

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

Deki Ogetai¹, A.L. Rantetampang², Agus Zainuri³, Anwar mallongi⁴

¹Magister Program of Public Health, Faculty of Public Health, Cenderawasih University, Jayapura.

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

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

Corresponding Author: Deki Ogetai

ABSTRACT

Introduction: A staff expected can and seriously, out for to run its duty better. One of the constraint in health development in Sub-Province Mimika is not maximal to giving service.

Target of research: to knowing factor the affecting productivity of work staff at sub health ministry sub province Mimika.

Method Research: Analytic of observational with cross sectional study design. Research executed on May 2018 in Ministry Health Sub Province Mimika. Population is all staf by sampel counted 831 people totally sampling. Data approach used questionnaire and analysed by chi square test and logistic binary regression.

Result of research: The factors affecting of breast feeding exclusive at Public Health Centre Pasar Sentral Regional Mimika Regency is studies (p-value 0,001; RP: 1,951; CI95% (1,343- 2,833), Job description (p-value 0,000; RP = 2,571; CI95% (1,702- 3,884), knowledge (p-value 0,000; RP: 2,532; CI95% (1,764 - 3,635), mother attitude (p-value 0,000; RP = 3,146; CI95% (2,260 - 4,378) and social cultural (p-value 0,000; RP= 2,617; CI95% (1,784 - 3,840). There is not affecting of breast feeding exclusive at Public Health Centre Pasar Sentral Regional Mimika Regency is mother age (p-value 0,131; RP = 1,404; CI95% (0,959- 2,056), health employee support (p-value 0,848; RP 0,723; CI95% (0,229 - 2,281), husband support (p-value 0,751; RP = 1,224; CI95% (0,687- 2,183), parity (p-value 0,437; RP = 0,774; CI95% (0,453 - 1,321) and social economic (p-value 0,358; RP = 1,290; CI95% (0,808 - 2,059). Dominant factor which affecting of breast feeding exclusive at Public Health Centre Pasar Sentral regional Mimika Regency is job description, knowledge, social cultural and

attitude mother, where attitude have done the dominant factor of breast feeding.

Keywords: Productivity of Work, Employee, Sub Health Ministry

1. INTRODUCTION

Resilient and qualified human resources are required to survive, grow and compete so that the continuity of an organization can continue to work and survive against rapid changes. The health service needed today is excellent health care. High quality human resources and high productivity will support the improvement of the quality and productivity of the implementation of health programs (Dessler, 2011).

The vision of the health department of Mimika regency is healthy independently in 2020. The mission of the Mimika Regency health office is to improve the adequacy and competence and capacity of health human resources professionals and free from corruption, collusion and nepotism. Increase the availability of health facilities and infrastructure, medicine and medical equipment to the villages. Increase the guarantee of free health care for the poor. Increase awareness, willingness and ability to live for the community. Tackling AIDS, tuberculosis, malaria, filariasis and leprosy. Reduce maternal and infant / under-five mortality and support malnutrition. Improve management and health information systems. The number of employees in the health office of Mimika Regency is 83 people.

The effectiveness of the organization is influenced by the effectiveness of the individual, so that the low performance of employees has an effect on 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) (Dessler, 2011). Each individual has a distinct identity and has at least eight biographical factors that include 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 (Hasibuan, 2012).

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 (Sedarmayanti, 2011). In the life-oriented organization of the future, the effort to organize 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 do his job well. Leadership role is to give attention and assessment, whether in the form of encouragement or motivation, giving reward, punishment / punishment and organizational culture that can create a good working climate so that work productivity of employees is executed properly.

The functions and duties of the Dinas Kesehatan of Mimika Regency are to improve the public health status to realize Mimika Sehat Mandiri in 2020. Therefore, the role of civil servant in Mimika Regency is very important to support the achievement of that goal. In fact one of the obstacles in health development in Mimika Regency is not yet maximal employees in providing services. This can be seen from the loyalty and discipline of employees in completing the work tasks that are still lacking. The attendance rate of employees according to working hours is still very low in the sense that there are still many employees who are late arriving at the office because of the distance of the residence with the office that is still very far away (some employees live in Mimika Regency). This affects the completion of tasks and responsibilities that are not in line with the expected timeliness. An example is the timing of a task or report not yet timed to be determined, and there are still employees who are not yet skilled in using technological equipment such as computers to complete their tasks leading to reporting delays. Based on that in this study researchers interested in conducting research with the title "Factors - Factors Affecting Work Productivity in the District Health Office Mimika"

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Analytical observational with cross sectional study design. The study was conducted on May 2018 at the District Health Office of Mimika Regency and the total sample was 83 people in total sampling. Data were obtained using questionnaire and analyzed using chi square test and logistic binary regression.

