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ABSTRACT
- **Background:** In the industrial revolution 4.0, there was a disruption of technology and innovation that led to major changes across the industrial sector and the service sector. The use of increasingly massive technology in various aspects gave rise to a new form of customer service that is systemized and integrated centrally or also referred to as a contact center (CC).
- **Aim:** The objective of this study is to test and analyze the role of employee engagement mediation in the influence of self-efficacy and quality of work life (QWL) on burnout in contact centers (CC).
- **Method:** This study is a quantitative study with the research subject being a CC employee at one of the life insurance companies in Indonesia with as many as 137 respondents. Data analysis techniques use Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) with the help of AMOS applications.
- **Findings:** The results showed that the role of employee engagement in mediating the effect of self-efficacy on burnout was significant.
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INTRODUCTION

In the Industrial Revolution 4.0, there is a disruption of technology and innovation that is causing major changes across the industrial and service sectors. The use of increasingly massive technology in various aspects gave rise to a new form of customer service that is systemized and integrated centrally or also referred to as a contact center (CC). The implementation of CC has become very important for the company in the last two decades because it is considered more efficient in providing service for customers (Saberi, Khadeer Hussain, & Chang, 2017). This new service has become the main point of contact of customer service in almost all companies including in the insurance industry.

The study of the benefits of implementing CC has been studied by many experts. Woodcock (2016) in his book explained that the existence of CC can reduce operational costs, maximize profit opportunities, and is a strategic step to increase competitive advantage in the era of accelerating the development of information technology. A study mentions that the existence of CC has a considerable influence on customer experience and retention. It has been proven that 70% of all business interactions can be handled by CC services and can increase the profit for companies by 25% to 95% (Saberi et al., 2017).

On the other hand, the implementation of CC has a variety of challenges. One of the challenges for companies that develop CC is that CC practitioners have the opportunity to experience burnout stress syndrome or burnout (Langenhoven, 2015). Burnout is a psychological syndrome due to a response to prolonged chronic interpersonal stress at work, so a person experiencing burnout will feel emotionally exhausted and low motivation to work (Maslach & Leiter, 2016). In this condition, the individual will have continued negative thoughts regarding his work. The symptoms are characterized by physical fatigue along with...
feelings of pressure, decreased sense of competitiveness, and low performance while working (Maslach & Leiter, 2016). Workers who experience burnout will feel the work they do becomes unsatisfactory and meaningless.

Burnout on CC is one of the big challenges that can not be avoided. Most of the causes are due to workers experiencing consistent pressure when receiving calls, especially when facing customer hard complaints and all their behavior and activities are monitored by the system (Ananthram, Teo, Connell, & Bish, 2018). A comparative study conducted in Korea showed that CC workers had the highest burnout rates compared to health workers and school counselors (Lee et al., 2019). This is also in line with a study conducted by D'Alleoa & Santangelo (2011) on contact center workers in Italy which showed that 20% of employees have high burnout rates. Meanwhile in Indonesia, 66.3% of contact center workers experience burnout at moderate levels (Sangadah, 2020).

Gap burnout phenomenon is also experienced by CC practitioners in one of the life insurance companies in Indonesia, namely Mandiri Inhealth Contact Center (MICC). The authors conducted preliminary research by interviewing several MICC employees. Based on the results of interviews conducted in March 2021, some employees indicated burnout symptoms such as lack of enthusiasm when going to start their work, feeling tired, tired and lacking energy after finishing work. At least 1 from 3 workers feel concerns that the work they do will complicate their emotions, and they feel a decrease in productivity at work. This is also supported by Key Performance Indicator (KPI) assessment data conducted by quality assurance which shows that there is a decrease in the average employee scoring results from February 2021 by 2.70 to 2.66 in March 2021 and high turnover intensity.

