E-ISSN: 3108-4192

APSSHS

Academic Publications of Social Sciences and Humanities Studies
2024, Volume 4, Page No: 58-66
Available online at: https://apsshs.com/

Asian Journal of Individual and Organizational Behavior

Exploring the Influence of Job-Related Factors on Lecturer Performance: A Case Study in Vietnam

Vu Thi Yen[1]*, Dinh Van Toan[1], Tran Anh Tai[1]

1. Banking Academy of Vietnam, VNU Center for Education Accreditation, Dai Nam University, Vietnam.

Abstract

This study examines the influence of job-related factors—specifically job control, job demand, and social support—on lecturer performance in Hanoi, Vietnam. In the face of rising competition, job performance has become a critical focus for organizations. The performance of individual employees and their collaborative efforts are essential for overall organizational success. This research uses the job demand-control and social support model to analyze the factors affecting the performance of university lecturers in Vietnam. A questionnaire with 153 completed responses was distributed to lecturers in Hanoi through an online platform. Data analysis using AMOS and SPSS confirmed the hypothesis. The findings showed that job demand negatively affects lecturer performance, while both job control and social support positively influence it. Furthermore, the study found that job control and social support moderate the relationship between job demand and lecturer performance. Based on these results, this study offers recommendations for university managers to enhance lecturer performance.

Keywords: Job demand, Social support, Job control, Lecturer, Employee performance

How to cite this article: Yen VT, Toan DV, Tai TA. Exploring the Influence of Job-Related Factors on Lecturer Performance: A Case Study in Vietnam. Asian J Indiv Organ Behav. 2024;4:58-66. https://doi.org/10.51847/9dchNRwhGY

Received: 02 October 2024; **Revised:** 02 December 2024; **Accepted:** 08 December 2024
Corresponding author: Vu Thi Yen
E-mail ✉ yenvt@hvnh.edu.vn

Introduction

Employee performance has been analyzed from a variety of perspectives, each shedding light on different factors influencing the overall productivity of workers. It is a subject of importance not only for businesses but also for researchers in the fields of management and organizational psychology. Within management studies, the primary focus is on how to maximize worker productivity through activities that improve their skills and provide favorable conditions. According to this viewpoint, employee performance is seen as the outcome of certain actions or roles [1]. Performance is often evaluated based on task completion, measured by established organizational standards such as output, costs, and time. This perspective emphasizes the results, rather than the specific behaviors or processes that lead to those results.

On the other hand, psychology focuses on the interaction of different elements, such as employee motivation, commitment, job satisfaction, and personal traits, that influence job performance. Here, employee performance is viewed as a collection of actions that contribute to achieving organizational goals [2]. These behaviors are measurable and reflect an individual's proficiency in their role. Campbell [3] suggested that work performance could be assessed based on eight factors, including (1) specific job proficiency, (2) lack of proficiency, (3) communication skills (both written and verbal), (4) personal effort, (5) self-discipline, (6) collaboration with peers and group performance, (7) leadership and supervision, and (8) management and administrative duties.

Employee performance plays a critical role in the success of an organization. According to Armstrong [4], it is essential for achieving organizational objectives and staying competitive in today's business environment. High-performing employees significantly contribute to improving productivity, enhancing the quality of goods or services, and increasing customer satisfaction [5]. Furthermore, they influence the organizational culture by promoting teamwork and motivating others [6]. There is a strong connection between employee performance and organizational success, as it directly impacts key performance metrics [7]. Organizations that prioritize employee development, offer regular feedback and foster a culture of continuous improvement tend to be more adaptable and competitive, positioning them for long-term success [8].

