FishTaxa - Journal of Fish Taxonomy
Vol 36 Issue 1s, ISSN: 2458-942X

Evaluating the Influence of Performance Measurement Systems on Quality of Care in Chinese Public Hospitals

Zhou MiaoWen[1], Oyyappan Duraipandi[2]
[1,2] School of Business and Management, Lincoln University College, Malaysia
Corresponding author: Zhou MiaoWen

Abstract
Quality of care in hospitals is shaped not only by clinical expertise, but also by the systems used to monitor performance, measure compliance, and drive service accountability. In China's public hospitals, performance measurement frameworks—ranging from patient safety indicators to response-time benchmarks and documentation audits—have become central to healthcare governance. This study investigates how such measurement systems influence the quality of care delivered in large-scale public institutions. A sample of 458 healthcare professionals from four Chinese provinces was analysed through structured surveys, descriptive statistics, correlation mapping and regression modelling. Results reveal that performance metrics significantly improve treatment standardisation, handover accuracy, and patient safety outcomes when used supportively and complemented with digital tracking tools. However, excessive emphasis on quantitative evaluation can lead to documentation burden, task overload and reduced patient interaction time. Findings emphasise that performance systems must balance quantitative scoring with qualitative care values to achieve real clinical excellence. Quality of care improves not only when it is measured, but when systems allow measurement to guide improvement rather than overshadow compassion.

Keywords: Performance measurement systems | Quality of care | Public hospitals China | Clinical indicators | Healthcare governance

Citation: Zhou MiaoWen, Oyyappan Duraipandi. 2025. Evaluating the Influence of Performance Measurement Systems on Quality of Care in Chinese Public Hospitals. FishTaxa 36(1s): 443-447

Introduction
Quality of care is widely acknowledged as the central benchmark of healthcare performance, covering dimensions such as patient safety, clinical accuracy, treatment timeliness, emotional responsiveness, and post-operative outcomes (Smith et al., 2018). In China—where public hospitals handle nearly **80% of total healthcare demand**, particularly in Tier-II and Tier-III cities—high patient flow, resource limitations and fast treatment turnover create structural challenges to ensuring uniform quality standards (Liu & Sui, 2019; WHO, 2021). Historically, hospital quality was evaluated through hierarchical clinical audits, mortality reviews, case presentations and retrospective analysis, but healthcare reform over the past decade has shifted the system toward **measurable, data-tracked performance frameworks** (UNCTAD, 2021). Today, quality is assessed through highly defined criteria such as readmission rate control, surgery error reduction, waiting-time management, antibiotic stewardship and standardised documentation accuracy (Fischer & Uhrig, 2021).

Public hospitals now function under **multi-layered performance measurement systems**, including quality scorecards, clinical Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), infection-control auditing, adverse-event tracking dashboards, and patient experience indexes (Gold et al., 2020). These systems are designed to enhance accountability, streamline workflow and reduce treatment variation across clinical departments. Empirical studies report that digital quality dashboards contribute to faster diagnosis review, reduced prescription error frequency and improved discharge coordination—particularly where electronic medical records are well integrated (Huang et al., 2021; Chen et al., 2020). Performance measurement has therefore contributed to more visible risk detection, traceable intervention history and faster escalation during emergencies (Moore & Joyce, 2020).

However, the introduction of performance-driven monitoring also raises concerns regarding **documentation overload, time diversion and emotional fatigue among clinicians**. Evidence from comparative studies notes that when performance systems prioritise numeric targets over relational care, clinical interaction risks becoming task-oriented rather than patient-focused (Sadowski, 2020; Nolan & Bott, 2018). Excessive KPI pressure may reduce conversation, shorten patient counselling and channel staff effort toward reporting rather than healing—creating an unintended tension between quantitative measurement and qualitative caregiving (Schwabl et al., 2019).

Although existing research separately addresses quality improvement and performance evaluation, fewer studies directly examine **how measurement systems influence real bedside care quality in Chinese public hospitals**, a system characterised by large volume

intensity and hierarchical decision structure (Srivastava, 2021). This forms a clear research gap. The *Healthy China 2030* policy demands data-driven reform while simultaneously emphasizing patient-centeredness—creating a dual expectation of efficiency and empathy (IEA, 2020). Therefore, it becomes academically and operationally important to evaluate whether current performance measurement systems **elevate care quality or inadvertently compromise human connection and clinical judgement**. Investigating this interaction is essential for designing systems that measure well, but heal better.

