

The Effect of Job Resources on Work Engagement through Job Crafting and Burnout in Public High School Teachers in West Kotawaringin

Yenni Lawrensia^{1*}, Tuty Lindawati²

Universitas Katolik Widya Mandala Surabaya, Indonesia

Email: yennilwrnsia@gmail.com^{1*}, tuty@ukwms.ac.id²

*Correspondence

ABSTRACT

Keywords:

Job Resources, Work Engagement, Job Crafting, Burnout.

This study aims to determine the effect of job resources on work engagement through job crafting and burnout in public high school teachers in West Kotawaringin. This study is a causal study. The data collection tool used is an online questionnaire in the form of a google form. Questionnaires are distributed by snowball sampling, where some subjects will be selected to represent the school and then distribute the questionnaire to others. The population in this study is public high school teachers in West Kotawaringin. The sample in this study was 166 respondents with the criteria of having worked as teachers for one year. Data analysis techniques in this study use SEM (Structural Equation Model) using the lisrel program. The results showed that there is a positive and significant influence between job resources on work engagement, there is a positive and significant influence between job resources on job crafting, there is a negative influence between job resources on burnout, there is no positive and significant influence between job crafting on work engagement, there is a negative influence between burnout on work engagement, there is a positive and significant influence between job resources on work engagement through job crafting, and there is a positive and significant influence between job resources on work engagement through burnout.



Introduction

Human resources (HR) are the most valuable assets for an organization (Rifa'i, Ananda, & Fadhli, 2018). Successful HR is seen from how it performs against the organization. Therefore, high employee performance is needed by companies, especially to face the era of globalization in order to survive and win the competition. According to (Aldrin & Merdiaty, 2019), employee performance is indispensable to improve organizational performance in any country. Capital, machines and methods that become company resources can no longer provide optimal results if they are not supported by human resources who have optimal performance. Today, however, the success of any

business is not only determined by employee performance but also by employee loyalty associated with a concept i.e. the concept of attachment. Engagement will result in positive things in the organization such as superior workplace performance. Based on a survey conducted by (De Beer, Tims, & Bakker, 2016), companies with a high level of employee engagement increase productivity by 20% and profits increase by 21% so that this engagement is proven to increase the development of an organization.

(De Beer et al., 2016) determines the current percentage of employee engagement as follows: 21% of employees are engaged employees, 54% of employees are not engaged employees and 19% of employees are actively disengaged. From these results, it can be concluded that there are still few workers who feel engaged in their work and employees who are not engaged in their work will have a negative impact, namely the target where employees work will not be achieved because there is no enthusiasm from within employees. (Jiménez, Bregenzer, Kallus, Fruhwirth, & Wagner-Hartl, 2017) define work engagement as the psychological state of employees who have the desire to contribute to the success of the company where the employee works and the desire of employees to continue to be part of the company where they work. Job resources are physical, social, psychological, or organizational aspects of work that are able to reduce job demands in relation to psychological sacrifice, provide a positive influence to achieve goals easily and encourage employees to be able to develop themselves.

In addition, the thing that can affect work engagement is burnout. Burnout is a term used to express a deterioration in mental or physical exertion. (Jiménez, Winkler, & Dunkl, 2017) define burnout as a form of fatigue caused by someone working intensely, dedicatedly and committedly, working full and very long and viewing their needs and wants as secondary. The causes of burnout come from two factors, namely: (1) external factors such as working conditions, lack of opportunities for self-development, lack of social support from leadership, excessive task demands and boring tasks and (2) internal factors including age, gender, honor, level of education, length of work and personality characteristics. Fatigue caused by burnout will affect low enthusiasm, dedication, and appreciation, which then gives the impression of low work engagement of a worker.

Researchers agree that the most important factor in determining student performance is teacher quality. Teachers play such a valuable role in shaping student growth, academically and socially. The role of the teacher has evolved from the traditional role of teaching, which used to be just teaching, to include administrative work. In addition, teachers are also responsible for disciplining and providing counseling to their students. School teachers are also considered as the backbone of a country's development as teachers play an important role in strengthening unity and building national identity as well as developing human resources to face the challenges of globalization. All this contributes to the view that education is a pillar of a country's success, while school teachers are a pillar of educational success.

Engagement is important for a teacher because engagement is a condition that shows when teachers can be the most influential part of students' lives, teachers who have high enthusiasm when teaching, teachers who care deeply about the success of students

even beyond existing standards, teachers who understand subjects well but are not afraid to admit that they still need to learn more, Teachers who take pride in their work can transmit their confidence and optimism. The level of teacher engagement decreases at the next level. Therefore, this study will refer to the highest level of school, namely Senior High School (SMA) to test whether the indication of engagement is proven to be less the higher the school level or the results obtained will be different.

Job resources will be a research variable that tests how big this variable is in increasing a teacher's work attachment. As explained by Schaufeli (2017) that job resources are used to monitor the workplace which aims to increase work engagement. Job resources impose a psychological motivation process that motivates teachers to engage in tasks and roles, leading to job enjoyment and attachment. Therefore, teachers will experience high job attachment if their job resources such as job control, access to information, and supervisory support are available because job resources help them to do their jobs.

