

## Work Engagement, Self Efficacy and Job Satisfaction of Professional Educators

Trisnadi Tarigan<sup>1</sup>, Dimiyati<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia  
[trisnaditarigan.2019@student.uny.ac.id](mailto:trisnaditarigan.2019@student.uny.ac.id)

### Abstract

*Teachers as professional educators have an important role in developing human resources. The task of the teacher is not only as a teacher but also as an educator, so that in addition to having the task of strengthening the intellectual capacity of students, it is also responsible for the formation and development of the personality capacity and abilities of students cognitively, affective and psychomotor. However, apart from these assignments, teachers still have various problems related to excessive workloads and quality demands that are not comparable to the economic and social welfare they receive and problems with politicization of teachers. This problem simultaneously affects work engagement, self-efficacy and job satisfaction of professional educators. Even though work engagement,*

### Keywords

teacher; work engagement; self efficacy; job satisfaction; educator



### I. Introduction

Indonesia regulates the duties and authorities of Teachers in Law Number 14 of 2005 concerning Teachers and Lecturers. Teachers are specifically mentioned as having various tasks, namely educating, teaching, guiding, giving directions, providing training, giving assessments, and conducting evaluations to students who take their education from an early age through formal government channels in the form of elementary to middle school. Therefore the teacher must be good at choosing the right learning strategy in this aspect, so that the objectives of the material can be achieved properly (Siahaan, 2020). Through this Law, teachers are placed in a vital and strategic position to be able to realize the goals of national education in Indonesia, namely as professional educators.

Teachers have an important role in optimizing human resource development through education and learning (Costley, 2009). Education in this case cannot be equated with learning which only focuses on intellectual development efforts alone. Education has a broad scope, not only limited to intellectual development but also developing all aspects of personality and individual abilities cognitively, affective and psychomotor. So it can be understood that education in this case has a wider contextualization than learning (Costley, 2009).

The important contribution of a teacher is certainly not free from problems. When teachers experience problems and obstacles in terms of teaching, often the teacher does not have a place to discuss and give input on what is being faced (Saragih, 2019). The majority of teachers in Indonesia still face threats related to demands for quality, welfare, and teacher politicization (Chang, Shaffer, Samarra, Ragatz, de Ree & Stevenson, 2014; Tobias, Fletcher, Dexter & Wind, 2014). In terms of quality, teachers are required to meet the government constitutional criteria such as pedagogical, personal, social and

professional competence. Then, in addition to the main tasks conveyed in the above Law, teachers also have demands to carry out sustainable professional development activities. These activities are related to (1) self-development, (2) scientific publications, and (3) the development of innovative learning (Kamdi, 2014).

Not only that, teachers are still required to do so carry out extracurricular coaching tasks, as well as other additional tasks of an administrative nature such as being the principal, vice principal of the school, homeroom teacher, and other administrative tasks. Teachers also carry out professional development through various scientific activities and training (Kamdi, 2014). The number of tasks that must be done by teachers means that the average teacher in Indonesia has an excessive workload if it is calculated in units of time, namely 56.02 hours per week instead of 40 hours per week (Kamdi, 2014).

However, in the context of the economic welfare of teachers in Indonesia, it is still far from prosperous. Even teachers are not free from jealousy based on the stratification between the state and the private sector, and between certification and non-certification. This is not more because economically the income between these strata is very much different even though the workload and quality demands are the same (Chang et al., 2014). Lumbanrau (2021) said that there are still many teachers in Indonesia who get compensation that is far from appropriate even though they have devoted themselves to education for dozens of years. There are honorary teachers who even get a salary of Rp. 50,000 per month for 15 years of service. Then in the political aspect, teachers as a means and also an important actor of education are often used and politicized by politicians to become a political commodity. This is due to the large number of teachers who have the ability to mobilize the masses, especially students and their families. This very significant ability and quantity of teachers can increase the potential for votes in general elections and can lead politicians to certain positions (Chang et al., 2014).

Various problems related to teachers presented by Chang et al. (2014) above can certainly affect the work engagement of a teacher in carrying out his obligations as an educator. Eventhough teacher attachment can have a positive impact on the process of organizing education. Teachers who are tied to their work are able to make students create a more effective school atmosphere and make class activities more meaningful. Effective schools will increase student involvement in increasing opportunities and achievements in learning. Tobias et al. (2014) found that when teachers care about students, it will make them work harder.

