MAGISTER MANAJEMEN-UNISSULA
SAMaJ
SULTAN AGUNG MANAGEMENT JOURNAL

Analysis of Employee Placement and Workload Distribution Policies in The Governance of Bumn Holdings Mind Id

Prayoga
Faculty of Economic, Universitas Islam Sultan Agung (UNISSULA) Semarang, Indonesia, E-mail: prayogappp8@gmail.com

Abstract. *This study aims to analyze employee placement and workload distribution policies in the governance of the state-owned holding company MIND ID. This study evaluates the relationship between corporate policy standardization and operational differentiation of member entities, as well as its impact on five key dimensions of human resource governance: competency-job fit, workload distribution, career development, employee mobility, and perceptions of organizational fairness. The research method used was descriptive qualitative with a case study approach. Data collection was conducted through in-depth interviews with holding company management and member entities, non-participant observation, and documentation studies such as annual reports and organizational guidelines. Informants were selected using purposive sampling techniques expanded with snowball sampling. Data analysis techniques referred to the interactive model of Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña, supported by a SWOT analysis to formulate recommendations for strengthening HR governance. The research results show that the implementation of employee placement at MIND ID takes place through a coordinative dynamic between the holding company, which sets the strategic direction, and member entities, which adapt it to their respective operational characteristics. The alignment of technical and behavioral competencies with job requirements is a key determinant of work effectiveness. Mismatched placements have the potential to trigger unequal work allocation, where workload equality should be interpreted as a proportional division of tasks based on capacity and level of difficulty. Furthermore, placement and mobility across functions and across entities have been shown to expand talent competency, although their implementation requires careful coordination. From the aspect of fairness, employee perceptions are strongly influenced by distributive, procedural, and interactional justice, particularly in terms of transparency of criteria and clarity of decision communication. The study's conclusion confirms that the effectiveness of placement governance at MIND ID is determined by the integration and coherence of these five dimensions. The holding's success is not measured by absolute uniformity, but rather by its ability to maintain equitable principles while providing operational adaptation space for subsidiaries in a fair and accountable manner.*

Keywords: *Competency; Distribution; Justice; Placement; Suitability.*

1. Introduction

The transformation of governance in State-Owned Enterprises requires that human resource management no longer be purely administrative. In increasingly complex corporate structures, the workforce is a strategic resource for translating organizational policies into operational performance (Ahmed, 2020). Therefore, decisions about who is placed in which positions are a crucial part of corporate governance.

Employee placement determines how individual competencies align with job requirements and the organization's strategic direction. Accurate placement also impacts job distribution, development opportunities, mobility, and employee equity (Srimulatsih, 2023). Thus, placement issues are inseparable from how organizations simultaneously allocate competencies, work, and opportunities. The primary issue is not simply whether a position is filled, but rather whether the person placed is capable of optimally fulfilling the position's demands. Furthermore, it is important to question whether the decision results in a proportional distribution of work and development opportunities for employees (Jamilus & Basri, 2024a). This perspective places placement policy as a strategic human resource management issue.

These issues gain further complexity in the governance of the state-owned enterprise holding company MIND ID. MIND ID integrates a number of strategic companies with different business characteristics, organizational structures, operational locations, and workforce needs. The group includes ANTAM, Bukit Asam, Freeport Indonesia, INALUM, Timah, and Vale Indonesia as part of the mining business ecosystem. This complexity results in inconsistent job configurations across functions and entities. By the end of 2024, the MIND ID Group had 69,258 employees spread across various member entities (AR-2024_MINDID-072025, n.d.). This scale demonstrates that workforce management within MIND ID is not an individual issue, but rather a governance issue at the holding level.

The larger and more diverse an organization's structure, the more complex the process of ensuring the right people are in the right jobs. This situation also creates challenges in maintaining policy consistency without ignoring the specific needs of each entity. Thus, the holding structure provides an important context for questioning how placement policies are designed, implemented, and experienced by employees.

