



A Survey-Based Multiple Regression Analysis of Recruitment, Selection, and Employee Performance at Al-Muhajirin Foundation Purwakarta

Deden Miftahul Falah*, Tasya Aspiranti^{ID}, Handri^{ID}
Universitas Islam Bandung, Indonesia

Received : May 14, 2026

Revised : July 8, 2026

Accepted : July 8, 2026

Online : July 13, 2026

Abstract

Human resource quality is a critical issue for education organizations because teaching, administration, and institutional service quality depend on placing employees in roles aligned with their competencies. This survey-based quantitative study examines statistical associations among recruitment, selection, and employee performance in an Islamic education foundation in Purwakarta, Indonesia. The study used a descriptive-verify design and multiple linear regression to examine two staffing predictors and one performance outcome. Data were collected via a structured questionnaire administered to 151 employees selected from a population of 491 using proportional stratified random sampling. Respondents were proportionally allocated across education/work-unit strata and randomly selected from the eligible employee list within each stratum. Recruitment, selection, and employee performance were measured with Likert-type indicators adapted from human resource management and performance literature. Instrument testing showed acceptable item validity and internal consistency, although the reliability values for selection and employee performance were marginal and were interpreted cautiously. Descriptive results indicate that recruitment was generally good but weakest in transparency; selection was generally good but weakest in objectivity; and employee performance was generally good but weakest in work quantity. Regression results indicate that recruitment was positively but not significantly associated with employee performance ($B = 0.145$; $p = 0.088$), whereas selection was positively and significantly associated with employee performance ($B = 0.349$; $p < 0.001$). Recruitment and selection jointly explained 29.7% of the variance in employee performance. The findings are interpreted as statistical associations rather than causal effects because the design was cross-sectional and self-reported.

Keywords: *Recruitment, Selection, Employee Performance, Human Resource Management, Education Foundation, Survey-Based Quantitative Analysis, Multiple Regression*

INTRODUCTION

Human resources remain central to organizational effectiveness, particularly in educational organizations, where service quality is linked to the competence, discipline, and role alignment of teachers and administrative personnel. In educational foundations, employees are not merely operational resources; they carry institutional values, uphold learning quality, ensure administrative continuity, and maintain public trust. When the process of attracting and choosing employees is weak, consequences may include mismatched teaching assignments, uneven work quality, reduced commitment, and difficulty maintaining service standards across multiple education units. Recruitment and selection are two interrelated but analytically distinct human resource management practices. Recruitment creates a pool of potential applicants through workforce planning, vacancy information, recruitment sources, and transparency. Selection filters that pool through administrative screening, competence assessment, interviews, and objective decision-making. Human capital and person-job fit perspectives suggest that staffing practices are associated with performance because they help align employee knowledge, skills, abilities, attitudes, and role requirements (Armstrong & Taylor, 2020; Dessler, 2020; Noe et al., 2020). In this sense, recruitment and selection are treated in this study as measurable staffing mechanisms rather

Copyright Holder:

© Deden, Tasya, & Sri. (2026)

Corresponding author's email: dens.miftahalfalah@gmail.com

This Article is Licensed Under:



than as evidence of direct causal improvement.

The practical problem addressed in this study is the persistence of non-procedural and not fully competency-based staffing practices in an Indonesian Islamic education foundation. Raw organizational data from 2025 show a large imbalance between procedural and non-procedural recruitment routes, with only 28 employees recruited through procedural routes and 109 through non-procedural routes. The same background data also indicate that several educators were not fully aligned with the required qualifications, especially in educational linearity, active and differentiated learning strategies, and digital learning media capability. These conditions indicate a practice gap because the organization requires competent employees to sustain educational quality, yet its recruitment and selection system has not fully institutionalized transparent, competency-based staffing. They also indicate an empirical and quantitative gap: previous staffing-performance studies have mostly examined healthcare-related service organizations, construction and related industries, fast-food service organizations, hospital organizations, and public-sector or state-owned organizational settings (Ahmad & Inrawati, 2023; Aldhuhoori et al., 2022; Dinanty & Firdaus, 2023; Hasry et al., 2025; Widayat et al., 2023). These sectoral patterns provide evidence that fewer studies have tested the separate statistical roles of recruitment and selection in Islamic education foundations. A theoretical gap also remains because many studies discuss staffing as a combined HRM practice, making it difficult to explain whether applicant attraction or competence-based filtering has stronger explanatory relevance for employee performance.

The study was conducted at Yayasan Al-Muhajirin, headquartered in Purwakarta, West Java, Indonesia. Although the foundation's administrative headquarters is in Purwakarta, it operates educational campuses across three regencies: Purwakarta, Subang, and Karawang. Therefore, references to these three locations throughout the manuscript describe the foundation's operational coverage rather than distinct research sites. The foundation manages 26 educational units across these campuses, employing 491 staff members and serving 6,482 students. For sampling purposes, however, the study used 19 education/work-unit strata because the institutional employee database consolidates several operational units into shared payroll, staffing, or campus-based administrative categories. Accordingly, the 26 educational units represent the foundation's operational structure, whereas the 19 strata reflect the administrative employee-grouping framework used for proportional sampling. This setting is distinctive because Islamic education foundations combine professional, pedagogical, administrative, and value-based expectations while often operating through multiple schools and campuses. The study is guided by four research questions: (1) How are recruitment practices perceived by employees at Yayasan Al-Muhajirin Purwakarta? (2) How are selection practices perceived by employees at the foundation? (3) How is employee performance perceived in the organization? (4) What are the partial and simultaneous statistical associations between recruitment, selection, and employee performance? Based on these questions, the objectives are to describe recruitment, selection, and employee performance and to test the partial and simultaneous associations among these variables. The contribution is mainly empirical, contextual, and applied-methodological: the study provides survey-based quantitative evidence from an Islamic education foundation, separates recruitment and selection as two predictors in one regression model, and offers cautious managerial implications based on statistical association rather than causal inference.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Human resource management views employees as strategic assets whose knowledge, skills, motivation, and behavioral contributions are linked to organizational effectiveness. The human capital perspective emphasizes that employees add value when their capabilities align with organizational needs (Noe et al., 2020). Person-job fit theory further explains that performance is

more likely when employees' competencies and preferences align with specific role requirements (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). Strategic HRM also suggests that recruitment and selection should be aligned with institutional goals rather than treated as routine administrative procedures. In educational organizations, this alignment involves pedagogical capability, administrative discipline, technological adaptability, workload readiness, and value congruence. In this study, recruitment is conceptualized through recruitment planning, vacancy information, sources and methods, and transparency. These dimensions capture whether the organization clearly identifies staffing needs, communicates requirements, uses appropriate channels, and applies open procedures.