Burnout to employees is directly proportional to the company's losses. Employees who experience burnout will decrease their productivity, unable to work optimally (Harnida, 2015), and have a tendency to quit their jobs (Eliyana, 2016). For that, companies need to know the factors that can lower employee burnout rates. Literature shows that an employee's engagement or attachment to his or her job is one of the factors that can minimize burnout (Cole, Walter, Bedeian, & O’Boyle, 2012). That is, when employees feel engaged in their work, they will work with passion and have a deep relationship with the company or organization they work for. Zoraya et al (2019) also explained in his research that employees who have a high attachment will be dedicated wholeheartedly, have high concentration and energy in work, and really enjoy their work. Employee engagement occurs when a person feels valued, enjoys, and believes in the work they do (Gallup, 2013).

Interestingly, researchers and practitioners are currently paying more attention to interventions by integrating between individuals and organizations because they are considered the most effective way to reduce burnout rates (Lubbadeh, 2020). One of the individual interventions regarding an employee's confidence in his or her ability to complete work is one of the factors that can increase employee engagement and minimize burnout (Aloe, Amo, & Shanahan, 2014). Bandura (1999) refers to this attitude as self-efficacy which is interpreted as one’s ability to be effective in every aspect.

Studies on the effect of self-efficacy on burnout prove that self-efficacy has a significant-negative effect on burnout (Boujut, Popa-Roch, Palomares, Dean, & Cappe, 2017). An experimental study of self-efficacy-based interventions to reduce burnout was conducted in three groups of students (Intervention, stress, and health). The results showed that there was a
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decrease in burnout rates in the intervention group and stress group, while there was no significant decrease in the healthy group in the observation period of 6 months (Lubbadeh, 2020).

While in some other studies also mentioned that self-efficacy has a significant and positive influence on employee engagement (Afdaliza, 2015). This is supported by research conducted by Trilolita et al (2017), which conducted research on the influence of self-efficacy on work attachment in employees in telecommunication companies and found that there is a significant positive relationship between the two variables. The influence between self-efficacy on employee engagement is strengthened by research conducted by several researchers who showed similar results (Xi Wen Chan et al., 2017; Tian, Wang, Zhang, & Wen, 2019). This means that an employee who has high self-efficacy will tend to feel more attached to his job, so they have a lower risk of burnout.

In addition to individual interventions, organizational interventions that need to be considered in managing burnout in employees are quality of work-life (QWL). QWL is a method of managing organizations and human resources that involves satisfaction in various needs in the workplace based on Maslow's level of needs (Sinval, Sirgy, Lee, & Marôco, 2020). Therefore, it is important for organizations to understand and understand what are the motivations, needs, and barriers of employees in their work environment (Seifi & Asgari, 2017) and Agarwal and Solanki (2020) in their research proving that high QWL has a significant effect on reducing employee burnout. Empirically, QWL has been shown to have a significant-negative effect on burnout.

While Wardani & Anwar (2019) in his research tested the relationship between QWL to employee engagement and found that QWL and employee engagement have a significant positive influence on each other. This is reinforced by the results of research conducted by Bamford et al (2013), Geisler et al (2019), and Irmawati & Wulandari Kn (2017) which showed that QWL has a significant positive effect on employee engagement. This means that when employees have a high level of QWL, they will feel more attached to their work which will then lower the burnout rate.

Based on the results of the above description, the authors were interested in conducting research on the role of employee engagement in mediating the influence of self-efficacy and quality of work life on burnout at Mandiri Inhealth Contact Center.

Research Model

In this study, the research model can be explained through the following schemes.
METHOD

Procedures and Samples

This research involved all contact center practitioners working in PT Asuransi Jiwa Inhealth Indonesia contact center department (MICC) which is located at C Simanjuntak Street No. 24, Yogyakarta and Bhayangkara Street No. 16-17, Solo, Central Java. A total of 137 respondents in the study were 137 employees with 53 from Solo and 84 from Yogyakarta.

The collection of research data was conducted by spreading research questionnaires through google form links in the form of e-questionnaires in the span of July 29, 2021 to August 14, 2021. Researchers leave a google form link to the Manager, Human Capital Staff, and IT Staff at MICC which is then distributed to all employees.