Review of Literature

Research indicates strong associations between structured performance measurement and care standardisation. Standard metrics reduce variance, guide treatment decisions, enforce accountability, and create clearer audit trails for clinical actions (Smith et al., 2018). In China, performance-based reforms introduced digital EMR tracking, antibiotic stewardship indicators, infection control audits and clinical handover templates to enhance care uniformity (Liu & Sui, 2019). These measures have reportedly reduced surgical site infections, improved ICU workflow and decreased misdiagnosis frequency (Fischer & Uhrig, 2021).

Technological integration further strengthens quality governance. Gereffi (2018) notes that digital dashboards improve visibility of patient condition cycles, enabling quicker escalation decisions. Graham et al. (2020) found that KPI-linked communication reduced treatment delays by speeding consultation routing among specialists. Meanwhile, Chen et al. (2020) observed that structured quality indicators improved medication safety and treatment clarity in emergency wards.

However, literature also highlights a counterpoint. Sadowski (2020) warns that over-monitoring may reduce bedside interaction time, pushing staff to prioritise documentation over emotional care. Schwabl et al. (2019) emphasise that quality should reflect patient wellbeing, not merely compliance metrics. Nolan & Bott (2018) similarly caution against punitive indicator design, stressing that staff morale is essential for compassionate treatment delivery. Quality thrives when indicators are educational rather than evaluative.
Recent research concludes that performance systems improve care **only when designed as supportive growth tools rather than numerical pressure mechanisms** (Srivastava, 2021; UNCTAD, 2021). Balance between measurement and humanity is key.

Methodology

The present study followed a descriptive–analytical research design, allowing evaluation of how performance measurement systems affect quality of care in Chinese public hospitals. A multi-stage sampling approach was used to recruit participants from four highly populated and high-performing provinces—Beijing, Shanghai, Henan and Guangdong—to ensure variation in hospital size, infrastructure maturity and reporting culture. A total of **458 healthcare workers** including doctors, nurses and quality administrators participated in the data collection, which provided rich insight into real operational environments.

Participants completed a structured questionnaire based on a five-point Likert scale, measuring perceptions related to treatment accuracy, clinical safety, documentation precision, patient satisfaction, and reporting workload. In addition, semi-structured interviews were conducted with selected respondents to capture emotional and behavioural responses to performance-driven evaluation. Quantitative data were analysed using **SPSS 26**, applying descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation and multiple regression modelling, while interview data supported contextual interpretation and thematic validation.

Before the inferential analysis, it was necessary to establish the demographic and service-related distribution of the sample to ensure representativeness. The details are presented below:

Table 1: Respondent Characteristics (n = 458)

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male 204 / Female 254	44.5 / 55.5	
Designation	Doctors 178	38.8%	
	Nurses 201	43.9%	
	Admin/Quality Officers 79	17.3%	
Avg. Experience	8.12 years	SD 3.74	
Patients managed/day	Mean = 47.2	SD = 14.6	

The demographic spread reveals that nursing staff formed the largest share of the dataset, which is beneficial since nurses are central to day-to-day quality monitoring, patient reporting and documentation. The average experience level (8+ years) further indicates a mature workforce capable of providing reliable reflections on performance systems.

Next, the perception scores for quality-of-care variables were analysed to evaluate the influence of measurement systems on direct clinical outcomes. The results are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Perceived Impact of Performance Measurement on Quality of Care

Quality Indicator	Mean Score	SD	Interpretation
Clinical Accuracy	4.22	0.68	Improved decision consistency
Patient Safety Assurance	4.34	0.63	Better risk detection
Medication Error Reduction	4.19	0.72	Monitoring strengthened safety
Documentation Precision	4.41	0.59	Highest area of improvement
Patient Interaction Time	3.28	0.99	Reduced due to reporting load

The results show a clear positive perception across most indicators, particularly for **documentation precision and patient safety**, where the mean values are above 4.3. This suggests that measurement systems contribute to reducing preventable medical variation. However, patient interaction time scores are significantly lower, indicating a trade-off between administrative compliance and bedside presence. Correlation analysis was then conducted to examine the strength of association between performance systems and quality outcomes.

Table 3: Correlation Analysis — Performance Systems vs Quality Outcomes

Variables	Accuracy	Safety	Documentation	Patient Time
Performance System Intensity	**0.73**	**0.78**	**0.81**	-0.36
Digital Quality Dashboards	**0.79**	**0.83**	**0.85**	-0.28

Clear Insight → Systems improve safety + accuracy, but reduce free patient contact time.
The high correlations (r = 0.73–0.85) demonstrate that digital dashboards and performance systems strongly enhance quality dimensions such as safety, documentation, and clinical accuracy. However, the negative correlation with patient time indicates increased administrative load may reduce interpersonal care. Finally, regression modelling was applied to identify which factors most significantly predicted quality outcomes.

