

# The Influence of Work Facilities and Work Ability on The Employee Performance at PT. Pos Indonesia (Persero) Pekanbaru

**Aldi Harmanto<sup>1</sup>, Sehani<sup>2\*</sup>, Ratna Dewi<sup>3</sup>, Fatmawati<sup>4</sup>**

<sup>1,2</sup> Departemen of Management, Universitas Islam Negeri Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau, Pekanbaru, Indonesia

<sup>3</sup> Departemen of Public Administration, Universitas Islam Negeri Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau, Pekanbaru, Indonesia

<sup>4</sup> Departemen of Islamic Counseling Guidance, Universitas Islam Negeri Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau, Pekanbaru, Indonesia

## ARTICLE INFO

### Article history:

Received Nov 19, 2023

Revised April 25, 2024

Accepted May 22, 2024

### Keywords:

Work Facilities, Work Ability,  
Employee Performance



This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.

Copyright © 2023 by Author.

Published by UIN Suska Riau

## ABSTRACT

This research was conducted at PT. Pos Indonesia (PERSERO) Pekanbaru. The purpose of this study is to determine the Effect of Work Facilities (X1) and Work Ability (X2) on Employee Performance (Y) of PT. Pos Indonesia (PERSERO) Pekanbaru, either partially or simultaneously. The population in this study was all employees at PT. Pos Indonesia (PERSERO) Pekanbaru totaling 100 people. The sampling method in this study used saturated sampling (census). The sample in this study was 100 employees. The data used are primary and secondary data. The data analysis method in this study was quantitative using multiple linear regression tests and the data was analyzed using the SPSS program. The results showed that the variables of Work Facilities and Work Ability affect Employee Performance both partially and simultaneously. The results of the coefficient of determination of 0,516, show that the variables of work facilities and overall work ability have an influence of 52,6 % on employee performance while the remaining 47,4% are influenced by other variables that were not studied in this study.

\*Corresponding author.

E-mail: [sehani@uin-suska.ac.id](mailto:sehani@uin-suska.ac.id) (Second Author)



## INTRODUCTION

Providing superior performance is the aspiration of every organization. Achieving good performance will create harmonious relationships, create a very comfortable work environment, and create goals. Increasing employee performance leads to company development. Therefore, various efforts to improve employee performance are very important because achieving organizational goals is very dependent on the human resources in the organization. Excellent performance from employees is highly expected by the company. Because the higher the employee's performance, the more productive the company is and the more capable the company is of achieving and realizing its goals. Employees who work at PT. Pos Indonesia is not just a formality, there must be joy in working. This must be paid attention to so that employees can carry out activities more actively and enthusiastically without feeling bored.

One way for companies to maintain and retain their workforce is by knowing the factors that can influence business performance so that the company has quality talent to achieve its goals. Therefore, every organization/institution should take steps to improve and improve the quality of employee performance. In other words, some factors influence the employee performance of PT. Pos Indonesia (Persero) Pekanbaru namely job opportunities, and ability to work (Arifin & Nurcaya, 2018).

Work facilities are services to support employee performance. Achieving the company's organizational goals requires real attention from the company. Companies must provide sufficient space for their employees. Companies must be able to provide the facilities needed to support performance to increase employee morale and improve employee performance in line with company goals.

Work equipment is damaged every year at PT. Pos Indonesia (Persero) Pekanbaru is a printer, barcode scanning tool, and computer. Apart from that, other supporting work facilities which also experience quite a large amount of damage every year are goods baskets and fans. Damage to work equipment at PT. Pos Indonesia (Persero) Pekanbaru causes obstacles to employee work performance. As a result, the impact on employee performance also decreases due to inadequate facilities.

Work ability can also influence employee performance. This is because work ability is an individual's ability to seriously and responsibly carry out the work assigned by the company in their field of work. An employee's work ability can be measured by the extent to which the employee can carry out work through his knowledge, training, and experience in his field of activity.

The problem of inadequate delivery of goods at the Pos Indonesia Persero Pekanbaru office is caused by the company employing employees whose specialization and expertise are not appropriate and providing training and placement of employees is not carried out by their expertise. In addition, there are many operational requirements for employees to complete their work quickly and accurately. Many employees work under pressure from their superiors. Working under pressure is nothing unusual for employees. This is normal because many employees work under pressure. The resulting

stress can include tight deadlines, demands from superiors, and employee performance problems.