The demographics of respondents based on the majority gender followed by women with 22 male respondents (16.06%) and 115 female respondents (83.94%). While the level of education is 69 (50.36%) with diploma education level and 68 (50.36%) with undergraduate education level. While based on age, 53 respondents (38.69%) are respondents aged 21 to 25 years, 72 respondents (52.55%) are respondents aged 26 to 30 years, 10 respondents (7.30%) are respondents aged 31 to 35 years, and as many as 2 respondents (1.46%) are respondents between the ages of 36 to 40 years. The picture of respondents based on marital status is that of married respondents as many as 41 respondents (29.93%), while as many as 93 respondents (67.88%) unmarried respondents and the rest as many as 3 respondents (2.19%) have other marital status.

Measurement

The burnout measurements in the study were conducted using the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) questionnaire to measure burnout rates for employees working in the health service and the public sector. It consists of three indicators: Emotional exhaustion, depersonalization or cynicism, and personal accomplishment. Questions asked based on personal feelings and attitudes of respondents. Assessment is measured on a Likert scale consisting of 5 points (Khamisa, Peltzer, Ilic, & Oldenburg, 2017). While the measuring tool used to measure employee engagement using the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) questionnaire developed by Schaufeli and Bakker in 2019. This instrument includes three indicators consisting of vigor, dedication, and absorption (Schaufeli, Shimazu, Hakanen, Salanova, & de Witte, 2019). While the measurement of self-efficacy uses a general self-
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efficacy questionnaire consisting of three indicators namely level or magnitude, generality and strength (Bandura, 2010; Bandura et al., 1999). For QWL measurements using the Quality of Work Life Scale (QWLS) questionnaire. The measurement indicator consists of seven dimensions, namely health and safety needs (the need for health and security), economic and family needs (The need for economic and family adequacy), social needs (The need to socialize), esteem needs (The need for self-esteem), actualizations needs (The need to actualize self), knowledge needs (The need to renew knowledge), and aesthetics needs (The need for beauty values) (Sinval et al., 2020).

Questionnaire sheets to measure each variable measured using the likert scale with weights for self efficacy, burnout, and employee engagement variables are: Strongly Disagree (STS) has a value weight of 1, Disagree (TS) has a value weight of 2, Neutral (N) has a value weight of 3, Agree (S) has a value weight of 4, Strongly Agree (SS) has a value weight of 5. As for the assessment weight on the quality of work life variables, namely: Strongly Disagree (STS) has a value weight of 1, Not Appropriate (TS) has a value weight of 2, Somewhat Disagree (ATS) has a value weight of 3, Simply Agree (CS) has a value weight of 4, Somewhat Agree (AS) has a value weight of 5, Agree (S) has a value weight of 6, Strongly Agree (SS) has a value weight of 7.

The validity test in this study was based on the value of loading factors using Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). The validity test results for exogenous constructs or self efficacy and QWL variables are: SE1 = 0.831, SE2 = 0.837, SE3 = 0.823, SE4 = 0.836, SE5 = 0.834, SE6 = 0.852, SE7 = 0.847, SE8 = 0.834, SE9 = 0.864, QWL1 = 0.895, QWL2 = 0.904, QWL3 = 0.911, QWL4 = 0.915, QWL5 = 0.920, QWL6 = 0.910, QWL7 = 0.915, QWL8 = 0.909, QWL9 = 0.900, QWL10 = 0.906, QWL11 = 0.909, QWL12 = 0.909, QWL13 = 0.934, QWL14 = 0.908, QWL15 = 0.924, QWL16 = 0.909. As for endogenous constructs or employee engagement and burnout variables: EE1 = 0.831, EE2 = 0.841, EE3 = 0.849, EE4 = 0.82, EE5 = 0.833, EE6 = 0.812, EE7 = 0.82, EE8 = 0.812, EE9 = 0.847, BO1 = 0.887, BO2 = 0.849, BO3 = 0.86, BO4 = 0.872, BO5 = 0.861, BO6 = 0.881, BO7 = 0.89, BO8 = 0.85, BO9 = 0.892, BO10 = 0.861, BO13 = 0.874, BO14 = 0.878, BO15 = 0.871, BO16 = 0.899, BO17 = 0.897, BO18 = 0.867, BO19 = 0.858.