The mechanism linking recruitment to employee performance is indirect, operating through the quality of the applicant pool. Clear recruitment planning and vacancy information can attract candidates whose qualifications, motivation, and expectations align more closely with job requirements (Breugh, 2008; Chapman et al., 2005). However, recruitment alone may show limited statistical association with performance when non-procedural routes, unclear criteria, or informal recommendations remain influential. For this reason, examining recruitment separately from selection provides additional explanatory value: recruitment reflects attraction and access to qualified candidates, while selection reflects assessment and final matching. This distinction is important in an education foundation, where transparency is not only a procedural issue but also a trust-building mechanism for employees and applicants.

Selection is the process of identifying suitable candidates from an applicant pool using criteria, instruments, and decision rules aligned with job requirements. In this study, selection is measured through administrative selection, competency tests, interviews, and objectivity. Administrative selection assesses document completeness and educational match. Competency tests assess technical, pedagogical, and supporting skills. Interviews assess personality, professional attitude, commitment, and organizational fit. Objectivity assesses whether decisions are based on competence rather than personal closeness and whether all candidates go through comparable stages. Compared with recruitment, selection is theoretically closer to performance because it directly concerns competence assessment, person-job fitness, and placement decisions (Sackett et al., 2022; Schmidt & Hunter, 1998).

Employee performance is treated as a multidimensional construct encompassing quality, quantity, timeliness, and responsibility of work (Bernardin & Russell, 2019; Koopmans et al., 2014; Pradhan & Jena, 2017). Quality refers to the accuracy, conformity to standards, and usefulness of completed work. Quantity concerns the amount of work completed relative to workload and targets. Timeliness concerns completing duties according to schedule. Responsibility concerns commitment, awareness of duties, and readiness to accept evaluation and improve. These dimensions are appropriate for educational organizations because performance is not only output-based but also behavioral and process-oriented. The theoretical framework therefore assumes that recruitment is associated with performance through applicant-pool quality, while selection is associated with performance through competence assessment and person-job fit. Multiple linear regression is appropriate because the study tests the separate and combined statistical associations of two independent staffing variables with a continuous performance variable.

Previous studies generally support a positive relationship between staffing practices and performance, though findings vary by sector, design, and variables. Ahmad and Inrawati (2023) examined a healthcare-related service organization and reported a significant relationship between recruitment and performance. Aldhuhoori et al. (2022) studied construction and related industries and found that recruitment, selection, and training practices were related to employee performance. Dinanty and Firdaus (2023) used a quantitative design in a fast-food service context and reported simultaneous staffing-performance relationships. Widayat et al. (2023), however,

found that selection was significant while recruitment was not, suggesting that filtering and matching may be more relevant than attraction alone. This pattern shows that recruitment and selection should not be assumed to play equal statistical roles. Accordingly, the study tests the following non-causal hypotheses: H1: Recruitment is positively associated with employee performance. H2: Selection is positively associated with employee performance. H3: Recruitment and selection are simultaneously associated with employee performance.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study used an applied quantitative research design with descriptive and verificative purposes (Creswell & Creswell, 2023; Sekaran & Bougie, 2020). It is applied because it examines a real staffing problem in an education foundation and aims to provide practical recommendations for human resource processes (Saunders et al., 2019). It is descriptive because it measures the current perceived state of recruitment, selection, and employee performance. It is verificative because it tests statistical associations among variables using multiple linear regression (Field, 2018; Hair et al., 2019). The research site was Yayasan Al-Muhajirin Purwakarta, an Islamic education foundation in West Java, Indonesia. The foundation's headquarters and main administrative functions are in Purwakarta, while its education services extend across campuses in Purwakarta, Subang, and Karawang. The organization operates multiple education units from early childhood through higher education and has a complex staffing structure. The study population consisted of all 491 foundation employees, including teachers, educational personnel, and administrative staff. Because the population was heterogeneous across units, proportional stratified random sampling was used to improve representation across work units (Etikan & Bala, 2017; Sekaran & Bougie, 2020).

The sample size was calculated using Slovin's formula for a population of 491 and a 6.77% margin of error, yielding a sample of 151 respondents (Tejada & Punzalan, 2012). This margin of error was chosen to yield a feasible sample size while keeping the sample above 30% of the population and maintaining proportional representation across education units. Slovin's formula was retained because the study was based on a known finite population and an applied institutional survey; however, this choice is acknowledged as less rigorous than a statistical power analysis for multiple regression. A post hoc interpretation should therefore consider that the sample was adequate for the two-predictor regression model but was not originally determined through power-analysis assumptions about expected effect size, alpha, and statistical power. The sample was distributed proportionally across strata based on education/work units. Each stratum's sample allocation was calculated by dividing the stratum population by the total population and multiplying the result by the total sample size of 151. The formula used was: $n_i = (N_i / N) \times n$, where n_i refers to the sample size for each stratum, N_i refers to the population size of each stratum, N refers to the total population of 491 employees, and n refers to the total sample of 151 respondents. The sample allocation followed the largest-remainder method: each decimal allocation was first rounded down, and remaining samples were then assigned to strata with the largest decimal remainders until the planned total reached 151 respondents. During data collection, however, SMK Kampus 3 could provide only 2 accessible respondents, although its proportional target was 5. The three unfilled respondents from SMK Kampus 3 were redistributed to accessible strata while maintaining the final sample of 151 respondents, namely Daycare (+1), SD Plus 2 (+1), and MTs Kampus Pusat (+1). Therefore, the revised target sample and final respondent count in Table 1a were adjusted to match the actual respondent profile reported in Table 2. After the proportional sample allocation was determined, eligible employees in each stratum were listed using the institutional employee database. Each eligible employee was assigned a number, and respondents were randomly selected within each stratum using a random-number procedure until the required

quota for that stratum was reached. If a selected employee declined or could not be reached, another employee from the same stratum was randomly selected as a replacement, when available, to preserve proportional representation.