Institutionally, MIND ID has positioned human resource management as part of the organization's strategic agenda. This framework encompasses organizational design alignment, strategic workforce planning, and succession planning. *planning, grading*, as well as individual performance management systems (AR-2024_MINDID-072025, nd). This policy demonstrates an effort to build more integrated HR governance at the holding level.

However, policy integration at the holding level does not automatically result in uniform practices across member entities. Differences in business characteristics can lead to differing competency requirements, job structures, work patterns, and workforce distribution across

entities. This raises the important issue of the relationship between holding policy standardization and HR management flexibility at the entity level. Standardization is necessary to maintain governance consistency, while differentiation is necessary to ensure policies remain aligned with the operational characteristics of each company. This tension can impact how organizations determine placements, allocate workloads, and provide mobility opportunities. Therefore, this study not only assesses the content of policies but also examines how these policies are translated into diverse organizational practices.

The first dimension that needs to be examined is the suitability of competencies to positions in the employee placement process. Each position requires specific knowledge, skills, experience, responsibilities, and abilities that must be met by its holder. Conversely, each employee has a competency profile formed through education, experience, training, performance, and development processes (Verma & Singh, 2023). When these two aspects are not adequately met, organizations can potentially experience inefficiencies.

Human resource utilization. Conversely, the alignment of competencies with positions allows organizations to utilize employee capacity more optimally. In the context of a holding company, the issue becomes more complex because competency requirements differ not only between positions but also between entities. Therefore, the research question goes beyond whether placements have been based on competencies (Jamil, 2015). Research needs to examine how competencies are defined, mapped, considered, and evaluated in the placement process. This issue is important because competency-based placement forms the basis for job allocation and subsequent career development. Therefore, competency-job alignment serves as a gateway to assessing the substantive quality of placement policies.

Placement accuracy further relates to how work is distributed once an employee is in a specific position. Administratively appropriate placement does not necessarily result in a balanced workload distribution. Differences in work volume, level of complexity, targets, responsibilities, and supporting resources can lead to differing workloads among employees (Permatasari, 2021). Under certain conditions, some employees may experience accumulated responsibilities while the capacities of others are not optimally utilized. This issue demonstrates that equalizing the workload does not mean giving all employees the same amount of work. Equity is more accurately understood as the proportional distribution of work based on capacity, competence, position, and Job demands. In a holding structure, these issues have the potential to become even more complex due to the different operational characteristics and workforce needs of each entity (Rifki & Hidayati, 2024). Therefore, research needs to examine the relationship between placement decisions and the resulting workload distribution patterns. This way, workload is not viewed as a separate issue, but as a direct consequence of workforce placement policies.

Workload distribution also has a subjective dimension because employees experience and assess their workload directly. A workload that is administratively considered proportional may not be perceived as such by the employee performing it (Inegbedion et al., 2020). These

differences can arise due to variations in task complexity, time pressure, additional responsibilities, or limited supporting resources. Therefore, workload analysis needs to reconcile objective measures of work with the employee's actual experience.

This approach allows research to identify whether placement policies actually result in proportional workforce utilization. Furthermore, perceptions of workload can influence employee assessments of the organization and management decisions. When the distribution of work is perceived as unequal, the issue can develop into an issue of organizational justice. Conversely, a distribution perceived as proportional can strengthen acceptance of the decision placement. Thus, the relationship between placement, workload distribution, and employee perceptions is a key issue in this research. This focus broadens the analysis of placement from mere job fit to its distributional consequences.

Placement policies also have consequences for employee career development and mobility within the organization. The position an employee holds can determine the type of experience, competency, professional network, and development opportunities they obtain (Rosyani & Yayuk Sri Rahayu, 2017). Therefore, placement decisions are essentially decisions about the direction of an individual's professional development. In holding organizations, mobility has strategic significance because talent can be developed through rotation, job transfers, assignments, or agency transfers. However, mobility that is not based on competency needs and career direction can result in suboptimal new placements. Conversely, strategically designed mobility can be a means of addressing competency gaps while expanding employee capacity.