From the existing phenomena and the results of interviews with the company, it is clear that employees' abilities while working are still given a direct understanding, that is if they just ask. This causes their work to be not optimal and employees have difficulty in solving the problems they encounter and the individual's ability to carry out various tasks within a worker is weak.

## METHODOLOGY

In the framework of this research, the author took the research location at PT. Pos Indonesia (Persero) Pekanbaru. In collecting data, the population for this research were all employees of PT. Pos Indonesia (Persero) Pekanbaru, totaling 112 people. This research took samples using the census sampling method. Census sampling is a sampling technique in which all members of the population are used as samples (Sugiyono, 2017). The research variables consist of independent variables, namely work facilities (X1) and work abilities (X2), as well as the dependent variable, namely employee performance (Y). The data analysis technique uses multiple linear regression analysis.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### ***Description of Respondent Characteristics***

The characteristics of respondents examined in the research include age, gender, highest level of education, and length of work. The number of samples in this research was 100 respondents. The characteristics of respondents based on age were dominated by those aged 30-39 years with 38 respondents with a percentage of 38%. Meanwhile, the characteristics of respondents based on gender were dominated by men, namely 74 respondents with a percentage of 74%. Characteristics of respondents based on recent educational background, research results show that at PT. POS Indonesia (Persero) Pekanbaru is dominated by 45 respondents with an SMA/SMK educational background with a percentage of 45%. Characteristics of respondents based on length of service, research results show that at PT. POS Indonesia (Persero) Pekanbaru is dominated by employees with a working period of 5 -15 years, namely 76 respondents with a percentage of 76%. This shows that employees at PT. POS Indonesia (Persero) Pekanbaru has a long period of service so it is quite experienced at work.

### ***Description Analysis of Work Facilities Variable (X1)***

The results of the recapitulation of respondents' responses regarding the work facilities variable (X1) can be seen in Table 1.:

Table 1. Recapitulation of Respondents' Responses Regarding Work Facilities Variables

No	Statement	Alternative Answer				
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Quite Agree	Don't Agree	Strongly Disagree
1.	The work tools provided helped me in completing my work.	28	50	18	4	0
		28%	50%	18%	4%	0%
2.	The facilities provided by the company currently speed up the work process.	27	47	21	5	0
		27%	47%	21%	5%	0%
3.	Office work equipment facilities (AC, Wifi, etc.) help the employee work.	30	41	25	3	1
		30%	41%	25%	3%	1%
4.	The complete facilities for places of worship function well.	31	42	17	9	1
		31%	42%	17%	9%	1%
5.	The available facilities are by the required needs.	27	51	18	4	0
		27%	51%	18%	4%	0%
Amount		143	231	99	25	2
Percentage %		28,6%	46,2%	19,8%	5%	0,4%

Source: Questionnaire Data, 2023

Based on Table 1, it can be seen that the results of respondents' answers to the five statements were 28.6% strongly agree, 46.2% agree, 19.8% quite agree, 5% disagree, and strongly disagree. agree 0.4%. So it can be concluded that work facility variables can influence employee performance at PT. Pos Indonesia (Persero) Pekanbaru.

### **Description Analysis of Work Ability Variable (X2)**

The results of the recapitulation of respondents' responses regarding the work ability variable (X2) can be seen in Table 2.:

Table 2. Recapitulation of Respondents' Responses Regarding Work Ability Variables

No	Statement	Alternative Answer				
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Quite Agree	Don't Agree	Strongly Disagree
1.	My education and knowledge are appropriate to my field of work.	31	37	31	1	0
		31%	37%	31%	1%	0%
2.	The training provided by the company can develop my ability to complete my work	29	42	27	2	0
		29%	42%	27%	2%	0%
3.	I can do a good job according to my field of experience.	29	42	27	2	0
		29%	42%	27%	2%	0%
4.	I want to follow technological developments in the company where I work	28	42	27	3	0
		28%	42%	27%	3%	0%

5. I attended training seminars to hone my skills at work	24	50	25	0	1
	24%	50%	25%	0%	1%
Amount	141	213	137	8	2
Percentage %	28,2%	42,6%	27,4%	1,6%	0,4%

Source: Questionnaire Data, 2023

Based on Table 2, it can be seen that the results of respondents' answers to the five statements stated that they strongly agreed 28.2%, agreed 42.6%, stated quite agreed 27.4%, stated they disagreed 1.6%, stated strongly disagreed 0.4%, so it can be concluded that the Work Ability variable can influence employee performance at PT. Pos Indonesia (Persero) Pekanbaru.