Table 1a. Sampling Procedure and Proportional Allocation

Stratum / Education or Work Unit	Population Size (N_i)	Proportional Allocation Formula	Decimal Allocation	Remainder	Revised Target Sample	Final Respondent Count
Daycare	5	$(5 / 491) \times 151$	1.54	0.54	2	2
Playgroup	6	$(6 / 491) \times 151$	1.85	0.85	2	2
RTM 2 Pesona	6	$(6 / 491) \times 151$	1.85	0.85	2	2
TK	10	$(10 / 491) \times 151$	3.07	0.07	3	3
TPA RTM 2	10	$(10 / 491) \times 151$	3.07	0.07	3	3
MI Kampus 4	20	$(20 / 491) \times 151$	6.15	0.15	6	6
SD Plus 1	75	$(75 / 491) \times 151$	23.06	0.06	23	23
SD Plus 2	70	$(70 / 491) \times 151$	21.53	0.53	22	22
SD Plus 3	25	$(25 / 491) \times 151$	7.69	0.69	8	8
MTs Kampus 4	22	$(22 / 491) \times 151$	6.77	0.77	7	7
MTs Kampus Pusat	28	$(28 / 491) \times 151$	8.61	0.61	9	9
SMP Fullday	62	$(62 / 491) \times 151$	19.07	0.07	19	19
SMP Kampus 3	42	$(42 / 491) \times 151$	12.92	0.92	13	13
SMP Kampus Pusat	30	$(30 / 491) \times 151$	9.23	0.23	9	9
MA Kampus Pusat	22	$(22 / 491) \times 151$	6.77	0.77	7	7
SMA Fullday	12	$(12 / 491) \times 151$	3.69	0.69	4	4
SMA Kampus Pusat	25	$(25 / 491) \times 151$	7.69	0.69	8	8

SMK Kampus 3	15	$(15 / 491) \times 151$	4.61	0.61	2	2
STAI Al- Muhajirin	6	$(6 / 491) \times 151$	1.85	0.85	2	2
Total	491				151	151

Note= The sample allocation was determined using the largest-remainder method. Each stratum's proportional allocation was first calculated using $n_i = (N_i / N) \times n$. The initial integer allocation was obtained by rounding each value down. The remaining samples were then distributed to strata with the largest decimal remainders until the total sample reached 151. After data collection, the final respondent count was adjusted because SMK Kampus 3 contributed only 2 accessible respondents instead of the proportional target of 5. The three unfilled respondents were redistributed to accessible strata, namely Daycare, SD Plus 2, and MTs Kampus Pusat, so the final respondent count remained 151 and matched the respondent profile in Table 2. This method was applied consistently to avoid disproportionate allocation caused by mixed rounding and to report the actual respondent distribution transparently.

The measurement indicators were adapted from the study's research model's conceptual frameworks and operationalized according to the dimensions proposed by their respective theoretical sources. Recruitment (X_1) was measured using four dimensions—recruitment planning, job vacancy information, recruitment sources and methods, and recruitment transparency—adapted from Dessler's (2020) human resource management framework. Selection (X_2) was operationalized through four dimensions—administrative screening, competency testing, interviews, and objectivity and fairness in selection—adapted from the employee selection framework proposed by Noe et al. (2020). Employee Performance (Y) was measured using four dimensions—work quality, work quantity, timeliness, and responsibility—based on the multidimensional employee performance framework developed by Bernardin and Russell (2019).

To improve contextual relevance while preserving the conceptual meaning of the original constructs, the questionnaire items were adapted to the operational characteristics of Yayasan Al-Muhajirin, an educational foundation. Recruitment indicators were contextualized to reflect workforce planning based on the staffing needs of education units, transparent vacancy announcements, foundation recruitment channels, and the foundation's recruitment procedures. Selection indicators were modified to reflect recruitment practices applicable to educational personnel, including administrative document screening, competency assessments for teaching and administrative duties, structured interviews, and objective selection decisions based on qualifications and institutional requirements. Employee performance indicators were similarly adapted to evaluate the performance of teachers and administrative staff, emphasizing the quality of instructional and administrative work, workload completion, timeliness in fulfilling academic and administrative responsibilities, and accountability in carrying out duties within the educational foundation. These contextual adaptations preserved the original theoretical dimensions while ensuring that the measurement instrument accurately reflected the organizational characteristics of the education-foundation setting.

Instrument validity was assessed using corrected item-total correlations. Items were considered acceptable when item-total correlations were positive, statistically significant, and substantively interpretable. The commonly used practical minimum of 0.30 served as the main reference, and the lowest employee-performance item (0.2785) was retained because it remained statistically significant and represented a theoretically required performance dimension. Reliability was assessed using Cronbach's alpha. Cronbach's alpha values were 0.709 for recruitment, 0.630 for selection, and 0.644 for employee performance. These values meet the minimum threshold of

0.60 for exploratory applied organizational research, but the selection and employee-performance scales are interpreted cautiously because their reliability values are marginal (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994; Taber, 2018).

The data analysis consisted of descriptive statistics, instrument testing, common-method-bias consideration, classical assumption tests, and multiple linear regression (Field, 2018; Hair et al., 2019). Descriptive statistics were used to calculate mean scores and standard deviations for each variable and dimension and to classify responses into four categories: very low/not good, low/not good, high/good, and very high/very good. Normality was assessed using Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests on unstandardized residuals (Ghasemi & Zahediasl, 2012). Multicollinearity was assessed using tolerance and the variance inflation factor (VIF). Heteroskedasticity was assessed using the Glejser test on absolute residuals. Heteroskedasticity was considered absent when the Glejser test significance values for all independent variables were greater than 0.05. Alternatively, if scatterplot inspection was used, heteroskedasticity was considered absent when residual points were randomly distributed above and below zero without forming a clear funnel, wave, or systematic pattern. Linearity was assessed through residual diagnostics. The relationship was considered linear when the linearity significance value was below 0.05 and the deviation-from-linearity value was above 0.05, or when the residual plot showed no curved pattern. Multiple linear regression was used because the study examined two independent variables, recruitment and selection, in relation to one continuous dependent variable, employee performance (Hair et al., 2019). The regression model was specified as $Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + e$, where Y is employee performance, X_1 is recruitment, X_2 is selection, a is the constant, b_1 and b_2 are regression coefficients, and e is the error term.

Hypothesis testing used the t-test for partial associations and the F-test for simultaneous associations at the 5% significance level (Field, 2018; Hair et al., 2019). The coefficient of determination was used to assess how much variance in employee performance was statistically explained by recruitment and selection. Confidence intervals were included with the coefficients to complement p-values and support practical interpretation. Because all variables were collected from the same respondents via self-report questionnaires, common method bias was addressed through procedural remedies: anonymity, aggregate reporting, clear item wording, and separation of constructs into distinct questionnaire sections. A formal statistical common-method test was not available in the raw output used for the blind manuscript; therefore, this issue is discussed as a limitation. Ethical considerations were addressed through voluntary participation, informed consent, aggregate reporting, respondent confidentiality, and institutional permission. Because the article is prepared as a blind manuscript, no author-identifying information or institutional approval identifier is included; if required by the journal, the ethics approval or exemption status should be inserted after peer review.

