



DOI: <https://doi.org/10.38035/dijdbm.v7i3>
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

The Influence of Human Resource Policy and Development on Security Performance at the Cimanggis Military Detention Installation

Muhammad Sastra Anafera¹, Yuni Pratikno², Jamal Hanaffy³.

¹Management and Business Study Program, Mitra Bangsa University, Jakarta, sastraanafera@gmail.com.

²Management and Business Study Program, Mitra Bangsa University, Jakarta, yuni.pratikno@gmail.com.

³Management and Business Study Program, Mitra Bangsa University, Jakarta, jamalhanaffy@umiba.ac.id.

Corresponding Author: sastraanafera@gmail.com¹

Abstract: Security and development at military detention facilities are strategic aspects that require effective policy support and continuous human resource development to ensure optimal and sustainable security performance. The Cimanggis Military Detention Facility has complex task characteristics, thus requiring professional personnel and policies that are able to accommodate operational dynamics and detainee development. This study aims to analyze the influence of policy effectiveness and human resource development on security performance at the Cimanggis Military Detention Facility, both partially and simultaneously. This study uses a quantitative approach with a survey method. Data were collected through distributing questionnaires to 96 personnel at the Cimanggis Military Detention Facility as research respondents. The data analysis technique used is multiple linear regression analysis with the help of the SPSS program. The results of the study indicate that partially policy effectiveness has a positive and significant effect on security performance with a t-value of 4.277 and a significance level of 0.004. In addition, human resource development also has a positive and significant effect on security performance with a t-value of 4.414 and a significance level <0.001. Simultaneously, the effectiveness of policies and human resource development have a significant effect on security performance at the Cimanggis Military Detention Installation, as indicated by the F-value of 27.219 with a significance of <0.001. The coefficient of determination (R Square) of 0.369 indicates that the two independent variables are able to explain 36.9% of the variation in security performance, while the remaining 63.1% is influenced by other factors outside the research model. This finding confirms that increasing policy effectiveness supported by planned, systematic, and sustainable human resource development is an important factor in strengthening security performance at the Cimanggis Military Detention Installation.

Keyword: Policy Effectiveness, Human Resource Development, Security Performance, Military Detention Installations.

INTRODUCTION

Security and military development are fundamental elements in the operation of military organizations because they are interconnected in shaping the discipline, professionalism, and effectiveness of members' duties. The Cimanggis Military Detention Installation, as one of the Indonesian Army's strategic facilities, plays a crucial role in managing detainees and developing members involved in the security process. Security encompasses not only physical supervision and access control, but also the implementation of strict procedures, risk management, and consistent discipline enforcement. Military development emphasizes improving competence, integrity, technical skills, and developing members' ethical and moral values. Handoko (2020) states that the quality of security and development is highly dependent on the integration of organizational policies with members' abilities in carrying out their duties, making the two inseparable elements in building an effective and professional military organization.

The effectiveness of organizational policies is a key factor in determining operational success. Clear and targeted policies provide systematic guidance for members in carrying out their daily tasks, including security and military training. Conversely, ineffective policies can lead to confusion, procedural violations, and decreased member discipline. The Cimanggis Military Detention Facility requires policies that are consistent, easy to understand, and adaptable to dynamic operational situations. Sugiyono (2018) emphasized that policy effectiveness is measured not only by formal documents but also by the level of acceptance, procedural implementation, and tangible results reflected in security and military training.

Human resource (HR) development is a crucial factor in supporting the success of security and development policies. Every military member needs to possess technical competence, soft skills, integrity, discipline, and the ability to adapt to the dynamics of their duties. The Cimanggis Military Detention Center implements a HR development program that includes technical training, discipline education, moral development, and regular performance evaluations. Wibowo (2019) states that structured HR development will increase productivity, motivation, compliance with regulations, and member loyalty to the organization. Therefore, HR quality directly influences the effectiveness of policy implementation.

The combination of policy effectiveness and human resource development is a key indicator in measuring the success of military security and development. Without clear policies, human resource development programs can be disorganized, while incompetent human resources make policy implementation less effective. This reciprocal relationship demonstrates that human resource development and policy effectiveness must be integrated to achieve optimal performance. Santoso (2022) emphasized that systematic evaluation of policies and human resource development can provide a basis for significant improvements to enhance the effectiveness of military organizations.

Furthermore, increasingly complex task dynamics require policy updates and continuous improvement of member competencies. The Cimanggis Military Detention Facility faces challenges in balancing administrative procedures, development needs, and the demands of professional security. Handoko (2020) stated that adaptive policies enable members to navigate complex situations without compromising the quality of security and development. The implementation of flexible policies also requires adequate facilities, such as detention rooms, training rooms, training facilities, and administrative infrastructure that support coordination and monitoring of member performance.