This research will more clearly see the relationship between various teacher problems in the context of demands for quality, economic welfare and also the politicization presented by Chang et al. (2014) above with the work engagement of these teachers from a theoretical perspective as well as various literatures that support these findings. In addition, further this research will also involve self-efficacy and job satisfaction, because both simultaneously also have an influence on the emergence of work engagement in a teacher (Chan, Kalliath, Brough, O'Driscoll, Siu & Tims, 2015; Garg, Dar & Mishra, 2017).

## **II. Review of Literatures**

### **2.1 Work Engagement Theory, Self Efficacy and Job Satisfaction**

#### **a. Work Engagement**

Kahn (Lu, Lu, Gursoy, & Neale, 2016) has a very important role in introducing the concept of work engagement, he is a character who first came up with this concept.

According to Kahn (Lu et al., 2016) this work engagement refers to a work that is done simultaneously and a person shows an expression of comfort in completing the task in his job. It can also be briefly understood as someone's personal expression in offering or promoting oneself to be able to connect and work for others. These personal expressions can be seen both physically, cognitively and emotionally.

In addition, work engagement is also defined by Scaufeli and Bakker (2006) as a positive and work-related state of mind. This state of positive thinking is characterized by enthusiasm, dedication, and absorption. Furthermore, the spirit referred to in this case is explained more to refer to high mental energy and resilience in a person during work, the willingness to channel energy to work, as well as a person's resilience at work even though he is in difficulties.

Then, dedication refers to someone who participates intensely in every task and job. In addition, someone in this case also feels the significance, enthusiasm, inspiration, pride, and feels challenged to every job they have. Next is absorption which refers to a person's ability to give full concentration and be happy to do his job. It is characterized by the individual feeling that it is difficult to separate themselves from their work and always feels that time flies quickly when working (Scaufeli & Bakker, 2006; Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma, & Bakker, 2002; Hakanen, Bakker & Schaufeli, 2006).

Slightly different from Kahn (Lu et al., 2016) as well as Scaufeli and Bakker (2006), Maslach, Jackson and Leiter (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2016) in this case that work engagement is how to understand and eliminate the causes of fatigue naturally, so that it can improve the quality of one's work. Meanwhile, Schmidt & Hunter (2004) defines work engagement as a combination of commitment and satisfaction at work. Satisfaction in this case refers to an emotional or attitude element. Satisfaction in Schmidt & Hunter (2004) terminology is similar to the comfort expression used by Kahn (Lu et al., 2016) in defining work engagement. Meanwhile, the commitment referred to by Schmidt & Hunter (2004) is something that is more intense involving something motivational and physical.

## **b. Self Efficacy**

Bandura (1997) as the originator of the self-efficacy theory defines that self-efficacy refers to an individual's belief in his ability to cultivate any behavior needed to produce a certain performance. This self-efficacy in this case can be said as something that reflects the ability to exercise control over individual behavior, motivation and social environment. Even self-efficacy related to one's belief in obtaining something can be used as a predictive factor that is more in determining one's success than a series of achievements, knowledge or skills and a person's talents (Bandura, 1997; Ahmad & Safaria, 2016).

Furthermore, Bandura (1997) in this case introduces a conceptual framework and emphasizes that this self-efficacy is stronger than the actual ability of the individual himself for each task at hand. Through this, what is expected is that individuals do not only rely on their basic abilities and talents in completing a job, but require the strength of belief that individuals can achieve the goals of the work. Ability without strong belief will not be able to guarantee that an individual can gain success, even the predictive value is very small compared to the belief itself (Chan, Kalliath, Brough, O'Driscoll, Siu & Timms, 2017; Bandura, 1995; Ahmad & Safaria, 2016).

Then, Bandura (1997) also said that this self-efficacy also determines whether the individual will initiate an action, how much effort the individual will invest and the individual's resilience in the face of obstacles and failures. For this reason, self-efficacy is also a positive self-evaluation construct that can reflect individual feelings regarding their ability to control the environment and the impacts that will be obtained successfully (Chan

et al., 2015; Hobfoll, Halbesleben, Neveu & Westman, 2018). Slightly different from Chan et al. (2017) and Hobfoll et al. (2017) who more see self-efficacy as a positive evaluation construct.

The orientation presented by Bandura (1997), Chan et al. (2017) and Hobfoll et al. (2017) and Hagger & Chatzisaranti (2005) related to self-efficacy have identical similarities, which are related to the individual's ability to obtain success in the future, by holding on to a belief to be able to behave or take actions that can have an impact on initiation of these successes.

