**The Effect of The Job Demands-Resources Model on Work Engagement Through Job Satisfaction in Master Management Students At Hasanuddin University**

Nur Fathirah Husain1, Idayanti Nursyamsi2, Wahda3

1,2,3 Universitas Hasanuddin; [fathirahhusain11@gmail.com](mailto:fathirahhusain11@gmail.com)

# Abstract

This study aims to determine the impact of the JD-R Model on Work Engagement and Job Satisfaction of Master of Management Students at Hasanuddin University Makassar. It investigates the effects of job demand-resources on work engagement, as well as the effects of job satisfaction on work engagement, both simultaneously and partially. The research used questionnaires and path analysis with 65 students from the Master of Management class of 2020-2021. The findings are as follows: (1) Job Resources positively and significantly affect job satisfaction. (2) Job demand negatively affects job satisfaction, indicating that lower job demand leads to higher job satisfaction. (3) Job Resources positively affect work engagement, with a low correlation. (4) Job demand significantly affects work engagement, showing a negative impact by reducing work engagement. (5) Job satisfaction positively affects work engagement, with a slight correlation.
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# INTRODUCTION

One of the human resources in the company is employees. Hasibuan (2013) states that an employee is anyone who provides services (both in the form of thoughts and energy) and gets a reward or compensation whose amount has been determined in advance. Employees are one of the important assets in a company that can realise the goals of the company. Therefore, employees are required to be able to work productively and professionally, both working individually and working with a team to achieve company goals. In addition to employees, companies also need to provide an effective work environment so that employees can work according to company expectations and ensure that employees are engaged with the company.

Kahn (1990) states that individuals are said to be engaged when they can place themselves and their roles at work both physically, cognitively and emotionally. Schaufeli, Salanova, González-romá, & Bakker (2002) state that individuals with work engagement as a state related to the completion of work positively characterised by vigour, dedication and absorption. Mujasih & Ratnaningsih (2012) argued that employees who are engaged in their work will be able to try harder to work, have a sense of loyalty to the company and make employees feel meaningful and integrated in a company or organisation which ultimately improves performance within the company.

Engagement can be categorised into three levels, namely engaged, partially engaged and disengaged. First, engaged, employees who have high engagement with the company will provide optimal work performance and results because employees can enjoy and love the work they do. Employees who feel happy with the work they do, then consider the work they do as part of their life that must be developed and will always be taken care of as well as possible (Bakker & Bal, 2010). Robetson (Ramdhani & Sawitri, 2017) also mentioned that when employees feel engaged with their work, they will undergo work with enthusiasm and desire to be able to provide all the assistance that can be given and ideas to be able to succeed the goals of the company where they work. Second, employees who are at the partially engaged level. At this level, employees have the principle of do it, get paid, go home. This means that employees who are at this level will complete the tasks they have as they are (as long as they are done) and do not really think about the quality of the work done.

The third level is disengaged. Employees who have a low level of engagement will feel unhappy and experience negative feelings at work, so they will affect their co-workers through negative emotions and tend to experience fatigue (Heikkeri in Ramdhani & Sawitri, 2017). Another impact obtained from the lack of work engagement on employees is that it makes employees lazy, work wholeheartedly, cannot complete and understand the tasks assigned so that it can have an impact on the company or organisation (Iswanto & Agustina, 2016).

One of the psychological factors behind the level of employee engagement with their work is job satisfaction. Saks (2006) states that employees will have a fully involved attitude and have a high work enthusiasm in the work or organisation in the long term which refers to involvement, enthusiasm and job satisfaction. Davis & Newstrom (1995) suggest that job satisfaction is a feeling about whether or not the work they are currently doing is pleasant. When employees join an organisation, they bring with them needs, wants, desires and past experiences that come together to form job expectations. Spector (1997) defines job satisfaction as a person's feelings towards work and aspects of their job.

Job satisfaction is the key to driving achievement at work, a sense of discipline and employee morale in supporting the realisation of company goals (Hasibuan, 2003). Employees with high levels of job satisfaction will work more productively and employee well-being (George & Jones, 2008). In addition, job satisfaction is also negatively correlated with turnover intention, psychological contract breach, as well as absenteeism, tardiness, and strikes (Rayton & Yalabik, 2014).

