

**WIKARA**

WIKARA NATIONAL ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT

Laman Jurnal: [ejournal.stie-wikara.ac.id](http://ejournal.stie-wikara.ac.id)

ISSN : 2721-8120 (p), 2797-3247 (e)

**STRATEGIC PRIORITY ANALYSIS IN THE CLEANING SERVICE INDUSTRY USING ANP SUPER DECISION SOFTWARE****Tri Hadi Sulistyanto<sup>1\*</sup>, Salsa Billah Arianti<sup>2</sup>, Salvina Maulidyas Stella<sup>3</sup>, Hesti Ariestia Ritonga<sup>4</sup>, Astiyani Ang<sup>5</sup>**Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Wibawa Karta Raharja<sup>1,2,3,4,5</sup>, Indonesia, Jawa Barat\*Email: [tri@stie-wikara.ac.id](mailto:tri@stie-wikara.ac.id)

<b>ARTICLE INFO</b>	<b>ABSTRACT</b>
<p><b>Artikel History:</b>  Received: July 2024  Revised: July 2024  Published: July 2024</p> <p><b>Keywords:</b>  Analytic Network Process,  Cleaning Service, Leadership,  Strategy</p>	<p><i>The cleaning service sector are the second most important job based on a survey conducted in 2021. Uniquely, although cleaner is ranked second among the most important jobs in Singapore, 42% of respondents are not willing to do this job. About 8,500 cleaning service workers had become unemployment due to the implementation of social restrictions in 2021. Strategy priority is one of the important things for company sustainability. This research analyzes strategic priority in Cleaning Service Industry in Jakarta, which can be gotten into groups of different Human Resources stragic: Leadership, Motivation, Communication, Knowledge Management, Communication and Social Capability, in order to enhance the corporate performance. by using Analytic Network Process (ANP) with a qualitative approach to decide one single best alternative. It can be concluded: The results of the ANP Super Decision analysis show that leadership is the most important variable in achieving performance. Leadership is the most important variable to achieve sustainable performance in companies in the cleaning service industry. This study uses a limited number of indicators based on previous research, while there are still many indicators that can be used in future research, such as the Leadership Variable, including: Contingent rewards, Constructive transactions, Management-by-exception Active and passive Corrective transactions and Laissez-faire. This research was conducted at a unique locus, where the research was carried out in the cleaning service industry sector which had never been done by previous researchers.</i></p>
<b>INFO ARTIKEL</b>	<b>ABSTRAK</b>
<p><b>Riwayat Artikel:</b>  Diterima : Juli 2024</p>	<p>Sektor jasa kebersihan merupakan salah satu bidang pekerjaan penting berdasarkan survei tahun 2021, bahkan menempati posisi kedua sebagai pekerjaan paling esensial di Singapura.</p>

# WIKARA

WIKARA NATIONAL ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT

Laman Jurnal: [ejournal.stie-wikara.ac.id](http://ejournal.stie-wikara.ac.id)

ISSN : 2721-8120 (p), 2797-3247 (e)

Direvisi: Juli 2024

Dipublikasikan : Juli 2024

**Kata kunci:**

*Analytic Network Process*, Jasa Kebersihan, Kepemimpinan, Strategi

Namun demikian, terdapat fenomena menarik di mana sekitar 42% responden tidak bersedia bekerja di sektor ini, serta sekitar 8.500 pekerja jasa kebersihan mengalami pengangguran akibat penerapan pembatasan sosial pada tahun 2021. Kondisi ini menunjukkan pentingnya penentuan prioritas strategi guna menjaga keberlanjutan perusahaan. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis prioritas strategi pada industri cleaning service di Jakarta melalui pendekatan manajemen sumber daya manusia, yang meliputi kepemimpinan, motivasi, komunikasi, manajemen pengetahuan, serta kemampuan komunikasi dan sosial dalam meningkatkan kinerja perusahaan. Metode yang digunakan adalah Analytic Network Process (ANP) dengan pendekatan kualitatif untuk menentukan alternatif strategi terbaik. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa variabel kepemimpinan merupakan faktor paling dominan dalam meningkatkan kinerja perusahaan dan mencapai keberlanjutan usaha pada industri jasa kebersihan. Kepemimpinan menjadi kunci utama dalam mengarahkan dan mengoptimalkan sumber daya manusia. Penelitian ini masih memiliki keterbatasan pada jumlah indikator yang digunakan, sehingga penelitian selanjutnya disarankan untuk mengembangkan indikator kepemimpinan yang lebih luas, seperti contingent rewards, constructive transactions, management-by-exception aktif dan pasif, corrective transactions, serta gaya laissez-faire. Penelitian ini juga memiliki kebaruan karena dilakukan pada sektor industri cleaning service yang masih jarang diteliti sebelumnya.

