Strata International Journal of Social Issues

Vol. 1 No. 2, August 2024, Pages. 46-59 |P-ISSN: 3046-7047, E-ISSN: 3046-7039

# The Influence of Planning, Monitoring and Maintenance of Human Resources on Employee Performance Biogen BB Bogor

**Ermiani[1*], Indupurnahayu[2], Akhmad Bakhtiar Amin[2]**
[1] Institut Teknologi dan Bisnis Visi Nusantra Bogor, Indonesia
[2] Universitas Ibn Khaldun Bogor, Indonesia

*Email: ermiani03@gmail.com

*DOI: 10.59631/sijosi.v1i2.209*

**Abstract**
Human Resource (HR) Planning is part of the management process that determines the movement of an organization's human resources from its current position to its desired position in the future. HR planning is closely related to the supervisory function because it can be said that planning is a standard or monitoring tool for the work being done. The HR maintenance function is also essential because employees are the assets (wealth) of every organization, and they always play an active role in determining whether or not the organization's goals are achieved. The research was carried out at BB Biogen Bogor. The research analyzes the influence of planning, monitoring, and Maintenance of Human Resources on Employee Performance. This research uses a survey method with a descriptive and causal approach. The sample used was 98 respondents. The research results show that Planning, Supervision, and Maintenance of Human Resources together have a real and positive influence with a contribution of 78.7%, and the remainder (21.3%) is influenced by other factors that are not central to this research.
**Keywords** : Employee, human resources, human resources maintenance, monitoring.

## 1. Introduction

The Center for Research and Development of Agricultural Biotechnology and Genetic Resources (BB Biogen) is an echelon IIb technical implementation unit (UPT) under the Agricultural Research and Development Agency, Ministry of Agriculture as a result of the status increase and change of name of the Research Institute for Biotechnology and Agricultural Genetic Resources (Balitbiogen) with echelon IIIa status, through Decree (SK) of the Minister of Agriculture No. 631/Kpts/OT.140/12/2003 dated 30 December 2003.

Human Resource Planning is part of the management process flow in determining the movement of an organization's HR (Merentek, Sumual, Usoh, & Kampilong, 2023) from the current position to the desired position in the future. The main goal of human resource planners is to manage recruitment and staffing in such a way that the right resources are available at the right time without incurring excessive labor expenditures (Berk, Bertsimas, Weinstein, & Yan, 2019). Therefore, in the literature, it is stated that human resource planning procedures are designed to ensure that

organizational plans and goals are achieved effectively and efficiently (Lim, Wang, & Lee, 2017).

HR planning is closely related to the supervisory function because it can be said that planning is a standard or monitoring tool for the work being done (Bachtiar, 2021). Likewise, giving orders is closely related to the supervisory function because supervision is a follow-up to orders that have been issued (Djadjuli, 2018). What is ordered must be monitored so that what is ordered is carried out. The main aim of supervision is to ensure that what is planned becomes a reality (Sunarti, 2018).

In organizations, after the planning and monitoring functions, the HR maintenance function is also essential because employees are the assets (wealth) of every organization who always play an active role and determine whether or not the organization's goals are achieved (Heryanto, 2021; Maulyan, Sandini, & Yuliyana, 2023). Suppose human resource maintenance is not paid attention to. In that case, work morale, employee attitudes, and loyalty will decrease, absenteeism and turnover will increase, and discipline will decrease so that procurement and development that have been carried out well and at high costs will be less meaningful in supporting the achievement of organizational goals (Maulyan et al., 2023). Suwatno & Priansa (2020) stated that the objectives of HR maintenance include 1) To increase employee work productivity, 2) Increase discipline and reduce employee absenteeism, 3) Increase loyalty and reduce employee turnover, 4) improve the welfare of employees and their families, 5) Improving the physical, mental and attitude conditions of employees, 6) Reducing conflict and creating a harmonious atmosphere and 7) Making employee procurement more effective. In research conducted by Humphrey Onoriode & Peter Samuel (2022), HR maintenance, such as communication and safety, significantly affects employee performance. This research was conducted to analyze the influence of HR planning, monitoring, and maintenance on the performance of BB Biogen Bogor employees, both partially and jointly.

