# PERFORMANCE EVALUATION USING THE MALCOLM BALDRIGE CRITERIA FOR PERFORMANCE EXCELLENCE IN THE AVP PRODUCTION DEPARTMENT OF PT. XYZ

**Nikita Dinda Purnamasari**[1]
**Universitas Pembangunan Nasional Veteran Jawa Timur, Surabaya, Indonesia**
**nikitadindaps@gmail.com**

**Iriani**[2]
**Universitas Pembangunan Nasional Veteran Jawa Timur, Surabaya, Indonesia**
**irianiupn@gmail.com**

## Abstract

In the era of intense global competition, companies must ensure that all organizational elements function optimally and align with strategic goals. PT. XYZ, a seafood processing company under X Group, faces challenges in achieving production targets, with an average realization of 59% in the first half of 2024. High employee turnover (13%) and dissatisfaction with wages and working conditions have been identified as key issues impacting performance. These challenges underscore the need for a comprehensive evaluation to improve productivity and achieve performance excellence. This study aims to evaluate the performance of the AVP production department at PT. XYZ using the Malcolm Baldrige Criteria for Performance Excellence (MBCfPE). Data collection involved distributing questionnaires to 30 respondents, including managers, supervisors, Rnd, Purchasing, and employees, followed by validity and reliability testing using Smart PLS software. The evaluation results indicate that the AVP production department achieved a total score of 814.53, placing it in the "Benchmark Leader" category. This score reflects strong performance across the seven MBCfPE criteria, demonstrating effective leadership, strategic planning, and operational focus. However, areas such as workforce engagement and satisfaction require further improvement. These findings provide actionable insights to enhance employee retention, operational efficiency, and overall performance. The results affirm that PT. XYZ's AVP production department has established itself as a leader in the seafood processing industry, offering a model for excellence that can inspire similar organizations.

**Keywords:** Employee Turnover, Malcolm Baldrige Criteria for Performance Excellence, Performance Indicators, Production Efficiency

## INTRODUCTION

In the face of increasingly intense global competition, companies must ensure that all organizational elements function effectively and contribute to the achievement of strategic goals (Pelealu, 2023). A company's success depends not only on the quality of the products or services it offers but also on the performance of every organizational element, including its employees (Pakpahan et al, 2022). Therefore, employee performance evaluation becomes a critical factor in determining the organization's effectiveness (Fatkhurrozi, 2024). This evaluation provides valuable feedback that helps ensure continuous improvement, ultimately contributing to the company's overall success (Kurniawan, 2023).

PT. XYZ focuses on processed food products made from seafood, including shrimp, squid, fish, and anchovies. Founded on November 11, 1987, the company has earned important certifications such as HACCP, Halal MUI, and food safety certifications, enabling it to enter international markets. A key component of the company's operations is seafood processing, where products are not only sold in raw form but also processed into value-added products, such as takoyaki and gyoza.

As part of its strategy to reduce waste, PT. XYZ processes frozen seafood that does not meet export standards, such as shrimp, fish, and octopus, into value-added products. These products are made from ingredients that may not meet the quality requirements for export but are still suitable for consumption. For example, shrimp that has passed 72 hours after harvest or does not meet size standards are often discarded despite being safe for consumption. By utilizing these underutilized ingredients in value-added products, the company has been able to reduce waste and improve production efficiency. This approach highlights the company's commitment to sustainability and optimal resource utilization.

Despite these innovations to reduce waste and improve efficiency, PT. XYZ still faces challenges in meeting its production targets. According to available data, the average production achievement for the first half of 2024 reached only 59%, significantly below the monthly target of 100%. This shortfall indicates operational performance issues that need to be addressed. The production performance showed a significant drop, with the lowest point recorded at 45% in April 2024, which signals deeper issues related to internal operations, particularly within the AVP Production Department.

One of the main factors impacting performance is the high employee turnover rate, which reached 13% in the first half of 2024. This figure is higher than the normal turnover rate of 5-10% per year (Moslem & Sary, 2021). Several factors contribute to this high turnover, including low job satisfaction due to inadequate wages and unfavorable working conditions. Employees working in the AVP Production Department, the majority of whom are daily workers (KHL), do not have long-term contracts or social security protection. They receive wages based on the quantity of products produced, regardless of the applicable minimum wage regulations. This situation leads to high dissatisfaction among employees, which in turn results in a high turnover rate.