### INTRODUCTION

According to a survey conducted in Singapore in 2020 by The Straits Times by asking 1,000 respondents which jobs are the most important in maintaining the continuity of Singapore, jobs in the cleaning service sector or commonly called ‘cleaner jobs’ are the second most important job (78%) after doctors or nurses in first place (86%), followed by garbage collectors in third place (77%). Uniquely, although cleaner is ranked second among the most important jobs in Singapore, 42% of respondents are not willing to do this job (The Strait Times, 2021). The percentage of jobs surveyed is presented in the following table.

Table 1. Important Job Survey & Jobs That I Don’t Want To Do

Rank	Top 5 Essential Job	%	Rank	Jobs that I don’t want to do	%
1	Doctor or Nurse	86%	1	Garbage Collector	57%
2	<b>Cleaner</b>	78%	2	Construction Worker	44%
3	Garbage Collector	77%	3	<b>Cleaner</b>	42%
4	Hawker	76%	4	Politician	36%
5	Deliveryman	70%	5	Telemarketer	31%
			6	Artist	29%
			7	Security Guard	29%
			8	Corporate Lawyer	26%
			9	Nurse	24%
			10	Doctor	21%
			11	Hawker	20%

Source : (The Strait Times, 2021).

Data from researchers in Indonesia (Hanoatubun, 2020) shows that in Indonesia more than 1,500,000 employees have been dismissed or laid off, there were 10% of employees have been dismissed and 90% of employees have been laid off. CNN Indonesia also stated that about 8,500 cleaning service workers had become unemployment. This is due to 190 malls closing because of the

implementation of large-scale social restrictions or PSBB, Pembatasan Sosial Berskala Besar (Sandi, 2020).

One of the parameters that is often used to measure performance is effectiveness, where effectiveness indicates the extent to which planned activities are realized and planned results are achieved. Organizational effectiveness is a measure of the organization's success in achieving the goals or objectives that have been set. The smaller the gap between targets and actual achievements, the higher the organizational performance. One of the analytical tools to measure the level of organizational efficiency is DEA (Data Envelopment Analysis) (Rakhmawati, 2018). There has been a lot of research literature that discusses the DEA method, to measure organizational efficiency (Machmud et al., 2019; Manasakis et al., 2013; Paradi & Zhu, 2013; Rakhmawati, 2018; Salawu & Odewole, 2020; Zhang et al., 2008). The efficiency of the three companies namely HESI, CKAI and BISR is presented in the following Table 2.

Table 2. Company Efficiency (DEA Analysis)

Company	Target		Actual		Efficiency <sup>*)</sup>
	Σ Employees	Σ Customers	Σ Employees	Σ Customers	
CKAI	500	65	320	18	0.64
HESI	400	45	200	25	0.56
BISR	400	45	200	20	0.50

<sup>\*)</sup> Efficiency is analyzed using the DEA (*Data Envelopment Analysis*) compared to the actual ideal efficiency 100%

Source: Research data (2022)

It can be seen from Table 2. above that the efficiency level of each company in terms of achieving the number of workers and the number of customers is all below 1 (one) from the results of the analysis using DEA or Data Envelopment Analysis software.

### Leadership

The process that involves an individual while influencing a group of people to achieve a common goal is called leadership (Northouse, 2016). Transformational leadership does more things together with followers and exhibits behaviors to achieve good results. There are 4 components of transformational leadership, namely: (1) Idealized Influence/L-IIN (2) Inspirational Motivation/L-IMO (3) Intellectual Stimulation/L-IST and (4) Individualized Consideration/L-ICO. These four leadership components can be measured using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ),

which is a widely accepted instrument for measuring various types of leadership (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

### **Motivation**

Motivation refers to a force either inside or outside of a person that evokes enthusiasm and persistence to pursue certain actions (Daft, 2010). Daft then divides motivation theory into 2 major parts, namely: Content Perspectives on Motivation and Process Perspectives on Motivation. The content perspective of motivation is divided into four theories of motivation as follows: 1). The Hierarchy of Needs Theory (Abraham Maslow) 2). ERG Theory (Clayton Alderfer) 3). Theory A Two-Factor Approach to Motivation (Frederick Herzberg) 4). Acquired Needs Theory (David McClelland). According to Robbin & Judge among the theories of motivation, McClelland has had the best research support. The three most frequently studied from the need theories are: 1). The need for achievement/M-ACH 2). The need for affiliation/M-AFF, and 3). The need for power/M-POW (Robbins & Judge, 2013).

### **Knowledge Management**

Knowledge Management is a key pillar in Human Capital Strategy. Knowledge management consists of three main types of capital, namely: human capital, structural capital, and customer capital. Human capital is basically the power possessed by the brains of employees (Liebowitz & Hopkins, 2004). Knowledge Management in this study uses four dimensions as has been used by previous researchers, namely 1). Knowledge Acquisition/K-ACQ 2). Knowledge Sharing / K-SHA 3). Knowledge Creation /K-CRE 4). Knowledge Retention /K-RET 5). Knowledge Application /K-APL (Aladwan & Aladwan, 2020; Korze et al., 2021; Nawaz & Shaukat, 2014).