## 2. Research Method

This research aims to evaluate the influence of planning, supervision, and maintenance of human resources on employee performance at the Bogor Center for Research and Development of Agricultural Biotechnology and Genetic Resources (BB BIOGEN). The research method used is quantitative with multiple linear regression techniques. Data will be collected through distributing questionnaires to employees selected randomly from the population using the Simple Random Sampling method. After the data is collected, multiple linear regression analysis will determine how much human resource planning, supervision, and maintenance affect employee

performance. In addition, the analysis results will be interpreted to provide a better understanding of the factors that influence employee performance at BB BIOGEN Bogor.

## 3. Results and Discussion

### 3.1 Respondent Description

**Table 1. The Description of Respondents**

| Characteristics | Categories | Total | Percentage (%) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Sex** | Male | 62 | 63,30% |
| | Female | 36 | 36,70% |
| **Marital status** | marriage | 86 | 87,80% |
| | unmarried | 12 | 12,20% |
| **Age** | 21-25 years old | 1 | 1,00% |
| | 26-30 years old | 3 | 3,10% |
| | 31-35 years old | 5 | 5,00% |
| | 36-40 years old | 3 | 3,10% |
| | 46-50 years old | 23 | 23,50% |
| | >50 years old | 48 | 49,00% |
| **Last Education** | junior high school | 3 | 3,10% |
| | Senior high school | 33 | 33,37% |
| | Diploma | 6 | 6,00% |
| | Baccalaureate | 5 | 5,10% |
| | Bachelor | 28 | 28,60% |
| | Master | 12 | 12,00% |
| | Doctor | 11 | 11,20% |
| **Working range** | 0-5 years | 6 | 6,10% |
| | 6-10 years | 6 | 6,10% |
| | 11-15 years | 9 | 9,20% |
| | 16-20 years | 15 | 15,30% |
| | 21-25 years | 17 | 17,30% |
| | 26-30 years | 17 | 17,30% |
| | >30 years | 28 | 28,60% |

The characteristics of the respondents sampled in this study were then grouped according to gender, marital status, age, highest level of education, and length of service. Respondent data based on gender was 62 men with a percentage of 63.30% and 36 women with a percentage of 36.70%. Respondent data based on the marital status of married employees numbered 86 people with a percentage of 87.8%, and unmarried employees numbered 12 with 12.2%.

Respondent data based on the age of employees aged 21-25 years is one person with a percentage of 1.00%, employees aged 26-30 years are 3 people with a

percentage of 3.10%, employees aged 31-35 years are 5 people with a percentage 5%, those aged 36-40 years amounted to 3 people with a percentage of 3.10%, aged 46-50 years there were 23 people with a percentage of 23.50%, those aged >50 years amounted to 48 people with a percentage of 49%.

Respondent data is based on the latest education. There are 3 employees with a junior high school level with a percentage of 3.10%, 33 high school employees with a percentage of 33.37%, 6 D3 employees with a percentage of 6%, 5 bachelor's degrees with a percentage of 5, 10%, 28 undergraduates with a percentage of 28.60%, 12 graduates with a percentage of 12%, and 11 graduates with a doctoral level education with a percentage of 11.20%.

Characteristics of respondent data based on length of service, employees with a service period of 0-5 years totaling 6 people with a percentage of 6.10%, a service period of 6-10% totaling 6 people with a percentage of 6.10%, a work period of 11-15 years totaling 9 people with a percentage of 9.2%, 16-20 years of service totaling 15 people with a percentage of 15.3%, 21-25 years of service totaling 17 people with a percentage of 17.30%, 26-30 years of service totaling 17 people with a percentage of 17 .30% and a work period of >30 years totaling 28 people with a percentage of 28.60%.