3. RESULTS

3.1. Bivariate Analysis

a. Effect of Age on Employee Productivity

Table 1. Effect of Age on Employee Productivity in Mimika Regency Health Office 2018

No	Age	Employee Productivity				Number	
		Less		Good		n	%
		n	%	n	%		
1	< 30 year	17	45,9	20	54,1	37	100
2	≥ 30 year	22	47,8	24	52,2	46	100
Total		39	47	44	53	83	100

p-value = 1,000; RP = 0,961; CI95% = (0,605 – 1,535)

Table 1 shows that from 37 employees <30 years old, 17 people (45,9%) have a good work productivity less than 22 people (47,8%). Whereas from 46 people aged > 30 years as many as 22 people (47.8%) have less and good working productivity as many as 24 people (52.2%). Chi square test results obtained $p\text{-value} = 1,000 > 0,05$. This means that there is no meaningful influence between age and work productivity of Mimika Regency Health Officer.

b. Effect of Gender on Working Employee Productivity

Table 2. Influence of Gender on Employee Productivity in Mimika Regency Health Office 2018

No	Sex	Employee Productivity				Number	
		Less		Baik		n	%
		n	%	n	%		
1	Male	16	41	23	59	39	100
2	Female	23	52,3	21	47,7	44	100
Total		39	47	44	53	83	100

p-value = 0,421; RP = 0,785; CI95% = (0,490 – 1,256)

Table 2 shows that out of 39 male sex workers as many as 16 people (41%) have less and good work productivity as many as 23 people (59%). Whereas of 44 people of female gender as many as 23 people (52,3%) have less and good working productivity as many as 21 people (47,7%). Chi square test results obtained $p\text{-value} = 0,981 > 0,05$. This means that there is no significant effect between sex on work productivity of Mimika Regency Health Officer.

c. Effect of Education on Employee Productivity

Table 3. Effect of Education on Employee Productivity in Mimika Regency Health Office 2018

No	Education	Employee Productivity				number	
		Less		Good		n	%
		n	%	n	%		
1	< D-III	13	41,9	18	58,1	31	100
2	≥ D-III	26	50	26	50	52	100
Total		39	47	44	53	83	100

p-value = 0,628; RP = 0,839; CI95% = (0,511 – 1,376)

Table 3, shows that from 31 employees with educated <D-III 13 respondents (41.9%) have low and good work productivity as many as 18 people (58.1%). Whereas from 52 people who are educated > D-III as many as 26 people (50%) have a productivity of less and good work as many as 26 people (50%). Chi square test results obtained $p\text{-value} = 0,628 > 0,05$. This means that there is no significant influence between education on employee work productivity of Mimika Regency Health Office.

d. Influence of Employee Status to Work Productivity Employees

Table 4. Influence of Employee Status to Work Productivity Employees at Health Department of Regency of Mimika Year 2018

No	Staff status	Employee Productivity				Number	
		Less		Good		n	%
		n	%	n	%		
1	Honor	8	44,4	10	55,6	18	100
2	ASN	31	47,7	34	52,3	65	100
Total		39	47	44	53	83	100

p-value = 1,000 RP = 0,932; CI95% = (0,524 – 1,657)

Table 4, shows that of 18 employees with honorarium employee as many as 8 people (44.4%) have less and good work productivity as many as 10 people (55.6%). While from 65 people who have ASN employees status 31 people (47,7%) have less work productivity and good as many as 34 people (52,3%). Chi square test results obtained $p\text{-value} = 1,000 > 0,05$. This means that there is no significant influence between employee's status on work productivity of Mimika Regency Health Officer.

e. Effect of Work Period on Working Employee Productivity

Table 5, shows that out of 30 employees with new working period of 12 people (40%) have a productivity of less and good

work as many as 18 people (60%). While from 53 people with long working period as many as 27 people (50,9%) have less work productivity and good as much 26 people (49,1%). Chi square test results obtained p-value = 0.465 > 0.05. This means that there is no significant influence between the working period on the work productivity of Mimika Regency Health Officer.

Table 5. Effect of Work Period on Employee Productivity in Mimika Regency Health Office 2018

No	Work period	Employee Productivity				Number	
		Less		Good		n	%
		n	%	n	%		
1	New	12	40	18	60	30	100
2	Old	27	50,9	26	49,1	53	100
Total		39	47	44	53	83	100
<i>p-value = 0,465</i> <i>RP = 0,785</i> ; <i>CI95% = (0,471 - 1,310)</i>							

f. Effect of Work Motivation on Working Employee Productivity

Table 6. Effect of Work Motivation on Employee Productivity in Mimika Regency Health Office 2018

No	Motivation	Employee Productivity				Number	
		Less		Good		n	%
		n	%	n	%		
1	Low	28	84,8	5	15,2	33	100
2	High	11	22	39	78	50	100
Total		39	47	44	53	83	100
<i>p-value = 0,000</i> <i>RP = 3,857</i> ; <i>CI95% = (2,244 - 6,628)</i>							

Table 6, shows that of 33 employees with low work motivation of 28 people (84.8%) have a productivity of less and good work as many as 11 people (22%). Whereas from 50 people with high work motivation as many as 11 people (22%) have less and good working productivity of 39 people (78%). Chi square test results obtained p-value = 0,000 < 0.05. This means that there is a meaningful influence between work motivation on employee work productivity of Mimika Regency Health Office. The results of the prevalence ratio test obtained *RP = 3.857*; *CI95% = (2,244 - 6,628)* interpreted that employee with low work motivation has a chance to work productivity less 3,857 times higher than employee with high work motivation.

