EPH-International Journal of Business & Management Science

CHALLENGES AND WORKLOAD BURDEN AMONG QUALITY PERSONNEL DURING ELECTRONIC MEDICAL RECORDS (EMR) IMPLEMENTATION IN PRIVATE TERTIARY CARE HOSPITALS OF TELANGANA

Srinivas Alakuntla[1]*, Susmit Jain[2], Jyotirmayee Tripathy[3]

[1]Ph.D ScholarIIHMR University, Prabhu Dayal Marg, Near Sanganer Airport, Maruti Nagar, Jaipur, Rajasthan state, India.Contact No: 9700322208
Email ID: Srinivas.phd9@iihmr.in
[2]Professor, IIHMR UniversityEmail ID: susmitjain@iihmr.edu.in
[3]Ph.D scholar,IIHMR UniversityEmail ID: jyotirmayee.phd10@iihmr.in

Article History
Received : *2026-03-12*
Revised : *2026-05-19*
Accepted :*2026-06-04*
Published :*2026-06-25*

Abstract
Electronic Medical Records (EMRs) are increasingly introduced in hospitals to improve documentation, operational efficiency, quality monitoring, and accreditation compliance. However, their implementation creates organisational and managerial challenges, particularly for quality personnel responsible for documentation review, audit preparedness, compliance monitoring, and coordination between clinical and information technology teams. Guided by the Technology Organisation Environment (TOE) framework, this study examined technological issues, organisational support, training adequacy, workload burden, and compliance-related pressures during EMR implementation in private tertiary care hospitals in Telangana. A cross-sectional descriptive study was conducted among 75 quality personnel using a structured questionnaire, and data were analysed through frequency and percentage distribution. The findings revealed that 85.3% of respondents reported increased work responsibilities, while 85.3% identified inadequate training as a major implementation challenge. Increased documentation workload was reported by 70.7%, and 56.0% experienced higher audit and compliance monitoring activities. Staff resistance and technical issues were reported by 42.7% and 40.0%, respectively. The study concludes that effective EMR implementation requires structured training, workload planning, leadership involvement, technical support, workflow redesign, and change management to improve quality outcomes.

Keywords: *Electronic Medical Records, Healthcare Digital Transformation, Quality Personnel, Workload Burden, Hospital Management, Change Management*

1. Introduction

Medical practices are adopting digital innovations to enhance their performance, quality of care, data availability, patient safety, and adherence to regulations. Of these technologies, Electronic Medical Records (EMRs) have emerged as a key part of the digital transformation in hospitals, as it enables electronic documentation, clinical information management, readiness for audits, decision making, and monitoring of quality (Menachemi & Collum, 2011; Kraus et al., 2021). But EMR is not just a technological change; it is also an organisational change process that impacts hospital processes and procedures, roles, communication, workload distribution, management, decision-making, and more (Yusof et al., 2008; Cresswell & Sheikh, 2013). Adopting EMR is therefore contingent upon the availability of the system, along with the ability of hospitals to manage change, redesign workflow, train users and provide operational support during implementation. Good use of health information technologies (HITs) and effective integration with everyday

Vol. 12 Issue 6 (June 2026)
ISSN: 2208-2190 Pages- 01-10
DOI: https://doi.org/10.69980/2590kb07
practice can lead to better documentation, improved information sharing, and better healthcare quality as demonstrated in prior research (Buntin et al., 2011; Campanella et al., 2016).

EMR can also facilitate various other aspects of better access to clinical information, continuity of care, and monitoring of performance indicators (Wager et al., 2017). These benefits are closely related to productivity, process standardisation, compliance monitoring and evidence-based decision making from a hospital management's point of view. However, EMR systems can have unintended side effects, such as the documentation burden, disruption of workflows, information overload, usability issues and resistance to the systems by staff members (Ash et al., 2007; Singh et al., 2013). Such challenges are especially significant for tertiary care hospitals, where the amount of documentation, accreditation standards, quality audits, and interdepartmental collaboration often leads to complexities. By adopting EMR, hospitals need to shift away from their paper-based or disjointed documentation systems toward more streamlined and structured electronic workflows. This shift typically requires adjustments in reporting, monitoring and accountability structures, and job roles.