Evaluation of policy effectiveness and human resource development must be integrated with assessments of security and coaching outcomes. Adequate facilities and robust training programs can improve member discipline, motivation, and readiness to face operational situations. Creswell (2019) emphasized that instilling discipline in members will strengthen policy implementation and support ongoing coaching. Therefore, this study aims to empirically

evaluate the relationship between policy effectiveness, human resource development, and the quality of security and coaching at the Cimanggis Military Detention Center. This study can serve as a basis for recommendations for improving policies and more effective human resource programs.

Policy

Organizational policies are guidelines that direct member behavior in achieving organizational goals. Robbins and Judge (2019) state that policies are formal rules or guidelines used to regulate member behavior to align with organizational goals. Meanwhile, Handoko (2020) emphasizes that effective policies serve as a framework for decision-making, resource allocation, and operational coordination. In a military context, policies are not only formal documents but also include the consistent implementation of procedures for securing and developing members (Sugiyono, 2018). This aligns with Daft's (2016) theory, which emphasizes that policies must be flexible, adaptive, and responsive to changing situations to be effective in operational control. Furthermore, according to Luthans (2018), the success of policy implementation is influenced by members' understanding and commitment to implementing existing rules.

Clear, systematic, and integrated policies can improve organizational performance by providing guidelines for all members to act consistently. Mintzberg (2015) stated that effective policies play a strategic role in decision-making, inter-unit coordination, and preventing internal conflict. Handoko (2020) added that consistently implemented policies will strengthen discipline, reduce procedural violations, and increase security effectiveness. In the context of the Cimanggis Military Detention Center, policies include prisoner supervision rules, standard operating procedures, and disciplinary enforcement mechanisms, all of which contribute to the quality of security performance.

Furthermore, policy effectiveness is measured by the extent to which it can be implemented effectively and produces the desired output. According to Robbins & Coulter (2017), effective policies are not only formal but must also be accepted by organizational members, easily understood, and support the achievement of objectives. Handoko (2020) emphasizes that adaptive policies are able to respond to the dynamics of tasks and member conditions, thereby minimizing the risk of operational failure. Meanwhile, Daft (2016) emphasizes the importance of integrating policies with internal control procedures for optimal security oversight and coordination. Thus, policies are a critical variable influencing security performance, particularly in high-risk military environments.

Human Resource Development

Human resource development is a systematic process aimed at improving the competence, skills, and performance of organizational members. Wibowo (2019) explains that human resource development includes technical training, discipline education, moral development, and the improvement of soft skills and interpersonal competencies. Handoko (2020) adds that human resource development focuses on empowering individuals to increase productivity and readiness to face complex tasks. Meanwhile, Mathis & Jackson (2019) state that effectively developed human resources will increase member motivation, loyalty, and operational performance. Fadli (2019) emphasizes that human resource quality is a key indicator of organizational effectiveness because individual competence determines the organization's ability to carry out its strategic mission. Meanwhile, Santoso (2022) highlights that good human resource development plays a role in shaping character, discipline, and work ethics that support professional performance.

Human resource development also includes continuous learning through formal and informal training. Noe (2017) stated that structured training programs improve members' knowledge, technical skills, and adaptability to dynamic tasks. Handoko (2020) added that

regular and planned training helps members navigate high-risk situations, such as prisoner security, crowd control, and threat response. Wibowo (2019) emphasized the importance of post-training evaluations to measure the effectiveness of human resource development, allowing organizations to tailor programs to members' needs. Furthermore, Fadli (2019) suggested that human resource development focused on soft skills and leadership will improve coordination, communication, and decision-making abilities in emergency situations.

Furthermore, human resource development serves as a strategic mechanism to improve overall organizational performance. Mathis & Jackson (2019) stated that organizations that invest in human resources will benefit from increased efficiency, reduced operational errors, and improved member morale. Santoso (2022) emphasized that high-quality human resources improve compliance with procedures, discipline, and security effectiveness. Handoko (2020) added that integrating human resource development programs with internal policies strengthens organizational performance. Therefore, human resource development is a crucial variable that can influence security performance at the Cimanggis Military Detention Facility.

Security Performance

Security performance is the ability of organizational members to carry out security tasks effectively, accurately, and consistently. Robbins & Judge (2019) define performance as the results of individual or group work that can be measured by quality, quantity, timeliness, and responsibility in completing tasks. Handoko (2020) adds that security performance includes compliance with procedures, response to security disturbances, supervision of detainees, and coordination between personnel. Creswell (2019) emphasizes that member discipline and integrity are key components of security performance, as non-compliance will directly impact security risks. According to Daft (2016), security performance is also influenced by the quality of implemented policies and human resource readiness, so performance evaluations must consider both factors. Furthermore, Santoso (2022) states that member morale and motivation are mediating variables that strengthen the effectiveness of policies and human resource development on security performance.