### **c. Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction is an individual thing which, according to Hirschfield (2000), is closely related to how much the individual enjoys his job and how much the individual's work or effort is valued. Then Locke (Barnes & Collier, 2013; Dagher, Chapa & Junaid, 2015) defines job satisfaction as something that includes a person's cognitive, affective, and evaluative reactions or attitudes related to their work. In addition, Locke (Barnes & Collier, 2013; Dagher, Chapa & Junaid, 2015) also states that job satisfaction is a positive emotional state that comes from assessing a person's job or work experience.

Locke (Barnes & Collier, 2013; Dagher, Chapa & Junaid, 2015) in this case emphasizes job satisfaction as a reactive dimension that occurs in individuals in responding to their work. While Hirschfield (2000), although also looking at the reactive dimension in individuals in the form of an expression of one's comfort at work, but also looks at the context of how the individual is valued in his work. Thus, Hirschfield (2000) implies that job satisfaction is not only a matter of individual expression in both cognitive, affective, and evaluative contexts but also wants to see that individual backgrounds can show reactive expressions in the form of enjoyment at work, which is related to how big the individual is. valued his work.

A different opinion is also conveyed by Kaswan (2012) who sees job satisfaction as a perceptual entity in the individual with regard to how much the individual contributes in providing an important value in his work. Job satisfaction as a perception certainly has different dimensions with job satisfaction as a reactive expression (Barnes & Collier, 2013; Dagher, Chapa & Junaid, 2015) and also a sense of comfort (Hirschfield, 2000). Perception in this case is more cognitive, while reactive expression and sense of comfort are on the affective spectrum as stated by Locke (Barnes & Collier, 2013; Dagher, Chapa & Junaid, 2015). This means that although the opinion of Kaswan (2012) is more spatial which only represents the cognitive dimension,

Then the evaluative dimension of reactive expression in job satisfaction according to the opinion of Locke (Barnes & Collier, 2013; Dagher, Chapa & Junaid, 2015) above has similarities with the opinion of Rivai (2006) which defines job satisfaction as individual efforts to feel work and aspects of work. aspects. This perspective of job satisfaction is certainly related to the evaluative dimension which can describe the feelings and attitudes of individuals at work, whether the individual evaluates himself that he is happy or not, and also whether the individual feels satisfied or dissatisfied at work.

Another opinion that can be used as a reference in defining job satisfaction is the opinion of Hasibuan (2011) which says that job satisfaction is related to the satisfaction enjoyed by individuals at work because of getting praise for work results, getting placement, treatment, work equipment and an atmosphere of a working environment. good. This opinion is the same as Spector (1997) who said that job satisfaction is related to the job itself, the salary earned and also the opportunity to develop. However, it is different

from Robbins (2003) who argues that praise, work environment, salary and also this development time are directly proportional to individual job satisfaction.

### III. Discussion

#### 3.1 Work Engagement, Self Efficacy and Teacher Job Satisfaction in Indonesia

Teachers who are completely engaged in their work will have self-confidence, be active, generate positive feedback, have value in the organization, and are satisfied with work (Schaufeli et al., 2002). Conversely, if the teacher is not attached, then the teacher will only present themselves physically at school without an outpouring of emotion, energy and passion in teaching and learning. Teachers who are not attached will have little or no emotional involvement at work, do not care about organizational goals and rarely enjoy their work. Albrecht (2010).

There are various factors that cause teachers to be unable to be tied to their work, one of these factors is related to the problems experienced by the teacher. This problem, as presented by Chang et. al (2014) in the previous discussion. One of them is related to teacher demands to meet the various criteria set by the government, plus the teaching and learning tasks that must be carried out every day. Various demands and also daily teacher routines such as demands to meet pedagogical competencies (making learning materials, formulating learning methods, etc.), personality (reflecting self-values that can be role models), social (paying attention to the environment and students' families) and professional (relating to teaching and learning and administrative demands) make teachers get an excessive workload (Chang et. al., 2014).

Karasek (Kain & Jex, 2010) in the theory demands-control model in this case says that high job demands, such as work overload and low work control, or an imbalance between job demands and control, will cause mental tension or job stress. within the individual. Moreover, the demands and control of these jobs are not balanced with the economic and social welfare obtained by individuals. The difference in income for each teacher stratification such as public and private, certification and non-certification which is not seen in the different aspects of each task that must be done will certainly create jealousy, meaning that it also affects social relations between teachers with certain stratifications (Chang et al. , 2014).