### **Communication**

Communication is a social process in which individuals use symbols to construct and interpret meaning in their environment (West et al., 2010). Organizational communication can be defined as a process of creating and discussing collectively, a system of meaning through practices that are oriented towards achieving organizational goals (Mumby & Kuhn, 2018). The grouping of communication satisfaction used by researchers from Turkey divides into 3 groups of categories, namely: 1). Relational Dimensions/ C-REL 2). Informational/Relational Dimensions/ C-IRD and 3). Informational Dimensions/ C-C-INF. This grouping is known as the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ) (Aydemir & Ayla, 2009).

### **Social Capability**

The social capability variable originated from social and political institutions proposed by Abramowitz in 1986 and the term social capability was first introduced by Casehi Ohkawa and Henry Rosovsky in 1973. The term social capability has been used mainly in understanding the economic development of a community or a nation. The term social capability is rarely used in the management literature. Although important, not many studies have empirically tested the construct of social capability in teams (Manjari, 2010). Social Capability can be defined as the ability to possess or acquire certain abilities aimed at coping with economic and social changes. Employees who have a certain level of social capability will have a participatory attitude in the company, will strengthen the employee organization, and will influence the employee's own attitude and influence the attitudes of colleagues (Muñoz-Pascual & Galende, 2020). The Social Capability variable consists of three basic dimensions, namely: (1) Communication Dimension/S-COM , (2) Conflict Resolution Dimension/ s-CON and (3) Support Dimension/ S-SUP (Manjari, 2010).


## **METHOD**

This research analyzes strategic priority in Cleaning Service Industry in Jakarta, which can be gotten into groups of different Human Resources stragic – Leadership, Motivation, Communication, Knowledge Management, Social Capability – in order to enhance the corporate performance by using Analytic Network Process (ANP). A quantitative approach from the modeling allowed obtaining decision criteria and alternatives (Hernández et al., 2013).

This research uses ANP (Analytic Network Process) analysis, which was introduced by Thomas L. Saaty (Saaty, 2004a, 2004b; Saaty & Vargas, 2013, 2006). The use of ANP analysis is intended to be able to assist decision making in obtaining the best alternative by displaying a priority order. The ANP method is used to assist decision makers when selecting the optimal strategy model based on ranking using several supporting factors (Kusnadi et al., 2016) ANP has been used for various research fields, that has been carried out in various countries such as Healthcare (Herat et al., 2012), High Tech Co (Lan et al., 2013), Financial (Ascarya, 2015), Supply Chain (Masoumik et al., 2015), Petrochemical (Khamseh & Marziaki, 2018), Banking (Kurniawan et al., 2016), Education (Kaur et al., 2018), and Supply Chain (Al-Mutairi et al., 2019).

Analytic Network Process (ANP) is a method in multi-criteria decision making that allows non-linear relationships and feedback between elements to make decisions. In general, the Multi Criteria Decision Making (MCDM) technique is used to determine the best alternative based on pairwise comparisons made by decision makers (Saaty, 2004b; Saaty & Vargas, 2013) Priority in implementing a sustainable HR performance strategy in the Cleaning Service Industry that is

considered quite important by the company's management when running its business. Strategic priorities are used as the basis for making decisions in determining policies in the HR field. This study raises the topic of employee performance models with the roles of Leadership, Motivation, Knowledge Management, Communication and Social Capability with the respondents are management representatives of three cleaning service companies in Jakarta. The model in this study will be analyzed using the analytic network process (ANP) so that the results can be obtained a model that can be applied to cleaning service providers. The model to be tested is as follows The model to be tested is presented in the following figure.



Source: Author (2022)

Figure 1. ANP Analysis Framework

In Figure 1 above, one priority will be selected from five strategies, namely: (1) Leadership with four dimensions: Idealized Influence (1.1.L-IIN), Inspirational Motivation (1.2.L-IMO), Intellectual Stimulation (1.3.L-IST) and Individualized Consideration (1.4.L-ICO) (2) Motivation with three dimensions, namely: Need for achievement (2.1.M .ACH), Need for power (2.2.M-POW), Need for affiliation (2.3.M-AFF), (3) Communication with three dimensions, namely: Relational Dimensions (3.1.C-REL), Informational/Relational Dimensions (3.2.C-IRD), Informational Dimensions (3.3.C -INF) (4) Knowledge Management with five dimensions, namely: Knowledge

Acquisition (4.1.K-ACQ), Knowledge Sharing (4.2.K-SHA) , Knowledge Creation (4.3.K-CRE), Knowledge Retention (4.4.K-RET) Knowledge Application (4.5.K-APL) (4) (5) Social Capability with three dimensions, namely: Communication Relationship Dimension (5.1.S-COM), Conflict Resolution Dimension (5.2.S-CON), Team Support Dimension (5.3.S-SUP). The analysis was carried out using the latest version of the ANP (Analytic Network Process) Super Decision software, version 3.2.0.