The question is whether these mobility opportunities are proportionally available to employees with different characteristics and positions. Therefore, research needs to examine whether placements function as a career development mechanism or merely as a mechanism to meet short-term organizational needs. This question is crucial for determining whether the interests of the organization and the interests of employee development are aligned. Thus, career and mobility are positioned as strategic consequences of placement policies, not as stand-alone HR issues.

In addition to structural and distributional issues, placement policies have a fairness dimension directly perceived by employees. Employees evaluate not only the position they obtain but also the process that leads to that decision. Transparency of criteria, consistency of procedures, access to information, and quality of communication can influence perceptions of fairness (Bradley, 2006). Similarly, differences in access to positions, workload, development, and mobility can shape employees' assessments of organizational treatment. MIND ID has affirmed its commitment to equal opportunity in employee management. However, this normative commitment does not necessarily explain how fairness is experienced in placement practices (AR-2024_MINDID-072025, n.d.). This is where a potential gap arises between the fairness envisioned in the policy and the fairness perceived by employees. This gap is important to examine because decisions that are

rational from an organizational perspective may not be perceived as fair by individuals. Therefore, perceptions of fairness are an important dimension for evaluating the quality of placement policy implementation. This analysis allows researchers to view the policy not only from a management perspective but also from the perspective of those who receive the decisions.

When these five dimensions are placed within a single framework, it is clear that placement policies actually form an interconnected chain of governance. Competence determines a person's suitability for a position, while the position determines the type and volume of work received. Job distribution, in turn, influences work experience and employees' opportunities to develop their capacities. Capacity development can open up or limit mobility and career progression within the organization. This entire process can ultimately influence employees' perceptions of organizational fairness. Therefore, placement issues are inappropriately analyzed solely through the relationship between competence and position. An analysis that only considers these two aspects potentially overlooks the consequences of placement on job distribution and career paths. Similarly, a stand-alone analysis of workload fails to explain how placement decisions shape this distribution.

This is where the research question becomes more specific when placed on the relationship between the holding company and MIND ID member entities. At the holding company level, integration demands relatively uniform HR principles and systems. At the entity level, operational needs require adjustments based on the nature of the business, location, job structure, and competency requirements of each entity. This creates the possibility of differences between corporately designed policies and practices at the unit or entity level. These differences do not necessarily indicate policy failure because certain differentiation is indeed necessary in a holding organization.

The academic issue lies in the boundary between necessary differentiation and inconsistencies that could undermine governance principles. In the context of placement, this boundary can be seen through differences in competency standards, workload distribution, mobility access, and career development opportunities. Employee perceptions of fairness then become one indicator for understanding how these differences are accepted and interpreted. Thus, this study views MIND ID's HR governance as a negotiation process between holding integration and entity differentiation. This perspective is a crucial distinction compared to placement research that only takes a single organization as the unit of analysis.

In previous research, studies on workforce placement generally prioritize the fit between competency and position. Other studies focus more on workload in relation to workforce needs, performance, productivity, or work pressure. Meanwhile, research on career and mobility tends to be located within the literature on talent management, promotions, rotations, or succession planning. Studies on organizational justice also generally address the

influence of perceived fairness on satisfaction, commitment, trust, performance, or turnover intentions.

This pattern shows that the five dimensions have actually received attention in the literature, but tend to be studied partially as a result, the relationship between placement decisions and job distribution, career paths, mobility, and perceptions of fairness has not been fully understood as a single continuum. Furthermore, this integrative study still has room for development when placed within the context of state-owned enterprise holding governance. Therefore, this research gap is not simply a lack of research on placement at MIND ID. The primary research gap is the limited approach that views placement as a mechanism that simultaneously connects these five dimensions within the holding structure.

Based on this research gap, this study offers innovation at two levels simultaneously: the conceptual and the contextual levels. At the conceptual level, the study offers an integrative analysis of placement policies by integrating competency-job fit, workload distribution, career development, employee mobility, and perceptions of fairness. These five dimensions are not treated as stand-alone variables, but as a series that demonstrates how placement decisions operate within HR governance. At the contextual level, this integration is analyzed within the BUMN MIND ID holding structure, which integrates corporate policies with the characteristics of member entities.