Based on a survey conducted by Gallup (2022) shows that K-12 workers (elementary to secondary teachers) have the highest level of burnout compared to other industries. The results are based on Gallup's Panel Workforce Study, conducted Feb. 3-14, 2022, with 12,319 full-time employees in the United States, including 1,263 K-12 workers. In the United States, 44% of teachers in K-12 education say they often or always feel burnout, while for college or university workers, the figure is as high as 35%. These are the top two jobs among the 14 listed in the 2022 Gallup Poll on burnout. Student performance can be negatively affected by teacher stress. In the first meta-analysis of teacher burnout research, a systematic literature review of 14 studies of 5,311 teachers and their 50,616 students showed evidence that teacher burnout is associated with poorer student academic achievement and lower quality student motivation. The findings repeat the need for more detailed studies but provide preliminary evidence that teacher burnout can affect the students they teach.

This study aims to find the impact of job demand and job resources on work engagement. The population in this study is employees of private companies in Korea. The study sample consisted of 198 participants. Data was collected directly from respondents by distributing questionnaires. The results of this study first show that job resources (job autonomy and performance feedback) have a positive and significant effect on work engagement. Second, it shows that job demands (technology demands) have a significant effect on job stress. Third, it shows that job resources (job autonomy) have a positive and significant effect on job crafting. Fourth, it shows that job demands (work overload and emotional demand) positively and significantly affect job crafting. Fifth, show job crafting has a significant effect on work engagement. Sixth, it shows that job crafting has a significant effect on job stress. Seventh, shows that job crafting mediates the relationship between job resources and engagement.

The second previous research that became a reference in this study was a study conducted by (Jimenez & Dunkl, 2017) in Malaysia with the title "Job Demands & Job Resources: Predicting Burnout and Work Engagement Among Teachers". The purpose of

this study is to understand how to increase teacher engagement adapted from cases that have continued to evolve over the past few years. The population in this study is primary and secondary school teachers in Malaysia. The study sample consisted of 600 respondents. The results of this study first show that there is a positive relationship between job demands and burnout. Second, it shows that there is a negative relationship between job resources and burnout. Third, it shows that there is a positive relationship between job resources and work engagement. Fourth, this study shows that burnout mediates the relationship between job resources and work engagement. The third previous research that became a reference in this study was a study conducted by (Ivanovic, Ivancevic, & Maricic, 2020) in Serbia entitled "The Relationship between Recruiter Burnout, Work Engagement and Turnover Intention: Evidence from Serbia". The aim of this study was to identify, understand and examine the relationship between burnout, engagement, and turnover intention of job recruiters in Serbia. Data was collected using an online questionnaire in a sample of 100 recruiters in Serbia. The results showed that work engagement negatively affected burnout and burnout had a positive impact on turnover intention, while the relationship between work engagement and turnover intention was not proven.

Based on the formulation of the problem, the purpose of this study is to analyze the influence of:

1. Job resources for work engagement in public high school teachers in West Kotawaringin
2. Job resources on job crafting for public high school teachers in West Kotawaringin
3. Job resources against burnout in public high school teachers in West Kotawaringin
4. Job crafting on work engagement for public high school teachers in West Kotawaringin
5. Burnout of work engagement among public high school teachers in West Kotawaringin
6. Job resources for work engagement through job crafting for public high school teachers in West Kotawaringin
7. Job resources on work engagement through burnout of public high school teachers in West Kotawaringin

Research Methods

Research Design

This study uses a type of causal research that aims to analyze the existence of causal relationships between variables. (Moleong & Edisi, 2004) stated that causal research is research conducted to determine the causal relationship between the variables being studied. The method used in the research was a survey, namely by distributing questionnaires to public high school teachers in West Kotawaringin.

Data Types and Sources

1. Data Type

This study uses quantitative data in the form of numerical numbers and analysis using statistics. According to Martono in (Sudaryono & Surbakti, 2017), quantitative research aims to describe social phenomena or symptoms quantitatively or analyze how social phenomena or symptoms that occur in society are interconnected with one another.

2. Data Sources

A data source is anything that can provide information regarding data. Based on the source, the data is divided into two, namely primary data and secondary data. The data source used in this study is the primary data source. Explained that primary data is a data source that directly provides data to data collectors. Primary data is also referred to as original data that has an up to date nature. Techniques that can be used to collect primary data are observation, interviews, and questionnaire distribution. The primary data used in this study was collected directly from public high school teachers in West Kotawaringin as respondents who will be distributed questionnaires on job resources, work engagement, job crafting, and burnout.

3. Data Collection Methods

The tool used to collect data is a questionnaire. The questionnaire was distributed directly to public high school teachers in West Kotawaringin who were willing to become respondents. The questionnaire is a data collection tool carried out by giving respondents a set of questions or written statements to answer. The questionnaire is distributed by snowball sampling, where several subjects will be selected to represent the school and then distributed the questionnaire to other teachers. Use the method of directly distributing questionnaires to respondents in the following ways:

- a. Questionnaires are distributed in the form of a google form
- b. Respondents fill out questionnaires according to the instructions provided.
- c. The completed questionnaire is collected and processed.