### 3.2 Validity and Reliability

The technique used to test this validity is "product moment correlation" from Pearson, with a confidence level of 95% (α = 0.05) carried out by correlating the score of each item with the total score. Validity test results were obtained using the SPSS program application by comparing the Corrected Item-Total Correlation value r calculated > r table. According to Sugiyono (2018), if r count > r table at a significant level of 5% (α = 0.05), and n = 98, r table = 0.197, then it can be said that an instrument is valid, and when r is calculated < r table, then the item is invalid. Valid research variable items can be used as instruments in research, or the questions asked can be used to measure the variables studied.

**Table 2. The Results of Validity and Reliability Test**

| Variables | Total Item | Validity | Reliability (Cronbach's Alpha) | Conclusion |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Planning | 7 | r count > r table (Valid) | 0.926 | Reliable and acceptable |
| Monitoring | 10 | r count > r table (Valid) | 0.938 | Reliable and acceptable |
| HR Maintenance | 19 | r count > r table (Valid) | 0.946 | Reliable and acceptable |
| Performance | 10 | r count > r table (Valid) | 0.924 | Reliable and acceptable |

Based on the Table 2 above, The results of the validity test show that all items from the research variables, including Planning, monitoring, and Maintenance of Human Resources (HR), are valid for performance. In detail, the validity test on the Planning variable with 7 items shows that all items have a calculated r value more significant than the r table. The same thing was found in the monitoring variable, with 10 items, and the HR Maintenance variable, with 19 items. Each item in this variable is proven to be valid for performance. Furthermore, the Performance variable with 10 items also shows high validity, where the calculated r-value is greater than the r-table, making it valid for HR Planning, monitoring, and Maintenance.

Apart from the validity test, a reliability test was also carried out to measure the internal consistency of the statements in the questionnaire. The reliability test results show high Cronbach's Alpha values for all variables. In the Planning variable, Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.926 indicates that the statements in the questionnaire are reliable and acceptable. Likewise, the monitoring variable obtained a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.938, and the HR Maintenance variable obtained a value of 0.946. These two values show a high level of reliability.

Finally, the reliability of the performance variable was also tested, and a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.924 was obtained. This value confirms that the statements in the questionnaire for the Performance variable are reliable and acceptable. Thus, all items in this research questionnaire can be considered valid and reliable, providing confidence that the instruments used can be measured accurately and consistently.

### 3.3 Descriptive Analysis of Variables

**Table 3. Descriptive Analysis of Variables**

| Categories | Question Number | Indicators | Highest/Lowest Score | Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Planning | 1 | Increased employee potential and satisfaction | Highest | 452 |
| | 7 | Adjustment to external organizational changes | Highest | 452 |
| | 4 | HR Mapping | Lowest | 424 |
| Monitoring | 9 | Objective information | Highest | 451 |
| | 11 | Timely evaluation of repairs | Highest | 451 |
| | 15 | Flexible system | Highest | 451 |
| | 12 | Centralized system | Lowest | 425 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| HR Maintenance | 20 | Work discipline | Highest | 457 |
| | 18 | Loyalty | Lowest | 421 |
| Performance | 47 | Cooperation | Highest | 454 |
| | 42 | Follow instructions | Lowest | 421 |

Descriptive Statistics for Planning Frequency Distribution SPSS, descriptive analysis results state the highest score in questionnaire statement number 1, indicator "Increasing employee potential and satisfaction," and indicator number" 7, "Adjustment to external changes in the organization," with a score of 452. The lowest score is in question number 4, indicator "HR "mapping," with a score of 424.