Apart from the demands-control model, there is also another theory that can explain work engagement, namely the job demand-resources model (JD-R) developed by Bakker and Demerouti (2007). This theory has a focus on work resources and personal resources. Job resources (for example, autonomy, feedback, support) and personal resources (for example, self-efficacy, optimism) according to this theory can directly affect work engagement and will have an impact in an organization, for example in terms of performance, creativity and will also affect income or financial results (Albrecht, 2010).

In addition, other research shows that work engagement is also closely related to overwork, lack of autonomy, emotional demands, low social support and role ambiguity. These things are factors for the emergence of stress and teacher fatigue at work (Chang 2009; Schaufeli & Enzmann, 1998; Lee & Ashforth, 1996). In accordance with the opinion of Bakker and Demerouti (2007; Albrecht, 2010), Hakanen, Bakker & Schaufeli (2006) said that in health psychology, teachers who experience stress are due to a mismatch between job demands and job resources (Hakanen, Bakker & Schaufeli). , 2006).

The importance of these work resources as well as personal resources can be seen clearly in the research conducted by Saputra and Sugiyono (2019) who found low teacher



efficacy and achievement motivation because they were unable to make scientific papers so that teachers felt satisfied with group IVa and felt lazy to continue to higher ranks. This example shows that the personal resources related to motivation and self-efficacy (Albrecht, 2010) of the teachers in making a work are lacking.

So what happens is that many teachers only carry out their teaching routines without paying attention to the quality of learning. There are even other findings that teachers have low work discipline, marked by going home ahead of work hours and being late (Saputra & Sugiyono, 2019). This is as stated by Albrecht (2010) that the lack of personal resources (in this context is motivation and self-efficacy) will have an impact on organizational performance, especially in terms of discipline (relating to in-role performance) and also creativity in teaching (Albrecht, 2010).

Then, in a study conducted by Chan et al. (2017) show that self-efficacy can be a factor that can lead to balance and work engagement for individuals who are married. Although there are roles that must be passed, namely between the individual as part of the family and also the individual as part of the job. This self-efficacy has a strong contribution in creating balance in individuals when facing various demands (Chan et al., 2017; Hobfoll, Halbesleben, Neveu & Westman, 2018), besides that self-efficacy is also able to encourage individuals to be able to put forth maximum effort and consistent (Chan et al., 2017) so that teachers can have high work engagement (Bandura, 1995). Seeing the various high demands that a teacher has (Chang et al., Sugiyono, 2019) makes self-efficacy important in an effort to increase the work engagement of these teachers.

Research related to teacher efficacy in contemporary education is based more on the social cognition theory put forward by Bandura (1995). Self-efficacy is defined as individual trust in its ability to organize, carry out a task, achieve certain goals, produce something and implement actions to achieve certain skills (Bandura, 1995). From this opinion, it can be concluded that the focus of self-efficacy is that each individual can be seen or predicted better through the beliefs held by the individual regarding their abilities, rather than their achievements, knowledge or skills.

Allinder's research (1994) finds things in accordance with the above opinion. The study found that high efficacy in a teacher would make the teacher better planning and organization. Teachers with high self-efficacy will be more open to new ideas, more willing to conduct experiments and develop new methods (Lev & Koslowsky, 2009; Aurah, Cassady & McConnell, 2014; Guskey, 2010), and more have a greater enthusiasm for and commitment to teaching (Allinder 1994; Coladarci 1992).

Furthermore, in addition to self-efficacy an instrument that can affect a teacher's job involvement is job satisfaction. According to Garg, Dar and Mishra (2017) job satisfaction is the main driver of one's attachment to work. In this context, when a teacher is tied to his job as an educator, the teacher will be involved in interactions consisting of challenges, inspiration, and pride. The interaction mode of this work engagement is ultimately the main contribution to the birth of teacher job satisfaction (Gark et al., 2017). The relationship between work engagement and job satisfaction is described by Lu, Lu, Gursoy, and Neale (2016) more simply, that job involvement consists of individual dimensions, and job satisfaction is the result of these dimensions.

A teacher's lack of job satisfaction will have a serious impact on the teacher's choice to continue working or choose to leave the job (Edinger & Edinger, 2018). This is because job satisfaction affects the enthusiasm of teachers in teaching (Weiqi, 2007). Teachers who do not have satisfaction and choose not to continue in carrying out their work will certainly have a serious impact on schools and students, especially with regard to student achievement, teacher quality, and accountability (Darling-Hammond, 2003).