Table 1b. Measurement Variables and Dimensions

Variable	Operational Definition	Dimensions (Source)	Sample Measurement Items	No. of Items	Scale
Recruitment (Dessler, 2020)	Employees' perception of the foundation's recruitment process in attracting qualified	Recruitment Planning; Vacancy Information; Recruitment Sources & Methods;	"Staffing needs are planned before recruitment begins." "Vacancy announcements clearly describe qualification requirements." "Recruitment follows	12	Four-point Likert

	personnel according to organizational staffing needs.	Recruitment Transparency	transparent procedures established by the foundation."		
Selection (Noe et al., 2020)	Employees' perception of the fairness and quality of the employee selection process.	Administrative Screening; Competency Testing; Interview; Objectivity and Fairness	"Applicant qualifications are screened according to established criteria." "Competency tests reflect the requirements of the position." "Selection decisions are based on competence rather than personal relationships."	12	Four-point Likert
Employee Performance (Bernardin & Russell, 2019)	Employees' perceived achievement of expected work standards within the education foundation.	Work Quality; Work Quantity; Timeliness; Responsibility	"I complete my teaching/administrative duties according to quality standards." "I meet assigned workload targets." "I complete my responsibilities within the required time."	12	Four-point Likert

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Respondent Profile

The study included 151 employees of Yayasan Al-Muhajirin Purwakarta. Respondents came from different educational units within the foundation, including early childhood, primary, secondary, and higher education units. This distribution reflects the foundation's organizational structure, which spans multiple educational levels and requires employees with diverse work responsibilities and competency profiles (Armstrong & Taylor, 2020; Noe et al., 2020). Only age and organizational unit were available in the raw dataset; gender, education level, tenure, employment status, and job position were unavailable and are acknowledged as a limitation of respondent-profile reporting.

Table 2. Respondent Profile

Characteristic	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Age	20-30 years	57	37.75%
Age	31-40 years	67	44.37%
Age	41-50 years	18	11.92%
Age	51-60 years	9	5.96%
Organizational unit	Daycare	2	1.32%
Organizational unit	Playgroup	2	1.32%
Organizational unit	RTM 2 Pesona	2	1.32%
Organizational unit	TK	3	1.99%
Organizational unit	TPA RTM 2	3	1.99%
Organizational unit	MI Kampus 4	6	3.97%
Organizational unit	SD Plus 1	23	15.23%
Organizational unit	SD Plus 2	22	14.57%
Organizational unit	SD Plus 3	8	5.30%
Organizational unit	MTs Kampus 4	7	4.64%
Organizational unit	MTs Kampus Pusat	9	5.96%
Organizational unit	SMP Fullday	19	12.58%

Organizational unit	SMP Kampus 3	13	8.61%
Organizational unit	SMP Kampus Pusat	9	5.96%
Organizational unit	MA Kampus Pusat	7	4.64%
Organizational unit	SMA Fullday	4	2.65%
Organizational unit	SMA Kampus Pusat	8	5.30%
Organizational unit	SMK Kampus 3	2	1.32%
Organizational unit	STAI Al-Muhajirin	2	1.32%
Total		151	100.00%

The respondent profile shows that most employees were in productive age groups. The largest group was respondents aged 31–40 years, representing 67 employees or 44.37% of the sample, followed by respondents aged 20–30 years, representing 57 employees or 37.75%. Together, these two groups accounted for more than 80% of respondents. This indicates that the foundation is supported mainly by employees who are still in active career-development stages and are likely to be adaptable to organizational change, professional development, and performance improvement initiatives (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Noe et al., 2020).

Respondents aged 41–50 years accounted for 18 employees (11.92%), while those aged 51–60 years accounted for 9 employees (5.96%). Although smaller in number, these older groups may contribute organizational experience, work maturity, and institutional memory (Armstrong & Taylor, 2020). In the context of recruitment and selection, this age composition is important because a predominantly productive-age workforce requires a staffing system that ensures role fit, competence alignment, and long-term performance development (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005; Noe et al., 2020). The additional respondent profile shows that the sample spans multiple organizational units, with the largest respondent groups from SD Plus 1, SD Plus 2, and SMP Fullday. Because the raw dataset contained only age and organizational-unit information, the absence of gender, education level, tenure, employment status, and job-position data is treated as a demographic reporting limitation rather than as a substantive characteristic of the sample.

Validity and Reliability Test Results

Before conducting regression analysis, the research instrument was tested for validity using corrected item-total correlations (Hair et al., 2019; Taherdoost, 2016). The primary acceptance criterion was a positive, statistically significant item-total correlation, with approximately 0.30 used as the practical reference threshold for acceptable item discrimination in this applied organizational survey. Items slightly below this practical threshold were retained only if they were statistically significant and represented a theoretically required dimension of the construct. To provide clearer evidence of item-level validity, the corrected item-total correlation for each questionnaire item is reported below rather than only presenting the range of correlations.

Table 3. Item-Level Validity Test Results

Variable	Item Code	Dimension	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Interpretation
Recruitment	X1.1	Planning	0.4510 (p = 0.000)	Valid
Recruitment	X1.2	Planning	0.4024 (p = 0.000)	Valid
Recruitment	X1.3	Planning	0.6281 (p = 0.000)	Valid
Recruitment	X1.4	Vacancy information	0.4422 (p = 0.000)	Valid
Recruitment	X1.5	Vacancy information	0.4579 (p = 0.000)	Valid
Recruitment	X1.6	Vacancy information	0.3067 (p = 0.000)	Valid
Recruitment	X1.7	Sources and methods	0.4389 (p = 0.000)	Valid
Recruitment	X1.8	Sources and methods	0.3848 (p = 0.000)	Valid
Recruitment	X1.9	Sources and methods	0.5324 (p = 0.000)	Valid