Descriptive Statistics for the Distribution of Monitoring Frequencies. The highest score is in questionnaire statement number 9, indicator "Objective information," number 11, indicator "Timely evaluation of improvements," and number 15, indicator "Flexible system," with a score of 451. The lowest score is in question number 12, indicator "Centralized system," with a score of 425—descriptive Statistics for the distribution of HR Maintenance Frequency. The highest score for questionnaire question number 20 is the "Work discipline" indicator, with a score of 457.

The lowest score is on question number 18, the "Loyalty" indicator, with a score of 421. The highest score is for Descriptive Statistics for Performance Frequency distribution on questionnaire statement num"er 47, the "Cooperation" indicator, with a score of 454. The lowest score is on question number 42, t"e indicator "Follow instructions," with a score value of 421

## 3.4 Interpretation of Inferential Statistics Data

### 3.4.1 Results of Correlation Analysis between Planning and Performance

**Table 4. Correlation between planning and performance Model Summary[b]**

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | .887[a] | .787 | .785 | 1.98844 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Planning
b. Performance

The calculation results above, R = 0.887, are located in the interval (0.80 – 1.000), based on Table 4; this shows that the relationship between Planning and Performance is Very Strong and positive.

### 3.4.2 Results of Regression Analysis between Planning and Performance

**Table 5. Results of Regression Analysis between Planning and Performance**

| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | t | Sig. |
| 1 | (Constant) | 7.652 | 2.239 | | 3.417 | .001 |
| | Planning | 1.317 | .070 | .887 | 18.844 | .000 |

a. Dependent Variable: Performance

The regression equation formed is:

Y = 7.652 + 1.317 X1

The interpretation of the equation is as follows:

a. The intercept or constant is 7.652

This means that if the independent variable X1 (Planning) is equal to zero, then the size of the variable Y (Performance) is 7.652

b. Direction number or regression coefficient

The variable X1 (Planning) of 1.317 means that the effect of Planning on Performance is positive, or any increase in the score value of variable X1 (Planning) by 1, the coefficient of determination of 0.787 or 78.7% means that the magnitude of the influence of Planning on Performance is 78.7%. In comparison, the rest (21.3%) is influenced by other factors not included in this study.

Increasing the Y (Performance) variable score value by 1.317

### 3.4.3 Results of Regression Analysis between Monitoring and Performance

**Table 6. Results of Regression Analysis between Planning and Performance**

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | .876[a] | .768 | .766 | 2.07568 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Monitoring

b. Dependent Variable: Performance

The results of the above calculations, R = 0.876, lie in the interval (0.80 - 1.000) based on Table 9; this shows that the relationship between monitoring and Performance is Very Strong and positive. This means that if supervision goes up, then performance goes up.

Based on the calculation of the regression coefficient in Table 6, it can be seen that the regression equation formed is:

Y = 6.951 + 0.939 X2

The interpretation of the equation is as follows:

1. Intercept or constant of 6.951

   This means that if the independent variable X2 (Monitoring) equals zero, the magnitude of variable Y (Performance) is 6.951.

2. Direction number or regression coefficient

   Variable X2 (Monitoring) of 0.939, this means that the effect of Supervision (X2) on Performance (Y) is positive, or every increase in the score value of variable X2 (Supervision) by 1 will increase the score value of variable Y (Performance) by 0.939.

**Coefficient of Determination**

The coefficient of determination of 0.768 or 76.8% means that the magnitude of the influence of Supervision on Performance is 76.8%. In comparison, the rest (23.2%) is influenced by other factors not included in this study.

### 3.4.4 Analysis of the Relationship between HR Maintenance and Performance

#### 3.4.4.1 Correlation Analysis

**Table 7. Correlation Analysis Results between HR Maintenance and Performance**

**Model Summary[b]**

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | .836[a] | 0.698 | 0.695 | 2.36805 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), HR Maintenance
b. Dependent Variable: Performance

The results of the above calculations, R = 0.836, lie in the interval (0.80 - 1.000); this indicates that the relationship between Discipline and Performance is Very Strong and positive. This means that if HR maintenance increases, then performance also increases.