High employee turnover not only disrupts operational stability but also impacts overall productivity. When experienced workers leave the company, PT. XYZ is required to recruit and train new employees, which consumes significant time and resources. The training process, which involves familiarizing new workers with the stringent quality standards set by various buyers, reduces efficiency and slows down production. This further exacerbates the difficulty in achieving production targets and impedes the company's long-term goals.

Data from the AVP Production Department show that the turnover rate reached 13%, with 9% resigning and 4% absent without notice. This indicates a serious issue in the company's human resource management. Furthermore, another challenge faced is the decline in product quality due to the lack of skills and experience among new employees, who require additional time to meet the required standards. Additionally, the company faces challenges in effective internal communication, which delays decision-making and operational planning.

In light of these issues, PT. XYZ recognizes that in order to remain competitive in the highly competitive seafood processing industry, the company must improve its operational performance and employee productivity. One approach to achieve this is through the application of a structured and comprehensive performance evaluation model, such as the Malcolm Baldrige Criteria for Performance Excellence (MBCfPE). This model includes seven key criteria that can be used to evaluate and improve company performance: leadership, strategic planning, customer focus, measurement and knowledge management, workforce focus, operations focus, and results (Herawan et al., 2023).

By utilizing the MBCfPE model, PT. XYZ can analyze every aspect of the company's operations and management to identify areas for improvement and develop strategies for overall performance enhancement. Through the application of these criteria, the company aims to address the existing problems, particularly those related to employee turnover, production efficiency, and the achievement of production targets. As a result, PT. XYZ will be better equipped to enhance its competitiveness in the global market and achieve the long-term goals it has set.

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

### Performance Evaluation

Performance evaluation is a process to assess employees' overall performance over a specific period within a company (Kasmir, 2016, in Sagala & Siagian, 2021). It is a method to evaluate employees' potential, contributions, and achievements, aiming for their development (Hartantik, 2014 in Sagala & Siagian, 2021). The purpose of performance evaluation is to measure the extent of a company's achievements, to assess both employee and organizational growth. A good performance evaluation should help employees understand their roles, recognize opportunities for risk-taking, and identify their strengths and weaknesses in fulfilling their duties (Waliamin, 2020).

### Malcolm Baldrige Criteria for Performance Excellence

The Malcolm Baldrige Criteria for Performance Excellence (MBCfPE) is a tool used to diagnose and improve the overall performance of organizations, both for-profit and non-profit. MBCfPE focuses on enhancing performance through measurement and feedback, aiming to deliver high-quality products and services. This approach assists companies in evaluating their performance at all levels, from leadership to employees and customers (Indrawan et al., 2022). Introduced by the U.S. government in 1987, MBCfPE was designed to support non-profit organizations, businesses, and higher education institutions in adopting quality management practices. The model helps organizations create a strong environment and drive exceptional performance by identifying strengths, opportunities, and potential improvements that impact stakeholders, employees, customers, and society.

MBCfPE serves as a method to continuously enhance organizational performance through established measurement criteria and feedback on delivering high-quality services (Restianingati, 2023).

**The Category of Malcolm Baldrige Criteria for Performance Excellence**

The Baldrige assessment, totaling 1000 points, evaluates key performance areas across seven categories. Leadership (120 points) assesses how senior leaders guide the organization and ensure governance and social responsibility. Strategic Planning (85 points) focuses on strategy development and implementation. Customer and Market Focus (85 points) evaluates how the organization meets customer needs and builds relationships. Measurement, Analysis, and Knowledge Management (90 points) examines how the organization measures and manages performance and knowledge. Workforce Focus (85 points) looks at workforce management and engagement. Process Focus (85 points) assesses how the organization designs and improves its processes. Business Results (450 points) evaluates outcomes related to product performance, customer satisfaction, workforce, leadership, and financial results (Restianingati, 2023).

**Interpretation of Malcolm Baldrige Performance Measurement**

The Malcolm Baldrige assessment begins with a questionnaire for company staff, which is based on questions aligned with the Malcolm Baldrige standards. The responses are then evaluated according to the guidelines of Malcolm Baldrige. The organization's condition is classified into eight levels based on the score obtained from evaluating the seven Malcolm Baldrige criteria. This classification is further clarified in the following table.