The novelty of this research does not stop at adding new research objects, but lies in a new way of reading the issue of placement within a multi-entity organizational structure. This research specifically examines how standardization of holding policies interacts with differentiation of entity practices. Then, we examine how these interactions are reflected in the five placement dimensions. This framework allows research to identify whether competency matching is accompanied by proportional workload distribution, open career opportunities, strategic mobility, and positive perceptions of fairness. Thus, the research's novelty lies in its attempt to explain the coherence or tension between dimensions in placement policies, rather than simply measuring each dimension separately.

Based on this problem construction, this research aims to analyze employee placement and workload distribution policies within the governance of the state-owned holding company MIND ID. The research first examines how placement policies are designed and translated from the holding company level to member entities. This research analyzes the suitability of employee competencies to job requirements as a basis for accurate placement. It also analyzes how placement decisions relate to workload equity and proportionality. The next aspect relates to career development and mobility as consequences of placement on the sustainability of talent management.

At the same time, the study examined employee fairness perceptions regarding the process, distribution, and outcomes of placement decisions. These five dimensions were then analyzed integratively to examine the relationship between policy design, entity

implementation, and employee experiences. With this approach, the study not only questions whether placement policies are fair but also whether they are fair.

2. Research Methods

This research uses a qualitative method with a descriptive approach. The qualitative approach was chosen because the research seeks to understand employee placement policies within the governance context of the state-owned holding company MIND ID. These issues relate not only to formal company regulations but also to implementation processes, managerial considerations, inter-institutional relationships, and employee experiences. Therefore, the research requires in-depth information exploration of human resource management policies and practices. A descriptive approach is used to systematically describe the implementation of employee placement policies within a holding structure. This study seeks to explain how policies at the holding level are translated into human resource management practices within member entities. The discussion focuses on understanding the relationship between corporate policies and the operational needs of each entity. Thus, the study not only describes policies but also analyzes the alignment between policy objectives and their implementation.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Employee Placement Policy in MIND ID Holding Governance

1) Direction and Objectives of Employee Placement Policy

Employee placement policy is a crucial instrument in MIND ID's human resource management. Placement is aimed at accurately matching organizational needs with employee capacity. This policy is not simply concerned with filling organizational positions. Placement also determines the utilization of competencies to support the company's strategic goals (Sumiyatun et al., 2019). Thus, placement has both administrative and strategic dimensions in HR governance.

The direction of placement policy is related to the organization's constantly changing needs. MIND ID has various entities with different business characteristics and competency requirements. This situation requires an integrated and adaptable policy. Placement needs to consider the function, responsibilities, complexity, and requirements of the position. This approach helps the organization utilize its workforce more optimally.

Placement objectives are inseparable from achieving organizational productivity. Appropriate placement aligns individual competencies with job requirements. This alignment can support quality task execution and decision-making. Conversely, a mismatch can reduce the optimal utilization of employee potential. Therefore, placement is part of a strategy to increase organizational effectiveness.

Placement direction is also related to sustainable human resource development. Employees are not solely placed based on current position requirements. Placement can consider potential competency development and career paths. This perspective enables organizations to develop talent according to long-term needs. Thus, placement policy is linked to sustainable talent management.

In the context of a holding company, the goal of placement is also related to strengthening synergies. Placement can be a mechanism for optimizing competencies across various organizational environments. Labor mobility can broaden employees' professional experience and capacity. However, this process requires coordination between the interests of the holding company and its member entities. Therefore, placement policy direction must consider integration and the specific needs of the entities.

2) Basis and Principles of Employee Placement Policy

Placement policies need to be based on systematic job requirements. Each position has competency requirements consistent with its functions and responsibilities. Employees also possess different knowledge, skills, experience, and potential. These differences require a process.