#### 3.4.4.1 Regression Analysis

**Table 8. Results of Regression Analysis between HR Maintenance and Performance**

**Coefficients[a]**

| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | | t | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| 1 | (Constant) | 3.064 | 3.137 | | 0.977 | 0.331 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| HR Maintenance | 0.537 | 0.036 | 0.836 | 14.902 | 0 |

The regression coefficient can be seen that the regression equation formed is:

Y = 3.064 + 0.537 X3

The interpretation of the equation is as follows:

1. Intercept or constant of 3.064
   This means that if the independent variable X3 (HR Maintenance) equals zero, the magnitude of variable Y (Performance) is 3.064.
2. The direction number or regression coefficient of variable X3 (HR Maintenance) of 0.537 means that the effect of HR Maintenance (X3) on Performance (Y) is positive or every increase in the score value of variable X3 (HR Maintenance) by 1, it will increase the score value of variable Y (Performance) by 0.537.
3. Coefficient of Determination
   In Table 4, it can be seen that the coefficient of determination of 0.698 or 69.8% means that the magnitude of the effect of HR Maintenance on Performance is 69.8%. In comparison, the rest (30.2%) is influenced by other factors not included in this study.

The calculation results above, R = 0.887, are located in the interval (0.80 – 1.000), based on Table 4; this shows that the relationship between Planning and Performance is Very Strong and positive.

### 3.4.5 Analysis of the Relationship between Planning, Monitoring, HR Maintenance and Performance

#### 3.4.5.1 Correlation Analysis

Correlation analysis is used to determine the direction and strength of the relationship between Planning, Monitoring, HR Maintenance, and Performance, using SPSS 17.0. The results obtained are:

**Table 9. Correlation results of planning, monitoring and maintaining HR on performance**

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | .896[a] | 0.803 | 0.796 | 1.93467 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), HR Maintenance, Monitoring, Planning

b. Dependent Variable: Performance

The calculation results above, R = 0.896, are located in the interval (0.80 – 1.000); this shows that the relationship between Planning, Supervision, and Maintenance of HR together on Performance is Very Strong and positive. This means that an increase in HR Planning, Supervision, and Maintenance will jointly cause an increase in Performance.

### 3.4.5.2 Regression Analysis

Regression analysis is intended to predict the value of Planning (X1), Monitoring (X2), and HR Maintenance (X3) on Performance (Y) using SPSS 17.0 calculations as follows:

Y = a + b X1 + b X2 + b X3

X1, X2, X3 = Independent variables

Y = Dependent variable

a = Intercept or Constant

b = Direction number or Regression Coefficient

From this information, using SPSS 17.0 calculations, the following results are obtained:

**Table 10. Results of Multiple Regression Analysis between Planning, Monitoring and Maintenance of Human Resources and Performance**

**Coefficients[a]**

| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| 1 | (Constant) | 4.911 | 2.584 | | 1.901 | 0.06 |
| | Planning | 0.735 | 0.225 | 0.495 | 3.274 | 0.001 |
| | Monitoring | 0.324 | 0.16 | 0.302 | 2.029 | 0.045 |
| | HR Maintenance | 0.076 | 0.072 | 0.118 | 1.055 | 0.294 |

a. Dependent Variable: Perfromance

Based on the calculation of the regression coefficients, it can be seen that the regression equation formed is:

Y = 4.911 + 0.735 X1 + 0.324 X2 + 0.076 X3

The interpretation of the equation is as follows:

1. The intercept or constant is 4.911

   This means that if the independent variables X1 (Planning), X2 (Monitoring),

2. Direction number or regression coefficient
   a. Variable
   b. Variable
   c. Variable X3 (HR Maintenance) is 0.076. This means that the influence of 0.076.