This study involved five strategies that would be processed using the Multi Criteria Decision Making (MCDM) technique to determine the best alternative strategy based on pairwise comparisons made by respondents so that priorities could be obtained. The respondents used were management representatives from PT HESI, PT CKAI, and PT BISR. Each respondent filled out the ANP questionnaire that had been provided in the form of pair-wise questionnaires.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

In testing using ANP software, the consistency of respondents' answers is measured and the level of the inconsistency from each answer. The level of the inconsistency of a good answer is less than 0.1 (Ergu et al., 2011). In Table 2. below, the inconsistency values for each respondent's answers are presented.

Table 3. Measurement of Respondents' Answer Inconsistency

No .	Comparison	Inconsistency Value	Annotation
1	Comparison with Respect to L-IIN	0.02177	Consistent
2	Comparison with Respect to L-IMO	0.02177	Consistent
3	Comparison with Respect to L-IST	0.02205	Consistent
4	Comparison with Respect to L-ICO	0.03028	Consistent
5	Comparison with Respect to M-ACH	0.0152	Consistent
6	Comparison with Respect to M-POW	0.0152	Consistent
7	Comparison with Respect to M-AFF	0.0152	Consistent
8	Comparison with Respect to C-REL	0.0152	Consistent

No	Comparison	Inconsistency Value	Annotation
9	Comparison with Respect to C-IRD	0.0152	Consistent
10	Comparison with Respect to C-INF	0.0152	Consistent
11	Comparison with Respect to K-ACQ	0.02205	Consistent
12	Comparison with Respect to K-SHA	0.0152	Consistent
13	Comparison with Respect to K-CRE	0.02655	Consistent
14	Comparison with Respect to K-RET	0.03114	Consistent
15	Comparison with Respect to K-APL	0.02205	Consistent
16	Comparison with Respect to S-COM	0.0152	Consistent
17	Comparison with Respect to S-CON	0.0152	Consistent
18	Comparison with Respect to S-SUP	0.0152	Consistent
19	Comparison with Respect to LEAD (P)	0.0116	Consistent
20	Comparison with Respect to LEAD (P)	0.02464	Consistent
21	Comparison with Respect to MOTV (P)	0.00885	Consistent
22	Comparison with Respect to MOTV (P)	0.03044	Consistent
23	Comparison with Respect to COMM (P)	0.01759	Consistent
24	Comparison with Respect to COMM (P)	0.02463	Consistent
25	Comparison with Respect to KMAN (P)	0.0152	Consistent
26	Comparison with Respect to KMAN (P)	0.01914	Consistent
27	Comparison with Respect to SCAP (P)	0.02365	Consistent

No	Comparison	Inconsistency Value	Annotation
28	Comparison with Respect to SCAP (P)	0.01914	Consistent

Source: Author (2022)

Based on the results of the synthesis using ANP software, which is shown in Table 3. it can be seen that all pairwise comparisons have an inconsistency value of  $< 0.1$ . Thus it can be said that the answers given by the respondents are consistent.

Sensitivity analysis was carried out using ANP software to determine the stability of the priorities of the selected strategy (Pringgajaya & Ciptomulyono, 2012). Sensitivity analysis is related to what-if questions to detect whether the final results obtained (strategy) will remain stable when the input changes. Sensitivity analysis also assesses whether changes to the inputs made will change the order of priority of the options. The significance of changes in inputs can be measured by changes in the Compatibility Index before the change (original) compared to changes in the Compatibility Index after changes in the input. Sensitivity analysis examines the stability of the selected priority by simulating variations carried out against the priority criteria in the model. For example, if a strategy is considered more important than other strategies, to answer the question whether the best choice for strategy will change and on which strategy priority will be chosen. Another question that can be answered with this analysis is how much proportion of these strategies (Darmawan, 2018). The results of the sensitivity tests performed on all dimensions are shown in Table 4. below.

Table 4. ANP Sensitivity Test (Model Stability) of All Dimensions

Parameter Value	Leadership	Motivation	Communication	Knowledge Management	Social Capability
<b>1. Sensitivity for node Idealized Influence (L-IIN)</b>					
0.0001	<b>0.363445</b>	0.205273	0.098791	0.1956	0.13689
0.25	<b>0.364971</b>	0.204034	0.098298	0.196602	0.136095
0.5	<b>0.366509</b>	0.202784	0.097802	0.197612	0.135293
0.75	<b>0.385625</b>	0.187258	0.091632	0.21016	0.125325
0.95	<b>0.402415</b>	0.173621	0.086212	0.221183	0.116569
<b>2. Sensitivity for node Inspirational Motivation (L-IMO)</b>					
0.0001	<b>0.361091</b>	0.207186	0.099551	0.194055	0.138118
0.25	<b>0.36378</b>	0.205001	0.098683	0.19582	0.136716
0.5	<b>0.366509</b>	0.202784	0.097802	0.197612	0.135293