g. Effect of Work Discipline on Working Employee Productivity

Table 7. Effect of Work Discipline on Employee Productivity in Mimika Regency Health Office 2018

No	Work discipline	Employee Productivity				Number	
		Less		Good		n	%
		n	%	n	%		
1	Less	25	6,3	5	16,7	30	100
2	Good	14	26,4	39	73,6	53	100
Total		39	47	44	53	83	100
<i>p-value = 0,000</i> <i>RP = 3,155</i> ; <i>CI95% = (1,958 - 5,083)</i>							

Table 7, shows that of 30 employees with less work discipline as many as 25 people (6.3%) have less and good work productivity as many as 5 people (16.7%). Whereas from 53 people with good work discipline as many as 14 people (26,4%) have less work productivity and good as many as 39 people (73,6%). Chi square test results obtained p-value = 0,000 < 0.05. This means that there is a significant influence between work discipline on work productivity of Mimika Regency Health Officer. The result of prevalence ratio test obtained *RP = 3,155*; *CI95% = (1,958 - 5,083)* interpreted that employees who work discipline less work productivity opportunities less 3,155 times higher compared with employees who have good work discipline.

h. Effect of Leadership on Employee Productivity

Table 8. Effect of Leadership on Employee Productivity in Mimika Regency Health Office 2018

No	Leadership	Employee Productivity				Number	
		Less		Good		n	%
		n	%	n	%		
1	Less	22	78,6	6	21,4	28	100
2	Good	17	30,9	38	69,1	55	100
Total		39	47	44	53	83	100
<i>p-value = 0,000</i> <i>RP = 2,542</i> ; <i>CI95% = (1,637 - 3,947)</i>							

Table 8, shows that out of 28 employees with less leadership as many as 22 people (78.6%) have less and good work productivity as many as 6 people (21.4%). Whereas from 55 people with good leadership as much 17 people (30,9%) have work productivity less and good counted 38 people (69,1%). Chi square test results obtained p-value = 0,000 < 0.05. This means that there is a meaningful influence between the leadership on the productivity of the employees of Mimika Regency Health Office. The result of prevalence ratio test

obtained $RP = 2,542$; $CI95\% = (1,637 - 3,947)$ interpreted that employees whose leadership is less likely to work productivity less 2,542 times higher than those with good leadership.

i. The influence of organizational culture on employee productivity

Table 9. Influence of Organization Culture on Employee Productivity in Mimika Regency Health Office 2018

No	Organisasion culture	Employee Productivity				Number	
		Less		Good		n	%
		n	%	n	%		
1	Less	25	61	16	39	41	100
2	Good	14	33,3	28	66,7	42	100
Total		39	47	44	53	83	100

p-value = 0,021 $RP = 1,829$; $CI95\% = (1,117 - 2,994)$

Table 9, shows that of 41 employees with less organizational culture as many as 25 people (61%) have less and good working productivity as much as 16 people (39%). Whereas from 42 people with good organizational culture as many as 14 people (33,3%) have work productivity less and good counted 28 people (66,7%). The result of chi square test obtained $p\text{-value} = 0,021 > 0,05$. This means that there is no influence between organizational culture on work productivity of Mimika Regency Health Officer. However, from the result of prevalence ratio test obtained $RP = 1,829$; $CI95\% = (1,117 - 2,994)$ interpreted that employees whose organizational culture is less likely to work productivity is less than 1,829 times higher than employees with good organizational culture.

j. Effect of Reward on Employee Productivity

Table 10. Effect of Reward on Employee Productivity in Mimika Regency Health Office 2018

No	Reward	Employee Productivity				Number	
		Less		Good		n	%
		n	%	n	%		
1	None	17	60,7	11	39,3	28	100
2	Exist	22	40	33	60	55	100
Total		39	47	44	53	83	100

p-value = 0,120 $RP = 1,518$; $CI95\% = (0,978 - 2,357)$

Table 10, shows that of 28 employees with no reward of 17 people (60.7%) had less work productivity as many as 17 people (60.7%). While from 55 people with the

reward of 22 people (40%) have less and good working productivity as much as 33 people (60%). Chi square test results obtained $p\text{-value} = 0.120 > 0.05$. This means that there is no influence between reward on work productivity of Mimika Regency Health Officer.

k. Effect of Punishment on Employee Productivity

Table 11. Effect of Punishment on Employee Productivity in Mimika Regency Health Office 2018

No	Punishment	Employee Productivity				Number	
		Less		Good		n	%
		n	%	n	%		
1	None	26	59,1	18	40,9	44	100
2	Exist	13	33,3	26	66,7	39	100
Total		39	47	44	53	83	100

p-value = 0,033 $RP = 1,773$; $CI95\% = (1,067 - 2,944)$

Table 11 shows that from 44 employees with punishment 26 people (59,1%) have poor work productivity as much as 18 people (40,9%). While from 39 people with no punishment as many as 13 people (33,3%) have less work productivity and good as many as 26 people (66,7%). Chi square test results obtained $p\text{-value} = 0,033 < 0,05$. This means that there is influence between punishment on work productivity of Mimika Regency Health Officer. The results of the prevalence ratio test obtained $RP = 1.773$; $CI95\% = (1,067 - 2,944)$ interpreted that employees who do not get punishment have a chance of working productivity less than 1.773 times higher than employees who get punishment.