This can be explained in the Job-Demands Resources sources model developed by Bakker, Demerouti, & Bakker (2013) which explains that employees have two things, namely job demands and job resources. Job demands are the workload that employees have on the company. Job resources are defined as resources obtained from interpersonal and social relationships in the work environment such as supervisor support, reward & punishment systems, work environment, colleagues to individual characteristics.

Individual characteristics can be in the form of psychological capital, supporting competencies and so on. This model explains that employees can reach the level of engagement at work when they have the resources to complete their workload. This means that when the company can fulfil the needs and desires of employees, employees will get satisfaction and experience pleasant emotions. Satisfied and happy employees will tend to work better because employees have positive feelings. This can improve and encourage employees to be able to excel and be disciplined at work. Conversely, when the resources owned by employees are few or insufficient, it allows employees to experience various problems such as burnout which will reduce productivity to physical and psychological health (Hasibuan, 2003).

Based on this description, it can be concluded that the fulfilment of resources from the company to support performance will provide positive energy for employees in completing their workload and as a consequence, employees will be engaged with their work. There are several studies that have been conducted in looking at the relationship and influence of job satisfaction and work engagement. Singh (2017) found that there is a positive relationship between employee engagement and job satisfaction and there is a significant influence of job satisfaction on employee engagement.Similar research conducted by Hapsari (2017) found that job satisfaction is a variable that needs to be considered to increase work engagement in employees.Research conducted by Abraham (2012) found that job satisfaction is the beginning of the formation of employee engagement.Employees who feel engaged will give their best in their work. This study also revealed that factors such as jobs, benefits, recognition, cooperation, fair treatment, sound company policies, team spirit and performance management systems can increase job satisfaction in employees which will lead to employee engagement. Garg and Kumar (2012) also proved from the results of previous research and with the help of employee engagement surveys that job satisfaction is a predictor of work engagement.

# LITERATURE REVIEW

1. **Definition of Job Demands**

Job demands are defined as job demands that trigger psychological fatigue (psychological stressors), such as non-stop work in long working hours, too much workload and limited time given to complete the work, and conflicts in job demands that must be resolved Job demands are physical, social and organisational elements in work activities that affect the psychological health of employees (Putra & Mulyadi, 2010).

Job demands are factors associated with a person's work and can be stressful if the speed of the task is felt to be excessive so that it can increase anxiety and stress (Koesmono, 2007). Job demands as a factor related to performance, work stressors, especially factors related to workload, stress related to unexpected tasks and work stress related to personal conflict, but also related to work intensity, time pressure, concentration and social pressure (Thirapatsakun, Kuntonbutr, & Mechinda, 2014).

**Aspects of Job Demands**

Karasek (1979) divided the aspects of job demands into three, namely:

1. Psychological stressors, which are related to certain jobs, such as workload and time pressure.
2. Skill discretion, this dimension focuses on a person's skills which he is required to apply to each of his jobs.
3. Decision authority is a person's ability to make decisions and do work correctly and effectively.
4. **Definition of Job Resources**

Job resources are aspects of work that function to help employees cope with job demands and the physiological and psychological consequences that occur, while stimulating growth, learning, and personal development (Demerouti, 2001). Job resources are obtained through interpersonal and social relationships, work arrangements, and the work itself (Bakker and Demerouti, 2007). Examples of job resources include: pay, support from superiors, feedback, role clarity, job autonomy, or empowerment.

Based on the conservation of resource theory (Suan and Nasurdin 2013) job resources are objects, personal characteristics, conditions, or energy that are valued by individuals or that serve as a means of achieving other resources. When individuals have high levels of job resources, they tend to be more energetic, dedicated, and passionate about their work, all of which are characterised by high employee engagement.

Schaufeli & Bakker (2004) explain that job resources are divided into four levels that are used as dimensions of job resources, as follows:

1. Organisation Level, namely organisational support consisting of training, technology, and supervision.
2. Interpersonal Level, namely social support from superiors (supervisory support) and colleagues (peer support).
3. Work Level, namely role clarity or role clarity.
4. Task level, namely performance feedback, job control and autonomy.
5. **Definition of Work Engagement**

Kular, Gatenby, Rees, Soane, & Truss (2008) argued that until now there is not even a consistent and universal definition of engagement itself, as well as in terms of operationalisation and measurement which are still in different ways. Work engagement refers to the relationship between employees and their jobs, while employee engagement is related to the relationship between employees and the organisation (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004).