## IV. Conclusion

Based on the above discussion, it can be concluded that work engagement, self-efficacy and teacher job satisfaction need serious attention from various parties. Various teacher problems that can reduce self-efficacy and teacher satisfaction in the context of their work will seriously affect teacher work engagement. Low self-efficacy and low job satisfaction, one by one or simultaneously, will also have an impact on the low work engagement of a teacher. Vice versa, if the teacher has high self-efficacy and high job satisfaction, the teacher will also have high work engagement. It means good self-efficacy,

The effort that needs to be done is to minimize the problems that are often faced by teachers, especially in the context of excessive workloads, demands for quality that are not comparable to an increase in economic and social welfare as well as various practical political factors that often involve teachers in it. Eliminating these problems will foster contribution, enthusiasm, motivation, inspiration, concentration, enthusiasm and creativity of teachers, where these are the aspects that influence self-efficacy, job satisfaction and work engagement which are very important in the context of improving the quality of education. in Indonesia.

## References

- Ahmad, A., & Safaria, T. (2013). Effects of Self-Efficacy on Students Academic Performance. *Journal of Educational, Health and Community Psychology*, Vol. 2(1), 22-29.
- Albrecht, S. L. (2010). *Handbook of Employee Engagement: Perspectives, Issues, Research and Practice*. UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited
- Allinder, R. M. (1994). The relationship between efficacy and the instructional practices of special education teachers and consultants. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, Vol. 17, 86-95.
- Aurah, C. M., Cassady, J. C., & McConnell, T. J. (2014). Predicting Problem Solving Ability From Metacognition and Self-Efficacy Beliefs on a Cross Validated Sample. *British Journal of Education* Vol.2(1), 49-72.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, A. (2007). The Job Demands- Resources Model: State Of The Art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol. 22 (3), 309-328.
- Bandura, A. (1995). *Self-Efficacy in Changing Societies*. New York: Cambridge University Press
- Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: Toward a Unifying Theory of Behavioral Change. *Stanford University. Psychological Review*, Vol. 84(2), 191- 215.
- Chan, X. W., Kalliath, T., Brough, P., O'Driscoll, M., Siu, O. L., & Timms, C. (2017). Self-efficacy and work engagement: test of a chain model. *International Journal of Manpower*, 38(6), 819-834. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJM-11-2015-0189>
- Chang, M. C., Shaeffer, S., Al-Samarrai, S., Ragatz, A. B., de Ree, J., & Stevenson, R. (2014). *Teacher Reform in Indonesia The Role of Politics and Evidence in Policy Making*. Washington DC: International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.
- Chang, M. L. (2009). An Appraisal Perspective of Teacher Burnout: Examining the Emotional Work of Teachers. *Educational Psychology Review*, Vol. 21(3),193-218. DOI: 10.1007/s10648-009-9106-y