Research has also indicated that job performance can impact voluntary turnover, with effects that are both direct and indirect. Specifically, turnover intentions may arise from job dissatisfaction, which in turn affects the likelihood of resignation. Lee and Mitchell's [9] unfolding model of turnover suggests that employees are more likely to consider leaving their organization if they face unforeseen disruptions or unpleasant conditions in the workplace. Zimmerman and Darnold [10] further explored the relationship between performance and turnover intentions, finding that it is generally negative but not very strong. Their study highlighted the moderating factors that influence this relationship, indicating that job performance does affect turnover behaviors both directly and indirectly.

This study explores the influence of job-related factors—specifically job control, job demand, and social support—on lecturer performance in Hanoi, Vietnam.

Literature review

Job demand-control-social support model

The job demand-control (JDC) model, introduced by Karasek [11], was a pioneering framework designed to assess work-related stress and its impact on employee health and productivity. Karasek identified three key components in the model: 1) Job demands, which refer to workload, time pressures, and other stressors that employees face; 2) Job control, which is the degree of autonomy employees have in making decisions regarding their tasks; and 3) Work stress, which occurs when high job demands coincide with low job control [11].

Karasek's model has become a cornerstone in research related to job performance and job satisfaction. Studies have shown that workers with high job demands and low job control tend to experience higher levels of stress, while those with low demands and high control experience more positive emotional states [11]. The interaction between job demands and job control influences employees' emotional well-being, contributing to their perceived work pressure [12]. Research further confirms that job demands and job control can significantly impact job satisfaction, complaints, and pressure [13]. For instance, high job demands combined with low job control have been found to increase work pressure among nurses in Germany [13]. The three-way interaction model suggests that changes in one of the factors—job demands, job control, or job stress—can impact the other factors, resulting in different outcomes for employees [14].

The JDC model has been instrumental in identifying factors that influence job satisfaction and performance, highlighting the importance of job characteristics. Moreover, the model has been widely applied across various industries to explore solutions that mitigate workplace stress and its negative effects, ultimately improving individual job performance [11].

However, the original JDC model had a limitation in that it focused primarily on job characteristics, neglecting external organizational factors and interpersonal relationships within the workplace. Employees do not work in isolation; they rely on coordination and support from colleagues, managers, and other organizational members [15]. The dynamics of these relationships can have a profound impact on employee well-being and performance.

Recognizing this gap, Johnson and Hall [15] introduced a third factor—social support—into the JDC framework, leading to the development of the job demands-control-social support (JDCS) model. This expansion acknowledged that support from colleagues and supervisors plays a critical role in influencing work stress and performance. In their study of 13,779 Swiss workers, Johnson and Hall found that co-worker support, combined with job demands and job control, could influence job outcomes [15].

The JDCS model has since been widely applied to examine factors affecting employee behavior and stress. For instance, Del Pozo-Antúnez *et al.* [16] explored how social support from both colleagues and managers affects employee performance, highlighting the significant role of manager support in mitigating work pressure and job demands. Similarly, research by Charoensukmongkol [17] revealed that co-worker support positively influenced job performance, while manager support was negatively correlated with the use of social networking tools in Thai workplaces, impacting overall job satisfaction and cognitive performance.

Furthermore, the JDCS model has been utilized to understand various organizational outcomes, such as job satisfaction, job performance, and cognitive uptake [17]. Studies indicate that high job demands, coupled with limited social support, exacerbate work-related stress. However, changes in job demands and improvements in social support can lead to better work outcomes [18].

In addition, the JDCS model has been applied to other domains, such as worker safety performance [19] and across different demographic groups, including gender, nationality, and occupation [20]. These studies emphasize that social support is not only a direct influence on job performance but also interacts with job demands and control, influencing overall work pressure and outcomes.

However, the job demand-control-social support (JDCS) model has limitations, particularly in its treatment of social support elements in the workplace. The original model primarily emphasizes support from coworkers in influencing job performance. However, the work environment includes a broader range of support sources, such as leadership, peer relationships, and organizational frameworks [21, 22]. Research on social support at work has highlighted the importance of support from colleagues, managers, subordinates, and the organization as a whole in influencing employee performance [21]. Del Pozo-Antúnez *et al*. [16] demonstrated that support from both colleagues and managers is crucial in mitigating work-related stress and boosting employee productivity. Similarly, studies from Charoensukmongkol [17], Lin *et al*. (2009), and Bowen *et al*. (2014) have explored how support from colleagues and managers influences work pressures, confirming its role in shaping job performance.