The involvement of leaders, staff acceptance, training needs, technical support and communication are all key elements in the successful implementation (Cresswell & Sheikh, 2013; Gagnon et al., 2012). Additionally, resistance to change, lack of confidence in system use, poor usability and insufficient system implementation support have been found to be important factors influencing health information systems' performance in studies on EMR adoption (Boonstra & Broekhuis, 2010; Kruse et al., 2016). Thus, EMR adoption should not be just considered a clinical or information technology (IT) activity, but one that involves managerial and operational activities. Thus, technology acceptance is crucial for digital healthcare transformation, as it can be affected by user readiness and perceived usefulness, which can ultimately drive the successful implementation of digital health systems (Stoumpos et al., 2023).

The study adopts the Technology Organisation Environment (TOE) framework and change management perspective to guide the study. TOE is a framework to understand technology adoption by technological, organisational and environmental aspects. Technological factors in the present study are: EMR usability, technical issues, system support and documentation-related functions. Organisational factors involve the training adequacy, workload planning, leadership support, staff readiness, workflow redesign and interdepartmental coordination. Environmental factors encompass accreditation needs, compliance requirements, quality monitoring requirements and the overall trend of healthcare digital transformation. Further, the change management lens can be used to understand the impact of staff resistance, changing roles, training and leadership involvement on EMR implementation success. These views all contribute to the knowledge that EMR is not just a technical change, but a managerial and organisational change that impacts quality personnel and hospital performance.

The role of quality personnel in the private sector, tertiary care hospitals, is crucial in linking the EMR implementation with the hospital performance, compliance with accreditation standards and quality improvement. They are responsible for the integrity of the records, the completeness of documentation, quality indicators, audit reports, staff training, accreditation standards, communication with clinical staff and information technology. In the process of implementing EMRs, the quality personnel frequently act as operational coordinators, who implement the documentation requirements in the digital system for the hospital's operations. They guarantee that the use of EMR is conducive to compliance, reporting accuracy and service quality. This position, however, can also present a greater workload, particularly when these are accompanied by standards of documentation, expectations of audits, system problems, and staff resistance. While there have been numerous studies that have investigated the implementation of EMR from the physicians', nurses', and clinical users' perspectives, there have been few studies that have investigated the EMR implementation from the perspective of quality personnel as a unique group of hospital managers.

The vast majority of the literature is related to clinician acceptance, productivity, usability and clinical outcomes (Adler-Milstein & Huckman, 2013; De Benedictis et al., 2020). Other studies have been identified that have addressed sociotechnical issues and evaluation methods in health information systems, but the workload of quality teams is an under-explored area (Sittig & Singh, 2010; Yusof et al., 2008). This gap is significant as quality personnel directly engage in documentation review, compliance monitoring, audit preparedness and performance reporting, all vital components of hospital management and digital governance. It's also worth considering the workload effects of the EMR implementation, as it doesn't necessarily reduce workload. Staff will need to do extra checks on documentation, validate electronic records, troubleshoot system issues, provide end-user training, ensure compliance with accreditation requirements, etc., in the early stages of implementation. When training is not lacking, or the technical assistance is slow, the quality personnel can be subjected to greater pressure and lower efficiency (De Benedictis et al., 2020). Digital health