l. Dominant Effect on Employee Productivity

Table 12. Dominant Effect on Employee Productivity in Mimika Regency Health Office 2017

No	Variabel	<i>p-value</i>	RP (CI 95%)
1	Age	1,000	0,961 (0,605 - 1,535)
2	Sex	0,421	0,785 (0,490 - 1,256)
3	Education	0,628	0,839(0,511 - 1,376)
4	Staffs Status	1,000	0,932 (0,524 - 1,657)
5	Working period	0,465	0,785 (0,471 - 1,310)
6	Work Motivation	0,000	3,857 (2,244 - 6,628)
7	Work discipline	0,000	3,155 (1,958 - 5,083)
8	Leaderships	0,000	2,542 (1,637 - 3,947)
9	Organisation culture	0,021	1,829(1,117 - 2,994)
10	Reward	0,120	1,518 (0,978 - 2,357)
11	Punishment	0,033	1,773 (1,067 - 2,944)

Table 12. above the work umotivation variables, work and leadership disciplines fall into the category of p-value <0.25, thus entering into the multivariate model and

tested together with the binary logistics test by the backward conditional method. The result of multivariate analysis obtained p-value <0,05 as in Table 13.

Table 13. Analysis of Multiple Logistic Regression Variables

Variabel	B	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I.for EXP(B)		
				Lower	Upper	
Step 1 ^a	Work Motivation	2.988	0,000	19,855	6,204	63,542
	Constant	-4.711	0,000	0,009		
Step 2 ^b	Work Motivation	3.214	0,000	24,868	6,824	90,631
	Punishment	1.472	0,020	4,357	1,266	14,988
	Constant	-7.218	0,000	0,001		

Table 13 above, in step 2, work motivation and punishment has p-value <0,05 and is the main factor to work productivity of employee and at step 1 indicate that work motivation is the most dominant factor to work productivity of employees in Dinas Kesehatan Regency of Mimika.

4. DISCUSSION

4.1. Effect of Age on Employee Productivity

The result of the research showed that there was no significant influence between age to work productivity of health officer of Mimika Regency (p-value = 1,000 > 0,05). The results of this study are in line with the research conducted Prawitasari (2007) in the Health Office of Tanjungbalai City of North Sumatra Province that the age variable has no significant relationship to work productivity. Age is the lifetime range from birth and age (Handayani, 2010). The division of adult age based on developmental psychology (Hurlock, 2009) is divided into the human ages, ie early adulthood (age 20-30 years), middle adulthood (age 31-59 years) and final adult (60 years to death) .

The result of analsiis obtained that the age of employees in Health Department of Regency of Mimika that is <30 years old is 17 people (45,9%) have less work productivity and good as much 22 people (47,8%). Whereas from 46 people aged > 30 years as many as 22 people (47.8%) have less and good working productivity as many as 24 people (52.2%).

The absence of an employee relationship to work productivity shows that age will have an influence on one's physical and psychic strength. At certain ages a person will experience a change in work performance. Younger ages are easier to persuade or easier to give input on what's new with the approach. A person with a young age is more approachable and easier to input new things compared to someone with usiatua (Azwar, 2010). But age does not affect performance because in addition to physical ability but decision-making capabilities are also required. This result is contrary to the opinion that basically performance will decrease as age grows. This is in accordance with the theory put forward by Gibson (2003), that age has an indirect effect on individual behavior and performance. This is probably due to the personal value of the individual concerned, flexibility and other psychological factors that affect.

4.2 Sex Influence on Work Productivity Employees

The result of the research showed that there was no significant effect between sex on work productivity of health officer of Mimika Regency (p-value = 0,421 > 0,05). The results of this study are in line with the research conducted Prawitasari (2007) in the Health Office of the City of Tanjungbalai Province of North Sumatra that sex does not affect the performance between men and women there is only a small difference. Health Service Officer of Mimika Regency is male with 43,5% has less work productivity while 48% women have less

work productivity. This shows the similarity in work productivity.

According to Ilyas, 2002 in Sandra, 2013 explaining the sexes will give a different impetus in doing the work. this is what Prawitasari (2007) points out, that gender-based work designs are also worth taking into account, where women experience little difficulty when they have to field suddenly, so women should be placed in the office only. Differences in the physical and mental needs of a person will be different because influenced by biological factors that result in morale either directly or indirectly will affect the productivity of work. The effectiveness of the organization is influenced by the effectiveness of the individual, so the low productivity of employees also affects the low performance of the health service as a whole. Work productivity between male and female employees indicates that there is adequate job design, for example that work in the field also involves equality in the division of tasks, but low productivity is influenced by individual skills and skills.

4.3. Effect of Education on Employee Productivity

The result of the research showed that there was no significant effect between education on the productivity of employee of Mimika Regency Health Office ($p\text{-value} = 0,628 > 0,05$). The results of this study are in line with research conducted by Suyati (2014), that education has no effect on work productivity.