Parameter Value	Leadership	Motivation	Communication	Knowledge Management	Social Capability
0.75	<b>0.385625</b>	0.187258	0.091632	0.21016	0.125325
0.95	<b>0.402415</b>	0.173621	0.086212	0.221183	0.116569
<b>3. Sensitivity for node Intellectual Stimulation (L-IST)</b>					
0.0001	<b>0.332926</b>	0.225119	0.097585	0.194225	0.150145
0.25	<b>0.348911</b>	0.214488	0.097688	0.195837	0.143075
0.5	<b>0.366509</b>	0.202784	0.097802	0.197612	0.135293
0.75	<b>0.39881</b>	0.181303	0.098011	0.20087	0.121007
0.95	<b>0.42906</b>	0.161184	0.098206	0.203921	0.107629
<b>4. Sensitivity for node Individualized Consideration (L-ICO)</b>					
0.0001	<b>0.373552</b>	0.175976	0.09514	0.211369	0.143963
0.25	<b>0.369997</b>	0.189508	0.096484	0.204425	0.139586
0.5	<b>0.366509</b>	0.202784	0.097802	0.197612	0.135293
0.75	<b>0.355149</b>	0.246026	0.102095	0.175422	0.121308
0.95	<b>0.346556</b>	0.278735	0.105343	0.158636	0.110729
<b>5. Sensitivity for node Need for achievement (M-ACH)</b>					
0.0001	<b>0.362752</b>	0.203836	0.096262	0.1924	0.14475
0.25	<b>0.364636</b>	0.203309	0.097034	0.195013	0.140009
0.5	<b>0.366509</b>	0.202784	0.097802	0.197612	0.135293
0.75	<b>0.369601</b>	0.201919	0.099069	0.201901	0.127511
0.95	<b>0.372055</b>	0.201231	0.100075	0.205306	0.121333
<b>6. Sensitivity for node Need for affiliation (M-AFF)</b>					
0.0001	<b>0.373687</b>	0.190696	0.098829	0.201978	0.13481
0.25	<b>0.370209</b>	0.196554	0.098331	0.199862	0.135044
0.5	<b>0.366509</b>	0.202784	0.097802	0.197612	0.135293
0.75	<b>0.349842</b>	0.230854	0.095418	0.187473	0.136413
0.95	<b>0.332772</b>	0.259601	0.092976	0.17709	0.137561
<b>7. Sensitivity for node Need for Power (M-POW)</b>					
0.0001	<b>0.371588</b>	0.202901	0.096925	0.199657	0.12893
0.25	<b>0.369048</b>	0.202842	0.097364	0.198634	0.132112

Parameter Value	Leadership	Motivation	Communication	Knowledge Management	Social Capability
0.5	<b>0.366509</b>	0.202784	0.097802	0.197612	0.135293
0.75	<b>0.346791</b>	0.202333	0.101207	0.189671	0.159998
0.95	<b>0.331079</b>	0.201974	0.10392	0.183344	0.179684
<b>8. Sensitivity for node <i>Relational Dimensions</i> (C-REL)</b>					
0.0001	<b>0.368078</b>	0.204124	0.095902	0.198583	0.133314
0.25	<b>0.367301</b>	0.203461	0.096843	0.198102	0.134293
0.5	<b>0.366509</b>	0.202784	0.097802	0.197612	0.135293
0.75	<b>0.363006</b>	0.199793	0.102046	0.195443	0.139713
0.95	<b>0.359976</b>	0.197206	0.105716	0.193567	0.143535
<b>9. Sensitivity for node <i>Informational/Relational Dimensions</i> (C-IRD)</b>					
0.0001	<b>0.368351</b>	0.197846	0.099036	0.196335	0.138432
0.25	<b>0.367424</b>	0.200331	0.098415	0.196978	0.136852
0.5	<b>0.366509</b>	0.202784	0.097802	0.197612	0.135293
0.75	<b>0.364735</b>	0.207542	0.096613	0.198842	0.132268
0.95	<b>0.363346</b>	0.211266	0.095682	0.199805	0.129901
<b>10. Sensitivity for node <i>Informational Dimensions</i> (C-INF)</b>					
0.0001	<b>0.368438</b>	0.202216	0.095326	0.198065	0.135954
0.25	<b>0.367486</b>	0.202497	0.096548	0.197841	0.135628
0.5	<b>0.366509</b>	0.202784	0.097802	0.197612	0.135293
0.75	<b>0.351569</b>	0.207185	0.116979	0.194101	0.130166
0.95	<b>0.334614</b>	0.212179	0.138743	0.190116	0.124348
<b>11. Sensitivity for node <i>Knowledge Acquisition</i> (K-ACQ)</b>					
0.0001	<b>0.366476</b>	0.202988	0.098015	0.197411	0.135111
0.25	<b>0.366492</b>	0.202886	0.097908	0.197511	0.135202
0.5	<b>0.366509</b>	0.202784	0.097802	0.197612	0.135293
0.75	<b>0.367359</b>	0.197654	0.092451	0.202669	0.139868
0.95	<b>0.36807</b>	0.193356	0.087969	0.206905	0.1437
<b>12. Sensitivity for node <i>Knowledge Sharing</i> (K-SHA)</b>					
0.0001	<b>0.37092</b>	0.204197	0.09232	0.1956	0.136962