Vol. 12 Issue 6 (June 2026)
ISSN: 2208-2190 Pages- 01-10
DOI: https://doi.org/10.69980/2590kb07
technologies can also lead to a higher mental workload when the interface is complex, there is extra documentation needed, and workflows are disrupted when implementing (Kremer et al., 2022).
Prior studies have highlighted the importance of learning support, involvement of the users and implementation planning for successful adoption of EHRs (McAlearney et al., 2012; Brommeyer & Liang, 2022). Likewise, digital systems may be burdened by usability issues, documentation requirements, and workflow misalignment, which can hinder the hoped-for benefits of these systems and impose extra burden on the users who are entrusted with the quality of the documentation (Ratwani et al., 2019; Moy et al., 2021). While there have been different studies on the implementation of EMR from the physician, nurse, clinical users, and information technology systems perspectives, to date, little research has been undertaken looking only at the quality personnel as a hospital management group. Quality personnel are important in documenting review, audit preparedness, accreditation compliance, quality indicator monitoring and coordination of clinical, administrative and information technology departments.
In the process of implementing EMR, these duties can significantly increase, resulting in more workload and pressure. This gap is crucial from a hospital management perspective as implementing EMRs involves not just a technological shift, but also an organisational and operational change. Without a proper understanding of the workload experiences of quality staff, hospitals might not plan for adequate training, staffing, redesign of workflows, technical assistance or leadership interventions. Hence, the present study takes up this gap by focusing on the problems faced by the quality personnel and workload during EMR implementation in private Tertiary Care Hospitals in Telangana. The major aim of this study is to evaluate the problems and workload of the quality personnel in implementing Electronic Medical Records (EMR) in private tertiary care hospitals in Telangana. The objectives of the study are to:
1. To identify the major challenges faced by quality personnel during EMR implementation.
2. To assess the workload burden associated with EMR-based documentation, audit activities, compliance monitoring, report generation, and data validation.
3. To examine the adequacy of training, technical support, and management support provided during EMR implementation.
4. To evaluate the perceived benefits of EMR implementation in relation to documentation quality, audit preparedness, and compliance monitoring.
5. To suggest hospital management strategies for improving EMR implementation, reducing workload burden, and strengthening quality management processes.

2. Methodology

2.1 Study Design

A cross-sectional descriptive study design was used to explore the difficulties faced by quality personnel and workload due to Electronic Medical Records (EMR) implementation in the private tertiary care hospitals in Telangana. This design was deemed suitable, as the study sought to describe the experiences, perceptions and operational problems that the quality personnel had at a particular moment in time. Factors that presented the greatest implementation difficulty, documentation burden, audit/compliance, training resources, technical support, and organisational support in implementing EMR systems were the focus of the study.

2.2 Study Setting

The study was carried out in selected private tertiary care hospitals of Telangana, where the EMR systems were already adopted or are in the process of being adopted. Hospitals that participated in the study were private multi-speciality tertiary care hospitals with well-established quality departments and documentation, audit and accreditation-related processes. These hospitals were chosen because the typical tertiary care hospital has complex clinical workflows, more documentation requirements and is more reliant on quality monitoring systems. Before the data collection, permission was taken from the concerned authorities of the hospital. The number of hospitals that participated in the study needs to be indicated, depending on where the actual study took place.

2.3 Study Population

The study population comprised quality personnel of private tertiary care hospitals who are directly involved in EMR-related activities. The audience consisted of Quality Heads, Quality Managers, Quality Executives, Quality Coordinators, Accreditation Managers, Accreditation Coordinators, and other quality professionals involved in documentation review, audit preparation, compliance monitoring, quality indicator tracking, report generation and/or coordination/communication with clinical and information technology teams. The

Vol. 12 Issue 6 (June 2026)
ISSN: 2208-2190 Pages- 01-10
DOI: https://doi.org/10.69980/2590kb07
personnel involved in quality were chosen because of their role in making sure EMR implementation assists with documentation, accreditation readiness, standardising workflows and hospital quality management.

2.4 Sample Size and Sampling Technique
In total, 75 quality personnel were part of the study. The subjects were selected using purposive sampling with inclusion criteria of those who were directly involved with the EMR implementation and quality management activities. The sampling method was deemed appropriate since the study sought information from a specific professional group with experience in the documentation, audit monitoring and compliance processes for EMR. The sample size of 75 was deemed sufficient for a descriptive study of a small and specialised group of hospital quality professionals. The target sample was to include three groups of participants based on their experience: senior level, middle level and junior level. The plan was to distribute its participants (25) into each of the categories to be representative of different professional levels of experience. Senior-level participants were defined as those having working experience of more than 10 years, middle-level participants were defined as having a working experience of 5-10 years and junior-level participants were defined as having a working experience of less than 5 years. Should there be a difference between the planned distribution and the actual distribution according to the demographics, this should be expressed explicitly in the results section.

2.5 Inclusion Criteria
The quality personnel included in the study were from private tertiary care hospitals where they were directly involved in EMR implementation, monitoring the EMR documentation, audit activities, accreditation support, compliance tracking, and other quality management processes. The participants also had to sign a consent to participate in the study in a voluntary manner.