### **Description Analysis of Employee Performance Variable (Y)**

The results of the recapitulation of respondents' responses regarding employee performance (Y) variables are shown in Table 3.:

Table 3. Recapitulation of Respondents' Responses Regarding Employee Performance Variables (Y)

No	Statement	Alternative Answer				
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Quite Agree	Don't Agree	Strongly Disagree
1.	Recapitulation of Respondents' Responses Regarding Performance Variables.	31	40	28	1	0
		31%	40%	28%	1%	0
2.	Recapitulation of Respondents' Responses Regarding Performance Variables.	27	35	34	4	0
		27%	35%	34%	4%	0%
3.	Recapitulation of Respondents' Responses Regarding Performance Variables.	23	40	24	13	0
		23%	40%	24%	13%	0%
4.	I make the most of resources and technology.	25	44	27	4	0
		25%	44%	27%	4%	0%
5.	I can complete the work by myself.	25	36	32	7	0
		25%	36%	32%	7%	0%
Amount		131	195	145	29	0
Percentage %		26%	39%	29%	5,8%	0%

Source: Questionnaire Data, 2023

Based on Table 3, it can be seen that the results of respondents' answers to the five statements were 26% strongly agree, 39% agree, 29% quite agree, 5.8% disagree, and 0% strongly disagree. So it can be concluded that the work performance variable can influence employee performance at PT. Pos Indonesia (Persero) Pekanbaru.

**Validity Test**

The following are the results of the validity test based on the distribution of the questionnaire carried out as follows:

Table 4. Validity Test Results

Variable	Statement	Corrected Item- Total Correlation	r table	Information
Work Facilities (X1)	X1.1	0,590	0,163	Valid
	X1.2	0,737	0,163	Valid
	X1.3	0,690	0,163	Valid
	X1.4	0,604	0,163	Valid
	X1.5	0,702	0,163	Valid
Work Ability (X2)	X2.1	0,666	0,163	Valid
	X2.2	0,696	0,163	Valid
	X2.3	0,780	0,163	Valid
	X2.4	0,672	0,163	Valid
	X2.5	0,647	0,163	Valid
Employee Performance (Y)	X2.1	0,569	0,163	Valid
	X2.2	0,506	0,163	Valid
	X2.3	0,689	0,163	Valid
	X2.4	0,714	0,163	Valid
	X2.5	0,710	0,163	Valid

Source: Processed Data of SPSS 25, 2023

Based on Table 4 above, it can be seen that for each statement in each variable, the Corrected Item Total Correlation value for each variable is > 0,163. This shows the data is valid because it meets the assumptions of the validity test.

**Reliability Test**

The following is a table of reliability test results for this research.

Table 5. Reliability Test Results

No	Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	Criteria	Information
1	Work Facilities (X1)	0,850	0,6	Reliable
2	Work Ability (X2)	0,868	0,6	Reliable
3	Employee Performance (Y)	0,834	0,6	Reliable

Source: Processed Data of SPSS 25, 2023

From Table 5 above, it can be seen that the reliability value of work facilities is 0,850, work ability is 0,868 and employee performance is 0,834, where the Cronbach's Alpha value for all variables is > 0.60, meaning that the measuring instrument used in this research is reliable or trustworthy.

### Normality Test

Normality testing uses the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, which is a normality test using the cumulative distribution function.