The questionnaire reliability test in this study using the resulting Construct Dependability (CR) and Variance Extracted (VE) figures can be used to determine the magnitude of reliability. If the CR value ≥ 0.70 and the VE value ≥ 0.50, then the gauge is considered reliable. (Tjahjono et al., 2021). Reliably test results for each questionnaire: SE has a CR = 0.956 value, and VE = 0.705, QWL has a CR = 0.987, and VE = 0.830, EE has a CR = 0.952, and VE = 0.688, while BO has a CR = 0.982, and VE = 0.763.

Data Analysis and Statistical Tests

Hypothesis testing on this study uses the help of Analysis Moment of Structural (AMOS) software. This aims so that the results obtained in this study are appropriate and can be accounted for. To perform a hypothesis test, it is necessary to determine the level of significance and the level of confidence. In social science, research generally uses a confidence level of 95%, so that the significance level is obtained by 5% or can be expressed as p value = 0.05 (Sekaran & Bougie, 2018). Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) is a statistical approach that combines the concept of factor analysis that enters the measurement model that explains
between variables with indicators and regression concepts through structural models that explain the relationship between variables (Tjahjono, Basuki, & Papupi, 2021).

The hypothesis test aims to determine answers supported by facts that have been collected and analyzed in data testing in hypothesis statements (Indriantoro & Supomo, 2018). The determination of hypotheses in this study refers to items that have met the criteria in SEM analysis. Data analysis can be determined based on the level of correlation significance (p value) and critical ratio (CR) value. The hypothesis is accepted if it has a significance value of < 0.05 and a CR value of ≥ 1.967. Conversely, if p value > 0.05 and CR value ≤ 1.967, then the hypothesis is rejected (Tjahjono et al., 2021).

While the hypothesis to know the role of mediation is measured based on the loading factor value directly and indirectly each variable that appears in the output standardized weights. If the value of direct relationship loading factors is higher than indirect influences, then the mediation variable has a role as a mediation on the influence of independent variables on the dependent variables used in the study.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The construction of the model in this study is based on the understanding of data analysis. In general, the model consists of two exogenous variables (Self-efficacy and quality of work life), one endogenous dependent variable (Burnout), and one mediation variable (Employee engagement). After the development of the theoretical model, the next stage is to arrange the model in the form of a path diagram to make the evaluated causal relationship clearer to be perceived. The following research models are formulated based on structural equations.

Figure 2. Structural Equations

Based on figure 2 theoretical conformity shows a fit model with the results of CMIN / DF = 1,302 shows that the research model is fit. The GFI value on this model is 0.716. A value close to the recommended level of ≥ 0.90 indicates a marginally fit research model. The
RMSEA value of this study is 0.047 with the recommended value of ≤ 0.08 this indicates a fit research model. The AGFI value on this model is 0.691 The value is close to the recommended level of ≥ 0.90 indicating a marginally fit research model. The TLI value in this study is 0.957 with the recommended value of ≥ 0.90 this indicates a fit research model. The CFI value in this study was 0.959 with the recommended value of ≥ 0.90 this indicates a fit research model. The IFI value in this study was 0.959 with the recommended value of ≥ 0.90 this indicates a fit research model. Based on the overall measurement of goodness of fit above indicates that the model proposed in this study is accepted.

Hypothesis Test

Based on the table above it is known that:

1) H1 = Self-Efficacy (SE) has a significant-positive effect on employee engagement (EE)

2) H2 = Quality of work life (QWL) has a significant-positive effect on employee engagement (EE)

3) H3 = Self-Efficacy (SE) has a significant-negative effect on burnout (BO)

4) H4 = Quality of work life (QWL) has a significant-positive effect on burnout (BO)

5) H5 = Employee Engagement (EE) has a significant-positive effect on Burnout (BO)