2.6 Exclusion Criteria
Those working in clinical areas not involved in quality management activities were excluded. We also excluded quality personnel who were not involved with EMR implementation or EMR-related quality activities. Those respondents who were not interested in participating or who did not give their consent were excluded.

2.7 Study Tool
Data was gathered using a descriptive questionnaire, which was structured according to the study's needs. The questionnaire was divided into four parts: demographic characteristics, challenges of EMR implementation, workload burden, organisational support, technical support, training adequacy and perceived benefits of EMR implementation. The questions were written in plain and straightforward language, so that there is no confusion, and they can be answered easily. The questionnaire was piloted with subject experts in hospital quality management and healthcare administration, to determine content relevance, clarity and appropriateness. A small group of quality personnel, representative of the total population, but not included in the sample in the pilot test. The wording, sequence and clarity of the items in the questionnaire were improved based on feedback from the pilot testing. If a reliability test was performed, it may be reported, or this should be stated transparently in a reliability assessment.

2.8 Data Collection Procedure
With the permission of participating hospitals, data were collected. Eligible participants were contacted and informed of the purpose of the study, the voluntary nature of participation, the confidentiality of responses and the use of data for academic and research purposes. With informed consent, the questionnaire was conducted among the participants. Completed questionnaires were scanned to ensure that the responses were complete before analysis.

2.9 Data Analysis
The data collected were put into MS Excel and then analysed using descriptive statistics. The data was summarised using frequencies and percentages since this study was a descriptive study to determine the extent of the challenges encountered with EMR, the workload burden, organisational supports and perceived benefits for the quality personnel. Due to the questionnaire mostly being categorical (i.e. yes/no), the results were presented using frequency and percentage distribution to facilitate the clear and interpretable presentation of the distribution of participant responses. No inferential statistical testing was performed as the

Vol. 12 Issue 6 (June 2026)
ISSN: 2208-2190 Pages- 01-10
DOI: https://doi.org/10.69980/2590kb07
aim of the study was not to test hypotheses or associations between variables, but rather to provide a description of quality personnel's experiences and perceptions of EMR implementation. So, Descriptive analysis was thought to be appropriate for this study. Data were tabulated, and percentage distributions were used to allow for comparison between the various challenges and indicators of workload.

2.10 Ethical Considerations

Since this study included the involvement of human beings, ethical principles were adhered to in the research process. Before data collection, permission was taken from the participating hospitals. The participants were instructed to have an understanding of the reasons for conducting the study, and informed consent was obtained. Confidentiality and anonymity were ensured, and no information that could identify individuals or organisations was revealed. All data obtained were for academics and research only. It should be reported transparently if the formal ethics committee approval was not obtained, and which institutional permission process was followed.

3. Data Analysis and Results

The data collected were analysed using descriptive statistics such as frequency and percentage distribution. The study was based on the demographic profile, challenges in EMR implementation, workload, organisational support and perceived benefits of EMR implementation reported by quality personnel in private tertiary care hospitals in Telangana. The results are indicated in five subsections. Because the data that were available were combined, inferential statistical analysis (chi-square testing) was not considered meaningful for this section. The results are, however, analysed in the context of hospital management and operations to draw out the implications for quality departments in the context of EMR implementation.

3.1 Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Table 1 presents the demographic profile of the respondents.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Respondents (n = 75)

Variable	Category	Frequency, n	Percentage, %
Age Group	25–35 years	49	65.3
	35–45 years	21	28
	46–55 years	5	6.7
	Above 55 years	0	0
Gender	Male	29	38.7
	Female	46	61.3
Job Level	Senior level	24	32
	Middle level	24	32
	Junior/operational level	27	36
Experience in Quality	Less than 5 years	23	30.7
	5–10 years	47	62.7
	More than 10 years	5	6.6

3.2 EMR Implementation Challenges

Table 2 summarises the major challenges experienced by quality personnel during EMR implementation.

Table 2. EMR Implementation Challenges Among Quality Personnel (n = 75)

S. No.	Implementation Challenge	Yes, n (%)	No, n (%)
1	EMR implementation increased work responsibilities	64 (85.3)	11 (14.7)
2	Staff resistance affected EMR implementation	32 (42.7)	43 (57.3)
3	Inadequate training created implementation challenges	64 (85.3)	11 (14.7)
4	Technical issues affected the smooth implementation	30 (40.0)	45 (60.0)

Table 2 shows that EMR implementation challenges were more strongly related to increased responsibilities and inadequate training than to staff resistance or technical problems.