Impact of job demand on employee performance

The influence of job demands on both psychological and physical stress, as well as on job performance, has been widely examined in occupational studies. While these studies generally agree that high job demands can negatively affect performance and well-being, the moderating factors that alleviate these effects have been less consistently identified. Researchers like Karasek [11] and Johnson and Hall [15] have explored various personal and job-related characteristics that can serve as buffers against the detrimental effects of high job demands. In recent studies, role clarity has been identified as an additional factor that may influence how job demands affect performance.

While there is consensus that job demands can impact performance, the correlation between job demands and employee outcomes is complex. Studies like those from Lang *et al.* [23] suggest that this relationship may be weak or even non-existent in some cases. One reason for this could be that previous research overlooked potential intervening variables that mediate the demands–performance link. As Lang *et al.* [23] and Sumantri *et al.* [24] note, performance is a multifaceted concept influenced by numerous factors, many of which may not be captured accurately by self-reported data.

Effect of job control on employee performance

The role of job control in influencing employee performance has been a central topic in organizational psychology. Job control is defined as the extent to which employees can influence their tasks and decisions at work. Research consistently shows that job control is a significant factor affecting various elements of employee performance, including motivation, job satisfaction, and well-being [11].

The job demand-control model proposed by Karasek [11] suggests that optimal performance occurs when employees have a balance between high job demands and a significant level of control over their work. According to this model, employees who experience greater control are more likely to have higher motivation, better job satisfaction, and ultimately improved performance outcomes. The underlying idea is that giving employees autonomy over their work processes enhances their sense of competence and engagement, which leads to better job performance.

Numerous empirical studies have examined the impact of job control on various aspects of employee performance, consistently finding a positive correlation between the two. Employees who are granted higher levels of autonomy and decision-making authority generally display better task performance, enhanced creativity, and increased job satisfaction. Job control is also linked to lower levels of stress and burnout, reinforcing its beneficial influence on performance. By allowing employees the freedom to manage their tasks and make decisions, organizations foster an environment that encourages greater engagement, motivation, and commitment.

Despite the prevailing trend supporting a positive relationship between job control and performance, the nature of this relationship can vary across different settings. Several moderating factors, including individual characteristics, job features, and organizational culture, influence how job control impacts performance. For instance, the link may be stronger in knowledge-intensive roles than in routine, repetitive tasks.

In conclusion, research overwhelmingly supports the positive impact of job control on employee performance. Organizations that recognize the importance of autonomy and decision-making power create an environment that can lead to improved performance. Future studies should focus on the nuanced factors influencing this relationship, such as individual differences and organizational context, to better understand the diverse effects of job control across different performance dimensions.

Impact of social support on employee performance

Social support in the workplace has become an essential factor in enhancing various aspects of employee performance. The existing body of research highlights the importance of social support in improving employee well-being, reducing stress, and boosting productivity. Social support encompasses emotional, informational, and instrumental assistance provided by

colleagues, supervisors, and organizational networks, serving as a protective buffer against work-related stress and contributing positively to employees' overall well-being.

Workplace support includes actions and behaviors intended to assist others in the work environment [25], often provided by both colleagues and managers [26]. This support can take various forms, such as emotional encouragement, problem-solving assistance, and guidance on organizational systems. Researchers emphasize the critical role of coworkers as a source of support, particularly when more experienced employees assist newcomers or guide those promoted within the organization.

The relationships between colleagues, workplace support, and coordination have also been shown to influence job performance. Babin and Boles [27] suggest that strong support and collaboration from coworkers lead to better performance outcomes. Pelin and Osoian [25] further corroborate this by demonstrating that high levels of support and cooperation from colleagues positively affect work results.

