APSSHS

Academic Publications of Social Sciences and Humanities Studies
2024, Volume 4, Issue 2, Page No: 31-40
Available online at: https://apsshs.com/

Journal of Applied Organizational Systems and Behavior

The Influence of Job-Related Factors on Lecturer Performance: Evidence from a Vietnamese Case Study

Lucas Pereira[1], Bruno Martins[1]*, Renata Azevedo[2]

1. Department of Organizational Behavior, Faculty of Management, University of Minho, Braga, Portugal.
2. Department of Human Resource Studies, Faculty of Economics, University of Porto, Porto, Portugal.

Abstract

This study aims to examine the effects of job-related factors—namely Job Demand, Job Control, and Social Support—on the performance of university lecturers in Hanoi, Vietnam. In the context of growing organizational competition, individual job performance and effective collaboration among staff are critical to overall institutional success. Drawing on the Job Demand-Control and Social Support (JDCS) model, this research explores how these variables influence lecturer performance within Vietnamese higher education institutions. Data were collected through an online survey distributed to lecturers currently employed in Hanoi, yielding 153 valid responses. The collected data were analyzed using AMOS and SPSS software, and the proposed hypotheses were empirically supported. Findings reveal that Job Demand negatively affects lecturer performance, whereas Job Control and Social Support exert positive and significant effects. Moreover, both Job Control and Social Support moderate the relationship between Job Demand and performance. The study provides practical implications for university administrators seeking to enhance lecturer effectiveness.

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

How to cite this article: Pereira L, Martins B, Azevedo R. The influence of job-related factors on lecturer performance: evidence from a Vietnamese case study. J Appl Organ Syst Behav. 2024;4(2):31-40. https://doi.org/10.51847/uDKsFUtMru

Received: 10 August 2023; **Revised:** 14 October 2023; **Accepted:** 21 November 2023
Corresponding author: Bruno Martins
E-mail ✉ bruno.martins@gmail.com

Introduction

The concept of employee performance has been explored through various perspectives across disciplines, particularly in management and organizational psychology. It is a subject of interest not only for business practitioners but also for scholars aiming to understand how individual contributions affect organizational success. In management studies, the emphasis is often placed on how employee productivity can be optimized through training, skill enhancement, and supportive work conditions. From this standpoint, performance is typically assessed by quantifiable outcomes—such as task completion, production volume, cost efficiency, and time management—based on predefined organizational standards [1]. This results-oriented approach focuses on what is achieved, rather than the behaviors or processes leading to those outcomes.

In contrast, psychological perspectives delve into the interplay of factors such as employee motivation, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and personal characteristics that influence performance outcomes. According to this behavioral approach, job performance encompasses a set of actions aligned with achieving organizational goals [2]. It includes all measurable behaviors that contribute to work effectiveness. Campbell (1990) offered a comprehensive model comprising eight dimensions of job performance [3]: (1) task-specific proficiency, (2) non-task-specific proficiency, (3) written and oral communication, (4) effort, (5) personal discipline, (6) facilitating peer and group performance, (7) supervision/leadership, and (8) management/administration.

Employee performance is widely recognized as a critical factor in organizational effectiveness. As Armstrong (2006) notes, it is central to the realization of organizational objectives and sustaining a competitive edge [4]. High-performing employees drive improvements in productivity, product or service quality, and customer satisfaction [5]. Additionally, their influence enhances organizational culture by promoting collaboration and motivation [6]. The alignment between employee efforts and strategic goals is therefore essential, as it impacts key performance indicators and overall organizational outcomes [7]. Organizations that prioritize employee development, implement effective feedback systems, and foster a culture of continuous improvement are more likely to adapt successfully to change, maintain competitiveness, and achieve long-term sustainability [8].

The potential impact of job performance on voluntary turnover is believed to be both direct and indirect, with the latter mediated by employees' intentions to quit. In particular, performance may directly influence unanticipated resignations. According to Lee and Mitchell's (1994) unfolding model of turnover, unexpected disruptions in the workplace environment can trigger a reconsideration of job commitment, prompting employees to contemplate leaving their positions [9]. These adverse experiences may lead employees to choose resignation over enduring psychologically distressing work conditions.

Zimmerman and Darnold (2009) found a modest negative relationship between job performance and intent to quit, indicating that as performance improves, the desire to leave may decline slightly [10]. However, the strength of this relationship is not consistent and may be influenced by unexamined moderating variables. Notably, a more consistent association was observed between objective performance ratings and turnover intentions. The study further confirmed that job performance can influence both the intention to leave and actual turnover behaviors, through both direct and indirect pathways.