Vol. 12 Issue 6 (June 2026)
ISSN: 2208-2190 Pages- 01-10
DOI: https://doi.org/10.69980/2590kb07

3.3 Workload Burden Associated with EMR Implementation

Table 3 presents the workload burden experienced by quality personnel after EMR implementation.

Table 3. Workload Burden Associated with EMR Implementation (n = 75)

S. No.	Workload Burden Indicator	Yes, n (%)	No, n (%)
1	Increased documentation workload	53 (70.7)	22 (29.3)
2	Increased audit and compliance monitoring activities	42 (56.0)	33 (44.0)
3	Increased report generation and data validation work	15 (20.0)	60 (80.0)

The findings indicate that EMR implementation added a noticeable workload burden for quality personnel, mainly through documentation review and compliance monitoring.

3.4 Organisational and Technical Support During EMR Implementation

Table 4 presents the availability of technical and management support during EMR implementation. Technical support was reported as available by 43 respondents or 57.3%, while 32 respondents or 42.7% reported that technical support was not available when required.

Table 4. Organisational Support During EMR Implementation (n = 75)

S. No.	Support Indicator	Yes, n (%)	No, n (%)
1	Technical support was available when required	43 (57.3)	32 (42.7)
2	Management actively supported EMR implementation	34 (45.3)	41 (54.7)

This suggests that EMR adoption may have been approached mainly as a technical activity rather than a broader organisational change process requiring active leadership, resource planning, staff motivation, and workflow support.

3.5 Perceived Benefits of EMR Implementation

Table 5 presents respondents' perceptions of the benefits of EMR implementation. Less than half of the respondents perceived improvement in audit preparedness and compliance monitoring. A total of 33 respondents, or 44.0%, reported improvement, while 42 respondents or 56.0%, did not perceive improvement in this area.

Table 5. Perceived Benefits of EMR Implementation (n = 75)

S. No.	Perceived Benefit	Yes, n (%)	No, n (%)
1	Improved audit preparedness and compliance monitoring	33 (44.0)	42 (56.0)
2	Improved documentation quality	11 (14.7)	64 (85.3)

The results showed that the benefits of the implementation of EMR were not strongly felt by quality personnel, especially in terms of documentation quality. In general, the study findings indicate that it is not enough that EMR systems will automatically make documentation better or audits ready, without effective training, redesigning workflows, staff engagement and management involvement. Table 6 is a summary of various issues reported by the respondents about the implementation of an EMR.

Table 6. Summary of Major EMR Implementation Issues Reported by Respondents

S. No.	Variable	Yes (%)
1	Increased work responsibilities	85.3
2	Inadequate training	85.3
3	Increased documentation workload	70.7
4	Increased audit and compliance monitoring activities	56.0
5	Staff resistance	42.7
6	Technical issues	40.0
7	Technical support available when required	57.3
8	Active management support	45.3
9	Improved audit preparedness and compliance monitoring	44.0
10	Improved documentation quality	14.7

Vol. 12 Issue 6 (June 2026)
ISSN: 2208-2190 Pages- 01-10
DOI: https://doi.org/10.69980/2590kb07
Overall, EMR implementation should be managed as an organisational change process rather than only a technology adoption activity, with greater attention to capacity building, staff support, and hospital-level implementation planning.

4. Discussion

The study results show that EMR implementation posed difficulties for the quality personnel in the tertiary care hospitals. While EMRs are implemented to enhance documentation, audit readiness, compliance monitoring, and hospital performance, the current results indicate that EMRs created more work and responsibilities for quality teams. These challenges can be viewed as a representation of the interaction between Technological, Organisational, and Environmental aspects, and are interpreted using the Technology Organisation Environment (TOE) framework. So, to achieve EMR adoption, it can't be thought of just as a technology installation activity, but rather as a process of organisational change that needs to be implemented throughout the hospital and includes the redesign of workflows, clarification of roles, training, technical support, monitoring systems, and the involvement of leadership. Based on the experiences of other organisations, the implementation of EHRs demands some preparation on the part of the organisation before the benefits that are anticipated can be fully realised (Nguyen et al., 2014; Ludwick & Doucette, 2009).