The concept of engagement was first introduced by Kahn (1990) as employees' mastery of their role at work. This means that employees who have engagement will bind themselves with their work, then will work and express themselves physically, cognitively and emotionally during their performance. The cognitive aspect refers to the employee's beliefs about the organisation, the leader and the job conditions.The emotional aspect refers to the description of the positive or negative feelings that the employee has towards the organisation and its leader.While the physical aspect is about the physical energy exerted by the employee in carrying out his role.Kahn (1990) also argues that engagement includes both psychological and physical presence when performing organisational roles.

According to Kahn, these levels are significantly influenced by three psychological domains, namely meaningfulness, security and availability. It is these domains that will influence how employees accept and perform their roles at work. However, while Kahn provides a comprehensive theoretical model of psychological presence, he does not propose an operationalisation of this engagement construct. In addition, Kahn's engagement model, has not been empirically tested in different contexts and among other occupational groups and this is one of its weaknesses (Chugtai, 2010).

**Aspects of Work Engagement**

Schaufeli et al. (2002) define work engagement as a positive motivational state, fulfilment, view of working conditions characterised by vigour, dedication and absorption. Based on this definition, Schaufeli and Bakker (2003) conceptualised the following aspects of engagement:

1. Vigour

Vigour refers to a high level of resilience, willingness to put in effort, not getting tired easily and persevering in the face of adversity. Typically people who score high on vigour have high energy, enthusiasm and stamina when working, while those who score low on vigour have low energy, enthusiasm and stamina during work.

1. Dedication

Dedication refers to feeling meaningful, enthusiastic and proud at work, and feeling inspired and challenged by it. People who score high on dedication strongly identify with their work because they find it a rewarding, inspiring and challenging experience, and they usually feel enthusiastic and proud of their work.

1. Absorption

Absorption refers to concentrating fully and deeply, being immersed in work where time passes quickly and having difficulty separating from work, thus forgetting everything around them.People who score high on absorption usually feel happy to have their attention occupied by work, feel immersed in work and have difficulty separating from work.As a result, everything around them is forgotten and time seems to pass quickly.In contrast, people with low absorption scores do not feel interested and are not immersed in work, do not have difficulty separating from work and they do not forget everything around them, including time.

1. **Definition of Job Satisfaction**

In general, job satisfaction is defined as the degree to which an individual is satisfied with his or her job (Spector, 1997), or an individual's perception of the job's ability to fulfil his or her physical and psychological needs (Locke, 1969). Individuals who perceive that the job can fulfil their needs will experience positive feelings, conversely, individuals who perceive that the job cannot fulfil their needs will experience negative feelings. In short, job satisfaction concerns how happy or unhappy individuals are with their jobs which is a function of the extent to which the job can fulfil individual needs.

There are two approaches to measuring job satisfaction, namely the general approach and the specific approach. The general approach focuses on an individual's general feelings towards his or her job, such as how the individual feels in general regarding his or her job. The second approach focuses on aspects of job satisfaction. From these aspects, it is then identified which aspects are still lacking and need to be improved.

1. **Conceptual Framework**

Referring to the preliminary description, a conceptual framework has been formed where job resources are variable X1, job demand variable X2, job satisfaction variable Y and Variable Z, namely work engagement.

Figure 3.1 Thinking Framework

*Job Resources (X1)*

*Job Demand (X2)*

*Job Satisfaction (Y)*

*Work engagement (Z)*

Source: Primary data processed (2022)

# RESEARCH METHOD

# Location and Research Design

# This research will be conducted at Hasanuddin University Postgraduate Program from May to June 2022 with details of May, arranging research permits at the research location and in June, distributing questionnaires and collecting data and information, as well as analysing and interpreting the data from the research results.

# This research is a quantitative approach that is used to test certain theories by examining the relationship between variables. The use of research methods will affect the research process and results. The research method is a technique used in research. The type of research used in this study is ex-post facto research with a quantitative approach. This research is intended to find the influence between the independent variable and the dependent variable. The quantitative approach is used to measure the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable based on statistical data obtained so as to test and answer the hypothesis in this study.

# Population and Sample

# The population in this study is a finite population or a population that can be statistically calculated (Valliant, 2009). Population is the entire unit of observation that has been determined in advance, so that the population is the source of an inference to a phenomenon (Wahda, 2007). The target population in this study are Master of Management Students at Hasanuddin University who have worked with a minimum work period of 2 years (two) years. Based on preliminary observations, the population size in this study was 116 people.