Based on the existing literature, a hypothesis is proposed: the support of colleagues influences the job performance of lecturers. Even though a lecturer's role may be well-defined in job descriptions or position outlines, tasks assigned by superiors and the organization remain essential for job performance. Therefore, support and guidance from direct supervisors are critical for achieving high levels of performance [26]. This managerial support is crucial as it shapes the employee's experience and, consequently, their performance.

Numerous empirical studies have examined the impact of job control on various aspects of employee performance, consistently finding a positive correlation between the two. Employees who are granted higher levels of autonomy and decision-making authority generally display better task performance, enhanced creativity, and increased job satisfaction. Job control is also linked to lower levels of stress and burnout, reinforcing its beneficial influence on performance. By allowing employees the freedom to manage their tasks and make decisions, organizations foster an environment that encourages greater engagement, motivation, and commitment.

Despite the prevailing trend supporting a positive relationship between job control and performance, the nature of this relationship can vary across different settings. Several moderating factors, including individual characteristics, job features, and organizational culture, influence how job control impacts performance. For instance, the link may be stronger in knowledge-intensive roles than in routine, repetitive tasks.

In conclusion, research overwhelmingly supports the positive impact of job control on employee performance. Organizations that recognize the importance of autonomy and decision-making power create an environment that can lead to improved performance. Future studies should focus on the nuanced factors influencing this relationship, such as individual differences and organizational context, to better understand the diverse effects of job control across different performance dimensions.

Impact of social support on employee performance

Social support in the workplace has become an essential factor in enhancing various aspects of employee performance. The existing body of research highlights the importance of social support in improving employee well-being, reducing stress, and boosting productivity. Social support encompasses emotional, informational, and instrumental assistance provided by colleagues, supervisors, and organizational networks, serving as a protective buffer against work-related stress and contributing positively to employees' overall well-being.

Workplace support includes actions and behaviors intended to assist others in the work environment [25], often provided by both colleagues and managers [26]. This support can take various forms, such as emotional encouragement, problem-solving assistance, and guidance on organizational systems. Researchers emphasize the critical role of coworkers as a source of support, particularly when more experienced employees assist newcomers or guide those promoted within the organization.

The relationships between colleagues, workplace support, and coordination have also been shown to influence job performance. Babin and Boles [27] suggest that strong support and collaboration from coworkers lead to better performance outcomes. Pelin and Osoian [25] further corroborate this by demonstrating that high levels of support and cooperation from colleagues positively affect work results.

Based on the existing literature, a hypothesis is proposed: the support of colleagues influences the job performance of lecturers. Even though a lecturer's role may be well-defined in job descriptions or position outlines, tasks assigned by superiors and the organization remain essential for job performance. Therefore, support and guidance from direct supervisors are critical for achieving high levels of performance [28]. This managerial support is crucial as it shapes the employee's experience and, consequently, their performance.

Materials and Methods

The research followed a systematic approach, beginning with an extensive review of both domestic and international literature related to the topic. This enabled the formulation of specific research questions, and hypotheses, and the development of the research model **(Table 1)**.

Table 1. Measurement scale

Variable	Source
Job demand	Based on Karasek's job demand control and social support model [11]
Job control	Based on Karasek's job demand control and social support model [11]
Co-worker support	Based on Karasek's job demand control and social support model [11]
Supervisor support	Based on Karasek's job demand control and social support model [11]
Student support	Adapted from Karasek's social support model [11]
Partner support	Adapted from Karasek's social support model [11]
Employee performance	Williams and Anderson [29]

The measurement scales used in this study were adapted from established theories and prior research. The questionnaire was created using these scales and then translated from English to Vietnamese to suit the context of university lecturers. To ensure clarity, the questionnaire was first tested with 10 lecturers in a pilot survey and revised accordingly for better comprehension and response accuracy.

