Personalialia dan Sumberdaya Manusia*. Yogyakarta: BPFE
- [9] Sastroasmoro, 2010. *Metode Peneltitian Klnis*. Jakarta: Bina Rupa Aksara
- [10] Sugiyono (2013). *Metode Penelitian Manajemen*. Bandung: Alfabeta
- [11] Helmi, Avin Fadilla (2006). *Disiplin Kerja*. Buletin Psikologi. Tahun IV, Nomor 2, Desember 2006.
- [12] Herlambang B. G, 2012. *Pengantar Manajemen*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.