Security performance at military installations is multidimensional and closely linked to policy implementation and member competency. Mintzberg (2015) emphasized that organizational operational success depends on the synchronization of formal procedures, team coordination, and member preparedness in critical situations. Handoko (2020) added that security performance evaluation includes measuring the timeliness of task execution, procedural accuracy, and the effectiveness of detainee supervision. Wibowo (2019) also emphasized that sound human resource development directly improves members' ability to maintain security and minimize the risk of disturbances. Fadli (2019) emphasized the importance of integrating policies, human resource development, and supporting facilities to ensure optimal security.

Furthermore, security performance measurement must be objective and based on measurable indicators. Noe (2017) stated that performance indicators should include quantitative aspects such as the number of incidents successfully handled, and qualitative aspects such as the level of compliance with SOPs, discipline, and team coordination. Handoko (2020) emphasized the need for continuous monitoring and routine evaluation to assess the effectiveness of policies and human resource development in supporting security performance. Santoso (2022) added that strengthening member morale, discipline, and professionalism plays a crucial role in maintaining security stability. Therefore, security performance is not only the result of individual abilities but also a reflection of the integration of policies and the quality of human resource development.

METHOD

Types of research

This study uses a quantitative approach with an explanatory research method, which aims to empirically analyze the influence of independent variables on the dependent variable. According to Sugiyono (2018), explanatory research is research conducted to test hypotheses about causal relationships between variables through the collection of numerical data that is then analyzed statistically. The quantitative approach was chosen because it allows researchers to measure the level of influence of policies and human resource development on security performance in an objective, measurable, and generalizable manner. Creswell (2019) adds that quantitative research is effective for understanding causal relationships, making it highly suitable for testing models of the influence of policies and human resources on security performance in military environments. This method also facilitates comparisons between members, pattern identification, and significance testing of proposed hypotheses.

Research Population and Sample

The population of this study was all personnel serving at the Cimanggis Military Detention Installation, totaling 126 members. To obtain representative data, a purposive sampling technique was used, considering that the selected members had experience and direct involvement in security and prisoner development. Based on calculations using the Slovin formula, a sample size of 96 respondents was obtained, which was considered sufficient for statistical analysis and representative of the overall population (Sugiyono, 2018). The sample selection was carried out carefully to cover various units, job levels, and work experience, so that the research results could describe the actual conditions of security performance at the installation as a whole. Creswell (2019) emphasized that appropriate sample selection is crucial for the validity and reliability of quantitative research results.

Method of collecting data

Data collection was conducted through a questionnaire designed based on research variable indicators. The questionnaire was chosen because it allows researchers to obtain data from a large number of respondents in a relatively short time and is structured (Sugiyono, 2018). Each question uses a 1–5 Likert scale to measure respondents' perceptions of policies, human resource development, and security performance. According to Sekaran & Bougie (2019), questionnaires are effective for quantitatively measuring individual attitudes, perceptions, and assessments, as well as facilitating the analysis of relationships between variables. Furthermore, the questionnaire is equipped with clear instructions to ensure respondents understand the questions and provide accurate answers. This technique also minimizes interview bias because respondents can answer anonymously and independently.

Research Instruments

The research instrument consists of three main variables, namely:

Policy (X_1): measured through indicators of procedural clarity, consistency of implementation, flexibility, transparency, and effectiveness of supervision.

Human Resource Development (X_2): measured through indicators of technical training, discipline education, moral and character development, soft skill improvement, and periodic performance evaluation.

Security Performance (Y): measured through indicators of compliance with SOPs, effectiveness of prisoner supervision, coordination between personnel, preparedness to face emergency situations, and quality of implementation of security duties.

This instrument was tested for validity and reliability before use to ensure each question item accurately and consistently measured the variables (Sekaran & Bougie, 2019; Sugiyono, 2018). The use of these measurable indicators facilitates statistical analysis in identifying causal relationships between variables and provides an objective empirical picture of security performance at the Cimanggis Military Detention Facility.

Data Analysis Methods

Data obtained from the questionnaire were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 29. The analysis began with validity and reliability tests to ensure the instrument could measure variables consistently. Next, a multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to determine the simultaneous and partial effects between policy (X₁) and human resource development (X₂) on security performance (Y) (Ghozali, 2021). Furthermore, a coefficient of determination (R²) test was conducted to measure the extent to which the independent variables explain the variability of the dependent variable, as well as an F-test and a t-test to test the significance of the influence of each variable (Hair et al., 2019). This analysis allows researchers to obtain objective empirical evidence regarding the causal relationship between policy, human resource development, and security performance.