Population, Sample, and Sampling Techniques

1. Populasi

According to Sugiyono (2016: 80), population is a generalized area consisting of objects/subjects with certain qualities and characteristics determined to be studied and then conclusions are drawn. The population in this study is public high school teachers in West Kotawaringin.

2. Sample

According to (Imperator, 2017) samples are part of the number and characteristics possessed by the population. According to (Hair Jr, Sarstedt, Hopkins, & Kuppelwieser, 2014), when using structural equation model (SEM) analysis, the minimum sample size is 100 to 200. In this study, the sample size used was 166 people obtained from a total of 7 public high schools in West Kotawaringin.

Sampling Techniques

The sampling method in this study is non-random sampling with purposive sampling techniques, which are sampling techniques that do not provide equal opportunities for population members to be selected as samples based on certain considerations. The sample criteria in this study are public high school teachers in West Kotawaringin who have worked for at least one year.

Data Analysis

The data analysis technique used in this study is the Structural Equation Model (SEM) with lisrel software. SEM is a statistical technique that can directly analyze the pattern of relationships between latent constructs and indicators, latent constructs with one another, and measurement errors.

1. Data Normality Test

According to Ghozali (2013: 110) the normality test aims to find out whether each variable is normally distributed or not. Yamin and Kurniawan (2009: 29) said that data normality consists of two types of output, namely:

2. Univariate normality

In univariate normality, data is said to be normally distributed if the p-values of chi-square skewness and kurtosis are at least 0.05. Conversely, if the data is not normally distributed, it is marked with a value of chi-square, Skewness, and Kurtosis less than 0.05.

3. Multivariate normality

In multivariate normality, data is said to be normally distributed if the p-values of chi-square skewness and kurtosis are at least 0.05. Conversely, if the p-values of chi square skewness and kurtosis are less than 0.05, then it can be said that the whole variable is not normally distributed.

4. Validity Test

(Yamin & Kurniawan, 2009) said that validity aims to prove whether an indicator can measure the latent variables used in research. In other words, the validity test is used to measure the validity or validity of a questionnaire. The validity of the construct can be measured through the statistical t-test approach of factor load provided that an indicator is said to be valid if the t value of the factor charge is > 1.96 .

5. Reliability Test

(Yamin & Kurniawan, 2009) said that reliability is used to obtain evidence that the information or data used is reliable and able to reveal information in accordance with reality. Reliability tests are performed with the Cronbach Alpha test. Cronbach's Alpha formula is as follows:

$$\text{Construct Reliability} = \frac{(\sum \lambda_i)^2}{(\sum \lambda_i)^2 + \sum e_i^2}$$

According to (Yamin & Kurniawan, 2009), if the alpha value > 0.7 , it means that reliability is sufficient, while if alpha is > 0.80 , it suggests all reliable items and all tests consistently internally because it has strong reliability.

6. Model Overall Fit Test

The overall fit test is used to test the research model used with data collected from respondents. According to (Yamin & Kurniawan, 2009), several indicators can be used to measure model testing, namely:

a. GFI (Goodness of Fit Index)

GFI is used to measure the ability of a model to explain data diversity. If the GFI value is greater than or equal to 0.90, then it can be explained that the model has a good fit feasibility.

b. AGFI (Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index)

AGFI is a modification of GFI by accommodating comparisons between free degree models with other models. With test criteria: if the AGFI value is greater than or equal to 0.90 is good fit, while if the value is $0.80 \leq \text{AGFI} < 0.90$ is marginal fit.

c. NFI (Normed Fit Index)

NFI is the magnitude of the mismatch between the target and base models. With test criteria: if the NFI value is greater than or equal to 0.90 is good fit, while if the value is $0.80 \leq \text{NFI} < 0.90$ is marginal fit.

d. IFI (Incremental Fit Index)

The provision of value in IFI if $\text{IFI} \geq 0.9$ is said to be a good fit, while if $0.8 \leq \text{IFI} < 0.9$, then it is said to be a marginal fit.

e. CFI (Comparative Fit Index)

The test criteria: if the CFI value is greater than or equal to 0.90 is a good fit, while if the value is $0.80 \leq \text{CFI} < 0.90$ is a marginal fit.

f. RFI (Relative Fit Index)

Its value ranges between 0 and 1. An RFI value of ≥ 0.9 is a good fit, while an RFI value of $0.8 \leq < 0.9$ is a marginal fit.

g. RMSEA (Root Mean Square Error of Approximation)

RMSEA is used to measure the average difference per degree of freedom expected in a population. With test criteria: if the RMSEA value is less than 0.08 is a good fit, while if the RMSEA value is smaller than 0.05 is a close fit.

Structural Model Conformity Test

The structural model fit test is used to test the relationship between hypothesized variables, that is, to find out whether the relationship coefficients between those variables are statistically significant or insignificant. The test commonly used is a two-way test, which uses a statistical t-value limit of 1.96. The coefficient of determination (R^2) explains how much the hypothesized exogenous variable in the equation can explain the endogenous variable. A large R^2 value indicates that the exogenous variable can explain the endogenous variable well.

