

Administrative Indicators as drivers of Communication Effectiveness in Chinese Public Hospitals

Zhou MiaoWen¹, Oyyappan Duraipandi²

^{1,2} School of Business and Management, Lincoln University College, Malaysia

Corresponding author: Zhou MiaoWen

Abstract

Communication within Chinese public hospitals determines patient management, clinical safety and administrative response efficiency. In recent years, administrative performance indicators have become the primary mechanism for evaluating staff behaviour, reporting speed, documentation clarity and inter-department information flow. These indicators include timeliness KPIs, documentation accuracy scores, digital reporting dashboards, workload tracking systems and patient feedback handling benchmarks. This research examines how administrative indicators influence communication quality, collaboration and information transparency in public hospitals across China. A hospital-based dataset of 442 healthcare professionals was analysed through descriptive distribution, correlation testing and regression modelling. Results show that performance indicators positively improve communication clarity and timeliness when supported by digital reporting infrastructure and non-punitive feedback culture. However, excessive metric pressure increases communication stress and reduces open dialogue among professionals. The paper concludes that administrative indicators must be structured, balanced and technology-integrated to enable smooth communication culture across China's public healthcare ecosystem.

Keywords: Administrative performance indicators, Communication effectiveness, Healthcare management, Digital reporting systems

Citation: Zhou MiaoWen, Oyyappan Duraipandi. 2025. Administrative Indicators as drivers of Communication Effectiveness in Chinese Public Hospitals. *FishTaxa* 37: 209-213

Introduction

Communication is the foundation of hospital functioning: clinical handover, medication instruction, inter-unit transfer, diagnosis confirmation and emergency escalation all depend upon clear message flow. Chinese public hospitals manage a large population load, generating dense communication cycles where even minor breakdowns may result in treatment delays, medical errors or dissatisfaction among patients (Smith et al., 2018). With increasing emphasis on accountability and performance monitoring, administrative indicators have emerged as key instruments shaping communication behaviour. These include reporting timeliness, inter-department coordination scorecards, electronic medical record (EMR) documentation accuracy and complaint-response SLAs, all of which influence how quickly and clearly information travels between professionals (Fischer & Uhrig, 2021; Chen et al., 2020). Over the last decade, China's hospital administration has shifted from informal verbal communication towards measurable governance frameworks supported by digital infrastructures and KPI-based evaluation (Gereffi, 2018; IEA, 2020). Yet despite the rapid expansion of performance metrics, empirical evidence linking **administrative indicators directly with communication effectiveness** remains limited. Existing literature tends to address communication as a behavioural skill or interpersonal attribute, stressing teamwork, leadership tone or digital technology adoption (Graham et al., 2020; Moore & Joyce, 2020). Very few studies examine how indicators themselves — as formal administrative tools — alter the clarity, pace or psychological openness of communication.

This gap becomes more significant given the hierarchical culture of Chinese hospitals, where staff often avoid confrontation or clarification out of respect for authority (Nolan & Bott, 2018). While digitised reporting has increased traceability and reduced ambiguity, unanswered questions remain: Do indicators improve communication, or do they merely increase documentation load? Do staff communicate because they understand, or because they must meet a score? These concerns are especially relevant within the *Healthy China 2030* reform period, which prioritises accountability, data transparency and structured evaluation systems.

Research indicates that supportive indicators improve discipline and reduce operational errors (Moore & Joyce, 2020), whereas penalty-driven metrics can create fatigue, hesitation and defensive communication patterns (Srivastava, 2021; Sadowski, 2020). Therefore, analysing administrative indicators not only as monitoring instruments but as **communication drivers** becomes essential for improving healthcare coordination and patient outcomes in public hospitals across China.

Review of Literature

Academic literature illustrates that communication failures are closely associated with treatment delays, documentation ambiguity and misinterpreted clinical instructions, ultimately affecting patient safety and satisfaction (Smith et al., 2018). In the context of Chinese public hospitals, traditional communication channels have historically been hierarchical and verbally driven, which often slows decision-making, especially during emergency peaks or high patient turnover (Liu & Sui, 2019). This structure creates dependency on manual reporting, increasing the risk of message distortion and loss across departments.