Table 6. Normality Test Results

			Unstandardized Residual
N			100
Normal Parameters <sup>b</sup>	Mean		0,0000000
	Std. Deviation		2,33298913
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute		0,076
	Positive		0,076
	Negative		-0,051
Test Statistic			0,076
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)			0,168 <sup>c</sup>
Monte Carlo Sig. (2-tailed)	Sig.		0,630 <sup>d</sup>
	99% Confidence Interval	Lower Bound	0,506

Source: Processed Data of SPSS 25, 2023

Based on Table 6, it can be seen that the Assymp Sig Kolmogrov-Smirnov value is greater than 5% (0,05). Thus, it can be concluded that the entire data used in this research is normally distributed.

### Multicollinearity Test

Multicollinearity testing by looking at the VIF (Variance Inflation Factor) value in this study is as follows.

Table 7. Multicollinearity Test Results

Model	Coefficients				Collinearity Statistics		
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
	B	Std. Error	Beta				
(Constant)	2,709	1,646		1,645	0,103		
1 Work Facilities	0,535	0,083	0,532	6,462	0,000	0,721	1,386
Work Ability	0,298	0,086	0,286	3,473	0,001	0,721	1,386

Source: Processed Data of SPSS 25, 2023



Based on Table 7, it can be seen that the tolerance value is  $> 0,1$  and  $VIF < 10$ , so there are no symptoms of multicollinearity between the independent variables in the regression model. It can be concluded that the regression model is free from multicollinearity.

**Autocorrelation Test**

In this study, the autocorrelation test was carried out by the Durbin-Watson (D-W) test to detect whether there is a correlation or not.

Table 8. Autocorrelation Test Results

<b>Model Summary</b>						
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson	
1	0,725 <sup>a</sup>	0,526	0,516	2,357	1,893	

Source: Processed Data of SPSS 25, 2023

The results of the autocorrelation test show that the Durbin-Watson value lies between  $-2$  and  $+2 = -2 < 1.893 < +2$ . It can be concluded that there is no autocorrelation in the regression model in this study.

**Multiple Linear Regression Analysis**

Multiple linear regression analysis aims to measure the strength of the influence of the independent variable on the dependent variable and to show the direction of that influence. Testing is based on the multiple linear regression equation as follows:

$$Y = a + b_1 X_1 + b_2 X_2 + e$$

Information:

Y = Employee Performance

a = Constant

b = Regression Coefficients

X1 = Work Facilities

X2 = Work Ability

e = Error Rate (error)

Table 9. Multiple Linear Regression Results

<b>Coefficients</b>						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2,709	1,646		1,645	0,103
	Work Facilities	0,535	0,083	0,532	6,462	0,000
	Work Ability	0,298	0,086	0,286	3,473	0,001

Source: Processed Data of SPSS 25, 2023

Based on the calculation results in Table 9, the multiple linear regression equation is obtained, namely:

$$Y = a + b_1 X_1 + b_2 X_2 + e$$

$$Y = 2,709 + 0,535X_1 + 0,298X_2 + e$$

Based on the multiple linear regression equation, it can be explained as follows:

1. The constant value (a) is 2,709. This means that the variables of work facilities and work ability at PT. Pos Indonesia (Persero) Pekanbaru is assumed to be zero (0), then employee performance at PT. Pos Indonesia (Persero) Pekanbaru was 2,709.
2. The coefficient value (b1) is 0,535. If the work facility variable increases by 1 unit, then employee performance will decrease by 0,535. Vice versa, if the work facilities variable decreases by 1 unit, then employee performance will decrease by 0,535.
3. The coefficient value (b2) is 0,298. If the work ability variable increases by 1 unit, then employee performance will increase by 0,298. Vice versa, if the work ability variable decreases by 1 unit, then employee performance will decrease by 0,298.
4. The standard error (e) is a random variable and has a probability distribution that represents all factors that influence Y but are not included in the equation.

**Partial Test (T-Test)**

Results of partial hypothesis testing using the t-test. This test is used to determine the influence of the independent variable partially on the dependent variable. The t-test analysis was carried out by comparing the calculated t and t table. The t-table value in this study is 1.660.