Validity Testing

$$r_{xy} = \frac{n(\sum XY) - (\sum X)(\sum Y)}{\sqrt{n(\sum X^2) - (\sum X)^2} \cdot \sqrt{n(\sum Y^2) - (\sum Y)^2}}$$

The basis for decision making in validity testing is as follows :

- a. If the r value is positive and the r result is > r table , then the item or variable is valid.
- b. If the r value is negative and r result < r table or r result is negative > r table then the item or variable is invalid.

A questionnaire is declared valid if the r value obtained from the calculation results (r_{xy}) is greater than the table r value (5%).

Instrument Reliability Test

According to Arikunto (2020:221), reliability refers to the degree to which an instrument is sufficiently reliable to be used using the Cronbach's Alpha formula. The formula used in this reliability test is as follows:

$$r_1 = \left[\frac{k}{(k - 1)} \right] \left[\frac{S_t^2 - \sum p_i q_i}{S_t^2} \right]$$

The basis for decision making in the reliability test in this study is as follows:

- 1) If the r alpha value is positive and r alpha > r table , then the item or variable is reliable.
- 2) If the r alpha value is negative and r alpha < r table or r alpha is negative > r table , then the item or variable is not reliable.

Multiple Regression Analysis

Sugiyono (2019:277) proposed multiple linear regression analysis used to make predictions, how the value of a variable changes dependent if the value of the independent variable is increased or decreased. This analysis is used by involving two or more independent variables. between the dependent variable (Y) and the independent variables (X₁ , and X₂), This method is used to determine the strength of the influence between several factors. independent variables simultaneously with the dependent variable

$$\mu Y / X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n = A + B_1 X_1 + B_2 X_2 + \dots + B_n X_n$$

technique used in this study was multiple linear regression. The analysis was conducted computerized using the computer program Statistical Product and Service Solutions (SPSS) Version 29 for Windows .

Hypothesis

Null Hypothesis 1 (H01): Policy does not have a significant effect on Security Performance at the Cimanggis Military Detention Installation.

Alternative hypothesis 1 (Ha1): Policy has a significant influence on Security Performance at the Cimanggis Military Detention Installation.

Null Hypothesis 2 (H02): Human Resource Development does not have a significant effect on Security Performance at the Cimanggis Military Detention Installation.

Alternative hypothesis 2 (Ha2): Human Resource Development has a significant effect on Security Performance at the Cimanggis Military Detention Installation.

Null Hypothesis 3 (H03): Policy and Human Resource Development simultaneously do not have a significant effect on Security Performance at the Cimanggis Military Detention Installation.

Alternative hypothesis 3 (Ha3): Policy and Human Resource Development simultaneously have a significant effect on Security Performance at the Cimanggis Military Detention Installation.

F test

The F test is used to determine whether there is a simultaneous influence between the independent variables on the dependent variable. The F test formula according to Sugiyono (2019:190) is as follows:

$$F = \frac{R^2 / k}{(1 - R^2) / (n - k - 1)}$$

Information:

F = F value (F count)

R2 = Multiple correlation coefficient

K = Number of independent variables

n = Sample size

The basis for making the decision is as follows:

- 1) If F count < F table , then H 0 is accepted.
- 2) If F count > F table , then H0 is rejected .

Coefficient of Determination

The definition of the coefficient of determination according to Andi Supangat (2018:350) is: " The coefficient of determination is a quantity to show the level of strength of the relationship between two or more variables in the form of a percentage (showing how much percentage of the diversity of y can be explained by the diversity of x), or in other words how much x can contribute to y."

Mudrajad Kuncoro (2021:100) states that the coefficient essentially measures the model's ability to explain variation in the dependent variable. The coefficient of determination

is between zero (0) and one (1). A small r2 value indicates that the independent variables' ability to explain variation is very limited. A value close to one indicates that the independent variables provide almost all the information needed to predict variation in the dependent variable.

The magnitude of the relationship between the variables “X 1 ” and “X 2 ” with the variable “Y” can be determined by using the coefficient of determination analysis, which is obtained by squaring the correlation coefficient. Based on the definition above, the coefficient of determination is part of the total diversity of the dependent variable that can be calculated by the diversity of the independent variable calculated with the coefficient of determination with the basic assumption that other factors outside the variable are considered fixed or constant. To determine the value of the coefficient of determination, it can be calculated using the formula

$$K_d = r^2 \times 100\%$$

Information:

Kd = Value of coefficient of determination

r = Correlation coefficient value.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Multiple Linear Regression Test Results Table

Coefficients ^a					
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	15,987	2,578		6,202	0
1 POLICY EFFECTIVENESS	0.328	0.105	0.388	4,277	0.004
HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT	0.489	0.111	0.47	4,414	0

a. Dependent Variable: SECURITY AND GUIDANCE

Source: Data Processing Results (SPSS 29), (2025)

The results of multiple linear regression analysis show the following regression equation:

1. Constant (B = 15.987, p < 0.001)

shows that if the Effectiveness of HR Policy and Development is zero, then the Security and Guidance value is estimated at 15.987.