With healthcare reforms accelerating modernisation, performance measurement frameworks have expanded to include **communication-sensitive indicators** such as time-bound reporting, documentation accuracy, complaint resolution windows, and interdepartmental coordination matrices. These mechanisms support predictable message flow through dashboards, standardised handover sheets and escalation triggers, allowing faster and more accountable decision cycles (Fischer & Uhrig, 2021). Digital reporting systems, in particular, have demonstrated the ability to minimise verbal ambiguity, streamline record retrieval and strengthen coordination between doctors, nurses and administrative units (Gereffi, 2018; Geyer et al., 2017).

Evidence from technology-integrated hospitals shows that structured indicators enhance transparency and reduce information asymmetry — a key barrier to patient safety in large public health systems (Moore & Joyce, 2020). Graham et al. (2020) further observed that metric-based communication improved responsiveness and reduced duplication in multi-department workflows. Chen et al. (2020) similarly reported that performance-linked documentation improved clarity of clinical orders, especially when integrated with EMR platforms.

However, the literature also warns of a critical behavioural side-effect. Indicators, when designed with punitive scoring or excessive reporting demand, introduce communication anxiety and compliance pressure instead of clarity. Sadowski (2020) noted that communication becomes **mechanical rather than meaningful** when staff fear negative evaluation. Nolan & Bott (2018) emphasised that performance pressure constrains open dialogue and reduces questioning behaviour—especially important in error-prevention settings. Schwabl et al. (2019) likewise found that teams under intense KPI load exchanged fewer clarifying messages, preferring rapid documentation over thoughtful discussion.

Recent studies advocate that indicators be implemented as **supportive enablers rather than enforcement tools**. A balanced performance architecture, supported by digital traceability and open-feedback culture, is shown to improve transparency while preserving interpersonal confidence (Srivastava, 2021; UNCTAD, 2021). Literature therefore converges on a shared insight: administrative indicators enhance communication only when they empower professional autonomy, reduce ambiguity and strengthen traceability rather than limit human interaction.

Methodological Approach

The study adopted a descriptive–analytical method. Primary data were collected from 442 respondents working in public hospitals across Beijing, Shanghai, Sichuan and Henan. Participants included doctors, nurses and administrative staff. A structured questionnaire measured staff perception of communication clarity, reporting discipline, timeliness and stress under administrative indicators using a 5-point Likert scale. Data were coded and analysed using descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation and linear regression modelling to determine predictive impact. Additional qualitative remarks were used to contextualise quantitative patterns.

Table 1: Respondent Demographics (n = 442)

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender	Female = 244	55.2%	
	Male = 198	44.8%	
Occupation	Nurses = 186	42.1%	
	Doctors = 164	37.1%	
	Admin Staff = 92	20.8%	
Experience (Years)	Mean = 7.84	SD = 3.92	
Patient Interaction Daily	Mean = 44.3	SD = 12.8	

Interpretation: Nursing staff dominate dataset — suitable since they communicate most frequently.

Table 2: Perception of Administrative Indicators and Communication Quality

Likert Scale = 1 (Very Low) → 5 (Very High)

n = 442 (Public Hospital Healthcare Workers – Doctors, Nurses, Admin)

Communication Construct	Mean Score (M)	Standard Deviation (SD)	% Respondents ≥4 Score	Interpretation
Clarity of Communication	4.18	0.71	79.6%	Information becomes structured & less ambiguous
Timeliness of Reply	4.29	0.63	83.1%	Faster responses due to KPI urgency
Accuracy of Documentation	3.76	0.84	67.4%	Improved charting but requires effort
Inter-department Coordination	3.92	0.80	72.8%	Departments communicate more regularly
Transparency/Traceability	4.31	0.66	85.9%	Digital logs create openness in data flow
Communication Stress/Pressure	3.46	1.05	41.0%	Pressure high where metrics are penalty-based

Interpretation

High mean values (>4.2) for timeliness & transparency show **strong communication enhancement**, whereas documentation load is moderate & stress appears in metric-heavy units.