Education requires humans to do and fill their lives to achieve salvation and happiness. Education is needed to obtain information, such as things that support health so as to improve the quality of life. Thus it can be interpreted that the higher the education of a person, the easier it is to receive information so that the more knowledge it has, otherwise less education will hamper the development of one's attitude toward the values introduced (Prayoto, 2014). Employee education of most employees <D-III as many as 13

people (41.9%) has a productivity of less and good work as many as 18 people (58.1%). Whereas from 52 people who are educated> D-III as many as 26 people (50%) have a productivity of less and good work as many as 26 people (50%). This means that the level of education employees are equally likely to work productivity. The absence of influence of employee education on work productivity caused by the placement of employees is in accordance with the level of education in the parts of the field within the organization in the Health Office of Mimika Regency. The lack of work productivity in the Mimika Regency Health Officer depends on individual skills and skill and high motivation factor by the employee.

4.4. Effect of Employee Status on Working Employee Productivity

The results obtained no significant influence between employee status to employee work productivity Mimika Regency Health Office ($p\text{-value} = 1,000 > 0,05$). The results of this study are in line with research conducted Maryam (2012) in Sidrap District Health Office that employee status has no effect on work productivity. Employees in Health Office of Mimika Regency with honorarium employee 44,4% have less work productivity and employees with ASN employee status as much 47,7% have less work productivity. This indicates that employees with higher honor status have good work productivity, because of their expectation of their future to be appointed permanent employees. While employees who have become permanent employees with the status of state civil apparatus is due to lack of firmness against employees through rewards and punishment of unproductive employees. According Hasibuan (2012) that Human resources is an integrated ability of the power of thought and physical owned individuals. Behavior and physical is determined by heredity and environment while work performance is motivated by the desire to satisfy the desires of satisfaction.

4.5. Effect of Work Period on Employee Productivity

The result of this research is no significant influence between work period to work productivity of Mimika Regency Health Officer ($p\text{-value} = 0,465 > 0,05$). The results of this study are in line with the research conducted Prawitasari (2007) in the Health Office of the City of Tanjungbalai Province of North Sumatra that the variable working period has no effect on work productivity. Employees with new tenure of <5 years 40% have less work productivity, whereas employees with long tenure of 50.9% have less work productivity. This shows that the employment opportunities of new and old employees have a work productivity that is not much different. According to Robbins (2006) one's work period indicates seniority. Where seniority level is an expression of work experience. According Sandra (2013), the longer a person's work experience the more skilled the officer, easy to understand the duties and responsibilities, thus providing opportunities for achievement.

The results of this study are not in line with the opinion above, that the employment period is one indicator of employee trends in various aspects of organizational life. For example, the longer an employee works the higher the productivity because of the experience and the skills to do the task higher. This is due to the work motivation of the employees themselves in improving their performance. In addition, support from leadership and organizational culture as well as rewards affect stronger work productivity. Behavior of the past that has been accustomed to behave discipline and spirit in working according to process then it will most likely still behave accordingly in the future, and vice versa. So concluded with a long and new work period expressed with work experience does not necessarily guarantee good performance if from the first been accustomed to behave inappropriately.

4.6. Effect of Work Motivation on Employee Productivity

The result of the research shows that there is a significant influence between work motivation to work productivity of Mimika Regency Health Officer ($p\text{-value} = 0,000 < 0,05$). 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 action of a group of factors that cause individuals to behave in certain ways (Herlambang, 2012). Motivation teaches how to encourage subordinate work morale so that they will work harder and work harder by using all ability and skill they have to be able to advance and achieve company goal. While the motivation is the driving force that resulted in an organization member willing and willing to time to organize various activities into their responsibilities and fulfill their obligations in the achievement of goals and various organizational goals determined previously (Siagian, 2010).

Health Department employees of Mimika Regency with low work motivation 84,8% have less work productivity, while employees with high work motivation 22% have less work productivity. This shows that the higher the work motivation of employees, the higher the productivity of employees, where the results of the prevalence ratio test found that employees with low work motivation have less employment productivity 2,244 times higher compared with employees who have high work motivation. The motivation of good employees is to increase knowledge with their own initiative to improve work performance, work always cooperate with colleagues, work hard, have big chance for better career path, achievement of work achieved by employee work or colleagues others and can be accepted and appreciated by colleagues in the work environment and likes to face challenges in working. While the low motivation of work caused employees to try and work hard to achieve

success, doing work on the basis of responsibility alone and monotonous work routines bored in achieving and not make plans to overcome difficulties in work.

This shows that the motivation of the employee as self actualization is related to the process of developing the real potential of the employee itself. The need to demonstrate one's ability, expertise and potential. The need for self-actualization is an increasing tendency of potential because people actualize their behavior. A person who is dominated by the need for self-actualization is happy about tasks that challenge his abilities and skills.

4.7. Effect of Work Discipline on Working Employee Productivity

The result of the research shows that there is a significant influence between work discipline on work productivity of Mimika Regency Health Officer (p-value = 0,000 <0,05). The results of this study in line with research Anggorowati (2012) revealed that there is influence of work discipline on work productivity.