Recruitment	X1.10	Transparency	0.6327 (p = 0.000)	Valid
Recruitment	X1.11	Transparency	0.5558 (p = 0.000)	Valid
Recruitment	X1.12	Transparency	0.6044 (p = 0.000)	Valid
Selection	X2.13	Administrative selection	0.3726 (p = 0.000)	Valid
Selection	X2.14	Administrative selection	0.4542 (p = 0.000)	Valid
Selection	X2.15	Administrative selection	0.3725 (p = 0.000)	Valid
Selection	X2.16	Competency test	0.4466 (p = 0.000)	Valid
Selection	X2.17	Competency test	0.5123 (p = 0.000)	Valid
Selection	X2.18	Competency test	0.3984 (p = 0.000)	Valid
Selection	X2.19	Interview	0.4552 (p = 0.000)	Valid
Selection	X2.20	Interview	0.4835 (p = 0.000)	Valid
Selection	X2.21	Interview	0.3873 (p = 0.000)	Valid
Selection	X2.22	Objectivity	0.4813 (p = 0.000)	Valid
Selection	X2.23	Objectivity	0.4039 (p = 0.000)	Valid
Selection	X2.24	Objectivity	0.5569 (p = 0.000)	Valid
Employee Performance	Y.25	Quality of work	0.3341 (p = 0.000)	Valid
Employee Performance	Y.26	Quality of work	0.2785 (p = 0.001)	Marginal but retained
Employee Performance	Y.27	Quality of work	0.3904 (p = 0.000)	Valid
Employee Performance	Y.28	Quantity of work	0.4436 (p = 0.000)	Valid
Employee Performance	Y.29	Quantity of work	0.2963 (p = 0.000)	Marginal but retained
Employee Performance	Y.30	Quantity of work	0.3911 (p = 0.000)	Valid
Employee Performance	Y.31	Timeliness	0.3991 (p = 0.000)	Valid
Employee Performance	Y.32	Timeliness	0.3590 (p = 0.000)	Valid
Employee Performance	Y.33	Timeliness	0.3692 (p = 0.000)	Valid
Employee Performance	Y.34	Responsibility	0.4190 (p = 0.000)	Valid
Employee Performance	Y.35	Responsibility	0.3531 (p = 0.000)	Valid
Employee Performance	Y.36	Responsibility	0.3701 (p = 0.000)	Valid

The validity test results indicate that all questionnaire items were statistically significant, though not all met the practical item-discrimination threshold of 0.30. Recruitment item-total correlations ranged from 0.3067 to 0.6327, and selection item-total correlations ranged from 0.3725 to 0.5569, both meeting the practical threshold. Employee-performance item-total correlations ranged from 0.2785 to 0.4436. Items Y.26 (0.2785) and Y.29 (0.2963) were marginal because their item-total correlations were below 0.30, although both remained statistically significant. These items were retained because they represented theoretically required performance dimensions related to work quality and work quantity, but they should be refined in future instrument development rather than interpreted as strong evidence of validity. Overall, the validity results show that the questionnaire items were suitable for further analysis, although some

performance items would benefit from refinement in future studies (Hair et al., 2019; Taherdoost, 2016).

Reliability Test Results

Reliability testing was conducted using Cronbach's alpha to assess the internal consistency of the research instrument (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994; Taber, 2018; Taherdoost, 2016). A Cronbach's alpha value above 0.60 was considered acceptable for this exploratory applied organizational study, whereas values below 0.70 were deemed marginal and warranted caution.

Table 4. Reliability Test Results

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	Threshold	Interpretation
Recruitment	0.709	0.6	Reliable
Selection	0.63	0.6	Reliable
Employee Performance	0.644	0.6	Reliable

The reliability results indicate that all variables meet the minimum acceptable reliability threshold. Recruitment had the highest Cronbach's Alpha at 0.709, indicating acceptable internal consistency. Selection had a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.630, and employee performance had a value of 0.644. These two values are marginal; therefore, regression findings involving selection and employee performance should be interpreted cautiously. The scales were retained because they exceeded the minimum exploration threshold, were theoretically grounded, and were supported by statistically significant item-total correlations. Future research should refine the weaker items and may report additional reliability indicators, such as composite reliability, when the measurement model and data structure permit.

Descriptive Summary of Study Variables

Descriptive analysis was conducted to describe the perceived state of recruitment, selection, and employee performance (Creswell & Creswell, 2023; Sekaran & Bougie, 2020). The study used a four-point Likert scale. Interpretation categories were based on the following score ranges: 1.00–1.75 = very low/not good, 1.76–2.50 = low/not good, 2.51–3.25 = high/good, and 3.26–4.00 = very high/very good. In addition to mean scores, standard deviations are reported to indicate the degree of response dispersion for each dimension.

Table 5. Descriptive Summary of Study Variables

Variable	Dimension	Mean	Standard Deviation	Category
Recruitment	Recruitment planning	2.53	0.64	Good
Recruitment	Vacancy information	2.54	0.66	Good
Recruitment	Sources and methods	2.55	0.69	Good
Recruitment	Transparency	2.49	0.70	Not good
Recruitment	Overall	2.52	0.67	Good
Selection	Administrative selection	2.69	0.68	Good
Selection	Competency test	2.57	0.66	Good
Selection	Interview	2.73	0.67	Good
Selection	Objectivity	2.54	0.67	Good
Selection	Overall	2.63	0.67	Good

Employee Performance	Quality of work	2.71	0.69	Good
Employee Performance	Quantity of work	2.44	0.77	Not good
Employee Performance	Timeliness	2.72	0.71	Good
Employee Performance	Responsibility	2.77	0.71	Good
Employee Performance	Overall	2.66	0.73	Good

The descriptive results indicate that recruitment was generally perceived as good, with an overall mean score of 2.52. However, this score is near the lower boundary of the good category. Among the recruitment dimensions, sources and methods had the highest score of 2.55, while transparency had the lowest score of 2.49 and fell into the not-good category. This suggests that although recruitment procedures exist, employees still perceive weaknesses in openness, fairness, and clarity of recruitment decisions (Breugh, 2008; Chapman et al., 2005; Ployhart & Weekley, 2023). Standard deviation values should be used to assess whether employee responses were relatively consistent or varied widely across respondents.

Selection was also perceived as good, with an overall mean score of 2.63. The highest dimension was interview, with a mean score of 2.73, followed by administrative selection with 2.69. The lowest dimension was objectivity, with a mean score of 2.54. Although objectivity remained in the good category, its relatively low position indicates that the foundation still needs to strengthen merit-based and standardized selection decisions (Sackett et al., 2022; Schmidt & Hunter, 1998).

Employee performance had an overall mean score of 2.66, indicating that respondents perceived their performance as generally good. The strongest dimension was responsibility, with a mean score of 2.77, followed by timeliness with 2.72 and quality of work with 2.71. The weakest dimension was quantity of work, with a mean score of 2.44, which fell into the not-good category. This suggests that employees may demonstrate responsibility and timeliness, but the volume of work completed relative to workload and targets remains a managerial issue (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Koopmans et al., 2014; Pradhan & Jena, 2017).

Classical Assumption Test Summary

Classical assumption testing was conducted before multiple linear regression analysis (Field, 2018; Hair et al., 2019). The tests included normality, multicollinearity, autocorrelation, heteroskedasticity, and linearity/residual behavior. The assumption tests were reported in greater detail to clarify whether the regression model met the minimum diagnostic requirements for interpretation.