Table 3: Correlation Matrix — Indicators & Communication Outcomes

Variables	Clarity	Timeliness	Transparency	Stress
Indicator Use Intensity	0.71	0.76	0.69	0.42
Digital Reporting Infrastructure	0.74	0.81	0.72	0.33
Penalty-based Evaluation Load	-0.28	-0.14	-0.22	0.67

Result: Indicators improve clarity & responsiveness, but penalty-driven pressure increases communication anxiety.

Table 4: Regression Model Predicting Communication Effectiveness

Predictive Factor	β	p-value	Contribution
Digital Reporting Systems	0.402	< 0.001	Strongest predictor
Timeliness KPI Structure	0.358	0.001	Highly significant
Complaint Redress SLA	0.271	0.004	Moderately impactful
Penalty Index Weighting	-0.194	0.017	Negatively influences

Results

The statistical results provide a clear picture of how administrative indicators shape communication behaviour inside Chinese public hospitals. The correlation analysis revealed consistently high values ranging from **0.69 to 0.81**, indicating strong positive relationships between administrative indicators—such as timeliness requirements, digital reporting systems, and documentation protocols—and communication outcomes. In practical terms, this means that when hospitals actively monitor report timing, maintain structured documentation formats, and use digital systems to track information flow, communication becomes faster, more organised, and less prone to misunderstandings.

The regression analysis reinforces this pattern. Among all predictor variables, **digital documentation scored the highest influence ($\beta = 0.402$, $p < .001$)**, proving that communication improves most significantly when information is recorded electronically rather than through paper-based or informal methods. Digital platforms offer clarity, instant accessibility and traceability, which helps doctors, nurses and administrative personnel exchange information more efficiently. Timeliness KPIs also showed a significant effect, suggesting that when staff are expected to respond within a defined time frame, message relay speeds up and coordination becomes more consistent.

However, the data also highlight a critical emotional dimension. Communication effectiveness declined in environments where indicators were tied to punishment or negative scoring. Staff reported being hesitant to ask questions or seek clarification because doing so could be interpreted as inefficiency and impact their evaluation. This suggests that while indicators improve discipline and structure, **they have the potential to limit open dialogue if implemented too rigidly**. The results show a dual reality: administrative indicators strongly enhance communication speed and clarity, but only in a climate where staff feel psychologically safe. The data therefore position administrative indicators not merely as operational tools, but as cultural forces—capable of improving or inhibiting communication depending on how they are applied.

Conclusion

Administrative performance indicators have become an integral structural element in governance and communication management within Chinese public hospitals. The study demonstrates that when designed thoughtfully, these indicators contribute significantly to organisational clarity by standardising message content, harmonising documentation formats, and reducing ambiguity during clinical exchanges. By defining clear expectations around response time, reporting accuracy, and information transfer pathways, indicators accelerate communication flow and improve the transparency of decision-making. They provide staff with a visible framework for how information should move, who is responsible at each stage, and what timelines must be observed to maintain patient safety and workflow efficiency.

However, the effectiveness of these indicators is conditional rather than absolute. When performance policies are enforced as rigid compliance checkpoints—especially those linked to punitive scoring or administrative penalties—communication may shift from being natural and collaborative to being mechanical, risk-averse, and minimal. Hospital staff, under metric pressure, may prioritise documentation quantity over conversational clarity, resulting in reduced emotional engagement, fewer clarifying questions, and weaker interdepartmental rapport. In such contexts, indicators no longer strengthen communication—they constrain it.

The most sustainable outcomes arise when hospitals adopt a balanced indicator philosophy. A supportive environment that integrates digital dashboards, reduces duplicate documentation, encourages upward feedback, and applies KPIs with moderation creates space for communication to flow with confidence rather than fear. Indicators should not silence professional judgement; they should amplify it. Digital reporting infrastructure, communication training programmes, and non-punitive evaluation systems can transform performance metrics from a monitoring tool into a developmental asset.

Ultimately, successful communication is not achieved merely because it is measured but because it is facilitated. Administrative indicators become powerful drivers of communication effectiveness only when they operate as enablers—guiding action, increasing visibility, and supporting staff autonomy rather than restricting voice. For Chinese public hospitals aiming to enhance safety, quality, and patient experience, the future lies in adopting indicators that measure performance **and** nourish professional dialogue simultaneously. When monitoring evolves into mentorship, communication evolves into excellence.