**Table 1.**
**Malcolm Baldrige Organization Level**

| Score Obtained | Criteria | Description |
|---|---|---|
| 876 – 1000 | World Leader | Excellent |
| 776 – 875 | Benchmark Leader | |
| 676 – 775 | Industry Leader | |
| 576 – 675 | Emerging Industry Leader | Average |
| 476 – 575 | Good Performance | |
| 376 – 475 | Early Improvement | |
| 276 – 375 | Early Result | Poor |

| | |
|---|---|
| 0 – 275 | Early Development |

Source: Romadoni et al., 2021

**Validity Test**

Validity testing measures the extent to which the data obtained aligns with the reality of the research object. There are two types of validity tests: convergent validity and discriminant validity. Convergent validity tests whether the questions in each latent variable are understood in the same way by both respondents and researchers. It is considered valid if the loading factor is greater than 0.7 and the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) value exceeds 0.5 (Permata et al., 2022). On the other hand, discriminant validity tests whether the statements within each latent variable are not mixed with others. It is considered valid if the cross-loading value is greater than 0.7 and the HTMT Ratio is below 0.90 (Imron & Wajdi, 2024).

**Reliability Test**

Reliability testing is used to assess whether an instrument, when applied multiple times to measure the same object, produces consistent results (Sugiyono, 2019 in Hakiki & Setiana, 2023). In Partial Least Squares (PLS), reliability for analyzing the Organizational Commitment construct is evaluated using Cronbach's alpha and Composite Reliability. Cronbach's alpha measures the lower bound of a construct's reliability, while Composite Reliability indicates the consistency of each item in measuring a latent variable or the true reliability of the construct. A Cronbach's alpha value greater than 0.7 and Composite Reliability greater than 0.7 are desirable, though values between 0.6 and 0.7 are still acceptable if other construct validity indicators are strong (Sulistiawan et al., 2020).

## RESEARCH METHOD

This study uses a quantitative approach, collecting primary and secondary data. Primary data was gathered through a questionnaire distributed online via Google Forms to 30 respondents, including 1 supervisor, 1 production manager, 3 R&D staff, 1 purchasing staff, and 24 production employees. The questionnaire utilized a Likert scale for responses. Secondary data was obtained from company documents, including the vision, mission, and employee data. The collected data were then analyzed by conducting validity and reliability tests using Smart PLS software. Once the data was confirmed valid and reliable, the analysis proceeded with calculations based on the Malcolm Baldrige Criteria for Performance Excellence method.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Convergent Validity Test

All question variables are considered valid because the loading factor values for each are greater than 0.70. Additionally, to meet the criteria for convergent validity, the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) value for each latent variable must be greater than 0.5. Below are the AVE results for each latent variable.

**Table 2.**
**Average Variance Extracted (AVE)**

| Variable | AVE |
|---|---|
| Leadership | 0,948 |
| Strategic Planning | 0,950 |
| Customer Focus | 0,795 |
| Measurement, Analysis, and Knowledge Management | 0,903 |
| Workforce Focus | 0,889 |
| Work Operations Focus | 0,816 |
| Results | 0,872 |

Source: data processing results from smartPLS, 2024

Table 2. shows that all question variables are valid, as their AVE values exceed 0.50, confirming their validity.

### Discriminant Validity Test

All question variables are confirmed valid based on the discriminant validity test, as evidenced by cross-loading values exceeding 0.70 and HTMT values meeting the discriminant validity criteria, which require HTMT to be less than 0.90. The HTMT results for each latent variable are presented below.

**Table 3.**
**Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio of Correlations (HTMT)**

| Variabel | Work Operations Focus | Customer Focus | Workforce Focus | Results | Leadership | Measurement, Analysis, and Knowledge Management | Strategic Planning |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Work Operations Focus | | | | | | | |
| Customer Focus | 0,123 | | | | | | |
| Workforce Focus | 0,174 | 0,342 | | | | | |
| Results | 0,214 | 0,234 | 0,180 | | | | |
| Leadership | 0,424 | 0,103 | 0,638 | 0,223 | | | |
| Measurement, Analysis, and Knowledge Management | 0,191 | 0,411 | 0,198 | 0,182 | 0,096 | | |
| Strategic Planning | 0,218 | 0,086 | 0,073 | 0,185 | 0,061 | 0,056 | |

Source: data processing results from smartPLS, 2024

Table 3 indicates that all question variables meet discriminant validity criteria, with HTMT values below 0.90, confirming their validity.