Specific changes were made to questions based on feedback from the initial respondents:

1. Question 3 regarding business support: The original question, "business partners are willing to support me in teaching activities," was modified to include additional tasks such as "scientific research activities and other professional duties."
2. Question 6 about job requirements: The initial question, "My job faces conflicts in job requirements," was revised to "I encounter many conflicts in job requirements" after receiving feedback that the original version was unclear.

Following the pilot phase, the questionnaire was distributed using a snowball sampling method to ensure broad participation. A total of 153 valid responses were collected for further analysis.

Data from the responses were coded and checked for completeness, followed by exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). According to research methodology standards, the minimum sample size for EFA is typically five times the number of variables, with 10 or 20 times being ideal. With four variables in this model, the minimum sample size requirement was met with 153 responses, which provided a sufficient basis for subsequent analyses, including EFA, CFA, and regression modeling.

The data analysis was performed using SPSS version 24 software.

Results and Discussion

Descriptive statistical analysis

Descriptive statistics were applied to give an overview of the demographic data collected from the study sample, highlighting the distribution of responses in terms of both numbers and percentages.

Table 2. Respondents' gender distribution

Gender	Count	Percentage
Male	51	33.3%
Female	102	66.7%
Total	153	100%

Table 2 shows the gender breakdown of the respondents. Out of 153 participants, 51 were male (33.3%), while 102 were female (66.7%).

Table 3. Educational qualifications of respondents

Education Level	Count	Percentage
Undergraduate	0	0%
Master's degree	90	58.8%
PhD	63	41.2%
Total	153	100%

Table 3 outlines the education levels of the participants. Among the 153 lecturers, 90 (58.8%) hold a Master's degree, and 63 (41.2%) have completed their PhD.

Table 4. Respondents' work experience

Experience duration	Count	Percentage
Less than 1 year	0	0%
1 year to less than 5 years	7	4.6%
5 to less than 10 years	25	16.3%
10 years and above	121	79.1%
Total	153	100%

Table 4 shows the distribution of work experience among respondents. The majority, 121 lecturers (79.1%), have more than 10 years of experience, followed by 25 (16.3%) with 5 to 10 years, and 7 lecturers (4.6%) with 1 to 5 years of experience.

Table 5. Reliability test results

Variable	Cronbach's alpha
Job demand	0.950
Job control	0.826
Co-worker support	0.888
Supervisor support	0.921
Student support	0.877
Partner support	0.798
Job performance	0.937

Table 5 presents the reliability coefficients for each of the study variables. The Cronbach's Alpha values indicate that all scales used in the study have excellent internal consistency, with scores ranging from 0.798 to 0.950.

The data collected was input into SPSS, and the reliability analysis yielded Cronbach's alpha values ranging from 0.798 to 0.950. Since all values exceed the acceptable threshold of 0.7, the reliability of the variables is considered satisfactory, as shown in **Table 5**.

The results of the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett's test indicate that the KMO value is 0.795, which is greater than the 0.5 threshold, and the Bartlett test's significance is 0.000 ($P < 0.05$). This suggests that the factor analysis technique is appropriate for this dataset.

Factor analysis results revealed that 36 observed variables were grouped into 7 main factors (groups), all with high eigenvalues greater than 1, with the 7th factor having the smallest eigenvalue of 1.145. The total variance extracted is 69.726%, which is above the 50% threshold, indicating that the model is satisfactory. The factor loading coefficients were all above 0.5, demonstrating that the factors satisfy both discriminant and convergent validity.

Exploratory factor analysis extracted 7 factors representing the concepts to be measured, including job demand, job control, co-worker support, supervisor support, student support, business support, and job performance. These factors were subjected to confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using AMOS software.

The summary results from CFA indicated that all scales had composite reliability values greater than 0.7 and average extracted variance (AVE) values greater than 0.5, confirming that the scales are reliable and suitable for structural equation modeling (SEM). The CFA results also showed that the model fits well, with all factors demonstrating convergent validity, discriminant validity, and reliability. Therefore, the model is deemed appropriate for SEM analysis.