# The sample is part of the number and characteristics possessed by the population (Sugiyono, 2015). The sampling technique uses non-probability sampling by accidental sampling where the sample is selected by chance.

# The research sample size was determined using the Cochran correction formula (Bartlett, Kotrlik, & Higgins, 2001), namely

# 

# Description:

# n = final sample size to be used in the study

# n0 = the required sample size

# Pop = The size of the research population.

# Based on the formula above, the sample size in this study is

# 

# Based on this formula and the population size previously mentioned, the minimum sample value is 55 samples.

# Data Collection Method

# The primary data used in this study were obtained directly from filling out a questionnaire (questionnaire) addressed to respondents including responses or views regarding the Job Resources Questionnaire, Job Demands Questionnaire, Job Satisfaction Questionnaire, and Work Engagement Questionnaire. Researchers will distribute questionnaires to respondents who are in the category of 2020-2021 batch students of the Master of Management Programme who are currently working. The questionnaire contains questions that are considered related to the research variables.

# Data Analysis Method

# Research Instrument Test

# As for testing the research instruments used in this study, using the instrument test as follows:

# Validation Test

# Validity is an index that shows the accuracy of the instrument in carrying out its function (Azwar, 2016). A research instrument can be said to be valid if it is able to measure what should be measured. Thus, research instruments need to be tested for validity before being used in the field. The validity that will be used in this study is construct validity. Construct validity is validity that refers to the extent to which a theoretical concept is measured, which is the basis for preparing the instrument (Mardapi, 2012). The measurement of the construct validity of the questionnaire instrument in this study uses a classical test theory approach. The validity value of the questionnaire instrument items is determined by looking at the distinguishing power index value. According to Retnawati (2015), the differentiating power index on the instrument item can be said to be good if it has a value greater than or equal to 0.3 while if the value obtained is small, it indicates the skewness of the distribution of scores from the population resulting in low test validity.

# Reliability Test

# Reliability is an index that shows the extent to which a measuring instrument can be trusted or reliable. This means that the instrument can be said to be reliable if the instrument is used to measure something with the same symptoms twice and the results are relatively consistent. The reliability of an instrument is determined from the reliability coefficient. Measurement of the reliability of the questionnaire to be used is determined through the Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient value. According to Mardapi (2017), an instrument can be used if it has a reliability coefficient value of more than equal to 0.70.

# Hypothesis Test

# Based on the identification of problems in this study, the hypothesis design is as follows:

# First Statistical Hypothesis:

# H01: Pyx1 = Pyx2 = 0 JD-R consisting of job demands and job resources simultaneously has no effect on job satisfaction.

# Ha1: There is at least one Pyxi ≠ 0, where i = 1, 2 JD-R consisting of job demands and job resources simultaneously affect the level of job satisfaction.

# Second Statistical Hypothesis:

# H02: Pyx1 = 0 where i = 1, 2 JD-R models consisting of job resources and job demands partially have no effect on job satisfaction.

# Ha2: Pyxi ≠ 0, where i = 1, 2, the JD-R model consisting of job resources and job demands partially affects job satisfaction.

# Third Statistical Hypothesis:

# H03: Pzx1 = Pzx2 = Pzy = 0 which consists of job resources and job demands and job satisfaction simultaneously have no effect on work engagement.

# Ha3: At least one Pzxi ≠ 0 or Pzy ≠ 0, where i = 1, 2 consisting of job resources and job demands and job satisfaction simultaneously affect work engagement.

# Fourth Statistical Hypothesis:

# H04: Pzxi = 0 or Pzy = 0, where i = 1, 2 consisting of job demands and job resources and job satisfaction partially have no effect on work engagement.

# Ha4: Pzxi ≠ 0 or Pzy ≠ 0, where i = 1, 2, consisting of job demands and job resources and job satisfaction partially affect the level of work engagement.

# Testing of the above hypotheses was carried out using path analysis, in accordance with the modification (wahda, 2007).

# RESEARCH RESULT

The validity test is carried out to determine whether the measuring instrument that has been prepared is really able to measure what should be measured. Testing the validity of each item is used item analysis, namely correlating the score of each item with the total score which is the sum of each item score (corrected item total correlation) and the value can be seen in the processing results using the SPSS 25.0 program in the item-total stasistic table in the corrected item-total correlation column> standard critical r value (0.30). A questionnaire that is declared valid means that the questionnaire is really able to measure what to measure.