Technological aspects of TOE, technical problems, system usability, documentation functions and support mechanisms all had an impact on quality personnel. Issues like system latency, usability issues, and interruptions can negatively impact user acceptance and potentially make users rely more upon quality teams for coordination and follow-up. Even though some of the respondents had access to technical support, ongoing problems mean that support needs are time-sensitive, must be readily available and must be integrated into the workflow. Organisational aspects, in particular, an increase in work responsibilities, came up as a critical issue. In the process of EMR implementation, quality teams were required to maintain documentation, engage the various clinical departments, help with audit readiness, audit workflow gaps, validate electronic documentation, and communicate with information technology teams. If these tasks are overlaid onto the normal workload and there is no additional manpower, protected time and/or workflow changes, then quality personnel can be subjected to role overload. This shows the need for workload planning, role allocation, task distribution, as well as accountability processes.

Another organisational variable that was crucial was training. Factors such as inadequate training can impact user confidence, system acceptance, documentation accuracy and compliance with EMR-based workflows. If the end users are not properly trained, the quality personnel could be spending more time on documentation, educating end users on the requirements of the EMR, and following up on departments, which increases the workload (Jeilani & Hussein, 2025). This could be a reason why, in the study, there was an improvement in workload, but not in the level of documentation quality perceived. Training is an ongoing capacity development process. Prior research highlighted the importance of user knowledge, confidence, and adaptation to electronic systems for successful health information system implementation (Holden, 2011; Provenzano et al., 2024).

The results also indicate that staff resistance had an impact on the implementation of EMR. Resistance is possible if staff feel the EMR systems are slow, are difficult to use, and interfere with their work routines. The results underscore the need to implement a structured change management process, involving staff, communicating within departments, obtaining user feedback, and resolving issues promptly. Large-scale health information system implementation also demonstrates a need for organisational preparedness, coordination and ongoing support between departments to ensure successful implementation (Sheikh et al., 2011; Gjellebæk et al., 2020).

The environmental element of TOE, accreditation requirements, compliance expectations, quality monitoring requirements, and healthcare digital transformation were all factors that added stress to quality personnel. While the implementation of EMR did lead to more documentation tasks and monitoring for audits, improvement in documentation quality and preparedness for audits were not significant. This could be due to early-stage issues, such as people still using paper-based methods, not filling in digital records, human error, and manual verification of records. This aligns with evidence that fragmented workflows and documentation requirements through electronic systems can contribute to increased documentation workload when workflows and systems are not tailored to the typical workflow (Moy et al., 2023).

Other studies have also revealed that workflow fragmentation, usability issues, and distributing documentation tasks among healthcare teams contribute to the burden of EHR-related documentation (Murad

Vol. 12 Issue 6 (June 2026)
ISSN: 2208-2190 Pages- 01-10
DOI: https://doi.org/10.69980/2590kb07
et al., 2024). The lower management support perceptions are important. Technical support alone can't do the trick when it comes to successfully implementing EMR. The leadership of the hospital will be key to planning, resource allocation, scheduling training time, supporting redesign of workflows and overcoming interdepartmental barriers. The absence of leadership involvement could cause the implementation of EMR to be considered an information technology project and not an organisational transformation project.
The availability of software and the key to maximising the financial and operational benefits of HIT is based on how well organisations align people, processes and performance goals (Goldzweig et al., 2009; Mauro et al., 2024). To achieve integrated TOE, the following measures are recommended for hospitals: improve usability of the EMR and technical support, train continuously, evaluate workload, staff to support, redistribute the workload and give protected time for EMR-related tasks. Regular review meetings, including quality, clinical, administrative and information technology representatives, should be established at the leadership team level. Hospitals need to reconfigure documentation and audit processes to minimise documentation duplication, increase accountability, and make the use of EMR more efficient.