Table 10. Partial Test Results (T-Test)

		<b>Coefficients</b>			
		Unstandardized		Standardized	
		Coefficients		t	Sig.
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	
1	(Constant)	2,709	1,646		1,645 0,103
	Work Facilities	0,535	0,083	0,532	6,462 0,000
	Work Ability	0,298	0,086	0,286	3,473 0,001

Source: Processed Data of SPSS 25, 2023

Thus the following results are obtained:

1. Work facilities. It is known that the t-count is 6,462 > t-table 1,660 and Sig 0,000 < 0,05. This shows that Ha is accepted and Ho is rejected. This means that work facilities influence employee performance at PT. Pos Indonesia (Persero) Pekanbaru.
2. Work ability. It is known that the t count is 3,473 > t table 1,660 and Sig 0,001 < 0,05. This shows that Ha is accepted and Ho is rejected. This means that work ability influences employee performance at PT. Pos Indonesia (Persero) Pekanbaru.

### **Simultaneous Test (F Test)**

This test is used to determine the effect of independent variables together (simultaneously) on the dependent variable. F-test analysis is carried out by comparing calculated F and table F. The F table value in this study is 3,08.

Table 11. Simultaneous Test Results (F Test)

<b>ANOVA<sup>a</sup></b>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	596,869	2	298,435	53,723	0,000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	538,841	97	5,555		
	Total	1,135,710	99			

Source: Processed Data of SPSS 25, 2023

It is known that the F count is  $53,723 > F$  table 3,08 with Sig.  $0,000 < 0,05$ . This shows that  $H_a$  is accepted and  $H_o$  is rejected because the calculated F is greater than the F table so there is a significant influence. This shows that the variables of work facilities and work abilities influence employee performance at PT. Pos Indonesia (Persero) Pekanbaru.

### **Coefficient of Determination Test (R<sup>2</sup>)**

According to Ghozali (2013), the coefficient of determination (R<sup>2</sup>) is used to determine the percentage contribution of independent variables which together can explain the dependent variable.

Table 12. Coefficient of Determination Test Results (R<sup>2</sup>)

<b>Model Summary</b>					
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	
1	0,725 <sup>a</sup>	0,526	0,516	2,357	

Source: Processed Data of SPSS 25, 2023

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the R Square value is 0,526 or 52,6%. This shows that the employee performance at PT. Pos Indonesia (Persero) Pekanbaru is influenced by work facilities and work ability by 52,6%. Meanwhile, the remaining 47,4% was influenced by other variables not observed in this study.

## **Discussion**

### **The Effect of Work Facilities on Employee Performance**

Based on the research results, it shows that work facilities influence employee performance with a calculated t value ( $6,462 > t$  table (1,660) and Sig ( $0,000 < (0,05)$ ). This shows that  $H_a$  is accepted and  $H_o$  is rejected. This means that the variable has a positive and significant influence from work facilities on employee performance at PT. Pos Indonesia (Persero) Pekanbaru.

Work facilities are everything that is used, worn, occupied, and enjoyed by employees both in direct connection with work and for the smooth running of work (Munawirsyah, 2017). The results of this research are also supported by research by Ani (Abadiyah, 2019) which states that work facilities have a significant effect on the performance of Tinombo District Office employees, Parigi Moutong Regency.

### ***The Influence of Work Ability on Employee Performance***

Based on the research results, it shows that Work Ability influences employee performance with a calculated t value (3,473) > t table (1,660) and Sig (0,001) < (0,05). This shows that  $H_a$  is accepted and  $H_o$  is rejected. This means that the variable has a positive and significant influence on work ability on employee performance at PT. Pos Indonesia (Persero) Pekanbaru.

According to Robbins (2006) (in (Rino et al., 2015) ability is an individual's capacity to carry out various tasks in a job. The results of this research are also supported by research by Abdul Hakim (Hakim, 2020) which states that there is a significant influence of Work Ability on employee performance at the Rantau Community Health Center, Aceh Tamiang Regency.

### ***The Influence of Work Facilities and Work Ability on Employee Performance***

It is known that the calculated F value is 53,723 with a significance of 0,000 so the calculated F (53,723) > F table (3,08) and sig. (0,000) < (0,05). then  $H_o$  is rejected and  $H_a$  is accepted. This means that there is a simultaneous influence of Work Facilities and Work Ability which have a significant influence on employee performance at PT. Pos Indonesia (Persero) Pekanbaru.