- Coladarci, T. (1992). Teachers Sense of Efficacy and Commitment to Teaching. *Journal of Experimental Education*, Vol. 60, 323-337. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00220973.1992.9943869>.
- Costley K.C. (2009). Charles Silberman's "Crisis in the Classroom, The Remaking of American Education": A Critical Analysis. Arkansas Tech University: Russellville.
- Dagher, G. K., Chapa, O., & Junaid, N. (2015). The historical evolution of employee engagement and self-efficacy constructs: An empirical examination in a non-western country. *Journal of Management History*, Vol. 21(2). 232-256. DOI: 10.1108/JMH-05-2014-0116
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2003). Keeping Good Teachers: Why It Matters, What Leaders Can Do. *Educational Leadership*. Vol, 60, 6-13
- Donald, C., Barnes, D. C., & Collier, J. E. (2013). Investigating work engagement in the service environment. *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 27(6), 485-499. DOI: 10.1108/JSM-01-2012-0021
- Edinger, S. K., & Edinger, M. J. (2018). Improving Teacher Job Satisfaction: The Roles of Social Capital, Teacher Efficacy, and Support. *School of Professional and Continuing Studies Faculty Publications*, 97. <https://scholarship.richmond.edu/spcs-faculty-publications/97>.
- Garg, K., Dar, I. Q., & Mishra, M. (2017). Job Satisfaction and Work Engagement: A Study Using Private Sector Bank Managers. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, Vol. 20(1). DOI: 10.1177/1523422317742987
- Guskey, T. R. (2010). Lessons of Mastery Learning. *Interventions That Work*, Vol. 68(2), 52-57.
- Hagger, M & Chatzisaranti, N. (2005). *Social Psychology of Exercise and Sport*. New York: McGraw-Hill
- Hakanen, J. J., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). Burnout and work engagement among teachers. *Journal of School Psychology*, Vol. 43(6), 495-513. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2005.11.001>
- Hasibuan, M. S. P. (2011). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Jakarta: PT Bumi Askara.
- Hirschfield, R. R. (2000). Does revising the intrinsic and extrinsic subscales of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire short form make a difference?. *Educational & Psychological Measurement*, Vol. 60, 255-270.
- Hobfoll, S. E., Halbesleben, J., Neveu, J. P., & Westman, M. (2018). Conservation of Resources in the Organizational Context: The Reality of Resources and Their Consequences. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 5, 103-128.
- Kain, J., & Jex, S. (2010). Karasek's (1979) Job Demands Control Model: a Summary Of Current Issues And Recommendations For Future Research. *New Developments in Theoretical and Conceptual Approaches to Job Stress Research in Occupational Stress and Well Being*, Vol. 8, 237-268. DOI: 10.1108/S1479-3555(2010)0000008009
- Kamdi, W. (2014). Kinerja Guru SMK: Analisis Beban Kerja dan Karakteristik Pembelajaran. *Teknologi dan Kejuruan*, Vol. 37(1), 1-12.
- Kaswan. (2012). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia untuk Keunggulan Bersaing Organisasi*. Jakarta: Graha Ilmu.
- Lee, R. T., & Ashforth, B. E. (1996). A meta-analytic examination of the correlates of the three dimensions of job burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(2), 123-133. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.81.2.123>



- Lev, S., & Koslowsky, M. (2009). Moderating the collective and self-efficacy relationship. *Journal of Educational Administration*, Vol. 47(4), 452-462. DOI: 10.1108/09578230910967437.
- Lu, L., Lu, A. C. C., Gursoy, D., & Neale, N. (2016). Work engagement, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions: A comparison between supervisors and line-level employees. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 28(5).
- Lumbanrau, R. E. (2021). Kasus Hervina dan Nestapa Kehidupan Guru Honorer: Dilema Antara Gaji Rendah, Pengabdian Tanpa Kepastian dan Cinta Pekerjaan. *BBC News Indonesia*. Link: <https://www.bbc.com/indonesia/indonesia-56094473>.
- Rivai, V. (2006). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia untuk Perusahaan: dari Teori ke Praktik*. Jakarta: Penerbit PT. Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Robbins, S. P. (2003). *Prinsip-Prinsip Perilaku Organisasi*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Saputra, D. H., & Sugiyono. (2019). Analyzing factors influencing the teacher career promotion. *Jurnal Kependidikan Penelitian Inovasi Pembelajaran*, Vol. 3(2), 291-301. DOI: 10.21831/jk.v3i2.20331.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The Measurement of Work Engagement With a Short Questionnaire A Cross-National Study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, Vol. 66(4), 701-716. DOI: 10.1177/0013164405282471
- Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The Measurement Of Engagement And Burnout: A Two Sample Confirmatory Factor Analytic Approach. *Journal Of Happiness Studies*, 71-92.
- Schaufeli, W.B., & Enzmann, D. (1998). *The burnout companion to study and practice: A critical analysis*. Philadelphia: Taylor & Francis.
- Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. (2004). General Mental Ability in the World of Work: Occupational Attainment and Job Performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 86(1), 162–173. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.86.1.162>.
- Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2016). Teacher Stress and Teacher Self-Efficacy as Predictors of Engagement, Emotional Exhaustion, and Motivation to Leave the Teaching Profession. *Creative Education*, 7, 1785-1799.
- Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes, and Consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage Publication Inc.
- Tobias, S., Fletcher, J. D., & Wind, A. P. (2014). Game-Based Learning. *Handbook of Research on Educational Communications and Technology*. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4614-3185-5\_38.
- Undang-Undang Nomor 14 tahun 2005 tentang Guru dan Dosen.
- Weiqi, W. (2007). The Structure of Secondary School Teacher Job Satisfaction and Its Relationship with Attrition and Work Enthusiasm. *Chinese Education & Society*, Vol. 40(5), 17-31. DOI: 10.2753/CED1061-1932400503.