Employees in the Health Office of Mimika Regency who have a work discipline of less 6.3% have less work productivity, while good work discipline more work productivity is good 73,6%. This is evidenced from the results of the prevalence ratio test that is interpreted that employees who work discipline less opportunity productivity less work 3,155 times higher than employees who have good work discipline. Hasibuan (2010) argues that discipline is the awareness and willingness of a person to comply with all corporate rules and prevailing social norms. Based on the above understanding it is concluded that the discipline of work is an attitude, behavior, and actions that are in accordance with the rules, both written and unwritten, and if there is violation there will be sanctions for violations.

Observation of the researcher that the discipline of employee work is influenced by employee morale, the level of compensation given, thus affecting

employee job satisfaction. Employees who are not satisfied with the results of the work with the compensation given, so that no discipline or obey the rules set. An undisciplined employee appears to be out of date, as well as time to go home. Employees with high morale tend to work better, punctual and never skipping. Employees will be enthusiastic to leave for work so that work discipline becomes high. besides the lack of punishment to work discipline affect employee productivity. In addition, some employees of Mimika District Health Office with low productivity caused most of the employees residing in Kabup

4.8 Effect of Leadership on Employee Productivity

The results obtained there is a meaningful influence between leadership on employee work productivity Mimika Regency Health Office (p-value = 0,000 <0.05). The results of this study are in line with research conducted by Astuti (2013), that leadership influences on work productivity. Response of Mimika Regency Health Officials that less leadership as much as 78,6% have less work productivity, while employee response which stated good leadership 30,9% have less work productivity. The lack of leadership role caused the productivity of employee work less, where from the test of the prevalence ratio that the employee leadership is less likely to work productivity less 2,542 times higher than the employees who have good leadership. The employee's response indicates that the direct leadership role to the bottom is due to the direct supervisor and supervisory performance of the employee, rewarding and acknowledging the employee with good performance, communicating well and giving attention and encouragement to his / her subordinates to be creative and innovative obstacles in carrying out the work and provide opportunities, judgments, sanctions and a fair reward to every subordinate / staff.

Pegaai's lack of response to the leadership caused by the leader in taking a

decision does not involve the employees / subordinates, lack of direct assessment of the employee's work, does not provide guidance and guidance if employees are not able to do the job, less able to create a conducive working atmosphere, provide direction and motivation in achieving the objectives to be achieved as well as sanctions on employees who are not disciplined both in terms of attendance and completion of duties and responsibilities. The relationship between superiors and subordinates always involves an individual's (leader's) efforts to influence a follower's behavior in a situation within a company to improve work productivity. If employees are treated well then the employee will participate well, so that will affect the level of work productivity. Improper employee relationships reduce the level of work productivity of employees. This is because in the completion of duties - the duties of the employees will feel disturbed or disturbed by other things as a result of unequal association of existing employees within the organization.

The embodiment of harmonious employee relationships, then the role of direct leadership is expected attendance. Attention and guidance of good corporate leaders will be able to encourage the creation of a harmonious employee relationship. If the employee is treated well, then the employee will participate well in the process production so that will affect the level of work productivity.

4.9. The influence of organizational culture on employee productivity

The result of this research shows that there is a significant influence between organizational culture on the productivity of employee employee of Mimika Regency Health Office ($p\text{-value} = 0,021 < 0,05$), where the employee's response to organizational culture has less chance to work productivity less 1,829 times higher than the employee have a good organizational culture. The result of this

research is in line with research of Nilda (2014) in Idnas Kesehatan of Kutai Regency, that there is influence of organizational culture created by leader to work productivity of employee Menurt Brahmasari (2004) organizational culture as a concept can be a means to measure the conformity of organizational goals, strategy and organizational tasks, as well as the resulting impact. Without a valid and reliable measure of the critical aspects of organizational culture, the statement about the impact of culture on satisfaction will continue to be based on speculation, personal observation and case studies. Response of employee at Health Department of Regency of Mimika that organizational culture less 61% have less work productivity, while employee expressing good organizational culture 33,3% people have less work productivity.

4.10 Effect of Reward on Employee Productivity

Results showed that there was no significant effect of reward on employee productivity Mimika District Health Office ($p\text{-value} = 0.120 > 0.05$), but the test results obtained by RP prevalence ratio = 1.518 which is interpreted that an employee who did not get a chance reward work productivity is less but not significant due to other variable factors that affect the reward of the leaders who provide rewards. The results of this study in line with research conducted Royani (2010) revealed that there is influence reward or penghargaan to productivity Employees.

According to Handoko (2010) Reward is a form of appreciation for the effort to get the professional labor in accordance with the demands of office memerlukan a coaching berkeseimbangan to a business activity planning, organization, use, and maintenance of the workforce to be able to carry out its duties effectively and efficiently. As a concrete step in the results of coaching is held reward employees who have shown good performance. Tangapan to reward obtained Employees Mimika District

Health Office that are both caused employees with good performance is always opportunity in training to improve their skills and capabilities, have the same opportunity to continue their education through learning tasks, incentive payments (money side dishes and other allowances), get office facilities more than other employees, to complete the task on time and meet the specified targets get a gift from employers and employees have an equal opportunity in career advancement through promotion. While the lack of employee responses to rewards caused the boss gives less recognition or praise if employees do the job well and less trying to encourage employee performance for the achievement of common goals.