5. Conclusion

The study concludes that there was a significant operational and workload-related challenge to quality personnel during the implementation of Electronic Medical Records (EMR) in private tertiary care hospitals. The results show that, although EMR systems are widely touted as benefits to improving documentation accuracy, audit preparedness, compliance monitoring, data accessibility, and overall hospital efficiency, these benefits were not necessarily experienced or felt during the implementation process. Rather, quality personnel saw an increase in work responsibilities, documentation demands, audit and compliance monitoring activities. This indicates that quality teams play a key part in supporting digital transformation and complying with documentation and accreditation requirements. A number of factors led to the challenges in implementing the study. A lack of training was a significant challenge identified, as it reduced users' confidence and required constant interventions and corrective actions to be taken by quality personnel. Staff resistance to new workflows and technical problems in using the system were additional challenges in the transition process. Furthermore, the management supports were found to be less satisfactory than the technical support, indicating the need for more management involvement during the implementation process. The results highlight that implementation of EMR should not be perceived as a ‘technology upgrade’ but rather as a whole organisational change process. To implement successfully, the need is for structured and ongoing training, workload planning, adequate staffing, responsive technical support, redesigning workflow and active involvement of the leadership. Hospitals that can tackle these aspects are more likely to decrease workload pressure, boost patient acceptance, upgrade documentation and reach the lasting benefits of digital transformation. Future research is needed to include larger, multi-state samples to enhance generalizability, conduct comparative analyses of the various hospital contexts, and use a variety of inferential statistical analyses to investigate the relationship between training, organisational support, workload burden, and EMR implementation outcomes.

REFERENCES

1. Adler-Milstein, J., & Huckman, R. S. (2013). The impact of electronic health record use on physician productivity. American Journal of Managed Care, 19(10), SP345–SP352.
2. Ash, J. S., Sittig, D. F., Dykstra, R., Campbell, E., & Guappone, K. (2007). Exploring the unintended consequences of computerized physician order entry. Studies in Health Technology and Informatics, 129, 198–202.
3. Boonstra, A., & Broekhuis, M. (2010). Barriers to the acceptance of electronic medical records by physicians. BMC Health Services Research, 10, 231.
4. Brommeyer, M., & Liang, Z. (2022). A systematic approach in developing management workforce readiness for digital health transformation in healthcare. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *19*(21), 13843.
5. Buntin, M. B., Burke, M. F., Hoaglin, M. C., & Blumenthal, D. (2011). The benefits of health information technology: A review of the recent literature shows predominantly positive results. *Health Affairs*, 30(3), 464–471.
6. Campanella, P., Lovato, E., Marone, C., Fallacara, L., Mancuso, A., Ricciardi, W., & Specchia, M. L. (2016). The impact of electronic health records on healthcare quality: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *European Journal of Public Health*, 26(1), 60–64.