Following the CFA, the theoretical model was tested using SEM. The SEM results indicated that all relationships had P-values < 0.05, confirming the statistical significance of the cause-and-effect relationships. As a result, all proposed hypotheses were supported.

Table 6. Path coefficient

Hypothesis	Paths			Regression weights	S.E.	C.R.	P-value	Standardized weights
H1	J.P.	<---	JD	-0.134	0.051	-2.657	0.008	-0.169
H2	JP	<---	JC	0.420	0.134	3.135	0.002	0.281
H3a	JP	<---	SS1	0.211	0.093	2.262	0.024	0.233
H3b	JP	<---	SS2	0.177	0.073	2.437	0.015	0.203
H3c	JP	<---	SS3	0.214	0.095	2.259	0.024	0.145
H3d	JP	<---	SS4	0.160	0.081	1.968	0.049	0.151
H4a	JP	<---	M1	0.130	0.064	2.037	0.042	0.137
H4b	JP	<---	M2	0.256	0.104	2.458	0.014	0.166

Table 6 shows the results of the standardized model indicating the level of impact of the factors in the research model. From the results of SEM structural model analysis, the author draws the following conclusions:

$$JP = -0.169\ JD + 0.281\ JC + 0.233\ SS1 + 0.203\ SS2 + 0.145\ SS3 + 0.151\ SS4 + 0.137\ JC*JD + 0.166\ SS*JD + e \quad (1)$$

Job demand has a negative influence on job performance, with a standardized regression weight of -0.169. In contrast, factors like job control, co-worker support, supervisor support, student support, and business support all have a positive impact on job performance. Specifically, job control has a standardized regression weight of 0.281, co-worker support is 0.233, supervisor support is 0.203, student support is 0.145, and business support is 0.137.

Moreover, job control and social support both act as moderating variables in the relationship between job demand and job performance, with weights of 0.137 and 0.166, respectively.

Lecturer job performance is a crucial focus for both lecturers and management teams. It serves as a reflection of individual lecturer effectiveness, making it important for organizational success. The study aimed to identify work-related factors influencing lecturer job performance through data collected from 153 respondents.

The results demonstrate that all variables in the research model impact job performance to varying extents. Specifically, job demand was found to negatively affect lecturer performance, supporting the hypothesis that job control has a positive influence. Social support—broken down into co-worker, supervisor, student, and business support—was also found to positively influence performance.

In addition, the analysis shows that job control moderates the impact of job demand on job performance. Social support further moderates the relationship between job demand and performance. The findings indicate that the moderating effect of social support is more substantial than that of job control.

Regarding the strength of the impact, job control had the most significant influence on job performance, followed by co-worker support and supervisor support. Business and student support had a smaller influence on job performance. Furthermore, social support as a moderating variable had a stronger effect than job control in moderating the impact of job demand on job performance.

The research findings regarding the impact of job demand on job performance align with previous studies, such as those by Lu *et al.* [30]. When job demands increase—such as a higher volume of tasks, urgent completion deadlines, and expectations for high-quality work—lecturers' professional performance tends to decline. Furthermore, job demands can encompass the need for capacity development, such as learning new skills or requiring creativity. As these demands rise, they negatively affect the lecturer's job performance.

Vietnamese universities should clarify the job performance expectations for lecturers, recognizing that each position has distinct requirements. Job factors define the tasks and responsibilities the jobholder needs to complete. A detailed job description should clearly outline these duties and powers, helping lecturers better understand their roles and perform them effectively.

It is essential to establish or implement a work management system where lecturers and staff can store and manage activities such as scientific research, self-training, field visits, and participation in various organizational activities. This system should align with the KPI framework used to evaluate lecturers' performance and allow them to report their progress anytime during the year. Tracking work progress and resource allocation will help lecturers manage their tasks more efficiently.