2. Policy Effectiveness (B = 0.328, p = 0.004 < 0.05)

The positive coefficient of 0.328 indicates that every 1 unit increase in Policy Effectiveness will increase Security and Guidance by 0.328 units, with a statistically significant effect.

3. Human Resource Development (B = 0.489, p < 0.001) The positive coefficient of 0.489 indicates that every 1 unit increase in Human Resource Development will increase Security and Guidance by 0.489 units, with a statistically significant effect.

From the standardized Beta value, it can be seen that Human Resource Development (Beta = 0.470) has a more dominant influence than Policy Effectiveness (Beta = 0.388) on Security and Guidance.

Thus, both independent variables simultaneously have a positive and significant effect on the dependent variable, meaning that the higher the Effectiveness of HR Policy and Development, the higher the level of Security and Guidance in the organization.

Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis testing is conducted to determine whether there is a significant influence between the independent variables on the dependent variable, either simultaneously or partially. In this study, the hypothesis test aims to examine the influence of Policy Effectiveness (X1) and Human Resource Development (X2) on Security and Guidance (Y). This test includes the t-test, F-test, and coefficient of determination

Variables	T count	Sig	Information
	4,277	0.004	Significant
Policy Effectiveness	4,414	0.001	Significant
Human Resource Development			
F Count	27,219	R	0.608
F Sign	0.001	Rsquare	0.369

Model Accuracy Testing/Simultaneous (F Test)

This test is conducted to determine the extent to which the independent variables used are able to explain the dependent variable simultaneously. In this study, the independent variables tested are Policy Effectiveness (X1) and Human Resource Development (X2) against the dependent variable of Security and Guidance (Y).

Based on the analysis results table, the calculated F value is 27.219 with F Sign = 0.001. Because the significance value (0.001) is smaller than 0.05, Ho is rejected. This shows that simultaneously, Policy Effectiveness and Human Resource Development have a significant effect on Security and Guidance.

Significance/Partial Testing (t-Test)

This test aims to determine the influence of each independent variable individually on the dependent variable. The results of the t-test show: 1) The Policy Effectiveness variable has a calculated t-value of 4.277 with a sig. 0.004. Since the significance value is less than 0.05, it can be concluded that Policy Effectiveness has a significant effect on Security and Guidance. 2) The Human Resource Development variable has a t-value of 4.414 with a significance value of 0.000. Since the significance value is less than 0.05, it can be concluded that Human Resource Development has a significant effect on Security and Guidance.

Thus, both independent variables have a positive and significant partial effect on the dependent variable.

Coefficient of Determination (R²)

The coefficient of determination is used to measure the extent to which independent variables can explain dependent variables. The R^2 value ranges from 0 to 1, with the higher the value, the greater the model's ability to explain the dependent variable.

Based on the analysis results, the R value was obtained = 0.608 and $R^2 = 0.369$. This indicates that 36.9% of the Security and Guidance variables can be explained by Policy Effectiveness and Human Resource Development, while the remaining 63.1% is influenced by other factors outside this research model.

The Influence of HR Policies and Development on Security Performance

Based on the results of data processing using the SPSS version 29 program, it was found that Policy (X1) and Human Resource Development (X2) had a positive and significant effect on Security Performance (Y), both partially and simultaneously. This finding indicates that the more effective the policies implemented and the more optimal the human resource development carried out, the better the quality of security and guidance at the Cimanggis Military Detention Installation. The results of this study are in line with the policy theory put forward by Wibowo (2019) and Nugroho (2020), which states that clear, consistent, and relevant policies can encourage improved organizational performance. In addition, this finding is also in line with previous research by Rahmadani (2022) and Putra & Simanjuntak (2023) which proves that policies and HR management have a significant contribution to security performance.

The Influence of Policy on Security Performance

Partially, Policy (X1) is proven to have a positive and significant influence on Security Performance. This is indicated by the t-statistic value of 4.277 which is greater than the t-table at the 0.05 significance level. This finding indicates that policies that are clearly formulated, on target, and consistently implemented can improve the quality of Security Performance. The results of this study are in line with the public policy theory proposed by Dye (2017) and Wibowo (2019), which emphasizes that policies are highly determined by clarity of objectives, consistency of implementation, and accountability of implementers. In addition, the results of this study are in line with previous research by Nugroho (2020) and Aditya (2021) which stated that effective organizational policies have a direct influence on improving performance and operational order.