Rational and measurable matching (Jamilus & Basri, 2024a). Thus, placement needs to be based on the suitability of the individual and the job. The principle of competency is an important foundation in employee placement policies. Competency helps organizations assess a person's ability to perform a specific job. Competency-based placement can reduce the risk of job mismatch. This fit also supports employee productivity and adaptability. Therefore, competency mapping is a crucial part of placement decision-making. The next principle relates to organizational needs and job effectiveness. Placement must consider the number and characteristics of the required workforce. These needs can differ between units and between entities within a holding company. Differences in needs do not necessarily indicate inconsistencies. Policy organization. Difference the can reflect the operational characteristics of each entity.

The principle of fairness is also relevant in employee placement policies. Placement decisions affect employees' jobs, responsibilities, and development opportunities. Therefore, the placement process needs to be explained. Transparency helps employees better understand the rationale for organizational decisions. This principle supports acceptance of placement policies and decisions.

In the MIND ID environment, the placement principle requires a balance between integration and differentiation. Holding requires the principle together to maintain consistent governance. Entities require flexibility to adapt to their respective business needs. This balance is an important foundation for implementing placement policies (Qomariyah, 2018). Therefore, policies need to be consistent in principle but adaptive in implementation.

3) Employee Placement Mechanism at Holding Level

The placement mechanism demonstrates the process of translating policies into organizational decisions. The process begins with identifying workforce and job needs. Next, the organization matches these needs with employee competencies. This matching requires information about positions and employee capacities. A systematic mechanism helps generate more rational placement decisions.

At the holding level, the placement mechanism is related to the strategic coordination function. The holding establishes the direction that serves as the framework for human resource management. Member entities then translate that direction according to their organizational needs. This relationship creates a coordination mechanism between the holding and entity levels. Therefore, placement does not occur in a separate organizational space.

Placement mechanisms need to take into account periodic mapping of organizational needs. Changes in business strategy can result in different competency requirements. Changes in organizational structure can also be influence the needs of a particular position. Therefore, placement decisions need to use up-to-date organizational information. This approach makes placement more responsive to company dynamics.

The placement mechanism is also related to the employee competency development process. Placements can be used to match individual abilities with organizational needs. In certain circumstances, placements can also broaden an employee's professional experience. This makes placements a tool for human resource development. Thus, the placement mechanism serves both administrative and developmental functions.

Within a holding structure, the mechanism must maintain a balance between organizational interests. The holding's needs must be aligned with the specific needs of its member entities. At the same time, employee development interests must be maintained. This balance determines the quality of placement policy implementation. Therefore, the placement mechanism is a crucial part of MIND ID's HR governance.

4) Implementation of Placement Policy in Member Entities

Placement policy implementation takes place within the business context of each member entity. Each entity has different job characteristics and workforce needs. These differences influence policy implementation at the operational level. Therefore, implementation does not always result in identical placement patterns. However, implementation remains consistent requires compliance with the direction of holding policy (Alizah & Mawar, 2024).

Business characteristics are a crucial factor in implementing placements. Entities with different business processes require different competencies and workforce sizes. These conditions influence decisions regarding employee positions and assignments. Placements

need to be tailored to the job requirements of each entity. Therefore, policy implementation requires an understanding of the organizational context.

Implementation also concerns the relationship between organizational needs and employee competencies. A mismatch between the two can impact job performance. Conversely, competency alignment can enhance productivity and work quality. Therefore, placement implementation requires ongoing competency mapping. This approach supports placement based on organizational needs.

In the context of a holding company, implementation can exhibit variations between member entities. This variation does not necessarily indicate a weakness in the placement policy. Variations can arise due to differences in location, structure, function, and job characteristics. What matters is the alignment of these variations with the principles of the holding company policy. Thus, implementation differentiation can be understood as a form of organizational adaptation.

Policy implementation ultimately needs to be seen through the experiences of the organization and employees. Placement determines how competencies are allocated within the job structure. Placement also influences job distribution and employee development opportunities. Therefore, implementation needs to be analyzed alongside competency, workload, career, and equity. This approach aligns with the integrative focus of MIND ID's research on HR governance.