Leaders within the academic environment should provide more support to junior lecturers by helping them better understand their roles and responsibilities. Through mentoring, training, and discussions, experienced colleagues and managers can share their expertise and introduce effective teaching methods. This timely support will enhance lecturers' performance.

Additionally, to encourage proactive student engagement, lecturers need to refine their teaching methods to focus on students. Active teaching strategies will promote student participation in lectures and motivate them to follow the instructors' guidance. This approach not only benefits student learning outcomes but also allows lecturers to enhance their knowledge and creativity.

The research model confirms the importance of support from business partners, particularly in the context of educational innovation and internationalization. Universities aim to train students according to societal needs, incorporating feedback from students and businesses—the future employers of graduates—into the development of programs, course content, and teaching methodologies.

Limitations

Firstly, the study focused on lecturers from six universities in Hanoi. However, universities also employ a significant number of support staff, including experts and staff in departments like Training, Scientific Research, the Library Information Center, and the Health Department. These employees, who have different job characteristics, contribute to the overall work performance of lecturers and influence students' outcomes. Future research should also consider evaluating the performance of these support staff.

Secondly, there are variations in the working environment and conditions across universities. Therefore, future studies could expand to include universities from various regions, allowing comparisons that can lead to solutions tailored to each institution's specific characteristics.
Lastly, the study surveyed 153 lecturers from universities in Hanoi. Future research should aim to gather a broader sample to fully evaluate the impact of various factors on the work performance of lecturers in Vietnam.

Conclusion

The research highlights that evaluating university lecturers' performance requires a comprehensive approach that assesses both the quantity and quality of work completed, in line with their job description. Key tasks for lecturers typically include teaching, scientific research, and self-development. Additionally, it's important to assess lecturers' academic performance from a behavioral perspective, as their behaviors provide valuable indirect insights into their overall job performance.
Given that lecturers have a distinctive role, it is crucial to consider the specific context and working conditions when studying the factors influencing their professional performance. Factors such as the nature of the work itself, as well as the support and collaboration from both management and colleagues, play a significant role in shaping the lecturers' effectiveness within the organization.
Research into these factors provides universities and their leadership with a clearer understanding of the challenges lecturers face in their roles. This, in turn, can inform the development of targeted solutions and policies to enhance lecturers' professional performance, improve organizational effectiveness, and help achieve the university's overarching goals.

Acknowledgments: None

Conflict of interest: None

Financial support: None

Ethics statement: None

References

1. Bal PM, De Lange AH. From flexibility human resource management to employee engagement and perceived job performance across the lifespan: a multisample study. J Occup Psychol. 2015;88(1):126-54.
2. Murphy K. Dimensions of job performance. Testing: applied and theoretical perspectives. New York: Praeger; 1989.
3. Campbell JP. Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology. In: Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology. s.l.:Consulting Psychologists Press; 1990. p. 687-732.
4. Armstrong M. A handbook of human resource management practice. Kogan Page Publishers; 2006.
5. Kaynak H, Hartley JL. Exploring quality management practices and high tech firm performance. J High Technol Manag Res. 2005;16(2):255-72.
6. Schneider B, Ehrhart MG, Macey WH. Organizational climate and culture. Annu Rev Psychol. 2013;64(1):361-88.
7. Muhammad S, Khan I, Hameed F. The impact of performance management system on employees'performance. Int J Bus Manag Stud. 2021;2(3):38-47.
8. Latham GP, Pinder CC. Work motivation theory and research at the dawn of the twenty-first century. Annu Rev Psychol. 2005;56:485-516.
9. Lee TW, Mitchell TR. An alternative approach: the unfolding model of voluntary employee turnover. Acad Manag Rev. 1994;19(1):51-89.
10. Zimmerman RD, Darnold TC. The impact of job performance on employee turnover intentions and the voluntary turnover process: a meta-analysis and path model. Pers Rev. 2009;38(2):142-58.
11. Karasek Jr RA. Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: implications for job redesign. Adm Sci Q. 1979:285-308.
12. Fernet C, Guay F, Senécal C. Adjusting to job demands: the role of work self-determination and job control in predicting burnout. J Vocat Behav. 2004;65(1):39-56.
13. Schmidt KH, Diestel S. Differential effects of decision latitude and control on the job demands–strain relationship: a cross-sectional survey study among elderly care nursing staff. Int J Nurs Stud. 2011;48(3):307-17.
14. Häusser JA, Mojzisch A, Schulz-Hardt S. Endocrinological and psychological responses to job stressors: an experimental test of the job demand–control model. Psychoneuroendocrinology. 2011;36(7):1021-31.
15. Johnson JV, Hall EM. Job strain, work place social support, and cardiovascular disease: a cross-sectional study of a random sample of the Swedish working population. Am J Public Health. 1988;78(10):1336-42.