The Influence of Human Resource Development on Security Performance

Human Resource Development (X2) was also shown to have a positive and significant effect on Security Performance, with a t-statistic value of 4.414. This finding indicates that training, coaching, competency improvement, and personnel capacity development programs play a crucial role in supporting the implementation of Security Performance. The results of this study align with the human resource development theory proposed by Handoko (2020) and Dessler (2020), which states that sustainable human resource development will improve personnel competence, motivation, and professionalism. This finding also aligns with previous research by Mangkunegara (2017) and Rahmadani (2022), which demonstrated that human resource development significantly impacts security performance and work discipline.

The Simultaneous Influence of HR Policy and Development on Security Performance

Simultaneously, Policy (X1) and Human Resource Development (X2) have a positive and significant effect on Security Performance (Y). This is indicated by the F-value of 27.219 with a significance level of 0.001. This finding proves that the combination of effective policies and optimal HR development can create conducive, directed working conditions and support the implementation of security and guidance optimally. The results of this study are in line with the performance management theory proposed by Mangkunegara (2017) and Armstrong & Taylor (2020), which emphasizes that organizational performance is influenced by the synergy

between strategic policies and the quality of human resources. In addition, these results are also in line with previous research by Putra & Simanjuntak (2023) which shows that policies and HR simultaneously have a significant effect on the performance of military organizations.

CONCLUSION

Based on the research results, it can be concluded that policies and human resource development have a positive and significant influence on security performance. This finding indicates that the effectiveness of implemented policies, when supported by a planned and sustainable human resource development program, can improve the overall quality of security implementation. Clear, consistent, and relevant policies provide a clear direction for task implementation, while human resource development strengthens the capacity of personnel to carry out their roles and responsibilities. These results are in line with the views of Wibowo and Nugroho, who emphasized that effective organizational policies are a strategic instrument in driving performance improvement, particularly in organizations with high-risk task characteristics such as security institutions.

Partially, policies have been shown to have a significant impact on security performance, indicating that the quality of policy formulation and implementation significantly determines the success of security tasks. Policies that are formulated precisely on target, understood by all personnel, and implemented consistently can create operational order, increase compliance with procedures, and strengthen work accountability. This finding aligns with the public policy theory proposed by Dye and Wibowo, which emphasizes the importance of clarity of objectives, consistency of implementation, and accountability of implementers in determining the effectiveness of organizational policies. Thus, policies serve not only as formal guidelines but also as instruments for controlling security performance.

In addition to policies, human resource development has also been shown to significantly impact security performance. Training programs, coaching, and personnel competency development play a crucial role in enhancing professionalism, discipline, and preparedness in carrying out security duties. Sustainable human resource development enables personnel to adapt to increasingly complex task dynamics and operational challenges. This finding aligns with the human resource development theory proposed by Handoko and Dessler and is reinforced by Mangkunegara's view that performance quality is largely determined by the level of competence and development of personnel. Overall, this study confirms that the synergy between effective policies and optimal human resource development is key to sustainably improving security performance.

REFERENCE

- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61–89.
- Santoso, I., & Madiistriyatno, H. (2021). *Metodologi penelitian kuantitatif*. Indigo Media.
- Pratikno, Y., & Hermawan, E. (2022). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia dalam praktik tata kelola organisasi yang baik*. Purbalingga: Eureka Media Aksara.
- Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R. E. (2011). *Diagnosing and changing organizational culture: Based on the competing values framework*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage Publications.
- Ghozali, I. (2018). *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate dengan SPSS 25*. Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2014). *Multivariate data analysis*. Pearson Education Limited.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. Sage Publications.

- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 293–315.
- Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2016). *Research methods for business: A skill-building approach*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Sugiyono. (2019). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Wibowo, A. (2018). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia untuk perusahaan*. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.
- Mangkunegara, A. P. (2017). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia perusahaan*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Hasibuan, M. S. P. (2016). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2017). *Organizational behavior*. Pearson Education Limited.
- Luthans, F. (2011). *Organizational behavior: An evidence-based approach*. McGraw-Hill.
- Siagian, S. P. (2015). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Gibson, J. L., Ivancevich, J. M., Donnelly, J. H., & Konopaske, R. (2012). *Organizations: Behavior, structure, processes*. McGraw-Hill Education.
- Robbins, S. P., & Coulter, M. (2016). *Management*. Pearson Education.
- Nasution, A. H. (2019). Budaya organisasi di instansi pemerintah. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, 7(2), 45–56.
- Prasetya, A., & Haryanto, S. (2020). Pengaruh budaya organisasi terhadap komitmen karyawan. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Bisnis*, 14(1), 12–25.
- Putra, R., & Widodo, A. (2021). Keterlibatan kerja dan kepuasan kerja pegawai di sektor publik. *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi*, 9(3), 101–115.
- Rahmawati, S. (2020). Analisis pengaruh budaya organisasi terhadap kinerja pegawai. *Jurnal Manajemen SDM*, 11(2), 78–90.
- Santoso, T. (2019). Keterlibatan kerja dan komitmen organisasi pada aparatur negara. *Jurnal Psikologi Organisasi*, 5(1), 33–45.
- Wijaya, D., & Hidayat, R. (2021). Pengaruh budaya organisasi terhadap kepuasan kerja dan kinerja. *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis*, 15(2), 55–68.
- Suharto, B. (2018). Komitmen organisasi dan pengaruhnya terhadap motivasi kerja. *Jurnal Manajemen Publik*, 10(2), 21–36.
- Wulandari, F., & Kurniawan, T. (2020). Keterlibatan kerja sebagai mediator pengaruh budaya organisasi terhadap kinerja. *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis*, 8(1), 44–57.
- Handayani, P. (2019). Budaya organisasi dan pengaruhnya terhadap produktivitas kerja. *Jurnal Ekonomi*, 12(1), 67–79.
- Sari, D., & Pratama, R. (2021). Pengaruh keterlibatan kerja terhadap komitmen organisasi. *Jurnal Psikologi Industri*, 6(2), 88–102.
- Hidayat, M. (2020). Analisis faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi komitmen organisasi di instansi pemerintah. *Jurnal Administrasi Negara*, 7(1), 23–38.
- Lestari, N., & Putri, A. (2019). Budaya organisasi dan efektivitas kerja pegawai. *Jurnal Manajemen Publik*, 11(3), 90–104.
- Fauzi, I., & Sari, Y. (2021). Keterlibatan kerja sebagai prediktor komitmen organisasi. *Jurnal Psikologi Organisasi*, 7(2), 56–70.
- Rahman, F., & Lestari, D. (2020). Pengaruh budaya organisasi terhadap kinerja karyawan di sektor publik. *Jurnal Manajemen SDM*, 12(1), 33–48.
- Gunawan, A., & Santoso, R. (2019). Hubungan keterlibatan kerja dan kepuasan kerja pegawai negeri. *Jurnal Psikologi Kerja*, 6(1), 17–29.
- Pratama, H., & Wicaksono, T. (2021). Budaya organisasi, keterlibatan kerja, dan komitmen organisasi. *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi*, 10(2), 65–80.

- Fitriani, R. (2020). Pengaruh keterlibatan kerja terhadap kinerja pegawai di instansi pemerintahan. *Jurnal Manajemen Publik*, 9(3), 44–58.
- Santoso, B. (2019). Analisis pengaruh budaya organisasi terhadap komitmen pegawai. *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Manajemen*, 14(2), 77–91.
- Indrawati, S., & Setiawan, A. (2021). Keterlibatan kerja sebagai variabel mediasi budaya organisasi dan kinerja. *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis*, 9(1), 34–47.
- Handayani, T. (2019). Budaya organisasi dan pengaruhnya terhadap kepuasan kerja pegawai. *Jurnal Manajemen Publik*, 11(2), 55–69.
- Wibowo, R., & Lestari, P. (2020). Pengaruh keterlibatan kerja dan budaya organisasi terhadap komitmen pegawai. *Jurnal Psikologi Organisasi*, 8(2), 45–59.
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1996). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of construct validity. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 49(3), 252–276.
- Becker, H. S. (1960). Notes on the concept of commitment. *American Journal of Sociology*, 66(1), 32–40.
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 268–279.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61–89.
- Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59(5), 603–609.
- Santoso, S., & Madiistriyatno, H. (2021). Metodologi penelitian kuantitatif: Konsep, teknik, dan analisis data. Jakarta: Rajawali Press.
- Hasibuan, M. S. P. (2019). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Luthans, F. (2011). *Organizational behavior: An evidence-based approach*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2018). *Organizational behavior*. New York: Pearson.
- Sedarmayanti. (2020). *Sumber Daya Manusia dan Produktivitas Kerja*. Bandung: Refika Aditama.
- Wibowo, A. (2019). *Manajemen Kinerja Pegawai: Teori dan Implementasi*. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.
- Ghozali, I. (2018). *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate dengan SPSS 25*. Semarang: UNDIP Press.
- Mangkunegara, A. P. (2020). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Perusahaan*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Tjiptono, F., & Diana, G. (2020). *Manajemen Pemasaran Jasa*. Yogyakarta: Andi Offset.
- Riana, R., & Nugroho, H. (2019). Pengaruh budaya organisasi terhadap komitmen organisasi karyawan. *Jurnal Manajemen & Organisasi*, 10(2), 145–160.
- Prasetyo, B., & Wulandari, D. (2020). Keterlibatan kerja dan kinerja pegawai: Studi pada instansi pemerintah. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, 12(1), 33–50.
- Hidayat, T., & Susanto, A. (2018). Budaya organisasi dan kepuasan kerja sebagai prediktor komitmen organisasi. *Jurnal Psikologi Industri dan Organisasi*, 5(2), 112–126.
- Kurniawan, D. (2019). Pengaruh motivasi kerja dan budaya organisasi terhadap komitmen pegawai. *Jurnal Manajemen SDM*, 8(1), 77–89.
- Sari, P., & Yulianto, B. (2020). Keterlibatan kerja dan kinerja pegawai dalam organisasi kepolisian. *Jurnal Administrasi & Manajemen Publik*, 11(2), 55–70.
- Setiawan, A., & Hartono, E. (2021). Budaya organisasi dan komitmen organisasi di instansi kepolisian. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen*, 14(1), 23–38.
- Rahayu, S., & Pratama, I. (2019). Analisis hubungan keterlibatan kerja dengan produktivitas pegawai. *Jurnal Psikologi Industri*, 6(2), 99–115.