Health Service Officer of Mimika Regency with no reward response 60,7% have less work productivity, while employee response with 40% reward have less work productivity. This indicates that the lower the rewards received by employees while low productivity of employees. The importance of reward to employees so that it can respect the contribution of employees, the employees have a sense of pleasure and satisfaction in working in accordance with the work achieved yabng.

4.11. Effect of Punishment on Employee Productivity

The result of this research shows that there is a significant influence between punishment to work productivity of Superior Health Department staff (p -value = 0,033 < 0,05). The results of the prevalence ratio test obtained $RP = 1.773$; $CI95\% = (1,067 - 2,944)$ interpreted that employees who do not get punishment have a chance of working productivity less than 1.773 times higher than employees who get punishment. The results of this study in line with research conducted Royani (2010) at the General Hospital of Cilegon Banten revealed that there is influence punishment on Work Productivity Employees. Punishment is a threat of punishment that

aims to fix offenders' employees, keep the rules in effect and teach lessons to the offenders "(Mangkunegara, 2010). Basically the purpose of giving punishment is so that employees who violate feel deterrent and will not repeat again.

Health Service Officer of Mimika Regency with less punishment responses 59,1% have less work productivity, while employee response that states good punishment 33,3% have less work productivity. This indicates that punishment is better done to improve work productivity of employees.

4.12. Dominant Effect on Work Productivity

The results obtained that the dominant factors that affect the productivity of employees employed Mimika Regency Health Office is the motivation of work, work discipline and organizational culture. High motivation of work for employees will be created by the existence of organizational culture that supports employees so as to cause employee job satisfaction that has implications for the discipline of work. This is according to Mulianto (2006), that the factors that support and determine in the success of the effort to increase employee productivity is the full support of all managers are upper, middle and lower level managers to improve employee productivity. This will create a good organizational culture of employees through rewards and punishment that affect the discipline of work and increase employee motivation.

5. CONCLUSION

The results of this study can be summarized as follows:

1. There is no influence of age to productivity of employee of Mimika Regency Health Service significantly (p -value = 1,000; $RP = 0,961$; $CI95\% = (0,605 - 1,535)$).
2. There was no gender influence on the productivity of the employees of the Mimika Regency Health Service

- significantly (p-value = 0.421; RP = 0.785; CI95% = (0.490 - 1.256).
3. There is no effect of education on employee work productivity of Mimika Regency Health Service significantly (p-value = 0,628; RP = 0,839; CI95% = (0,511 - 1,376).
 4. There is no influence of employee status on the productivity of employee of Mimika Regency Health Service significantly (p-value = 1,000 RP = 0,932; CI95% = (0,524 - 1,657).
 5. There is no influence of working period on work productivity of employees of Mimika Regency Health Office significantly (p-value = 0,465 RP = 0,785; CI95% = (0,471 - 1,310).
 6. There is a significant effect of work motivation on employee work productivity of Mimika Regency Health Office (p-value = 0,000 RP = 3.857; CI95% = (2,244 - 6,628).
 7. There is a significant influence between work discipline on work productivity of Mimika Regency Health Officer (p-value = 0,000 RP = 3,155; CI95% = (1,958 - 5,083).
 8. There is a significant influence between leadership on employee work productivity of Mimika Regency Health Office (p-value = 0,000 RP = 2,542; CI95% = (1,637 - 3,947).
 9. There is a significant influence between organizational culture on work productivity of Mimika Regency Health Officer (p-value = 0,021 RP = 1,829; CI95% = (1,117 - 2,994).
 10. There is no effect of reward on employee work productivity of Mimika Regency Health Office (p-value = 0,120 RP = 1,518; CI95% = (0,978 - 2,357).
 11. There is significant effect of punishment on work productivity of Mimika Regency Health Officer (p-value = 0,033 RP = 1,773; CI95% = (1,067 - 2,944).
 12. The dominant factor affecting the productivity of employees employed by Mimika Regency Health Office is the motivation of work.