Parameter Value	Leadership	Motivation	Communication	Knowledge Management	Social Capability
0.25	<b>0.368726</b>	0.203494	0.095047	0.196601	0.136132
0.5	<b>0.366509</b>	0.202784	0.097802	0.197612	0.135293
0.75	<b>0.341111</b>	0.19465	0.129367	0.209195	0.125678
0.95	<b>0.318541</b>	0.187422	0.157414	0.219487	0.117135
<b>13. Sensitivity for node Knowledge Creation (K-CRE)</b>					
0.0001	<b>0.366322</b>	0.200988	0.098386	0.197728	0.136576
0.25	<b>0.366416</b>	0.201886	0.098094	0.19767	0.135934
0.5	<b>0.366509</b>	0.202784	0.097802	0.197612	0.135293
0.75	<b>0.368212</b>	0.219139	0.092487	0.196552	0.12361
0.95	<b>0.369562</b>	0.232096	0.088277	0.195712	0.114354
<b>14. Sensitivity for node Knowledge Retention (K-RET)</b>					
0.0001	<b>0.370136</b>	0.20379	0.098597	0.188862	0.138614
0.25	<b>0.368364</b>	0.203299	0.098209	0.193138	0.136991
0.5	<b>0.366509</b>	0.202784	0.097802	0.197612	0.135293
0.75	<b>0.352303</b>	0.198843	0.094686	0.231885	0.122282
0.95	<b>0.336819</b>	0.194547	0.091289	0.269243	0.108101
<b>15. Sensitivity for node Knowledge Application (K-APL)</b>					
0.0001	<b>0.366577</b>	0.203106	0.09751	0.196804	0.136004
0.25	<b>0.366543</b>	0.202945	0.097656	0.197207	0.135649
0.5	<b>0.366509</b>	0.202784	0.097802	0.197612	0.135293
0.75	<b>0.365398</b>	0.19749	0.102615	0.210927	0.12357
0.95	<b>0.364394</b>	0.192712	0.106958	0.222945	0.112991
<b>16. Sensitivity for node Dimensi Hubungan Komunikasi (S-COM)</b>					
0.0001	<b>0.365661</b>	0.203357	0.097382	0.198726	0.134874
0.25	<b>0.366085</b>	0.203071	0.097592	0.19817	0.135083
0.5	<b>0.366509</b>	0.202784	0.097802	0.197612	0.135293
0.75	<b>0.381347</b>	0.192766	0.105147	0.178128	0.142613
0.95	<b>0.394425</b>	0.183935	0.111622	0.160954	0.149065
<b>17. Sensitivity for node Dimensi Penyelesaian Konflik (S-CON)</b>					

Parameter Value	Leadership	Motivation	Communication	Knowledge Management	Social Capability
0.0001	<b>0.360875</b>	0.205731	0.10034	0.200599	0.132455
0.25	<b>0.363662</b>	0.204273	0.099084	0.199121	0.133859
0.5	<b>0.366509</b>	0.202784	0.097802	0.197612	0.135293
0.75	<b>0.381165</b>	0.19512	0.091201	0.189842	0.142673
0.95	<b>0.394093</b>	0.188359	0.085378	0.182987	0.149184
<b>18. Sensitivity for node Dimensi Dukungan kepada tim (S-SUP)</b>					
0.0001	<b>0.364917</b>	0.203811	0.097088	0.199228	0.134956
0.25	<b>0.365712</b>	0.203298	0.097444	0.198421	0.135124
0.5	<b>0.366509</b>	0.202784	0.097802	0.197612	0.135293
0.75	<b>0.381989</b>	0.192805	0.104745	0.181899	0.138563
0.95	<b>0.394922</b>	0.184467	0.110546	0.16877	0.141295

Source: Author (2022)

The sensitivity test results are shown in Table 4.32. (Model Stability) of the dimensions used in this study as follows: changes in the parameter values of each dimension ranging from 0.0001-0.25-0.5-0.75 to 0.95 remain stable resulting in the Leadership Variable priority. For example, the change in the parameter value of the Idealized Influence dimension from 0.0001-0.25-0.5-0.75 to 0.95 remains stable resulting in the Leadership Variable priority with a weight of 0.363445 - 0.364971 - 0.366509 - 0.385625 and 0.402415 continues to increase up to 0.402415 respectively.