3.2. Competency Matching with Position

1) Employee Competency Identification and Mapping

Competency identification is a crucial step in human resource management. This process helps organizations understand each individual's overall capabilities. Employee competencies need to be identified before placement decisions are made. This identification encompasses knowledge, skills, experience, and development potential.

The leader, identified by the initials PS, explained that competency identification is the foundation of human resource management. Assessment alone is not enough Consider formal education or length of service. Organizations need to consider employees' actual abilities and professional experience. Leadership potential is also relevant in the identification process.

Competency identification needs to be tailored to the job characteristics of each position. Each position has different responsibilities and levels of complexity. These differences determine the competencies required of the position holder. Therefore, organizations need clear competency standards.

In the context of MIND ID, competency identification encompasses the mining sector. Competency needs are influenced by the business characteristics of each member entity.

Companies engaged in mining activities have specific technical requirements, while downstream activities require different industry competencies.

One stakeholder, identified as AA, emphasized the importance of competencies aligned with downstream developments. Technical competencies encompass mastery of mineral processing and industrial technology. Furthermore, quality control is a necessary skill. These needs evolve with the project's stages and complexity.

Competency identification must also take into account changes in the company's business strategy. Strategic changes can impact job and workforce needs. Therefore, competency mapping needs to be carried out systematically Periodic mapping helps organizations anticipate future competency needs.

Competency mapping provides an overview of employee capacity and potential. This information can be used in the placement and rotation process. Mapping also helps organizations design employee career development. Thus, mapping serves more than just administrative purposes. The PS explains that competency mapping can support succession planning. Competency data helps organizations identify employee readiness for specific positions. However, mapping results should not be the sole basis for decisions. Consideration of organizational needs is still necessary in the placement process.

Competency mapping within a holding company must consider the needs of its member entities. Each entity has different work characteristics and operational environments. Therefore, competency standards must be applied contextually. This approach maintains policy alignment without neglecting operational needs.

Based on the interview results, competency identification and mapping have a strategic function. Both serve as the basis for employee placement decisions. This process connects organizational needs with individual capacities. Therefore, the accuracy of the mapping determines the quality of placement decisions.

a. Competency Competence with Job Requirements

Competency-to-job fit is a key principle of employee placement. This principle emphasizes the relationship between individual abilities and job demands. Placement should not be based solely on workforce availability. Organizations need to ensure that employees' abilities support the responsibilities of the position.

PS explained that competency suitability is assessed through specific comparisons. The comparison is made between the individual's profile and the job requirements. The individual profile encompasses both technical and behavioral competencies. Meanwhile, the job requirements reflect the job's duties and responsibilities.

Job requirements need to be formulated based on objective organizational needs. This formulation includes education, experience, skills, and responsibilities. Each requirement

must relate to the characteristics of the job. This ensures a measurable basis for suitability assessments. Formal education is one element in competency assessments. However, education alone does not fully reflect a person's ability to perform a job. Professional experience can provide insight into an employee's practical abilities. Previous performance is also a consideration in the assessment.

In addition to technical competencies, organizations need to pay attention to behavioral competencies. Communication and coordination skills support implementation Cross-functional work. Leadership skills are required in positions with managerial responsibilities. Adaptability is also crucial in facing changes in the business environment. AA emphasizes that competency requirements differ across functions. Operational positions require process mastery and work control. Strategic positions require analytical skills and cross-functional coordination. These differences should be reflected in the requirements of each position.

In downstream activities, competency alignment is crucial. Mineral processing requires mastery of technology and industrial processes. Project management also requires management and coordination skills. Employees must understand the complexity of the work according to their responsibilities. Competency alignment does not always mean that all requirements are perfectly met. Organizations may identify gaps between capabilities and job requirements. These gaps need to be analyzed based on their level of importance. The results of the analysis determine the necessary development actions. PS explains that competency gaps can be addressed through several steps. These steps include training, mentoring, and development assignments. Alignment of responsibilities can also be an alternative solution. Placement evaluations are necessary if gaps persist.