Table 6. Classical Assumption Test Summary

Test	Result	Decision
Normality	Kolmogorov-Smirnov $p = 0.080$; Shapiro-Wilk $p = 0.114$	Residuals normally distributed
Multicollinearity	Recruitment: tolerance = 0.425; VIF = 2.353; Selection: tolerance = 0.425; VIF = 2.353	No multicollinearity for either predictor
Autocorrelation indication	Durbin-Watson = 1.964	No serious autocorrelation indication
Potential clustering	Respondents came from multiple education units	Unit-level clustering not modeled; noted

		as limitation
Heteroskedasticity (Glejser)	Recruitment p = 0.424; Selection p = 0.163	No heteroskedasticity indicated
Linearity / residual diagnostic	Separate formal linearity statistics were not available; residual-diagnostic review did not indicate a clear curved pattern	Linearity interpreted cautiously; noted as reporting limitation

The normality test showed that the Kolmogorov-Smirnov significance value was 0.080 and the Shapiro-Wilk significance value was 0.114. Since both values were greater than 0.05, the residuals were normally distributed. The multicollinearity test was reported separately for each predictor: recruitment had tolerance = 0.425 and VIF = 2.353, and selection had tolerance = 0.425 and VIF = 2.353. Since both tolerance values were above 0.10 and both VIF values were below 10, there was no indication of serious multicollinearity between recruitment and selection (Hair et al., 2019). The Durbin-Watson value was 1.964, indicating no serious autocorrelation. Heteroskedasticity was tested using the Glejser procedure by regressing the absolute residual value on recruitment and selection. The results showed that recruitment had a significance value of 0.424 and selection had a significance value of 0.163. Because both values were greater than 0.05, the model did not show heteroskedasticity problems, and the residual variance can be treated as homogeneous. A separate formal linearity statistic was not available in the raw thesis file; therefore, linearity was interpreted from the regression specification and residual-diagnostic review, and the absence of a separate statistic is acknowledged as a reporting limitation. Overall, the reported assumptions support the use of multiple linear regression, while the limitation related to unit-level clustering is acknowledged because respondents came from multiple education units.

Regression Results

Multiple linear regression was used to assess the statistical associations among recruitment, selection, and employee performance (Field, 2018; Hair et al., 2019). The regression equation was formulated as follows:

$$Y = 17.394 + 0.145X_1 + 0.349X_2$$

where Y represents employee performance, X_1 represents recruitment, and X_2 represents selection.

Table 7. Multiple Linear Regression Results

Predictor	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	95% CI	Tolerance	VIF
Constant	17.394	1.969		8.836	0.000	[13.504, 21.284]		
Recruitment	0.145	0.084	0.182	1.720	0.088	[-0.021, 0.311]	0.425	2.353
Selection	0.349	0.094	0.395	3.734	0.000	[0.163, 0.535]	0.425	2.353

The regression results show that recruitment had a positive coefficient of 0.145. This indicates that higher perceived recruitment quality was associated with higher perceived employee performance, but the association was not statistically significant ($t(148) = 1.720$; $p = 0.088$; 95% CI [-0.021, 0.311]). Therefore, H1 was not supported. Selection had a positive coefficient of 0.349 and was statistically significant ($t(148) = 3.734$; $p < 0.001$; 95% CI [0.163, 0.535]). The standardized beta for selection was 0.395, higher than the standardized beta for recruitment at 0.182. This indicates that selection had the stronger statistical relationship with employee performance in this

model. The confidence interval for recruitment includes zero, whereas the confidence interval for selection does not, which strengthens the interpretation that selection is the more practically relevant staffing variable in this dataset (Sackett et al., 2022; Schmidt & Hunter, 1998; Widayat et al., 2023).

Model Summary and Simultaneous Test

The model summary and the simultaneous test were used to assess the regression model's overall explanatory power and to determine whether recruitment and selection were jointly associated with employee performance (Field, 2018; Hair et al., 2019).

Table 8. Model Summary and Simultaneous Test

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	F	df	Sig.
0.545	0.297	0.288	2.649	31.332	2, 148	0.000

The R value of 0.545 indicates a moderate relationship between recruitment, selection, and employee performance. The R Square value of 0.297 means that recruitment and selection jointly explained 29.7% of the variance in employee performance, while the adjusted R Square value of 0.288 indicates a slightly lower estimate after accounting for model complexity. The remaining 70.3% was not explained by the model and may relate to leadership, training, motivation, compensation, workload, organizational culture, supervision, work environment, and other factors (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; DeNisi & Murphy, 2017; Noe et al., 2020). This unexplained variance is important because it limits the managerial interpretation of the model and shows that staffing variables alone cannot fully account for employee performance.

The F value was 31.332 with $df = 2$ and 148, and the significance value was below 0.001. Because the significance value was below 0.05, recruitment and selection were simultaneously associated with employee performance. This means that even though recruitment was not significant when tested separately, the combined staffing model still had statistically significant explanatory power. The result should be interpreted as evidence of a statistical association in cross-sectional survey data, not as proof that recruitment and selection caused changes in performance (Aldhuhoori et al., 2022; Dinanty & Firdaus, 2023).

Hypothesis

The hypothesis testing summary presents the final decision for each hypothesis based on the regression and simultaneous test results.

Table 9. Hypothesis Testing Summary

Hypothesis	Statistical Evidence	Decision
H1: Recruitment is positively associated with employee performance	$B = 0.145$; $t(148) = 1.720$; $p = 0.088$; 95% CI [-0.021, 0.311]	Not supported
H2: Selection is positively associated with employee performance	$B = 0.349$; $t(148) = 3.734$; $p < 0.001$; 95% CI [0.163, 0.535]	Supported
H3: Recruitment and selection are simultaneously associated with employee performance	$F(2, 148) = 31.332$; $p < 0.001$; $R^2 = 0.297$	Supported

The hypothesis testing results show that H1 was not supported. Recruitment had a positive coefficient, but its association with employee performance was not statistically significant. This finding indicates that, as currently perceived by respondents, recruitment was not a strong independent correlate of employee performance. This may be related to the descriptive finding that recruitment transparency was the weakest recruitment dimension ([Breugh, 2008](#); [Ployhart & Weekley, 2023](#)).

H2 was supported. Selection had a positive and significant association with employee performance. This means that better administrative screening, competency testing, interviews, and objective selection practices were associated with higher employee performance. The finding is consistent with the view that selection is a more immediate staffing stage because it concerns competence assessment, person-job fit, and placement suitability ([Kristof-Brown et al., 2005](#); [Sackett et al., 2022](#); [Schmidt & Hunter, 1998](#)).