To see the mediation relationship between independent variables to dependent variables through variable mediation is to compare standardized direct effect values with standardized indirect effects. This means that if the standardized direct effects value is less than the standardized indirect effect, it can be said that the mediation variable has an indirect influence in the relationship between the two variables.
Table 3. Standardized Indirect Effect Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variabel</th>
<th>QWL</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>EE</th>
<th>BO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Engagement (EE)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout (BO)</td>
<td>-.114</td>
<td>-.496</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on tables 2 and 3 of the effect between self-efficacy on burnout mediated by employee engagement comparing between direct effect values < indirect effect values, testing the relationship of the two variables showed a value of \(-0.105 < 0.496\). This indicates that employee engagement mediated self efficacy against burnout. While the results of testing the influence between quality of work life on burnout mediated by employee engagement showed a value of \(-0.260 > -0.114\). This indicates that employee engagement does not mediate the quality of work life against burnout. Based on testing it can be concluded that:

1) H6 = Employee Engagement (EE) mediates the influence of Self-Efficacy (SE) on Burnout (BO) is accepted.

2) H7 = Employee Engagement (EE) mediating the influence of Quality of work life (QWL) on Burnout (BO) is rejected.

**Effect of Self-Efficacy on Employee Engagement (Accepted)**

Based on the results of the data analysis in table 1 obtained the result that hypothesis 1 regarding the effect of self efficacy on employee engagement is accepted and H0 is rejected with the parameters of the estimation value of the standardized regression weight coefficient obtained by 0.766 and the value of C.R 9.322. This indicates that the relationship of self efficacy with employee engagement is positive. This means that the increase in self efficacy, the increase in employee engagement. The relationship test of the two variables showed a probability value of 0.000 (p<0.05). These results support and are in line with previous research that has generally stated that self-efficacy has a significant-positive influence on employee engagement.

In terms of CC employee phenomenon, the average employee at MICC has a high level of self-efficacy, they feel confident in the ability they have in completing challenging jobs well and as expected. They also feel that they have a positive outlook and a high commitment in doing work at MICC. Employees at MICC feel proud and enthusiastic to be part of MICC, so increasingly have an emotional connection and attachment while doing their work at MICC.

An individual's confidence in the ability he has regarding his success to complete tasks as expected will make an employee work diligently and will always give the best results. Self efficacy is a personal factor that can regulate a person's behavior in achieving goals (Trilolita et al., 2017). The employee's confidence in the ability to complete his work makes employees feel more attached to his work. This is because employees who feel able or have the capacity to complete the difficulty level of a given task, the more they neglect jobs that are likely beyond their means, so they will work enthusiastically and passionately (Afdaliza, 2015). Employees who have a deep attachment or high employee engagement will care about what they do and enthusiastic and committed to providing the best for the company (Trilolita et al., 2017).
The Effect of Quality of Work Life on Employee Engagement (Accepted)

Based on the results of the data in table 1, it was found that the results of the influence of quality of work life on employee engagement had an estimated value of 0.126 and a value of C.R 3.176. This shows that the relationship of quality of work life with employee engagement is positive. This means that the increasing quality of work life will increase employee engagement. Testing the relationship of the two variables showed a probability value of 0.001 (p<0.05), it can be concluded that the quality of work life has a significant-positive effect on employee engagement. These results support and are in line with previous research that generally states that quality of work life has a significant-positive influence on employee engagement.

Viewed from the aspect of phenomena in MICC, the management of employees at MICC is based on meeting basic needs based on maslow's needs. With adequate facilities to support work as well as a special room for entertainment, bonuses and compensation in accordance with performance, a positive work environment, comprehensive knowledge management, and the establishment of an Internal Culture Team (TIB) as a forum for employees to meet their actualization needs. MICC has tried to create a pleasant work environment to support employee performance so as to increase morale, enthusiasm and employees have a deep emotional connection to the organization (Engage).

Quality of work life is a perspective on individuals, work, and organizations that focuses on the impact of work on individuals and organizational effectiveness as a basis in making decisions and problems in the organization (Kurniawati, 2018). Companies that manage quality of work life well will cause satisfaction in each employee to what has been given by the company. Thus, there will be volunteerism to employees in doing their work, and employee engagement will increase. Conversely, if the employee feels dissatisfied with what he gets to his job, employees will tend to get away from their current job (Kurniawati, 2018).