Competency suitability assessments need to be conducted objectively and periodically. Job changes can alter a job's competency requirements position. Therefore, previous assessment results need to be updated. This update maintains the relevance of employee placement decisions.

b. Implementation of Competency-Based Placement in Holding and Member Entities

Competency-based placement policies require coordination across organizational levels. At the holding level, policies provide direction for human resource management. At the entity level, policies are implemented based on operational needs. This relationship characterizes the governance of the MIND ID holding. PS explained that the holding establishes a management framework and principles. This framework serves as a reference for all member entities. However, its implementation does not require completely identical procedures. Each entity still requires room for adjustment.

Policy standardization aims to maintain alignment in human resource management. Alignment is necessary to ensure that placement principles have a common direction. However, standardization must not ignore business characteristics. The operational needs of each entity remain a consideration. AA explains that competency requirements differ

across entities. These differences are influenced by business type and operational technology. Location of activities can also impact workforce needs. Therefore, placement must consider the conditions of each entity.

Competency requirements also change according to the project implementation stage. The planning stage requires analytical and the construction phase requires technical expertise and project control. The operations phase requires process mastery and ongoing oversight.

Competency-based placement requires linking job needs with employee availability. This process requires information on individual competency profiles. Accurate job requirements information must also be available. Both forms of information form the basis for coordination between the holding company and the entity. Coordination across organizational levels helps reduce placement discrepancies. The holding company can guide workforce policies and planning. The entity provides information on actual job needs. This communication supports more contextual decisions.

Both PS and AA emphasize the importance of organizational coordination. PS emphasizes the alignment of human resource policies. AA emphasizes communication and joint planning across organizational levels. Both perspectives highlight the importance of policy and operational integration. Employee mobility can be part of implementing competency-based placement. Mobility allows for the utilization of competencies across units or entities. Cross-entity experience also broadens employees' business understanding. However, mobility must consider job readiness and suitability Implementing placement requires an evaluation of the needs of the organization and employees. The evaluation can take into account job performance and competency suitability. The distribution of responsibilities also needs to be assessed. Evaluation results can be used to improve placement policies.

c. Competency Mismatch and Its Implications for Placement Effectiveness Competency mismatch occurs when abilities do not meet job requirements. This condition can arise due to job changes or organizational needs. Gaps can also arise due to competency mapping not enough accurate. Because That organization need recognize discrepancies in a way systematic. Mismatch competence canaffect the performance of job responsibilities. Employees may need more time to complete tasks. The quality of work may also be substandard. These conditions can hinder achievement of organizational targets.

4. Conclusion

Based on the results of research and discussions regarding employee placement and workload distribution policies in the governance of the state-owned holding company MIND ID, it can be concluded that the implementation of employee placement policies takes place through a coordinative relationship between the holding company and its member entities. The holding company plays a role in establishing the strategic direction, principles, and general framework for human resource management, while the member entities adjust their implementation to their respective business characteristics, job requirements, and

operational conditions. This relationship demonstrates the need to balance policy standardization at the holding company level with implementation differentiation at the entity level. Standardization is necessary to maintain consistency of principles, objectivity, transparency, and accountability, while differentiation is needed to ensure policies remain relevant to diverse operational needs. Thus, the effectiveness of placement policy implementation at MIND ID depends heavily on coordination, clarity of authority, communication, and a balance between policy integration and flexibility of member entities.

5. References

Aggarwal-Gupta, M., & Kumar, R. (2010). *Look Who's Talking! Impact of Communication Relationship Satisfaction on Justice Perceptions*. *Vikalpa: The Journal for Decision Makers*, *35*(3), 55–66. https://doi.org/10.1177/0256090920100304

Ahmed, G. (2020). Human Resource Management: The Consequences of Changes in Government Management. *International Journal Papier Public Review*, *1*(2), 1– 5. https://doi.org/10.47667/ijppr.v1i2.11

Ahsan, K. P. (2024). Peran Mutasi dan Promosi dalam Pengembangan Karir dan Kinerja Pegawai. *PRODUKTIF: Jurnal Kepegawaian Dan Organisasi*, *3*(1), 49–59. https://doi.org/10.37481/jko.v3i1.131