3. Coefficient of Determination

Table 10 shows that the coefficient of determination is 0.803 or 80.3%, and the adjusted coefficient of determination is 0.796 or 79.6%. According to Santosa & Ashari (2005), "Because the regression equation uses many independent

variables, the coefficient used to explain this equation is the adjusted coefficient of determination."

The results of the adjusted coefficient of determination of 0.796 or 79.6% mean that the magnitude of the influence of Planning, Monitoring, and Maintenance of HR together on Performance is 79.6%. In comparison, the remainder (20.4%) is influenced by other factors not included in this study.

### 3.4.6 Hypothesis testing

#### 3.4.6.1 T-Test

Real level (α), α value = 5% or (0.05)

and the t table value has degrees of freedom (db) = 98 – 3 = 95 at t table = 1.665

Test criteria:

Ho is accepted (Ha is rejected) if t count < t table

Ho is rejected (Ha is accepted) if t count >

1). T-test (Partial Analysis) between Planning and Performance

a). Hypothesis formulation

Ho = There is no influence of planning on performance

Ha = There is an influence of Planning on Performance

b). Statistical test value

Based on calculations with SPSS 17.0, t = 18.844

c). Conclusion

Because t = 18.844 > t table = 1.665, Ho is rejected (Ha is accepted), meaning there is a significant influence between planning and performance.

2). T-test (Partial Analysis) between Monitoring and Performance

a). Hypothesis formulation

Ho = There is no influence of HR maintenance on performance

Ha= there is an influence of HR maintenance on performance

b). Statistical test value

Based on calculations with SPSS 17.0, t = 17.832

c). Conclusion

Because t = 17.832 > t table = 1.665, Ho is rejected (Ha is accepted), meaning there is a significant influence between supervision and performance.

3). T-test (partial analysis) between HR maintenance and performance. Based on calculations with SPSS 17.0, t = 14.902

Conclusion

Because t = 14.902 > t table = 1.665, Ho is rejected (Ha is accepted), meaning there is a significant influence between HR Maintenance and Performance.

### 3.4.6.2 F-Test (Simultaneous Analysis)

Real level (α), α value = 5% or (0.05), and F table value with

V1 = dk numerator = k = 3

V2 = dk denominator = n – k – 1 = 98 – 3 – 1 = 94 in F table = 2.70

Test criteria:

Ho is accepted (Ha is rejected) if F count < F table

Ho is rejected (Ha is accepted) if F count > F table

F-Test (Simultaneous Analysis) between Planning, Monitoring, HR Maintenance and Performance

**Table 11. F-Test Results**

**ANOVA[b]**

| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Regression | 1431.714 | 3 | 477.238 | 127.5 | .000[a] |
| | Residual | 351.837 | 94 | 3.743 | | |
| | Total | 1783.551 | 97 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), HR Maintenance, Monitoring, Planning
b. Dependent Variable: Performance

1. Hypothesis formulation

   Ho = There is no influence of HR Planning, Supervision, and Maintenance on Performance

   Ha = There is an influence of HR Planning, Supervision, and Maintenance on Performance

2. Statistical test value

   Based on calculations with SPSS 17.0, it can be seen in Table 11 that calculated F = 127.503

3. Conclusion

   Because F count = 127.503 > F table = 2.70, Ho is rejected (Ha is accepted), meaning there is a significant influence between Planning, Supervision and Maintenance of HR together on Performance.

## 4. Conclusion

Based on data processing and hypothesis analysis of the influence of Planning, Monitoring, and Maintenance of Human Resources on the Performance of BB Biogen Employees, Ministry of Agriculture, Bogor, it can be concluded that Planning has an influence of 78.7% on Performance, with the remaining 21.3% being influenced by

other factors such as organizational culture and leadership. The influence of Monitoring on Performance reached 76.8%, while the remaining 23.2% was influenced by factors such as competency and Monitoring technology. HR maintenance has a 69.8% influence on Performance, with 30.2% influenced by other factors such as the compensation system and work climate. Overall, HR planning, monitoring, and maintenance influence 79.6% of performance, and 20.4% are influenced by other factors not included in this research.