Uji Hypoplant

This test is necessary to determine the significance of the results of Structural Equation Modelling. The cut-off of a data is said to be significant if the test criterion is 1.96. According to (De Beer et al., 2016), if each parameter estimate has a t value greater than 1.96, the relationship between variables is declared significant.

Results and Discussion

Normality Test

Normality testing uses two tests, namely univariate normality and multivariate normality. Univariate normality is a normality test for each indicator and multivariate normality is a normality test for all indicators that make up the research model. The results of univariate normality testing are shown in the following table:

Table 1
Univariate Normality Table

No.	Variable	Skewness and Kurtosis		Information
		Chi-Square	P-Value	
1.	JR1	42.451	0.001	Abnormal
2.	JR2	34.801	0.021	Abnormal
3.	JR3	39.013	0.040	Abnormal
4.	JR4	48.653	0.135	Normal
5.	JR5	19.014	0.101	Normal
6.	JR6	21.243	0.070	Normal
7.	JR7	33.843	0.091	Normal
8.	JC1	17.985	0.358	Normal
9.	JC2	23.196	0.055	Normal
10.	JC3	30.069	0.029	Abnormal
11.	JC4	62.399	0.019	Abnormal
12.	JC5	57.763	0.175	Normal
13.	JC6	50.224	0.010	Abnormal
14.	JC7	62.623	0.058	Normal

15.	JC8	14.461	0.025	Abnormal
16.	JC9	37.626	0.032	Abnormal
17.	JC10	45.611	0.038	Abnormal
18.	BO1	38.453	0.085	Normal
19.	BO2	42.394	0.035	Abnormal
20.	BO3	29.251	0.000	Abnormal
21.	BO4	18.002	0.006	Abnormal
22.	BO5	20.976	0.001	Abnormal
23.	BO6	41.913	0.022	Abnormal
24.	BO7	39.050	0.000	Abnormal
25.	BO8	18.012	0.001	Abnormal
26.	WE1	23.244	0.100	Normal
27.	WE2	22.727	0.182	Normal
28.	WE3	27.607	0.032	Abnormal
29.	WE4	21.849	0.057	Normal
30.	WE5	55.882	0.261	Normal
31.	WE6	34.957	0.222	Normal
32.	WE7	56.749	0.130	Normal
33.	WE8	63.659	0.003	Abnormal
34.	WE9	56.125	0.061	Normal
35.	WE10	39.849	0.143	Normal
36.	WE11	23.633	0.086	Normal

Source: Appendix 5, processed

Based on Table 1, it can be seen that univariately, the normality assumption in some indicators is not fulfilled because the p-value is less than the set cut-off of 0.05. However, half the indicators of the existing amount are already met because the p-value is more than the cut off. Furthermore, to see the overall data declared normal or not, a multivariate normality test can be used as a reference for normality.

Table 2
Multivariate Normality Table

<i>Skewness</i>		<i>Kurtosis</i>			<i>Skewness and Kurtosis</i>		
<i>Value</i>	<i>Z-Score</i>	<i>P-Value</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Z-Score</i>	<i>P-Value</i>	<i>Chi-Square</i>	<i>P-Value</i>
400.550	18.553	0.000	1469.737	9.252	0.000	429.815	0.000

Table 2 shows that the data are abnormally multivariate because the P-value of skewness and kurtosis is less than 0.05, which is 0.000, but the analysis can still be continued.

Validity Test

Validity Test is the level of reliability and validity of the tools used. The following are the results of validity testing in this study:

Table 3
Validity Testing Results

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Factor</i>		<i>Conclusion</i>
		<i>Loading (T-Value)</i>	<i>Cut Off</i>	
<i>Job Resources</i>	JR1	-	-	
	JR2	7,73	>1,96	Valid
	JR3	7,87	>1,96	Valid
	JR4	6,87	>1,96	Valid
	JR5	7,08	>1,96	Valid
	JR6	7,00	>1,96	Valid
	JR7	6,14	>1,96	Valid

	JC1	-	-	
	JC2	6,64	>1,96	Valid
	JC3	4,28	>1,96	Valid
	JC4	8,54	>1,96	Valid
	JC5	7,35	>1,96	Valid
<i>Job Crafting</i>	JC6	8,82	>1,96	Valid
	JC7	8,95	>1,96	Valid
	JC8	6,18	>1,96	Valid
	JC9	4,34	>1,96	Valid
	JC10	5,00	>1,96	Valid
	BO1	-	-	
	BO2	16,18	>1,96	Valid
	BO3	15,74	>1,96	Valid
	BO4	15,57	>1,96	Valid
<i>Burnout</i>	BO5	17,61	>1,96	Valid
	BO6	16,55	>1,96	Valid
	BO7	18,55	>1,96	Valid
	BO8	15,35	>1,96	Valid
<i>Work Engagement</i>	WE1	-	-	
	WE2	7,72	>1,96	Valid
	WE3	11,76	>1,96	Valid
	WE4	7,35	>1,96	Valid

WE5	6,56	>1,96	Valid
WE6	6,20	>1,96	Valid
WE7	7,97	>1,96	Valid
WE8	7,04	>1,96	Valid
WE9	6,93	>1,96	Valid
WE10	5,86	>1,96	Valid
WE11	7,13	>1,96	Valid

Based on Table 3 it can be seen that the data is valid because all indicators have a loading factor greater than 1.96.