- Wijaya, M. (2020). Komitmen organisasi: Teori dan implementasi di sektor publik. *Jurnal Administrasi Negara*, 8(1), 45–60.
- Fauzi, A., & Yuniar, R. (2019). Hubungan budaya organisasi dengan kinerja pegawai. *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen*, 7(2), 120–135.
- Koesoema, R. (2021). Manajemen sumber daya manusia dan pengaruhnya terhadap kinerja. *Jurnal Ekonomi & Manajemen*, 12(1), 77–92.
- Susanti, E., & Hidayat, R. (2020). Pengaruh keterlibatan kerja terhadap komitmen organisasi. *Jurnal Psikologi Organisasi*, 9(2), 55–70.
- Prabowo, D. (2019). Budaya organisasi dan loyalitas pegawai: Studi pada instansi pemerintahan. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, 10(1), 15–30.
- Handayani, P., & Nugraha, A. (2020). Analisis komitmen organisasi di sektor kepolisian. *Jurnal Manajemen Publik*, 11(2), 101–115.
- Arifin, Z. (2019). Hubungan motivasi dan keterlibatan kerja dengan produktivitas pegawai. *Jurnal SDM dan Manajemen*, 6(1), 45–60.
- Utami, S., & Wibowo, B. (2021). Budaya organisasi dan kinerja pegawai: Kajian empiris. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Organisasi*, 13(2), 77–95.
- Nugroho, S. (2020). Komitmen organisasi dan loyalitas pegawai di instansi publik. *Jurnal Administrasi & Manajemen*, 9(1), 33–50.
- Rahman, F., & Lestari, D. (2019). Pengaruh keterlibatan kerja terhadap efektivitas pegawai. *Jurnal Psikologi Kerja*, 8(2), 88–102.
- Anwar, H. (2020). Manajemen sumber daya manusia dan pengembangan pegawai. *Jurnal Manajemen & SDM*, 11(1), 55–70.
- Putri, A., & Santoso, B. (2019). Budaya organisasi sebagai prediktor komitmen pegawai. *Jurnal Psikologi Organisasi*, 7(2), 101–115.
- Yulianto, R. (2020). Analisis hubungan keterlibatan kerja dan kinerja pegawai di sektor publik. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, 12(1), 45–60.
- Hidayat, M., & Saputra, T. (2019). Komitmen organisasi dan loyalitas pegawai: Studi empiris. *Jurnal Manajemen Publik*, 10(2), 77–90.
- Wibisono, A. (2021). Budaya organisasi dan kepuasan kerja sebagai faktor penguat komitmen pegawai. *Jurnal Psikologi Industri*, 9(1), 33–50.
- Prasetyo, D. (2020). Pengaruh keterlibatan kerja terhadap kinerja pegawai di instansi pemerintah. *Jurnal SDM dan Organisasi*, 11(2), 55–70.
- Sari, L., & Hadi, R. (2019). Hubungan budaya organisasi, motivasi, dan komitmen organisasi. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Organisasi*, 8(1), 45–60.
- Nugroho, P. (2021). Keterlibatan kerja dan loyalitas pegawai: Studi di instansi kepolisian. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, 13(2), 77–95.
- Fitriani, Y., & Prabowo, H. (2020). Analisis komitmen organisasi sebagai variabel penguatan kinerja. *Jurnal Manajemen SDM*, 10(1), 33–50.
- Gunawan, H. (2019). Budaya organisasi dan pengaruhnya terhadap produktivitas dan komitmen organisasi. *Jurnal Manajemen SDM*, 10(1), 23–36.