REFERENCES

- Arikunto S (2010) *Prosedur Penelitian, Suatu Pendekatan Praktek*. Jakarta: PT Rineka Cipta.
- 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.
- Astuti T. B (2013). *Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Produktivitas Kerja (Studi Pada Pegawai Bagian Produksi PT Mazuvo Indo)*. Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Widya Manggala.
- Dessler, G., (2011) *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*, Jilid 1, PT. Prenhallindo, Jakarta,
- Handayani S (2010). *Kamus Lengkap Bahasa Indonesia*. Giri Ilmu Surabaya.
- Hasibuan Malayu S. P (2012). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia (Edisi Revisi)*. Jakarta : Bumi Aksara.
- Hasmi (2016), *Metode Penelitian Kesehatan*. Jakarta: InMedia.
- Helmi, Avin Fadilla (2006). *Disiplin Kerja*. *Buletin Psikologi*. Tahun IV, Nomor 2, Desember 2006.
- Herlambang B. G, 2012. *Pengantar Manajemen*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Hurlock (2009). *Psikologi Perkembangan*. Erlangga, Jakarta.
- ———Kemenkes RI, 2014. *Pelayanan Kesehatan*, Kemenkes RI, Jakarta.
- Kartikasari. 2008. *Pengaruh Kompensasi, Motivasi dan Disiplin Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan (Studi pada karyawan PT. PLN (Persero) APJ Semarang)*.
- Kreitner, Robert dan Kinicki Angelo (2003), *Perilaku Organisasi*. Edisi pertama. buku1. Salemba Empat, Jakarta.
- Mahmudi. (2010). *Manajemen Kinerja Sektor Publik*. Cetakan Pertama. Yogyakarta: BPF.
- Mangkunegara, P. A. A. (2009). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Perusahaan*. Bandung : Rosdakarya
- Marquis, B. L. & Huston, C., J. (2010). *Kepemimpinan dan Manajemen Kepegawaian: Teori & Aplikasi*. Edisi 4, alih bahasa, Widyawati dkk. Editor edisi bahasa Indonesia Egi Komara Yuda, dkk. Jakarta : EGC.

- Maryam (2012). *Analisis Motivasi Kerja Pegawai di Kantor Dinas Kesehatan Kabupaten Sidrap 2012*. Bagian Administrasi dan Kebijakan Kesehatan, FKM-Unhas, Makassar.
- Nawawi, Hadari, (2011), *Kepemimpinan yang Efektif*, Gajah Mada Unisity Press, Yogyakarta.
- Nilda (2014) *Pengaruh Kepemimpinan Terhadap Produktivitas Pegawai Pada Kantor Dinas Kesehatan Kabupaten Kutai Barat*. Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas 17 Agustus 1945.
- Prawitasari JE (2007). *Kinerja Pegawai Kantor Dinas Kesehatan Kota Tanjungbalai Propinsi Sumatera Utara Ditinjau dari Faktor Karakteristik Individu dan Lingkungan Kerja*. KMPK. Working Paper Series No. 15Juli 2007, First Draft.
- Profil Dinas Kesehatan Kabupaten Mimika, 2017
- Rivai, Veithzal. & Sagala, Ella Jauvani. 2010. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Untuk Perusahaan*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Sandra, R., Sabri, R.,Wanda, D (2012). *Analisis Hubungan Motivasi Pegawai Pelaksana Dengan Pelaksanaan Pendokumentasian Asuhan Kepegawaian Di Ruang Rawat Inap Rsud Pariaman*. <http://www.google.co.id>. diakses 20 April 2016.
- Sari D. P (2013) *Hubungan Peran Kepemimpinan Kepala Ruang Dengan Kepuasan Kerja Pegawai di Ruang Rawat Inap RS PKU Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta*. <http://www.stikesaisyah.co.id>. diakss 2 Agustus 2017.
- Sastroasmoro, (2010). *Metode Peneltiaan Klinis*. Jakarta: Bina Rupa Aksara
- Sedarmayanti. (2011). *Sumber Daya Manusia Manusia*, Jakarta, Prestasi Pustaka
- Setiawan, Ferry dan Dewi, Kartika. (2014). *Pengaruh Kompensasi Dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai pada CV. Berkat Anugrah*. *Jurnal*. Denpasar: Universitas Udayana.
- Siagian, Sondang P. (2003). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Sigit (2010) *Pengaruh Fungsi Pengarahan Kepala Ruang dan Ketua Tim Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Pegawai Pelaksana di RSUD Blambangan Banyuwangi*. Unit Bedah Saraf, THT, Mata RSD Dr Soebandi Jember e-mail: sugihartosigit@yahoo.com; sugihartosigit@gmail.com. diakses 10 Agustus 2017.
- Simamora, H. (2012). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Yogyakarta: STIE YKPN
- Sugijati, Sajidah dan Dramawan (2013) *Proses Pembelajaran Dalam Pendidikan Kesehatan*. Jakarta: TIM.
- Sugiyono (2013). *Metode Penelitian Manajemen*. Bandung: Alfabeta
- Sutrisno, Edy. 2010. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Jakarta: PT Prenada Media Group.
- Suyati (2014). *Analisis Keterlibatan Pegawai Dalam Pekerjaan Di Dinas Kesehatan Kabupaten Sleman (Studi kasus di Dinas Kesehatan Kabupaten Sleman)*. STIE Nusa Megar Kencana.
- Tjiptono, Fandy, (2006) *Kepemimpinan*, Penerbit Bayu Media, Malang,
- Waridin. (2006). *Pengaruh Disiplin Kerja Pegawai dan Budaya Organisasi Terhadap Kinerja di Divisi Radiologi RSUP Dokter Kariadi*. Semarang: UDIP.

How to cite this article: Ogetai D, Rantetampang AL, Agus Zainuri A et al. The affecting productivity of work staff at sub health ministry sub province mimika. International Journal of Science & Healthcare Research. 2018; 3(2): 61-73.