Reliability Test

Reliability tests are measured using the construct reliability formula as follows:

$$\text{Construct Reliability} = \frac{(\sum \lambda_i)^2}{(\sum \lambda_i)^2 + \sum e_i^2}$$

Construct reliability can be said to be reliable if the results exceed 0.7. The results of the construct reliability calculation of each variable are shown in the following table:

Construct Reliability Variabel Job Resources (JR)

Table 4
Hasil Perhitungan Uji Construct Reliability Job Resources

Indikator	λ	λ^2	$(1-\lambda^2)$	$\frac{(\sum \lambda)^2}{\sum (1-\lambda^2)}$	CR	Ket
JR1	0,74	0,5476	0,4524			
JR2	0,68	0,4624	0,5376			
JR3	0,61	0,3721	0,6279			
JR4	0,68	0,4624	0,5376			
JR5	0,65	0,4225	0,5775			
JR6	0,72	0,5184	0,4816			
JR7	0,68	0,4624	0,5376			
\sum JR	4,76	3,7522	3,7522	26,4098	0,857924	Reliabel
$(\sum$ JR) ²	22,6576					

Source: Appendix 7

From the calculation of construct reliability job resources in Table 4, it can be concluded that the job resources variable is reliable because the reliability value shown is 0.85 where the value exceeds the cut off of >0.7.

Construct Reliability Variabel Job Crafting (JC)

Table 5
Job Crafting Construct Reliability Test Calculation Results

Indikator	λ	λ^2	$(1-\lambda^2)$	$(\sum \lambda)^2 + \sum (1-\lambda^2)$	CR	Ket
JC1	0,67	0,4489	0,5511			
JC2	0,64	0,4096	0,5904			
JC3	0,61	0,3721	0,6279			
JC4	0,75	0,5625	0,4375			
JC5	0,69	0,4761	0,5239			
JC6	0,74	0,5476	0,4524			
JC7	0,76	0,5776	0,4224			
JC8	0,63	0,3969	0,6031			
JC9	0,66	0,4356	0,5644			
JC10	0,62	0,3844	0,6156			
$\sum JC$	6,77		5,3887	51,2216	0,894796	Reliabel
$(\sum JC)^2$	45,8329					

From the calculation of construct reliability job crafting in Table 5 it can be concluded that the job crafting variable is reliable because the reliability value shown is 0.89 where the value exceeds the cut off which is >0.7.

Construct Reliability Variabel Burnout (BO)

Table 6
Construct Reliability Burnout Test Calculation Results

Indikator	λ	λ^2	$(1-\lambda^2)$	$(\sum \lambda)^2 + \sum (1-\lambda^2)$	CR	Ket
BO1	0,85	0,7225	0,2775			
BO2	0,86	0,7396	0,2604			
BO3	0,91	0,8281	0,1719			
BO4	0,89	0,7921	0,2079			
BO5	0,89	0,7921	0,2079			
BO6	0,89	0,7921	0,2079			
BO7	0,88	0,7744	0,2256			
BO8	0,89	0,7921	0,2079			

ΣBO	7,06	1,767	51.6106	0,965763	Reliabel
$(\Sigma BO)^2$	49,8436				

From the calculation of construct reliability burnout in Table 6, it can be concluded that the burnout variable is reliable because the reliability value shown is 0.96 where the value exceeds the cut off of >0.7 .

Construct Reliability Variabel Work Engagement (WE)

Table 7
Work Engagement Construct Reliability Test Calculation Results

Indikator	λ	λ^2	$(1-\lambda^2)$	$\frac{(\Sigma \lambda)^2 + \Sigma (1-\lambda^2)}{\Sigma (1-\lambda^2)}$	CR	Ket
WE1	0,79	0,6241	0,3759			
WE2	0,68	0,4624	0,5376			
WE3	0,76	0,5776	0,4224			
WE4	0,63	0,3969	0,6031			
WE5	0,71	0,5041	0,4959			
WE6	0,73	0,5329	0,4671			
WE7	0,76	0,5776	0,4224			
WE8	0,77	0,5929	0,4071			
WE9	0,75	0,5625	0,4375			
WE10	0,73	0,5329	0,4671			
WE11	0,63	0,3969	0,6031			
ΣWE	7,94		5,2392	68.2828	0,923272	Reliabel
$(\Sigma WE)^2$	63,0436					

From the calculation of construct reliability work engagement in Table 7, it can be concluded that the burnout variable is reliable because the reliability value shown is 0.93 where the value exceeds the cut-off of >0.7 .

Uji Model

A model-wide fit test is a test performed to analyze a model's fit to data. The following are the results of the fit test of the entire model in this study.