7. Cresswell, K., & Sheikh, A. (2013). Organizational issues in the implementation and adoption of health information technology innovations. International Journal of Medical Informatics, 82(5), e73–e86.
8. De Benedictis, A., Lettieri, E., Gastaldi, L., Masella, C., Urgu, A., & Tartaglini, D. (2020). Electronic Medical Records implementation in hospital: An empirical investigation of individual and organizational determinants. *PloS one*, *15*(6), e0234108.
9. Gagnon, M. P., Desmartis, M., Labrecque, M., et al. (2012). Systematic review of factors influencing the adoption of information and communication technologies by healthcare professionals. *Journal of Medical Systems*, 36(1), 241–277.
10. Gjellebæk, C., Svensson, A., Bjørkquist, C., Fladeby, N., & Grundén, K. (2020). Management challenges for future digitalization of healthcare services. *Futures*, *124*, 102636.
11. Goldzweig, C. L., Towfigh, A., Maglione, M., & Shekelle, P. G. (2009). Costs and benefits of health information technology. Evidence Report/Technology Assessment, 132, 1–71.
12. Holden, R. J. (2011). Physicians' beliefs about using EMR and CPOE: In pursuit of a contextualized understanding. International Journal of Medical Informatics, 80(2), 71–80.
13. Jeilani, A., & Hussein, A. (2025). Impact of digital health technologies adoption on healthcare workers' performance and workload: perspective with DOI and TOE models. *BMC Health Services Research*, *25*(1), 271.
14. Kraus, S., Schiavone, F., Pluzhnikova, A., & Invernizzi, A. C. (2021). Digital transformation in healthcare: Analyzing the current state-of-research. *Journal of business research*, *123*, 557-567.
15. Kremer, L., Lipprandt, M., Roehrig, R., & Breil, B. (2022). Examining mental workload relating to digital health technologies in health care: systematic review. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, *24*(10), e40946.
16. Kruse, C. S., Kristof, C., Jones, B., Mitchell, E., & Martinez, A. (2016). Barriers to electronic health record adoption: A systematic literature review. Journal of Medical Systems, 40(12), 252.
17. Ludwick, D. A., & Doucette, J. (2009). Adopting electronic medical records in primary care: Lessons learned from health information systems implementation experience in seven countries. *International Journal of Medical Informatics*, 78(1), 22–31.
18. Mauro, M., Noto, G., Prenestini, A., & Sarto, F. (2024). Digital transformation in healthcare: Assessing the role of digital technologies for managerial support processes. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *209*, 123781.
19. McAlearney, A. S., Robbins, J., Kowalczyk, N., Chisolm, D., & Song, P. H. (2012). The role of cognitive and learning theories in supporting successful EHR implementation. Advances in Health Care Management, 12, 107–133.
20. Menachemi, N., & Collum, T. H. (2011). Benefits and drawbacks of electronic health record systems. Risk Management and Healthcare Policy, 4, 47–55.
21. Moy, A. J., Hobensack, M., Marshall, K., Vawdrey, D. K., Kim, E. Y., Cato, K. D., & Rossetti, S. C. (2023). Understanding the perceived role of electronic health records and workflow fragmentation on clinician documentation burden in emergency departments. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, *30*(5), 797-808.
22. Moy, A. J., Schwartz, J. M., Chen, R., Sadri, S., Lucas, E., Cato, K. D., & Rossetti, S. C. (2021). Measurement of clinical documentation burden among physicians and nurses using electronic health records: a scoping review. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, *28*(5), 998-1008.
23. Murad, M. H., Stelling, B. E. V., West, C. P., Hasan, B., Simha, S., Saadi, S., ... & Wang, Z. (2024). Measuring documentation burden in healthcare. *Journal of general internal medicine*, *39*(14), 2837.
24. Nguyen, L., Bellucci, E., & Nguyen, L. T. (2014). Electronic health records implementation: An evaluation of information system impact and contingency factors. International Journal of Medical Informatics, 83(11), 779–796.
25. Provenzano, M., Cillara, N., Curcio, F., Pisu, M. O., González, C. I. A., & Jiménez-Herrera, M. F. (2024). Electronic health record adoption and its effects on healthcare staff: A qualitative study of well-being and workplace stress. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, *21*(11), 1430.
26. Ratwani, R. M., Reider, J., & Singh, H. (2019). A decade of health information technology usability challenges and the path forward. JAMA, 321(8), 743–744.
27. Sheikh, A., Cornford, T., Barber, N., et al. (2011). Implementation and adoption of nationwide electronic health records in secondary care in England: Final qualitative results from prospective national evaluation. *BMJ*, 343, d6054.

Vol. 12 Issue 6 (June 2026)
ISSN: 2208-2190 Pages- 01-10
DOI: https://doi.org/10.69980/2590kb07

28. Singh, H., Spitzmueller, C., Petersen, N. J., Sawhney, M. K., Sittig, D. F. (2013). Information overload and missed test results in electronic health record–based settings. *JAMA Internal Medicine*, 173(8), 702–704.
29. Sittig, D. F., & Singh, H. (2010). A new sociotechnical model for studying health information technology. Quality and Safety in Health Care, 19(Suppl 3), i68–i74.
30. Stoumpos, A. I., Kitsios, F., & Talias, M. A. (2023). Digital transformation in healthcare: technology acceptance and its applications. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, *20*(4), 3407.
31. Wager, K. A., Lee, F. W., & Glaser, J. P. (2017). Health Care Information Systems: A Practical Approach for Health Care Management (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
32. Yusof, M. M., Kuljis, J., Papazafeiropoulou, A., & Stergioulas, L. K. (2008). An evaluation framework for Health Information Systems. International Journal of Medical Informatics, 77(6), 386–398.