Effect of Self-Efficacy on Burnout (Rejected)

Based on the results of the data in table 1, it was found that the results of the influence of self-efficacy on burnout have parameters of estimation values of standardized regression weight coefficient obtained by - 0.118 and values C.R -0.989. This shows that the relationship of Self Efficacy with Burnout is negative. This means that the increase in self efficacy will decrease burnout. Testing the relationship of the two variables showed a probability value of 0.322 (p>0.05), it can be concluded that H0 is accepted and H3 rejected i.e. self efficacy has no effect on burnout.

From the aspect of employee phenomena at MICC, that CC employees at MICC have high self-confidence in the work he does well and maximally. In some jobs employees use the experiences they have experienced to solve problems and obstacles in their work. They are confident in the potential they have in resolving the difficulties faced and can view things from a positive side under any circumstances. However, this has not been enough to support lowering burnout rates in MICC employees.

From the aspect of management research, although from various literature shows that self efficacy has a significant negative effect on the phenomenon of burnout (Boujut et al., 2017; Smetackova, 2017), and it is proven that high self efficacy can decrease burnout levels (de Oliveira & ChangotheRest, 2018), but self with burnout does not support each other. From the
results of this study, it was found that the self efficacy of an employee does not have a direct
effect with the occurrence of burnout phenomenon because burnout syndrome occurs due to
prolonged stress and pressure that is felt continuously at work (Maslach & Leiter, 2016). Thus,
burnout syndrome is not directly affected by self efficacy by employees.

**Effect of Quality of work life on Burnout (Accepted)**

Based on the results of the data in table 1, it was found that the result of the effect of quality
of work life on burnout has an estimated value of -0.208 and a value of C.R -4.771 with a
probability value of 0.000. The size of p value is less than 0.05 and the value of C.R less than
0. It can be concluded that the quality of work life has a significant-negative effect on burnout.
These results support and are in line with previous research that generally states that employee
engagement has a significant-negative effect on burnout.

In general, management has tried to implement organizational management interventions
well, by providing facilities that can support work, providing incentives and benefits for
shifting employees, reward systems and a sportsmanship social environment in an effort to
support employee performance and comfort in work. It's just that, the majority of employees at
MICC are still at a moderately even high burnout level. In some cases of employees who
experience symptoms of burnout syndrome either at moderate or high levels, they feel less
satisfied with the need for health and safety needs at MICC. Programs regarding health
prevention and maintenance in MICC environments are not yet maximal and the gap in work
support facilities between MICC Solo and Yogyakarta, as well as job security in MICC
environments that have not been managed properly such as the availability of fire
extinguishers, appropriate air circulation, mechanisms and equipment for first handling in
accidents raise concerns in employees about safety at work.

Based on Maslow's level of needs, the quality of work life (QWL) is divided into several
levels of needs, namely basic needs such as health and safety needs, as well as economic and
family needs, while high-level needs include social needs, reward needs, self-actualization
needs, the need for knowledge and the needs of public places in the workplace (Sinval et al.,
2020). The work environment is a very important component, especially regarding the health
and safety of work in carrying out tasks that need a basic level that must be met (Cascio, 1998).
A higher quality of working life can be achieved if workers or employees and organizations
share the same goals. Increasing QWL is one of the goals of organizations in the world,
considering that it can encourage innovation in the workplace and sustainable work, as well as
mutual satisfaction with the reciprocity provided between workers and companies, so as to
reduce burnout levels in employees (Sinval et al., 2020).

**Effect of Employee Engagement on Burnout (Accepted)**

Based on the results of the data in table 1, it was found that the result of the influence of
employee engagement on burnout has an estimated value of -0.727 and a value of C.R -5.125
with a probability value below 0.01. So it can be concluded that employee engagement has a
significant-negative effect on burnout. These results support and are in line with previous
research that generally stated that employee engagement has a significant-negative effect on
burnout.
In view of the aspect of phenomena in Mandiri Inhealth Contact Center, the majority of employees who have a positive perspective on the work they do or have a high vigor aspect and have an emotional attachment and pride to the organization (Dedication) tend to avoid physical and mental fatigue, as well as cynicism and personal accomplishment. Conversely, employees who view the work they do negatively have a tendency to experience emotional and physical fatigue, have an attitude of cynicism and experience decreased self-achievement.