Table 8
Model Conformity Test

<i>Goodness Of Fit Index</i>	<i>Cut Off Value</i>	<i>Result</i>	<i>Information</i>
Chi Square		867,46	

Significance Probability	$\geq 0,05$	0,000	Not Fit
RMSEA	$\leq 0,08$	0,054	Good Fit
NFI	$\geq 0,90$	0,95	Good Fit
SMOKE	$\geq 0,90$	0,98	Good Fit
RFI	$\geq 0,90$	0,95	Good Fit
CMIN/DF	$\leq 2,83$	1,87	Good Fit
CFI	$\geq 0,95$	0,98	Good Fit

Judging from table 8 above, it can be concluded that the model used in this study as a whole can be said to be suitable because the value of the model fit test indicator is met, there are only three indicators that are not met.

Uji Hypoplant

Table 9
Research Hypothesis Test Results

Hipotesis	Variable	T-Value	Cut Off	Information
H1	<i>Job Resources → Work Engagement</i>	7,80	>1.96	Significant
H2	<i>Job Resources → Job Crafting</i>	8,85	>1.96	Significant
H3	<i>Job Resources → Burnout</i>	-3,74	>1.96	Significant
H4	<i>Job Crafting → Work Engagement</i>	1,06	>1.96	Insignificant
H5	<i>Burnout → Work Engagement</i>	-2,30	>1.96	Significant
H6	<i>Job Resources → Job Crafting → Work Engagement</i>	7,79	>1.96	Significant
H7	<i>Job Resources → Burnout → Work Engagement</i>	2,49	>1.96	Significant

The significance test criterion with the T-Table was 1.96. The positive direction if the T-Value > 1.96 then significant and the negative direction if $- T \text{ Value} < -1.96$ then significant. Based on Table 4.17, the results of hypothesis testing can be explained as follows:

1. Job Resources (JR) have a positive and significant effect on Work Engagement (WE). This influence is evidenced by a t-value of 7.80 (t-value > 1.96).
2. Job Resources (JR) has a positive and significant effect on Job Crafting (JC). This influence is evidenced by a t-value of 8.85 (t-value > 1.96).
3. Job Resources (JR) negatively and significantly affect Burnout (BO). This influence is evidenced by a t-value of -3.74 (t-value < -1.96).
4. Job Crafting (JC) has a positive effect on Work Engagement (WE). This effect is not significant, as evidenced by a t-value of 1.06 (t-value < 1.96).
5. Burnout (BO) has a negative and significant effect on Work Engagement (WE). This effect is evidenced by a t-value of -2.30 (t-value < -1.96).
6. Job Resources (JR) has a positive and significant effect on Work Engagement (WE) through Job Crafting (JC). This influence is evidenced by a t-value of 7.79 (t-value > 1.96).
7. Job Resources (JR) have a positive and significant effect on Work Engagement (WE) through Burnout (BO). This influence is evidenced by a t-value of 2.49 (t-value > 1.96).

The Effect of Job Resources on Work Engagement

Judging from the statistical results, it is stated that the effect of job resources on work engagement is positive. Test the hypothesis that job resources have a positive effect on work engagement in State High School teachers in West Kotawaringin is proven by a t-value of 7.80 (more than the cut off of 1.96). This proves the influence of job resources on work engagement.

Based on respondents' answers obtained from public high school teachers in West Kotawaringin, it can be seen through descriptive statistics that the job resources variable has an average value of 4.19. The average value proves that respondents agree on the job resources variable which has seven indicators. The most widely agreed indicator is about how to receive sufficient information about the goals and results of the work of the respondents. While the indicator that is less agreed is how respondents have freedom in carrying out their work activities. The average value of the work engagement variable is 4.15. The average value also proves that respondents agree with the measurement of work engagement variables which have 11 indicators.

It can be concluded that when the dimensions in job resources are fulfilled in a worker, it will increase the work engagement of the worker. The fulfillment of factors in job resources such as freedom in doing work, feedback that is always given to employees, getting clear information about their work and the existence of a good relationship between employees and superiors will make employees more attached to their company

because they feel positive in their work and do not feel burdensome about their work. The better or more fulfilled job resources in employees, the higher their attachment to the organization or company.

The results of this study are supported by research conducted by (Kotze, 2018) which proves that job resources affect work engagement in employees of private companies in Korea. Another study conducted by Kunte & Rungruang (2018) on employees of various industries in Thailand also confirmed that job resources have a positive influence on work engagement. Studies say that job resources such as perceived organizational and social support, autonomy, and good relationships with management have also been shown to increase job engagement

The Effect of Job Resources on Job Crafting

Judging from the statistical results, it is stated that the influence of job resources on job crafting is positive. Test the hypothesis that job resources have a positive effect on job crafting in State High School teachers in West Kotawaringin is proven by a t-value of 8.85 (greater than the cut off of 1.96). This proves the influence of job resources on job crafting.

Based on respondents' answers obtained from public high school teachers in West Kotawaringin, it can be seen through descriptive statistics that the job crafting variable has an average value of 4.16. The average value proves that respondents agree on the job crafting variable which has ten indicators. Of the 10 existing indicators, there are several indicators with the highest agreed value. It can be concluded that teachers feel they can improve themselves about the importance of their work for the success of organizations and communities, teachers can prioritize work that matches their respective skills or interests and teachers think about how their work positively impacts their lives. Based on answers on job resources variables, respondents answered in agreement on each indicator. However, the indicator with the lowest level of approval in the job resources variable is how respondents have freedom in carrying out their work activities. This means that there is not much freedom that teachers can do in their work.