**Composite Reliability and Cronbach's Alpha**

**Table 4.**
**Composite Reliability and Cronbach's Alpha**

| Variable | Composite Reliability | Cronbach's Alpha |
|---|---|---|
| Leadership | 0,986 | 0,982 |
| Strategic Planning | 0,987 | 0,983 |
| Customer Focus | 0,939 | 0,923 |
| Measurement, Analysis, and Knowledge Management | 0,974 | 0,965 |
| Workforce Focus | 0,970 | 0,959 |
| Work Operations Focus | 0,946 | 0,928 |
| Results | 0,972 | 0,963 |

Source: data processing results from smartPLS, 2024

Table 4 shows that the composite reliability and Cronbach's alpha values for all question variables exceed 0.7, meeting the required criteria and confirming the reliability of all variables.

**Assessment of the Success of Each Malcolm Baldrige Indicator**

The following presents the scoring results for the seven criteria based on the Malcolm Baldrige scoring guidelines, obtained through interviews with the heads of divisions or designated representatives at PT. XYZ. These criteria include leadership, strategic planning, customer and market focus, measurement, analysis, and knowledge management, workforce focus, work operations focus, and results. The scoring results for these seven criteria are as follows:

**Table 5.**
**Company Performance Assessment Summary**

| No | Criteria | Value | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Sub-Category Points** | **Category Points** | **Percentage (%)** |
| 1 | **Leadership (120)** | | **101,43** | **84,53** |
| | 1.1 Senior Leadership (70) | 59,27 | | |
| | 1.2 Governance and Social Responsibility (50) | 42,17 | | |
| 2 | **Strategic Planning (85)** | | **71,55** | **84,18** |
| | 2.1 Strategy Development (40) | 33,60 | | |
| | 2.2 Strategy Implementation (45) | 37,95 | | |
| 3 | **Customer Focus (85)** | | **71,70** | **84,35** |
| | 3.1 Consumer Voice (40 | 33,60 | | |
| | 3.2 Customer Handling (45) | 38,10 | | |
| 4 | **Measurement, Analysis, and Knowledge Management (90)** | | **71,85** | **79,83** |
| | 4.1 Measuring, Analyzing, and Improving Organizational Performance (45) | 35,55 | | |
| | 4.2 Managing Information, Organizational Knowledge, and Information Technology (45) | 36,30 | | |
| 5 | **Workforce Focus (85)** | | **71,82** | **84,49** |
| | 5.1 Workforce Environment | 33,87 | | |

| No | Criteria | Value | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Sub-Category Points | Category Points | Percentage (%) |
| | (40) | | | |
| | 5.2 Workforce Handling (45) | 37,95 | | |
| 6 | **Work Operations Focus (85)** | | **65,98** | **77,63** |
| | 6.1 Work System (45) | 34,65 | | |
| | 6.2 Work Process (40) | 31,33 | | |
| 7 | **Results (450)** | | **360,20** | **80,04** |
| | 7.1 Product and Process Results (120) | 95,20 | | |
| | 7.2 Customer-Focused Results (90) | 71,40 | | |
| | 7.3 Workforce-Focused Results (80) | 64,00 | | |
| | 7.4 Leadership and Governance Results (80) | 64,53 | | |
| | 7.5 Financial and Market Results (80) | 65,07 | | |

Source: Processed Data, 2024

Example Calculation for the Leadership Sub-Category

➢ Calculation Example for Senior Leadership (70 Points)

This sub-criterion consists of 2 question items with a maximum of 70 points. The calculation for each item follows the data analysis formula:

Percentage = (Total questionnaire recap / Maximum total) * 100

- A11 = (126/150) * 100 = 84%
- A12 = (128/150) * 100 = 85.33%

Average = (84 + 85.33) / 2 = 84.67%

Once the percentage for each item is obtained, it is converted to points as follows:

Score = (Average / 100) * Senior Leadership Points

= (84.67% / 100) * 70

= 59.27

➢ Calculation Example for Governance and Social Responsibility (50 Points)

This sub-criterion consists of 2 question items with a maximum of 50 points. The calculation for each item follows the data analysis formula:

Percentage = (Total questionnaire recap / Maximum total) * 100

- A21 = (126/150) * 100 = 84%
- A22 = (127/150) * 100 = 84.67%

  Average = (84 + 84.67) / 2 = 84.33%

Once the percentage for each item is obtained, it is converted to points as follows:

Score = (Average / 100) * Governance and Social Responsibility Points

= (84.33% / 100) * 50

= 42.17

➢ Total Points for Criteria

= Senior Leadership Sub-Criteria Points + Governance and Social Responsibility Sub-Criteria Points

= 59.27 + 42.17 = 101,43

➢ Percentage (%) = (101,43/120)*100 = 84, 53

**Table 6.**
**Total Performance Category Assessment**

| No | Criteria | Value (A) | Ideal (B) | GAP (C) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Leadership | 101,43 | 120 | 18,57 |
| 2 | Strategic Planning | 71,55 | 85 | 13,45 |
| 3 | Customer Focus | 71,70 | 85 | 13,3 |
| 4 | Measurement, Analysis, and Knowledge Management | 71,85 | 90 | 18,15 |
| 5 | Workforce Focus | 71,82 | 85 | 13,18 |
| 6 | Work Operations Focus | 65,98 | 85 | 19,02 |
| 7 | Results | 360,2 | 450 | 89,8 |
| | **Total** | **814,53** | **1000** | |

Source: Processed Data, 2024

Overall, the total performance gap is 185.47 points out of a possible 1000, suggesting areas for improvement in almost every criterion, especially in achieving the desired results.

**Table 7.**
**Company Class Classification**

| Company Class Classification | Criteria | Obtained Score | Position of PT. XYZ |
|---|---|---|---|
| Excellent | World Leader | 876 – 1000 | |
| | Benchmark Leader | 776 – 875 | 814,53 |
| | Industry Leader | 676 – 775 | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Average | Emerging Industry Leader | 576 – 675 |
| | Good Performance | 476 – 575 |
| | Early Improvement | 376 – 475 |
| Poor | Early Result | 276 – 375 |
| | Early Development | 0 – 275 |

Source: Processed Data, 2024

Based on the calculation using the Malcolm Baldrige Criteria for Performance Excellence (MBCfPE), the company achieved a total score of 814.53 out of a maximum of 1000, reflecting an achievement rate of 81.45%. This places the company in the Benchmark Leader category, indicating that its practices and results are above the industry average and can serve as a benchmark for other organizations. While this overall performance is strong, improvements are still necessary, particularly in categories with lower scores, to continue enhancing performance and reach higher levels in the future. This analysis is part of the company's performance evaluation to address the research problem, identifying both strengths and areas requiring further attention.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the Malcolm Baldrige Criteria for Performance Excellence (MBCfPE) evaluation, PT. XYZ achieved a score of 814.53, placing it in the Benchmark Leader category. To reach World Leader status, improvements are needed in several areas. Leadership can be enhanced by increasing leaders' involvement, offering clearer direction, and establishing structured performance evaluations. In Strategic Planning, more employee involvement and improved communication of goals and strategies are essential. For Customer Focus, PT. XYZ should strengthen customer feedback channels and improve responsiveness. In Measurement, Analysis, and Knowledge Management, the company should refine its performance measurement systems and facilitate better knowledge sharing. Workforce Focus can be improved by providing more opportunities for skill development and knowledge transfer. For Work Operations Focus, adopting new methods to increase efficiency and improving inter-departmental communication are key. Lastly, Results can be improved by refining performance measurement systems and implementing targeted marketing strategies to enhance customer retention and attract new clients. By focusing on these areas, PT. XYZ can enhance its performance and progress toward becoming a World Leader.