As described previously, a paired questionnaire was used which reduces the time required for in-depth interviews with respondents and at the same time provides consistent results. After that, the geometric mean of each respondent is calculated for each paired question, so that the researcher has one geometric mean response from each respondent, which is then entered into the ANP model and synthesized as was done by previous researchers (Ascarya, 2015) . The geometric mean is calculated using the following formula (Roefeldt, 2018; Saaty & Vargas, 2006; Tanjung et al., 2019):


$$GMean = \sqrt[n]{(R_1 \times R_2 \times R_3 \times \dots \times R_n)}$$

GMean = Geometric Mean

R<sub>n</sub> = Value of respondents questionnaire n

n = Number of respondent

The results of the pairwise comparison questionnaire are then entered into the ANP Super Decision software, as can be seen in Figure 2.



Source: Author (2022)

Figure 2. Overall Synthesized Priorities

Based on the results of the ANP Superdecision analysis in the image above, a priority scale can be made for policy choices as shown in the following Table 5.

Table 5. Strategy Priority

Variable	<i>Normalized</i>	<i>Limiting</i>	Priority
1. <i>Leadership</i>	0.36651	0.229214	1
2. <i>Motivation</i>	0.20278	0.126821	2
3. <i>Communication</i>	0.09780	0.061165	5
4. <i>Knowledge Management</i>	0.19761	0.123586	3
5. <i>Social Capability</i>	0.13529	0.084611	4

Sumber: Author (2022)

As shown in Table 5., the order of priority to achieve good performance is: (1) Leadership, (2) Motivation, (3) Knowledge Management, (4) Social Capability and (5) Communication.

### CONCLUSION

From the results of research that has been carried out related to sustainable HR performance strategies in the cleaning service industry, it can be concluded as follows: The results of the ANP Super Decision analysis show that leadership is the most important variable in achieving performance. This can be seen from the level of the priority value after being analyzed by ANP Super Decision. Leadership is the most important variable to achieve sustainable performance in companies in the cleaning service industry.

This study uses a limited number of indicators based on previous research, while there are still many indicators that can be used in future research, such as the Leadership Variable, including: Contingent rewards, Constructive transactions, Management-by-exception Active and passive Corrective transactions and Laissez-faire.

## REFERENCE

- Aladwan, S. I., & Aladwan, I. (2020). The Impact of Knowledge Management on Organizational Performance: A Field Study at Safeway Group in Jordan. *International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research*, 9(5), 292–298. www.ijstr.org
- Al-Mutairi, G., Mhaisen, F., Al-Humaidi, R., Al-Ajran, M., Al-Bather, H., & Smew, W. (2019). Developing Green Supply Chains for New Kuwait: A strategic approach. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management*, 2019(MAR), 1503–1513.
- Ascarya. (2015). Determining The Real Causes of Financial Crisis In Islamic Economic Perspective: ANP Approach. *Tazkia Islamic Finance and Business Review*, 9(2), 109–127.
- Aydemir, O., & Ayla, O. (2009). An analytic study of communication satisfaction in the Turkish Postal Service. *Selçuk İletişim*, 6(1), 51–66.
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership*.
- Daft, R. L. (2010). *Management*, South-Western Cengage Learning. Canada.
- Darmawan, D. P. (2018). *Analytic Network Process: Untuk Pengambilan Keputusan dalam Lingkungan Bisnis yang Kompleks*.
- Ergu, D., Kou, G., Peng, Y., & Shi, Y. (2011). A new consistency index for comparison matrices in the ANP. In *New State of MCDM in the 21st Century* (pp. 47–56). Springer.
- Hanoatubun, S. (2020). Dampak Covid–19 terhadap Prekonomian Indonesia. *EduPsyCouns: Journal of Education, Psychology and Counseling*, 2(1), 146–153.
- Herat, A. T., Noorossana, R., & Serkani, E. S. (2012). Using DEMATEL Analytic network process (ANP) hybrid algorithm approach for selecting improvement projects of Iranian excellence model in healthcare sector. *African Journal of Business Management*, 6(2), 627–645.
- Hernández, C. T., Castro, R. C., Marins, F. A. S., & Durán, J. A. R. (2013). Using the analytic network process to evaluate the relation between reverse logistics and corporate performance in Brazilian companies. *Investigación Operacional*, 33(1), 13–22.
- Kaur, I., Shri, C., & Mital, K. M. (2018). Performance management model for teachers based on emotional intelligence and social media competencies. *Journal of Advances in Management Research*.
- Khamseh, & Marziaki, S. (2018). Development of Innovation Management Model in Petrochemical Companies Producing Polyethylene Products and Prioritizing Factors with Fuzzy Network Analysis Process. *Knowledge Accounting and Audit Management*, 7(27), 163–180.