The results of this study are supported by research conducted by (Kotze, 2018) on employees of private companies in Korea proving that job resources have a positive and significant effect on job crafting. Job autonomy is one dimension in job resources where each indicator discusses how a worker has freedom in doing his job and can decide for himself how his work is carried out.

The Effect of Job Resources on Burnout

Judging from the statistical results, it is stated that the effect of job resources on burnout is negative. The hypothesis test stating that job resources negatively affect burnout in State High School teachers in West Kotawaringin is proven by a t-value of -3.74 (less than the cut-off of -1.96). This proves the negative influence of job resources on burnout.

Based on respondents' answers to the burnout variable, respondents answered disagree on each indicator. The indicator that had the highest level of disapproval was that teachers felt emotionally drained because of their work. Judging from respondents'

answers to the job resources variable, respondents on average answered in agreement on each indicator. Based on questionnaires on job resources variables, each teacher feels they have freedom in doing work activities, each teacher has an influence in planning activities and work speed, each teacher can decide for himself the content of his work activities, each teacher receives enough information about the goals and results of their work, each teacher feels that their work gives direct feedback on how well they do their job, Every teacher feels that their boss tells them how good they are at doing and every teacher has colleagues telling them about how good they are at doing their job. What the teachers feel proves that the job resources in the teachers have been fulfilled, so that the teachers do not feel fatigue in themselves. Teachers don't feel emotionally drained from work, don't feel physical fatigue at the end of the workday, don't feel lethargic when they wake up in the morning because they have another day at work, don't feel pressured when working with people all day and don't feel tired and frustrated because of work.

The Effect of Job Crafting on Work Engagement

Based on respondents' research obtained on job crafting in public high school teachers in West Kotawaringin, it can be seen that the average respondent answered in agreement on the job crafting variable which has 10 indicators. The most widely agreed indicator is that respondents prioritize jobs that match their skills or interests and they think about how their work can have a positive impact on their lives. The indicator with the lowest level of approval was about how respondents could change the scope or type of tasks they completed at work. This means that respondents cannot easily change how they work or the types of tasks they perform, such as changes in the way they teach, which is basically teaching in the classroom.

Judging from the statistical results, it is stated that the effect of job crafting on work engagement is positive. The hypothesis test stating that job crafting has a positive effect on work engagement in State High School teachers in West Kotawaringin is not proven with a t-value of 1.06 (less than the cut off of 1.96). This proves the absence of the influence of job crafting on work engagement.

When viewed from the results of respondents' answers in this study, from the three dimensions in job crafting, namely task crafting, relational crafting, and cognitive crafting, then in this study the respondents felt that what they could do in job crafting was how they could change their perspective or their perspective on their work, Judging from the value of the most widely agreed indicator, they are able to think that their work can have a positive impact on their lives. If teachers can only change the way they view work, but cannot change in detail how their work matches what they expect, for them it has not been able to increase their engagement in accordance with the results of respondents' answers the indicator with the lowest level of approval is about how teachers can change the scope or type of their tasks. When viewed at the level, high school teachers may not have many ways to teach their students because students will also understand the simple learning process. Unlike if the research is conducted at the elementary school (SD) level, teachers can be required to be more creative in teaching because elementary students will more easily understand the lesson in certain ways. Teachers already have standards in the

teaching and learning process, only the way of delivering the material can vary. If teachers can be more free to express themselves in the delivery of learning materials, it will be easier to increase work engagement.

How Burnout Affects Work Engagement

Based on respondents' answers obtained from public high school teachers in West Kotawaringin, it can be seen through descriptive statistics that the burnout variable has an average value of 2.51. The average value proves respondents disagree on the burnout variable, with 8 indicators. The indicator with the highest disapproval level was that teachers felt emotionally drained because of their work. The indicator with the lowest level of disapproval was related to how they felt others at work blamed them for the problem.

Negative influence means that when a worker or teacher has a low burnout rate, their engagement will be higher. But on the contrary, if teachers feel very high burnout in their work, their engagement will be lower. Judging from the respondents' answers in this study, it can be concluded that teachers feel low burnout. This can be seen from the answers of respondents who disagreed on all indicators in the burnout variable. Teachers do not feel high emotions in their work; teachers do not feel excessive physical fatigue when work hours are over, teachers do not feel lethargic when they have to get up early and have a new day again to work; teachers do not feel pressure to work with people around them, teachers do not feel frustrated because of their work, teachers do not feel that their lives and careers will not change and teachers do not think that people in their workplaces blame them when things go wrong.

The Effect of Job Resources on Work Engagement through Job Crafting

Judging from the statistical results, it is stated that the influence of job resources on work engagement through job crafting is positive. Test the hypothesis that job resources positively affect work engagement through job crafting in State High School teachers in West Kotawaringin is proven by a t-value of 7.79 (more than the cut-off of 1.96). This demonstrates the influence of job resources on work engagement through job crafting.