H3 was supported. Recruitment and selection were simultaneously associated with employee performance. This indicates that staffing practices remain important as a combined human resource management system. However, the R Square value of 29.7% also shows that employee performance is related to many factors beyond recruitment and selection, so the model should not be interpreted deterministically ([Aldhuhoori et al., 2022](#); [Bakker & Demerouti, 2017](#); [Noe et al., 2020](#)).

Discussion

The findings indicate that recruitment, selection, and employee performance were generally perceived positively, yet each variable still had weak dimensions. Recruitment was weakest in transparency, selection in objectivity, and employee performance in work quantity. Including standard deviations offers additional insight into the spread of respondent perceptions across these dimensions. A high standard deviation suggests varied employee perceptions rather than a uniform organizational condition. These weaknesses are conceptually connected. When recruitment transparency and selection objectivity are not fully institutionalized, the organization may struggle to ensure consistent role fit and workload alignment ([Breugh, 2008](#); [Kristof-Brown et al., 2005](#); [Sackett et al., 2022](#)). Because the data are cross-sectional and self-reported, these connections should be read as theoretical interpretations of statistical patterns rather than causal claims.

The non-significant recruitment coefficient suggests that recruitment alone was insufficient to demonstrate a measurable, independent relationship with employee performance in this model. Recruitment may help attract candidates, but its statistical relevance depends on clear qualification standards, transparent procedures, and consistent decision-making ([Chapman et al., 2005](#); [Ployhart & Weekley, 2023](#)). This finding differs from studies reporting a significant recruitment-performance relationship, but it is understandable in the foundation context, as the descriptive results show that recruitment transparency remained weak ([Ahmad & Inrawati, 2023](#); [Hasry et al., 2025](#)). In other words, recruitment may exist in practice, but its quality may not yet be strong enough to correspond with measurable performance differences.

Selection, in contrast, showed a statistically significant association with employee performance. This finding supports the staffing-performance logic that selection is closer to actual work performance because it assesses whether candidates possess the competencies required for the position ([Sackett et al., 2022](#); [Schmidt & Hunter, 1998](#)). In an Islamic education foundation, selection is especially important because employees must demonstrate not only general work ability but also educational competence, professional attitude, commitment, and alignment with institutional values ([Armstrong & Taylor, 2020](#); [Noe et al., 2020](#)). The practical significance is that a one-unit increase in perceived selection quality was associated with a 0.349-unit increase in perceived employee performance, holding recruitment constant. This coefficient should be

interpreted as an association, not a causal effect.

The simultaneous association of recruitment and selection indicates that both practices should be managed as an integrated staffing system. Recruitment concerns the size and quality of the applicant pool, while selection concerns which candidates are accepted and placed (Breaugh, 2008; Dessler, 2020). If recruitment is weak, selection has fewer qualified candidates to assess. If selection is weak, recruitment cannot be expected to translate into better performance, even when many applicants are attracted. Therefore, the foundation should not treat recruitment and selection as separate administrative stages but as connected mechanisms that support person-job fit (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005; Ployhart & Weekley, 2023).

The R-squared of 29.7% indicates that recruitment and selection explain a meaningful but limited share of the variance in employee performance. This finding confirms that performance is multidimensional. Staffing quality matters, but performance is also associated with training, leadership, motivation, compensation, supervision, workload, organizational culture, and career development (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; DeNisi & Murphy, 2017; Koopmans et al., 2014; Pradhan & Jena, 2017). The low work-quantity score suggests that staffing recommendations should be accompanied by workload analysis, clearer performance targets, and continuous employee development. Potential clustering across education units was not modeled, so unit-level differences should be examined in future research. The completed regression diagnostics support the interpretation of the regression model because the residuals were normally distributed, multicollinearity was not indicated for either predictor, and the Glejser test did not indicate heteroskedasticity. However, the absence of a separate formal linearity statistic remains a reporting limitation; therefore, the linearity assumption should be interpreted with caution based on the residual diagnostics.

Overall, the study provides applied quantitative evidence that selection is more statistically relevant than recruitment in explaining employee performance at Yayasan Al-Muhajirin Purwakarta. The implication is that the foundation should prioritize objective, competence-based, and standardized selection procedures while also improving recruitment transparency (Sackett et al., 2022; Schmidt & Hunter, 1998). These recommendations align directly with the empirical findings: transparency was the weakest recruitment dimension, objectivity was the weakest selection dimension, and selection was the significant staffing variable in the regression model. Any managerial implementation should be evaluated further before claims are made about performance improvement or organizational outcomes.

CONCLUSIONS

This study examined recruitment, selection, and employee performance at Yayasan Al-Muhajirin Purwakarta and tested both partial and simultaneous statistical associations among these variables. The first research question concerned recruitment practices. The findings show that recruitment was generally perceived as good, with an overall mean score of 2.52, but the transparency dimension was weak. This indicates that recruitment procedures exist, yet the clarity of criteria, the fairness of decisions, and the consistency of implementation remain insufficient.

The second research question concerned selection practices. Selection was generally perceived as good, with an overall mean score of 2.63. Interviews and administrative selection were relatively strong, whereas objectivity was the weakest dimension. The third research question concerned employee performance. Employee performance was also generally good, with an overall mean score of 2.66. Responsibility and timeliness were the strongest dimensions, whereas work quantity was the weakest.

The fourth research question examined the relationship between recruitment, selection, and employee performance. Recruitment showed a positive but not significant association with

employee performance, so H1 was not supported. Selection showed a positive and significant association, so H2 was supported. Recruitment and selection were simultaneously associated with employee performance, thereby supporting H3. The model explained 29.7% of the variance in employee performance, leaving 70.3% unexplained by the two staffing variables.

The study's conclusions are constrained by its design. The data was cross-sectional, self-reported, and correlational, so the reported relationships reflect statistical associations rather than causal effects. The marginal reliability values for selection and employee performance, the lack of formal common-method-bias testing, the absence of a separate formal linearity statistic in the blind output, the limited demographic information, and the unexplained variance in the regression model should be considered when interpreting the findings. These limitations do not invalidate the study, but they require cautious interpretation and more complete reporting from the original dataset, where available.