To increase the influence of Planning, it is recommended that BB Biogen, the Ministry of Agriculture, and Bogor focus on mapping human resources based on competency, for example, through job promotions based on employee position analysis. To increase the influence of Monitoring, comprehensive and tiered Monitoring must be implemented, with a quarterly evaluation of the implementation of Monitoring to see the output. The influence of HR maintenance can be increased by giving attention and appreciation to outstanding employees, such as announcing the best employees every month.

Performance improvement can be achieved by improving the lowest indicator, "Following instructions," giving task orders per SOPs and employee competencies. This action will ensure that the tasks given are in accordance with the employee's abilities, thereby increasing work effectiveness and efficiency. By implementing these suggestions, it is hoped that the performance of BB Biogen Employee Performancegor Ministry of Agriculture can continue to improve significantly.

## References

Bachtiar, B. (2021). Analisis Fungsi Pengawasan Berbasis Kinerja Di Sekretariat Daerah Kabupaten Gowa. *Al Qisthi Jurnal Sosial Dan Politik*, 87–106. https://doi.org/10.47030/aq.v10i2.83

Berk, L., Bertsimas, D., Weinstein, A. M., & Yan, J. (2019). Prescriptive analytics for human resource planning in the professional services industry. *European Journal of Operational Research*, *272*(2), 636–641. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2018.06.035

Djadjuli, D. (2018). Pelaksanaan Pengawasan Oleh Pimpinan Dalam Meningkatkan Kinerja Pegawai. *Dinamika : Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Administrasi Negara*, *4*(4), 565–573. https://doi.org/10.25157/dinamika.v4i4.879

Heryanto, T. (2021). Program Pemeliharaan Karyawan Dalam Mencapai Tujuan Institusi. *El-Ecosy : Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Keuangan Islam*, *1*(1), 89. https://doi.org/10.35194/eeki.v1i1.1139

Humphrey Onoriode, O., & Peter Samuel, A. (2022). Effect of Employee Maintenance and Training Costs on Organizational Performance. *AKSU Journal of Management Sciences*, *7*(1&2), 96–106. https://doi.org/10.61090/aksujomas.2022.006

Lim, S., Wang, T. K., & Lee, S.-Y. (2017). Shedding New Light on Strategic Human Resource Management: The Impact of Human Resource Management Practices and

Human Resources on the Perception of Federal Agency Mission Accomplishment. *Public Personnel Management*, *46*(2), 91–117. https://doi.org/10.1177/0091026017704440

Maulyan, F. F., Sandini, D., & Yuliyana, W. (2023). Pengaruh Program Pemeliharaan Karyawan Terhadap Prestasi Kerja Karyawan. *Jurnal Sains Manajemen*, *5*(1), 26–33. https://doi.org/10.51977/jsm.v5i1.1047

Merentek, T. C., Sumual, T. E., Usoh, E. J., & Kampilong, J. K. (2023). Perencanaan Sumber Daya Manusia dalam Pendidikan Masa Depan. *El-Idare: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, *9*(1), 29–35. https://doi.org/10.19109/elidare.v9i1.16516

Santosa, P. B., & Ashari. (2005). *Analisis statistic dengan Microsoft exel dan SPSS*. Yogyakarta: Andi.

Sugiyono. (2018). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Sunarti, N. (2018). Pengawasan sebagai fungsi Badan Permusyawaratan Desa (BPD) Dalam Pelaksanaan Pembangunan Infrastruktur Di Desa. *Dinamika : Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Administrasi Negara*, *5*(2), 46–55. https://doi.org/10.25157/dinamika.v5i2.1413

Suwatno, & Priansa, D. J. (2020). *Manajemen SDM dalam Organisasi Publik dan Bisnis*. Bandung: Alfabeta.