Judging from the respondents' answers to the variable of job resources who agreed there is freedom in carrying out work activities and can decide the content of work activities, teachers can do job crafting in doing their work. So, when the freedom to change the scope is allowed, it will increase teachers' work engagement. Although in the variable of job crafting, the teachers agree that they can only change the way they view the work rather than have the freedom to change the scope of work, the teachers still agree that there is an opportunity for them to change the scope of work.

The Effect of Job Resources on Work Engagement through Burnout

Judging from the statistical results, it is stated that the effect of job resources on work engagement through burnout is positive. Test the hypothesis that job resources positively impact work engagement through burnout in State High School teachers in West Kotawaringin is proven by a t-value of 2.49 (more than the cut off of 1.96). This demonstrates the influence of job resources on work engagement through burnout.

The results of this study are supported by research conducted (Jimenez & Dunkl, 2017), proving that burnout mediates the relationship between job resources and work engagement. The results of research conducted by (Barkhowa, 2020) on manufacturing industry employees in Salatiga also prove that job resources affect work engagement through burnout as an intervening variable. (Barkhowa, 2020) wrote in the results of his research that in the variable of job resources, research respondents felt that they had the opportunity to develop careers in the company, had good communication between colleagues in the company, felt that all the information needed by employees in helping complete responsibility tasks was always in the company, getting support from superiors, having groups in the work environment positively; All employees always participate in decision making, and the type of work done by employees in the company is very varied. If this is fulfilled by employees, it can affect burnout because respondents feel always excited at work and they feel not tired when doing work. When employees are enthusiastic in doing their work, it will increase work engagement because employees have high energy while working, feel excited and enthusiastic when doing their work, where all feelings of enthusiasm arise when what is needed in job resources has been obtained by employees in their work.

Conclusion

Based on the analysis and discussion, it can be concluded that Job Resources (JR) has a positive and significant effect on Work Engagement (WE), Job Crafting (JC), and a negative impact on Burnout (BO) in public high school teachers in West Kotawaringin. However, Job Crafting (JC) does not positively affect Work Engagement (WE) and Burnout (BO) negatively affects Work Engagement (WE). In addition, Job Resources (JR) also positively affects Work Engagement (WE) through Job Crafting (JC) and through Burnout (BO).

Bibliography

- Aldrin, Neil, & Merdiaty, Netty. (2019). Effect of job crafting on work engagement with mindfulness as a mediator. *Cogent Psychology*, 6(1), 1684421. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311908.2019.1684421>
- Barkhawa, Mokhammad Khukaim. (2020). Pengaruh Job Resources Terhadap Work Engagement Melalui Burnout Karyawan Industri Manufaktur di Salatiga. *Fokus Ekonomi: Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi*, 15(1), 241–261. <https://doi.org/10.34152/fe.15.1.241-261>
- De Beer, Leon T., Tims, Maria, & Bakker, Arnold B. (2016). Job crafting and its impact on work engagement and job satisfaction in mining and manufacturing. *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences*, 19(3), 400–412.
- Hair Jr, Joe F., Sarstedt, Marko, Hopkins, Lucas, & Kuppelwieser, Volker G. (2014). Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM): An emerging tool in business research. *European Business Review*, 26(2), 106–121.
- Imperatori, Barbara. (2017). *Engagement and disengagement at work: Drivers and organizational practices to sustain employee passion and performance*. Springer.
- Ivanovic, Tatjana, Ivancevic, Sonja, & Maricic, Milica. (2020). The relationship between recruiter burnout, work engagement and turnover intention: Evidence from Serbia. *Engineering Economics*, 31(2), 197–210.
- Jiménez, Paul, Bregenzer, Anita, Kallus, K. Wolfgang, Fruhwirth, Bianca, & Wagner-Hartl, Verena. (2017). Enhancing resources at the workplace with health-promoting leadership. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 14(10), 1264.
- Jimenez, Paul, & Dunkl, Anita. (2017). The buffering effect of workplace resources on the relationship between the areas of worklife and burnout. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 234160.
- Jiménez, Paul, Winkler, Bianca, & Dunkl, Anita. (2017). Creating a healthy working environment with leadership: the concept of health-promoting leadership. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 28(17), 2430–2448.
- Kotze, Martina. (2018). How job resources and personal resources influence work engagement and burnout. *African Journal of Economic and Management Studies*, 9(2), 148–164.
- Moleong, Lexi J., & Edisi, PRRB. (2004). Metodologi penelitian. *Bandung: Penerbit Remaja Rosdakarya*, 3(01).
- Rifa'i, Muhammad, Ananda, Rusydi, & Fadhli, Muhammad. (2018). *Manajemen peserta didik (Pengelolaan peserta didik untuk efektivitas pembelajaran)*.

The Effect of Job Resources on Work Engagement through Job Crafting and Burnout in Public High School Teachers in West Kotawaringin

Sudaryono, Sudaryono, & Surbakti, Natangsa. (2017). *Hukum Pidana Dasar-Dasar Hukum Pidana Berdasarkan KUHP dan RUU KUHP*.

Yamin, Sofyan, & Kurniawan, Heri. (2009). *SPSS complete: Teknik analisis statistik terlengkap dengan software SPSS*. Jakarta: Salemba Infotek, 328.