It is known that the R-value is 0,725. So it can be concluded that there is a strong relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable. Meanwhile, the Adjusted R square value is 0,516, the Employee Performance variable can be explained by the Job Facilities and Work Ability variables of 52,6%, while the remaining 47,4% is another variable that was not examined in this research.

Performance is the result of work and work behavior that has been achieved in completing the tasks and responsibilities given in a certain period (Ende et al., 2023). The results of this research are in line with research conducted by Iswatun Chasanah (Chasanah & Rustiana, 2017) with the title "The Influence of Work Ability, Work Facilities and Principles of Work Procedures on Employee Performance in District Offices throughout Batang Regency" which states that Work Facilities and Work Ability have a simultaneous effect on performance. employee.

## **CONCLUSION**

Based on the results of research conducted regarding the influence of work facilities and work ability on employee performance at PT. Pos Indonesia (Persero)

Pekanbaru, this research concludes that work facilities partially have a significant and positive effect on employee performance at PT. Pos Indonesia (Persero) Pekanbaru. by showing the value that  $t$  arithmetic  $(6,462) > t$  table  $(1,660)$  and  $Sig$   $(0,000) < (0,05)$ .

Work ability partially has a significant and positive effect on employee performance at PT. Pos Indonesia (Persero) Pekanbaru. by showing the value that  $t$  count  $(3,473) > t$  table  $(1,660)$  and  $Sig$   $(0,001) < (0,05)$ .

Work facilities and work abilities simultaneously influence employee performance at PT. Pos Indonesia (Persero) Pekanbaru. by showing the value that  $F$ count  $53,723 > F$ table  $3,08$  with  $Sig$ .  $0,000 < 0,05$  and with an  $R$  Square value of  $0,526$  or  $52,6\%$ . This shows that the performance of employees at PT. Pos Indonesia is influenced by work facilities and work ability by  $52,6\%$ . Meanwhile, the remaining  $47,4\%$  was influenced by other variables not observed in this study.

## REFERENCES

- Abadiyah, A. K. (2019). Pengaruh Fasilitas Kerja, Kemampuan Dan Disiplin Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Pada Kantor Kecamatan Tinombo Kabupaten Parigi Moutong. *Jurnal Ekonomi Trend*, 7(2), 19–29.
- Arifin, A., & Nurcaya, N. (2018). Pengaruh Motivasi dan Lingkungan Kerja terhadap Kinerja Pegawai pada Sekretariat Daerah Kabupaten Kutai Timur. *Prosiding FRIMA (Festival Riset Ilmiah Manajemen Dan Akuntansi)*, 1, 728–738.
- Chasanah, I., & Rustiana, A. (2017). Pengaruh kemampuan kerja, fasilitas kerja, dan prinsip prosedur kerja terhadap kinerja pegawai di Kantor Kecamatan Se Kabupaten Batang. *Economic Education Analysis Journal*, 6(2), 433–446.
- Ende, E., Sulaimawan, D., Sastaviana, D., Lestariningsih, M., Rozanna, M., Mario, A., Mahmudah, S., Bayudhigantara, E. M., Johannes, R., & Marry, F. (2023). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia*.
- Hakim, A. (2020). *Pengaruh Kemampuan, Fasilitas Kerja dan Kompetensi Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Puskesmas Rantau Kecamatan Rantau Kabupaten Aceh Tamiang*.
- Munawirsyah, I. (2017). The Effect of Job Satisfaction and Work Facilities on Work Motivation and Its Impact on the Performance of Non-Medical Employees at the Subulussalam City Regional General Hospital. *Journal of Business Administration*, 6(01), 44–51.
- Rino, S., Nuryanti, N., & Restu, R. (2015). *Pengaruh Kemampuan dan Fasilitas Kerja Terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Karyawan Bagian Produksi Pada PT. Marita Makmur Jaya Kecamatan Rupa, Kabupaten Bengkalis*. Riau University.
- Sugiyono, F. X. (2017). *Neraca Pembayaran: Konsep, Metodologi dan Penerapan* (Vol. 4). Pusat Pendidikan Dan Studi Kebanksentralan (PPSK) Bank Indonesia.