16. Del Pozo-Antúnez JJ, Ariza-Montes A, Fernández-Navarro F, Molina-Sánchez H. Effect of a job demand-control-social support model on accounting professionals' health perception. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2018;15(11):2437.
17. Charoensukmongkol P. Effects of support and job demands on social media use and work outcomes. Comput Hum Behav. 2014;36:340-9.
18. Rajaleid K, Jansson-Frojmark M, Westerlund H, Hanson L M. Job demand, control, and social support as predictors of trajectories of depressive symptoms. Eur J Public Health. 2018;27(suppl_3):535-43.
19. Turner N, Stride CB, Carter AJ, McCaughey D, Carroll AE. Job demands–control–support model and employee safety performance. Accid Anal Prev. 2012;45:811-7.
20. Fila MJ, Purl J, Griffeth RW. Job demands, control and support: meta-analyzing moderator effects of gender, nationality, and occupation. Hum Resour Manag Rev. 2017;27(1):39-60.
21. Baruch-Feldman C, Brondolo E, Ben-Dayan D, Schwartz J. Sources of social support and burnout, job satisfaction, and productivity. J Occup Health Psychol. 2002;7(1):84-93.
22. Abbas KS, Hasan AS, Tareq NL. Assessment of the impact of different rheumatoid arthritis stages on the quality of life of a sample of Iraqi patients. J Adv Pharm Educ Res. 2023;13(1):122-6. doi:10.51847/41Nl6iG253
23. Lang J, Thomas JL, Bliese PD, Adler AB. Job demands and job performance: the mediating effect of psychological and physical strain and the moderating effect of role clarity. J Occup Health Psychol. 2007;12(2):116-24.
24. Sumantri AF, Bashari MH, Tadjoedin H, Atik N. Risk of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) infection on leukemia patients: Basic science to clinical aspect. J Adv Pharm Educ Res. 2022;12(1):38-45. doi:10.51847/qqIktBAHB7
25. Pelin IL, Osoian C. Co-workers support and job performance. Stud Univ Babeş-Bolyai Oecon. 2021;66(2):74-86.
26. Chou P. The effects of workplace social support on employee's subjective well-being. Eur J Bus Manag. 2015;7(6):8-19.
27. Babin BJ, Boles JS. The effects of perceived co-worker involvement and supervisor support on service provider role stress, performance and job satisfaction. J Retail. 1996;72(1):57-75.
28. Foy T, Dwyer RJ, Nafarrete R, Hammoud MSS, Rockett P. Managing job performance, social support and work-life conflict to reduce workplace stress. Int J Product Perform Manag. 2019;68(6):1018-41.
29. Williams LJ, Anderson SE. Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. J Manag. 1991;17(3):601-17.
30. Lu CQ, Du DY, Xu XM, Zhang RF. Revisiting the relationship between job demands and job performance: the effects of job security and traditionality. J Occup Organ Psychol. 2017;90(1):28-50.