Vigor can be defined as an outpouring of energy and a strong mentality during work, motivation to get the job done well, perseverance and persistence in the face of work difficulties (Maslach & Leiter, 1997). Employees who are diligent and persistent in the face of difficulties or obstacles in completing their work tend to stay afloat and remain motivated to give their best in getting their work done (Afdaliza, 2015). Dedication is emotional connection, meaning, enthusiasm, and pride in work (Maslach & Leiter, 1997). Employees who have high dedication will devote all their energy and concentration to the work they do. Employees who work with pride and full of energy will foster a pleasant feeling of the work they do so that employees will be more emotionally stable and not easily feel frustrated and depressed. Conversely, if the employee does not have an emotional attachment to his work, the employee will work half-heartedly and full of compulsion because he has no concern for the organization and the work he does (Zoraya, 2019).

The role of Employee Engagement in mediating the influence of Self-Efficacy on Burnout (Accepted)

Based on the results of the data obtained that the role of employee engagement (EE) in mediating the influence of self efficacy (SE) on burnout (BO) is accepted. This can be proven by the direct effect value of 0.105 less than the indirect effect value of -0.496 so that it can be concluded that employee engagement acts as a mediation of the influence of self-efficacy on burnout.

In terms of employee phenomena, if you pay attention to the condition of employees at MICC, then the employee feels confident in his ability and potential in completing the given work and has a positive view of the work he does. They will also work with full energy, passion, high dedication and commitment to their work. With that passion and enthusiasm the employee feels the work he does becomes fun, so as to minimize burnout.

Viewed from the research aspect of management In accordance with the literature study that has been explained, it can be made a conceptual relationship between employee engagement and burnout. This is supported by several studies that generally show that employee engagement has a significant negative effect on burnout (Aryatno, 2019; Christiany & Widhianingtanti, 2017; Cole et al., 2012; Zoraya, 2019). As for the research conducted by E. S. S. Chan et al (Edmund S. S. Chan, Ho, Ip, & Wong, 2020), that self efficacy has a significant positive effect on employee engagement. In this study also explained that the importance of self-confidence in the competence possessed and intrinsic motivation in regulating engagement and functioning as a mechanism of self-motivation.
**The role of Employee Engagement in mediating the influence of Quality of work life on Burnout (rejected)**

Based on the results of the data obtained that the role of employee engagement (EE) in mediating the influence of quality of work life (QWL) on burnout (BO) was rejected. This can be proven by the direct effect value of -0.260 greater than the indirect effect value of -0.114. So it can be concluded that employee engagement does not act as a mediation of the influence of self-efficacy on burnout.

In terms of employee phenomenon at MICC, when it is considered that employees who feel satisfied with the management of employees at MICC, then they also feel that they are passionate and feel proud of their work. They will work with full energy and have a positive outlook on their work, so they will be more stable in the face of difficulties and obstacles during work. However, this is not enough to support the role of employee engagement in mediating the relationship between quality of work life and burnout.

From the aspect of management research, although the literature shows that quality of work life has a significant positive effect on employee engagement (Kurniawati, 2018), and employee engagement has a significant negative influence on burnout (Cole et al., 2012), as well as the findings in this study show that supporting both results of the study, but employee engagement does not mediate the relationship between quality of work life to burnout. The results of this study shows that the quality of work life affects the level of burnout directly because quality of work life is the management of working conditions that not only focuses on physical needs but also involves all aspects of human health such as psychological, cognitive and social needs of employees, so it is an important factor that needs to be considered in minimizing burnout in employees (Acar & Erkan, 2018).

**CONCLUSION**

What can be concluded from this study is that management should pay more attention to interventions that integrate between individuals and organizations, especially by further improving the quality of work life and employee engagement in CC practitioners as a step in minimizing burnout levels. In addition, the implementation of self efficacy-based programs also needs to be considered, because with high self efficacy will increase employee engagement in employees, so that burnout levels can be controlled.
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