Petanda: Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi Dan Humaniora, *6*(1), 78–87. https://doi.org/10.32509/petanda.v6i1.3801

Bagdadli, S., & Paoletti, F. (2000). THE IMPORTANCE OF ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE IN CAREER DECISIONS. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, *2000*(1), A1–A6. https://doi.org/10.5465/apbpp.2000.5438580

Baron, J. N., & Kreps, D. M. (1999). Consistent Human Resource Practices. *California Management Review 41*(3), 29–53. https://doi.org/10.2307/41165996

Beugre, C. D., & Baron, R. A. (2001). Perceptions of Systemic Justice: The Effects of Distributive, Procedural, and Interactional Justice. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *31*(2), 324–339. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2001.tb00199.x

Bintang Nur Machmuda, & Mei Retno Adiwati. (2024). ANALISIS BEBAN KERJA KARYAWAN DENGAN METODE FULL TIME EQUIVALENT PADA DEPARTEMEN LABORATORY PT X. *EKBIS (Ekonomi & Bisnis)*, *12*(2), 23–31. https://doi.org/10.56689/ekbis.v12i2.1473

Bradley, L. M. (2006). Perceptions of justice when selecting internal and externaljob candidates. *Personnel Review*, *35*(1), 66–77. https://doi.org/10.1108/00483480610636795

Brown, G., Bemmels, B., & Barclay, L. J. (2010). The importance of policy in perceptions of organizational justice. *Human Relations*, *63*(10), 1587–1609. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726710362273

Çelik, T. Z., & Köse, G. (2022). *Effective Strategies for Managing Workload and Stress* (pp. 223–243). https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-6684-3937-1.ch013

Chouhan, V. S., & Srivastava, S. (2014). Understanding Competencies and Competency Modeling — A Literature Survey. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, *16*(1), 14–22. https://doi.org/10.9790/487X-16111422

Colquitt, J. A., & Zipay, K. P. (2015). Justice, Fairness, and Employee Reactions. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, *2*(1), 75–99. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032414-111457

Crawshaw, J. R. (2006). Justice source and justice content: evaluating the fairness of organisational career management practices. *Human Resource Management Journal*, *16*(1), 98–120. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-8583.2006.00006.x

Eiselt, H. A., & Marianov, V. (2008). Employee positioning and workload allocation. *Computers & Operations Research*, *35*(2), 513–524. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cor.2006.03.014

Evans, P. (1987). The Context of Strategic Human Resource Management Policy in Complex Firms. In *Personal-Management und Strategische Unternehmensführung* (pp. 105–117). Physica-Verlag HD. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-00805-8_8

Flint, D., Haley, L. M., & McNally, J. J. (2012). Dimensionality of Organizational Justice in a Call Center Context. *Psychological Reports*, *110*(2), 677–693. https://doi.org/10.2466/01.07.21.PR0.110.2.677-693

Folger, R. (1987). Distributive and procedural justice in the workplace. *Social Justice Research*, *1*(2), 143–159. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01048013

Gelens, J., Hofmans, J., Dries, N., & Pepermans, R. (2014). Talent management and organisational justice: employee reactions to high potential identification. *Human Resource Management Journal*, *24*(2), 159–175. https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12029

Gonczi, A., & Hager, P. (2010). The Competency Model. In *International Encyclopedia of Education* (pp. 403–410). Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-044894-7.00790-9

Grünig, R., & Morschett, D. (2012). Defining the strategic objectives. In *Developing International Strategies* (pp. 261–271). Springer Berlin Heidelberg. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-24725-5_15

Hanjani, A. R., & Singgih, M. L. (2019). Workload Analysis at Biro Human Capital to Increase Productivity. *IPTEK Journal of Proceedings Series*, *0*(5), 404. https://doi.org/10.12962/j23546026.y2019i5.6377

Hax, A., & Majluf, N. (1994). Corporate strategic tasks. *European Management Journal*, *12*(4), 366–381. https://doi.org/10.1016/0263-2373(94)90023-X