## REFERENCES

Fatkhurrozi, T. (2024). Islamic Capital Market Investment Alternatives Facing the 2024 Election Year. *Danadyaksa: Post Modern Economy Journal*, *1*(2), 148–163. https://doi.org/10.69965/danadyaksa.v1i2.33

Hakiki, R., & Setiana, A. (2023). The Influence of Leadership Style on Employee Performance at the Regional Technical Implementation Unit of Pagerageung Community Health Center, Tasikmalaya District. *Journal of Innovation Research and Knowledge*, 2(8). https://bnr.bg/post/101787017/bsp-za-balgaria-e-pod-nomer-1-v-buletinata-za-vota-gerb-s-nomer-2-pp-db-s-nomer-12

Herawan, O. E., Fathurohman, & Nindiani, A. (2023). Measuring Company Performance Using the Malcolm Baldrige Method (Case Study: PT. XYZ Assembly Division). *Entrepreneur: Journal of Business Management and Entrepreneurship*, 4(03), 204–212. https://doi.org/10.31949/entrepreneur.v4i03.6924

Imron, A. A., & Wajdi, M. F. (2024). Analysis of the Influence of Brand Image, Discounts, and Brand Ambassadors on Purchase Intentions for SOMETHINC Products. *Innovative: Journal of Social Science Research*, 4(2), 8350–8363. https://doi.org/10.31004/innovative.v4i2.10336

Indrawan, D. R., Putra, A. P., Sompie, C. R., & Malinda, M. (2022). Analysis of the Malcolm Baldrige Criteria for Performance Excellence (MBCFPE) on the Performance of the 'Good On You' SME. *FTI Dissemination Proceedings*, 4(1), 712–717. www.ekon.go.id

Kurniawan, Z. (2023). Post-Covid-19 Performance Management (Definition, Objectives, and How to Implement It in the Workplace). *Jurnal Exchall (Economic Challenge)*, 5(1), 39–46.

Moslem, M., & Sary, F. P. (2021). The Effect of Job Insecurity and Job Stress on Turnover Intentions of Employees at Kaltim Post Samarinda. *Psikostudia: Journal of Psychology*, 10(2), 153. https://doi.org/10.30872/psikostudia.v10i2.5221

Pakpahan, R., Sinaga Simanjorang, E., & Prayoga, Y. (2022). Performance Evaluation of SAMSAT Office Employees in Motor Vehicle Title Transfer Fee Services at The Rantauprapat SAMSAT Office. *Indonesian Interdisciplinary Journal of Sharia Economics (IIJSE)*, *5*(2), 887-901. https://doi.org/10.31538/iijse.v5i2.3926

Pelealu, D. R. . (2023). Human Resources Management and Total Quality Management as an Effort to Improve Company Performance. *Majapahit Journal of Islamic Finance and Management*, *2*(1), 23–39. https://doi.org/10.31538/mjifm.v2i1.23

Permata, R., Syaidatussalihah, & Kurniawan, A. (2022). The Effect of Gender on Student Academic Achievement Using SEM-PLS Approach. *Journal of Mathematics Education*, 5(2), 93–101.

Restianingati, V. (2023). Measurement of SOE Performance Based on the Malcolm Baldrige Criteria for Performance Excellence (MBCfPE) 2016. *JKMP (Journal of Public Policy and Management)*, 11(1), 16–28. https://doi.org/10.21070/jkmp.v11i1.1720

Romadoni, N., Hasanah, H., & Wijaya, H. (2021). Measuring PT. Krakatau Posco Energy's Performance Using the Malcolm Baldrige Criteria for Performance Excellence. *Jurnal InTent*, 4(2), 156–167.

Sagala, S. A., & Siagian, V. (2021). Performance Assessment Using the Balanced Scorecard Method on Pharmaceutical Companies Before and During Covid (2019-2020) Listed on the IDX. *Perspektif Journal*, 19(2), 145–149. https://doi.org/10.31294/jp.v19i2.11269

Sulistiawan, A., Sari, E. Y. D., & Situmorang, N. Z. (2020). Validity and Reliability of Organizational Commitment Using Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). *Psikoislamika: Journal of Psychology and Islamic Psychology*, 17(2), 134–144. https://doi.org/10.18860/psikoislamika.v17i2.10526

Waliamin, J. (2020). The Effect of Performance Appraisal on Employee Motivation and Productivity at Pangrango 2 Hotel Bogor. *Creative Research Management Journal*, 3(1), 77–84. https://doi.org/10.32663/crmj.v3i1.1244