Based on the tables above on testing the statement items on the Job Resources Characteristics (X1), Job Demands Characteristics (X2), Job Satisfaction Characteristics (Y), and Work Engagement Characteristics (Z) each item is declared valid, which is indicated by the value of each statement item having a positive correlation coefficient value and greater than the critical r value of 0.30. So it can be concluded that all question items submitted are valid and can be further analysed.

**Reliability Test**

The reliability test aims to determine whether the data collection tool basically shows the level of accuracy, accuracy of stability or consistency of the tool in revealing certain symptoms from a group of individuals, even though it is carried out at different times / a variable is said to be reliable if the Cronbach alpha value is greater than 0.6. Testing was carried out with the SPSS 25.0 programme with the Cronbach's Alpha formula. Based on the level of reliability, the results of the reliability coefficient test (r Alpha) on the four variable instruments tested can be summarised in the table below:

Table 5.14. Reliability Test Results

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variabel** | ***Croanbach’s Alpha*** | **Kriteria** | **Keterangan** |
| *Job Resources* (X1) | 0,71 | >0,6 | Reliabel |
| *Job Demands* (X2) | 0,72 | >0,6 | Reliabel |
| *Job Satisfaction* (Y) | 0,90 | >0,6 | Reliabel |
| *Work Engagement* (Z) | 0,80 | >0,6 | Reliabel |

**Hypothesis Test**

After testing the assumptions, hypothesis testing is then carried out using path analysis. The results of data analysis using path analysis using the Lisrel 8.50 programme are as follows:

Table 5.16. Estimated Path Coefficient

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Hubungan Kausal antar variabel | Koefisien Jalur | Kesahihan Standar | Nilai t hitung | Hasil Uji (thitung < -1.96 atau thitung > 1.96) |
| JR → JS | 0.49 | 0.100 | 7.57 | Signifikan |
| JD → JS | -0.51 | 0.120 | -7.89 | Signifikan |
| JR → WE | 0.32 | 0.085 | 4.11 | Signifikan |
| JD → WE | -0.25 | 0.100 | -3.11 | Signifikan |
| JS → WE | 0.43 | 0.075 | 3.94 | Signifikan |

Table 5.17. Estimation of Structural Equations

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Model Struktural | Persamaan Struktural Estimasi | R2 |
| JS =ρyx1JR + ρyx2JD + ρyε1 | JS = 0.49JR – 0.51JD + 0.07 | 0.93 |
| WE = ρzx1JR + ρzx2JD + ρzyJS + ρzε2 | WE = 0.32JR – 0.25JD + 0.43 + 0.05 | 0.95 |

Table 5.18. Model Fit Test Results

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Ukuran GOF | Estimasi | Hasil Uji |
| Chi Square | 0.00 | Data Model Fit |
| P Value | 1.00 |
| RMSEA | 0.00 |

Table 5.19. Effect of Exogenous Variables on Endogenous Variables

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variabel Eksogen | | Pengaruh | | | Total |
| Langsung | Tidak Langsung | |
| Melalui JS | Melalui JD |
| Job Resource | JR | 24.01% |  | 18.49% | 42.50% |
| Job Demand | JD | 26.01% | 17.64% |  | 43.65% |
| Pengaruh total variabel JR dan JD terhadap JS | | | | | 93% |
| Pengaruh variabel lain ε1 terhadap JS | | | | | 7% |
| Total | | | | | 100% |

Table 5.20. Effect of Exogenous Variables on Endogenous Variables

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variabel Eksogen | | Pengaruh | | | | Total |
| Langsung | Tidak Langsung | | |
| Melalui JR | Melalui JD | Melalui JS |
| *Job Resource* | JR | 10.24% | - | 4.51% | 4.41% | 19.16% |
| *Job Demand* | JD | 6.25% | 7.40% | - | 4.84% | 18.49% |
| *Job Satisfaction* | JS | 18.49% | - | - | - | 18.49% |
| Pengaruh total variabel JR dan JD dan JS terhadap WE | | | | | | 95% |
| Pengaruh variabel lain ε2 terhadap WE | | | | | | 5% |
| Total | | | | | | 100% |

# DISCUSSION

The participants in this study were Master of Management students class 2020-2021. There were 65 participants in the study, each of whom filled out a questionnaire that had been distributed using google form.