- Korze, A. V., Buheji, M., & Davidovie, D. (2021). Re-Interpretation of “Sustainability” Concept, in Post-Covid-19 Period. *International Journal of Management (IJM)*, 12(2), 156–165. <https://doi.org/10.34218/IJM.12.2.2021.016>
- Kurniawan, H., Satria, A., & Suprayitno, G. (2016). Perancangan Strategi Bauran Pemasaran Untuk Meningkatkan Kepuasan Dan Loyalitas Nasabah Pembiayaan Umrah. *Jurnal Aplikasi Bisnis Dan Manajemen (JABM)*, 2(1), 32.
- Kusnadi, Surarso, B., & Amien, W. (2016). Implementasi Metode Analytic Network Proses Untuk Penentuan Prioritas Penanganan Jalan Berdasarkan Tingkat Pelayanan Jalan. *Jurnal Sistem Informasi Bisnis*, 105–113.
- Lan, L. W., Wu, W.-W., & Lee, Y.-T. (2013). On the Decision Structures and Knowledge Discovery for ANP Modeling. *International Journal of Intelligence Science*, 03(01), 15–23. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ijis.2013.31a003>
- Liebowitz, J., & Hopkins, J. (2004). Linking knowledge management with human capital strategy development. *Issues in Information Systems*, 5(1), 194–200.
- Machmud, A., Ahman, E., Dirgantari, P. D., Waspada, I., & Nandiyanto, A. B. D. (2019). Data envelopment analysis: The efficiency study of food industry in Indonesia. *Journal of Engineering Science and Technology*, 14(1), 479–488.
- Manasakis, C., Apostolakis, A., & Datseris, G. (2013). Using data envelopment analysis to measure hotel efficiency in Crete. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*.
- Manjari, M. (2010). *Capability , And Their Fit On Software Development Team Performance : An Empirical Study*.
- Masoumik, S. M., Abdul-Rashid, S. H., & Olugu, E. U. (2015). The development of a strategic prioritisation method for green supply chain initiatives. *PLoS ONE*, 10(11). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0143115>
- Mumby, D. K., & Kuhn, T. R. (2018). *Organizational communication: A critical introduction*. Sage Publications.
- Muñoz-Pascual, L., & Galende, J. (2020). Ambidextrous relationships and social capability as employee well-being: The secret sauce for research and development and sustainable innovation performance. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(9), 3072.
- Nawaz, M. S., & Shaukat, S. (2014). Impact of knowledge management practices on firm performance: Testing the mediation role of innovation in the manufacturing sector of Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences (PJCSS)*, 8(1), 99–111.
- Northouse, P. G. (2016). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Sage publications.
- Paradi, J. C., & Zhu, H. (2013). A survey on bank branch efficiency and performance research with data envelopment analysis. *Omega*, 41(1), 61–79.
- Pringgajaya, K. A., & Ciptomulyono, U. (2012). Implementasi Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) dan Pendekatan Analytical Network Process (ANP) untuk Pengembangan Produk Hetric Lamp yang Ramah Lingkungan. *Jurnal Teknik ITS*, 1(1), A515–A520.

- Rakhmawati, T. (2018). *Pengukuran Efisiensi di Instansi Pemerintah dengan Metode Data Envelopment Analysis DEA untuk Mendukung Reformasi Birokrasi*.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2013). *Organizational behavior* (Vol. 4). New Jersey: Pearson Education.
- Saaty, T. L. (2004a). Decision making—the analytic hierarchy and network processes (AHP/ANP). *Journal of Systems Science and Systems Engineering*, 13(1), 1–35.
- Saaty, T. L. (2004b). Fundamentals of the analytic network process—Dependence and feedback in decision-making with a single network. *Journal of Systems Science and Systems Engineering*, 13(2), 129–157.
- Saaty, T. L., & Vargas, L. G. (2013). The analytic network process. In *Decision making with the analytic network process* (pp. 1–40). Springer.
- Saaty, T. L., & Vargas, L. L. (2006). *Decision Making With The Analytic Network Process Economic, Political, Social and Technological Applications with Benefits, Opportunities, Costs and Risks*.
- Salawu, R., & Odewole, P. (2020). *The Efficiency of Personnel Costs Utilisation among MDAs in Nigeria: The Data Envelopment Analysis Approach*. XX, 2020.
- Sandi, F. (2020, October 26).  
<https://www.cnbcindonesia.com/news/20200514173655-4-158564/ribuan-pekerja-cleaning-service-jadi-pengangguran-dadakan>. Ribuan Pekerja Cleaning Service Jadi Pengangguran Dadakan.
- The Strait Times. (2021, December 5).  
<https://www.straitstimes.com/singapore/how-the-survey-was-conducted>.
- West, R. L., Turner, L. H., & Zhao, G. (2010). *Introducing communication theory: Analysis and application* (Vol. 2). McGraw-Hill New York, NY.
- Zhang, B., Bi, J., Fan, Z., Yuan, Z., & Ge, J. (2008). Eco-efficiency analysis of industrial system in China: A data envelopment analysis approach. *Ecological Economics*, 68(1–2), 306–316.