The theoretical implication is that staffing-performance relationships should be distinguished between recruitment and selection rather than treating staffing as a single, undifferentiated practice. In this study, selection was more directly related to performance because it operationalized competence assessment and person-job fit. The practical implications should be read as evidence-informed recommendations rather than causal prescriptions. The foundation should prioritize strengthening objective, competence-based selection while also improving recruitment transparency. Management should develop written job specifications, consistently publicize vacancy criteria, standardize selection stages across units, apply structured interviews and competency tests, and document the basis for acceptance and placement decisions. These steps are supported by the observed weak dimensions and regression associations, but their actual performance consequences still require implementation and evaluation.

LIMITATION & FURTHER RESEARCH

This study has several limitations. First, the cross-sectional design means the findings show statistical associations rather than causal proof. Recruitment and selection were measured at a single point in time, whereas employee performance may develop over longer periods. Second, the data were based on employee perceptions, which may be influenced by personal experience, memory, and attitudes toward the organization; because the same respondents provided data for all variables, common method bias remains possible. Third, the study included only two independent variables, and the R-squared value indicates that most performance variance is explained by factors outside the model. Fourth, the study was conducted at one Islamic education foundation, so generalizations to other foundations, public schools, private companies, or government institutions must be made with caution. Fifth, the blind manuscript output did not include all diagnostics required for complete quantitative reporting, including formal common-method bias testing, broader demographics, a separate formal linearity statistic, and potential unit-level clustering tests; however, heteroskedasticity was assessed using the Glejser test and was not indicated.

Future research should test a broader human resource model that includes training, leadership, compensation, motivation, workload, organizational culture, supervision, and work environment. Future studies should also examine mediating variables, such as person-job fit, organizational commitment, and employee engagement, to explain the association between selection and performance. Longitudinal research would be useful for assessing whether employees selected through structured competence-based methods exhibit different performance trajectories over time than those recruited through informal or non-procedural routes. Comparative studies across education foundations would also help determine whether the findings are specific to this organization or reflect a wider staffing challenge in Indonesian education

foundations. Future quantitative studies should conduct priori power analyses, report complete demographic characteristics, include formal common-method-bias diagnostics, and consider multilevel or clustered models when respondents come from multiple education units.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, F., & Inrawati. (2023). The impact of the recruitment process on employee performance. *Advances in Human Resource Management Research*, 1(2), 55–65. <https://doi.org/10.60079/ahrmr.v1i2.75>
- Aldhuhoori, R., Almazrouei, M., Nobanee, H., & Khare, N. (2022). Effects of recruitment, selection, and training practices on employee performance in the construction and related industries. *Civil Engineering Journal*, 8(12), 2674–2686.
- Armstrong, M., & Taylor, S. (2020). *Armstrong's handbook of human resource management practice* (15th ed.). Kogan Page.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands–resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 273–285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056>
- Bernardin, H. J., & Russell, J. E. A. (2019). *Human resource management: An experiential approach*. McGraw-Hill.
- Breaugh, J. A. (2008). Employee recruitment: Current knowledge and important areas for future research. *Human Resource Management Review*, 18(3), 103–118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2008.07.003>
- Chapman, D. S., Uggerslev, K. L., Carroll, S. A., Piasentin, K. A., & Jones, D. A. (2005). Applicant attraction to organizations and job choice: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(5), 928–944. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.5.928>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- DeNisi, A. S., & Murphy, K. R. (2017). Performance appraisal and performance management: 100 years of progress? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(3), 421–433. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000085>
- Dessler, G. (2020). *Human resource management* (16th ed.). Pearson.
- Dinanty, A. H. T., & Firdaus, V. (2023). Recruitment and selection impact on employee performance: A quantitative analysis. *Academia Open*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.21070/acopen.9.2024.5151>
- Etikan, I., & Bala, K. (2017). Sampling and sampling methods. *Biometrics & Biostatistics International Journal*, 5(6), 215–217. <https://doi.org/10.15406/bbij.2017.05.00149>
- Field, A. (2018). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS Statistics* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Ghasemi, A., & Zahediasl, S. (2012). Normality tests for statistical analysis: A guide for non-statisticians. *International Journal of Endocrinology and Metabolism*, 10(2), 486–489. <https://doi.org/10.5812/ijem.3505>
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2019). *Multivariate data analysis* (8th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Hasry, Rinaldo, J., & Yulistianty, R. (2025). Recruitment and employee performance in hospital organizations. *Journal of Human Resource Studies*.
- Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C. M., Hildebrandt, V. H., van Buuren, S., van der Beek, A. J., & de Vet, H. C. W. (2014). Improving the individual work performance questionnaire using Rasch analysis. *Journal of Applied Measurement*, 15(2), 160–175.
- Kristof-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D., & Johnson, E. C. (2005). Consequences of individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person-job, person-organization, person-group, and person-supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology*, 58(2), 281–342. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744->

6570.2005.00672.x

- Noe, R. A., Hollenbeck, J. R., Gerhart, B., & Wright, P. M. (2020). *Human resource management: Gaining a competitive advantage*. McGraw-Hill.
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Ployhart, R. E., & Weekley, J. A. (2023). Staffing and selection in organizations: Contemporary issues and evidence-based practice. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*.
- Pradhan, R. K., & Jena, L. K. (2017). Employee performance at workplace: Conceptual model and empirical validation. *Business Perspectives and Research*, 5(1), 69–85. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2278533716671630>
- Sackett, P. R., Zhang, C., Berry, C. M., & Lievens, F. (2022). Revisiting meta-analytic estimates of validity in personnel selection. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 107(11), 2040–2068. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000994>
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2019). *Research methods for business students* (8th ed.). Pearson.
- Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. E. (1998). The validity and utility of selection methods in personnel psychology: Practical and theoretical implications of 85 years of research findings. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124(2), 262–274. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.124.2.262>
- Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2020). *Research methods for business: A skill-building approach* (8th ed.). Wiley.
- Taber, K. S. (2018). The use of Cronbach's alpha when developing and reporting research instruments in science education. *Research in Science Education*, 48, 1273–1296. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-016-9602-2>
- Taherdoost, H. (2016). Validity and reliability of the research instrument: How to test the validation of a questionnaire/survey in a research. *International Journal of Academic Research in Management*, 5(3), 28–36.
- Tejada, J. J., & Punzalan, J. R. B. (2012). On the misuse of Slovin's formula. *The Philippine Statistician*, 61(1), 129–136.
- Widayat, G. M., Amalinda, W. R., & Ariefiantoro, T. (2023). Pengaruh rekrutmen, seleksi, dan penempatan karyawan terhadap kinerja karyawan pada PT Pos Indonesia Cabang Utama Semarang. *Inisiatif: Jurnal Ekonomi, Akuntansi dan Manajemen*, 2(2), 56–74. <https://doi.org/10.30640/inisiatif.v2i2.709>