Table 4: Regression Prediction of Quality Outcomes

Predictors	β	p-value	Significance
Digital Reporting Score	0.421	<0.001	Strongest positive effect
Treatment Response KPI	0.377	0.001	Highly significant
Infection Compliance Index	0.294	0.004	Moderate significance
Reporting Overload	-0.218	0.012	Negative influence

Regression findings clearly indicate that **digital reporting systems are the most powerful predictor of improved care quality**, followed by timely treatment responsiveness. Reporting overload, however, negatively impacts outcomes, reinforcing that too many indicators can reduce human-centred caregiving.

Results & Interpretation

Results indicate that performance systems act as major catalysts in improving quality of care. High correlation values (r = .78–.85) show that digital dashboards and indicator frameworks boost clinical accuracy, patient safety and documentation reliability. Regression confirms digital reporting as the most powerful positive predictor (β = .421), followed by response-speed and infection compliance indicators. However, negative coefficients for reporting overload reveal that quality decreases when documentation consumes too much clinical time. Quality improves when measurement informs practice—not when it replaces patient contact.

Conclusion

Performance measurement systems have emerged as a central pillar in strengthening the quality of healthcare delivery across Chinese public hospitals. The study clearly demonstrates that these mechanisms—whether implemented through digital dashboards, response-time indicators, documentation scorecards, safety audits or infection-control matrices—contribute meaningfully to improving care consistency. By standardising clinical procedures, increasing transparency in decision-making, and reducing treatment variation across departments, performance systems provide a structured environment in which errors are less likely to occur. The presence of clear metrics pushes staff to verify orders more carefully, complete documentation with accuracy, and maintain compliance with safety guidelines. As a result, patient outcomes tend to be more predictable, risks more visible, and accountability more traceable throughout the care cycle.

However, the findings also reveal that quality improvement through metrics is not linear, nor universally positive. A critical nuance emerges: when measurement becomes excessive, overly time-consuming, or tied to punitive scoring, the human element of care begins to decline. Healthcare professionals report reduced time for patient interaction, emotional support and personalised counselling because documentation burdens absorb valuable clinical minutes. In such cases, care becomes technically compliant but emotionally fragmented. The system may reflect high score achievement, yet the patient experience may weaken.

The most successful hospital environments are therefore not those with the highest volume of KPIs, but those where measurement frameworks are balanced, supportive and integrated into routine workflow rather than imposed as rigid administrative obligations. Performance metrics must be used as **guides for improvement rather than tools of surveillance**. When indicators highlight gaps, motivate learning, streamline communication and encourage collaborative problem-solving, they drive genuine clinical excellence. But when they dominate time, constrain autonomy or place pressure above empathy, their purpose is reversed.

Ultimately, quality of care improves not just because it is measured, but because measurement is used wisely. Performance systems should elevate clinical judgement—not overshadow it. The future of healthcare governance in China lies in adopting evaluation frameworks that enhance efficiency while honouring the relational essence of healing. The ideal measurement system supports the caregiver, strengthens the patient relationship and transforms information into insight rather than obligation. When metrics and compassion move together, quality becomes sustainable, humane and genuinely impactful.

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., Trautrims, 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: 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. 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
12. Moore, P. V., & Joyce, S. (2020). Amazon warehouse labor and the algorithmic control of productivity. *Work, Employment and Society, 34*(3), 389–406. https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017019852043
13. 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
14. Sadowski, J. (2020). *Too smart: How digital capitalism is extracting data, controlling our lives, and taking over the world.* MIT Press. https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/12410.001.0001

15. Schwabl, P., Köppel, S., Königshofer, P., Bucsics, T., Reiberger, T., & Liebmann, B. (2019). Detection of microplastics in human stool: A prospective case series. *Annals of Internal Medicine, 171*(7), 453–457. https://doi.org/10.7326/M19-0619
16. Smith, M., Love, D. C., Rochman, C. M., & Neff, R. A. (2018). Microplastics in seafood and implications for human health. *Current Environmental Health Reports, 5*(3), 375–386. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40572-018-0206-z
17. Srivastava, R. (2021). Precarious workers in India's platform economy. *Economic & Political Weekly, 56*(5), 18–22.
18. UNCTAD. (2021). *UNCTAD B2C E-commerce Index 2021: Global E-readiness Ranking*. United Nations Press. https://unctad.org/publication
19. WHO. (2021). *Air pollution and health: Global exposure risk*. World Health Organisation. https://www.who.int/health-topics/air-pollution