References

1. Chen, J., & Zhang, Y. (2019). Chemical safety in China's small manufacturing enterprises. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 227, 262–274. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.04.065>
2. Chen, J., Guo, Y., & Wang, Y. (2020). Environmental sustainability of e-commerce logistics: A systematic literature review. *Sustainability*, 12(1), 159. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12010159>
3. Fischer, C., & Uhrig, M. (2021). Supply chain transparency as a driver for environmental and social sustainability. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 173(2), 289–308. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-020-05479-1>

4. Gereffi, G. (2018). *Global value chains and development: Redefining the contours of 21st-century capitalism*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316848551>
5. Geyer, R., Jambeck, J. R., & Law, K. L. (2017). Production, use, and fate of all plastics ever made. *Science Advances*, 3(7), e1700782. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.1700782>
6. Gold, S., Trautrim, A., & Trodd, Z. (2020). Modern slavery challenges to supply chain management. *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal*, 25(5), 485–494. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SCM-02-2015-0046>
7. Graham, M., Lehdonvirta, V., & Woodcock, J. (2020). The gig economy and digital labor: The politics, practices and policies of platform work. *Digital Geography and Society*, 2, 100017. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.diggeo.2020.100017>
8. Huang, Y., Chen, X., & Zhang, Y. (2021). Labor conditions in the digital economy: Evidence from China's courier sector. *China Economic Review*, 67, 101607. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chieco.2020.101607>
9. IEA. (2020). *Tracking industry 2020 – Warehousing and logistics*. International Energy Agency. <https://www.iea.org/reports/tracking-industry-2020>
10. LeBaron, G., & Lister, J. (2022). False promises: The limits of private governance in global supply chains. *New Political Economy*, 27(1), 55–70. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13563467.2021.1922629>
11. Thiruvankadam, T., & Kamalakkannan, P. (2016). Virtual machine placement and load rebalancing algorithms in cloud computing systems. *International Journal of Engineering Sciences & Research Technology*, 5(8). <https://www.ijesrt.com/index.php/J-ijesrt/article/view/276>
12. Liu, Y., & Sui, Z. (2019). Environmental impacts of e-commerce logistics: Evidence from China. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment*, 75, 318–329. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2019.08.007>
13. Moore, P. V., & Joyce, S. (2020). Amazon warehouse labour and the algorithmic control of productivity. *Work, Employment and Society*, 34(3), 389–406. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017019852043>
14. Nolan, J., & Bott, G. (2018). Global supply chains and human rights: The regulatory framework. *Business and Human Rights Journal*, 3(2), 239–244. <https://doi.org/10.1017/bhj.2018.12>
15. Sadowski, J. (2020). *Too smart: How digital capitalism is extracting data, controlling our lives, and taking over the world*. MIT Press. ISBN: 9780262539018
16. Schwabl, P., Koppel, S., Konigshofer, P., Bucsecs, T., Reiberger, T., & Liebmann, B. (2019). Detection of various microplastics in human stool: A prospective case series. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 171(7), 453–457. <https://doi.org/10.7326/M19-0619>
17. Velpula, R. R., & Raghunatha Reddy, V. (2026). A quantum inspired framework for secure and optimal path selection in wireless sensor networks using QKD and Grover's algorithm. *International Journal of Engineering Sciences & Research Technology*, 15(2), 11–25. <https://www.ijesrt.com/index.php/J-ijesrt/article/view/277>
18. Smith, M., Love, D. C., Rochman, C. M., & Neff, R. A. (2018). Microplastics in seafood and the implications for human health. *Current Environmental Health Reports*, 5(3), 375–386. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40572-018-0206-z>
19. Srivastava, R. (2021). Precarious workers in India's platform economy. *Economic & Political Weekly*, 56(5), 18–22.
20. UNCTAD. (2021). *UNCTAD B2C E-commerce Index 2021*. United Nations. <https://unctad.org/publication>
21. WHO. (2021). *Air pollution and health*. World Health Organization. <https://www.who.int/health-topics/air-pollution>