The simultaneous test above shows that the value of Fcount = 78.65 is greater when compared to Ftable and a significance level of 95% (α = 0.05). The test results show that the tcount value = 7.57 when compared to the ttable = 1.96, so that it is in accordance with the testing criteria for hypothesis testing where if tcount> 1.96 or < -1.96 then H02 is rejected and Ha2 is accepted. This means that Job Resources has a significant influence on Job Satisfaction.

The results of this study are in line with research conducted by Charlotte Jonasson, et al (2017) based on the JD-R model which conducted research with variable teacher-student relations as Job Resources on Job Satisfaction in an expatriate academy environment. It was found that Job Resources had a positive effect on Job Satisfaction.

For the results of the calculation of direct and indirect effects, it can be seen that the direct effect of the Job Demand (JD) variable on Job satisfaction (JS) in this study is 26.01% while the indirect effect through the Job Resource (JR) variable is 17.64% Based on the results of these calculations, the total effect of the Job Resources (JS) variable on Job Satisfaction (JS) in this study is 43.65% in this case it can be concluded that the Job Resources (JS) variable has a "Moderate Correlation" level of influence on the Job Satisfaction variable. The results of this study are in line with research conducted by Ibrahim (2013) conducted research by examining the relationship between psychological work environment named Job Demands, Job Control, Social Support and Job Satisfaction in manufacturing companies which aims to test the Job Demands Control (JDC) model (Karasek, 1979) and Job Demands Control Support (JDCS) model (Johnson and Hall 1988, Karasek and Theorell 1990).

The Job Resources (JR) variable on Work Engagement (WE) in this study is 19.16%, in this case it can be concluded that the Job Resources (JS) variable has a "Low Correlation" level of influence on the Work engagement (WE) variable. Rokach & Neto (2000) mentioned several factors that cause loneliness are unfulfilled expected intimate relationships, the effects of changes in personal and social conditions, and feelings of social discomfort. Woodward, Zabel, and De Costa, (1981) suggested that although divorce is not the main factor for feelings of extreme loneliness, it can be one of the factors in causing feelings of loneliness in both men and women. Also according to the results of research by Rotenberg, et al (2010) that low trust in others will increase feelings of loneliness in individuals. These findings are associated with the cognitive scheme of lonely individuals that they are relatively untrusted by close friends.

The total effect of the Job Demands (JD) variable on Work Engagement (WE) in this study is 18.49%, in this case it can be concluded that the Job Demands (JD) variable has a "Slight Correlation" level of influence on the Work engagement (WE) variable. High job demands can lead to work stress and other health complaints, thus affecting the level of worker productivity. Based on this, job demands should have a negative influence on work engagement, so that the lower the level of job demands, the higher the level of work engagement in each individual or employee at work. These results are in accordance with research (Zulaicha, 2021) which states that Job Demand (work demands) has a negative influence on employees.

For the total effect on the Job Satisfaction (JS) variable on Work Engagement (WE) in this study of 18.49%, in this case it can be concluded that the Job Satisfaction (JS) variable partially has a "Slight Correlation" level of influence on the Work engagement (WE) variable. This is in accordance with research previously conducted by Abraham (2012), (Yalabik, et al (2013), W. Schaufeli & Salanova (2011), Garg & Kumar (2012) and Singh (2017) who found that job satisfaction is a predictor of work engagement. So it can be said that when employees experience job satisfaction, it will show that the resources needed have been fulfilled. Therefore, high and low job satisfaction also contributes to high and low work engagement owned by employees. The relationship between the two variables is shown by several factors that have been mentioned previously. Yalabik, et al. (2013) found that job satisfaction along with affective commitment significantly influenced work engagement and resulted in good work performance.

# CONCLUSION

The results of hypothesis testing show that there is a direct and indirect effect of the Job Demand-Resources Model on Work Engagement through Job Satisfaction. The job demand variable has a significant negative effect on the work engagement and job satisfaction variables.

In accordance with the results of the study, so that researchers formulate suggestions, namely

1. for agencies or companies that have employees who are temporarily carrying out education to pay attention to workloads, especially excessive workloads that demand attention in various ways and job resources, especially in work relationships and support from superiors or supervisors in order to get the expected job satisfaction and work commitment.
2. Agencies can further increase job satisfaction and employee engagement, one of which is by paying attention to communication between supervisors and employees by giving praise or giving directions more effectively. It can also reduce workload or divide the workload that must be done more effectively.
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