Literature review

The job demand–control–social support (JDCS) model

The Job Demand–Control (JDC) model, first introduced by Karasek (1979), provides a framework for understanding occupational stress and promoting workplace well-being [11]. This model identifies three core components: (1) Job demands, encompassing factors such as workload and time pressure, which act as stressors; (2) Job control, referring to employees' autonomy and decision-making capacity in their roles; and (3) Job strain, which arises when job demands are high while job control is low.

The JDC model has been extensively employed in studies examining employee performance and job satisfaction. Empirical evidence supports the model's assertion that high job demands combined with low job control can lead to emotional exhaustion and reduced well-being. Conversely, environments with lower demands and higher autonomy tend to foster more positive emotional states among employees [11].

Further studies have emphasized the interaction between job demands and job control in shaping employees' psychological experiences at work. For instance, Fernet *et al*. (2004) highlighted how this interaction contributes significantly to perceived work pressure [12]. The model has also been utilized to assess outcomes such as job satisfaction, complaints, and stress levels [13]. Specifically, a study on nurses in Germany confirmed that while job demands and control may not interact directly, both independently influence perceived stress levels [13].

Moreover, Hauser *et al*. (2011) proposed that the interaction among job demands, control, and stress operates as a three-way relationship, wherein variations in one element can significantly alter the dynamics of the others [14]. This highlights the complexity and interdependence of factors contributing to occupational stress and performance outcomes.

The Job Demands–Control (JDC) model, developed by Karasek (1979), identifies key job-related factors that influence employee job satisfaction and performance [11]. This model also highlights the complex, multidimensional interactions between these job-specific elements. Widely adopted across various industrial sectors, the JDC model has served as a foundation for proposing interventions aimed at mitigating workplace stress and enhancing individual job performance through better management of job demands and control mechanisms [11].

Despite its broad applicability, a notable limitation of the original JDC model is its omission of organizational and interpersonal dynamics within the workplace—specifically, the broader social environment in which employees operate. Employees rarely work in isolation; rather, their effectiveness often depends on collaboration and support from others in the organization, including colleagues, supervisors, subordinates, and external partners [15]. These interactions significantly shape workers' psychological experiences and behavioral responses.

To address this limitation, Johnson and Hall (1988) introduced social support as a third critical component, thereby expanding the JDC model into the Job Demands–Control–Support (JDCS) model [15]. Based on a large-scale survey of 13,779 Swiss workers, their findings revealed that support from coworkers plays an important role in moderating job-related stress. In this extended model, social support—particularly from coworkers—interacts with job demands and control to influence employees' well-being and performance outcomes [15]. The JDCS model has since become a foundational framework for analyzing how social and structural job factors shape employee behavior and stress levels.

Further research has explored the specific impacts of different types of support within the workplace. For example, Del Pozo-Antúnez *et al*. (2018) applied the JDCS model and emphasized that social support encompasses both managerial and peer support [16]. Their findings showed that peer support significantly enhanced performance among accounting professionals, while managerial support played a more direct role in shaping job demands and perceived stress.

Similarly, Charoensukmongkol (2014) found that while coworker support had a positive influence on job satisfaction and performance outcomes, support from direct supervisors could sometimes negatively affect employees' use of workplace technologies, such as social networking tools [17]. These findings indicate that the source and nature of social support are critical, as they influence not only job performance and satisfaction but also how employees engage cognitively with their work [17].

Subsequent applications of the Job Demands–Control–Support (JDCS) model have confirmed that high job demands combined with low levels of social support significantly increase employee stress levels. Accordingly, adjustments in job demands and enhancements in social support systems may lead to improved occupational outcomes [18].

The JDCS model has also been utilized to examine safety-related behaviors in the workplace. Turner *et al*. (2012) applied the model to explore how job-related factors influence safety performance [19]. Similarly, Fila and colleagues (2017) investigated how job demands, control, and support interact under varying conditions of gender, nationality, and occupational roles [20]. These findings underscore that social support plays a more complex role than initially assumed—its impact involves not only direct effects but also a three-way interaction with job demands and control, collectively shaping workers' experiences of stress and their behavioral responses.

Despite these advances, one notable limitation of the JDCS model is its incomplete representation of social support dimensions. Most applications of the model emphasize coworker support, overlooking other influential sources within the organizational ecosystem [21, 22]. However, the work environment encompasses a broader range of support systems. Studies have increasingly recognized that social support may come from multiple sources: colleagues, supervisors, subordinates, and the organization as a whole [21]. For instance, Del Pozo-Antúnez *et al*. (2018) confirmed that both peer and managerial support significantly influence work-related stress [16]. Parallel findings by Charoensukmongkol (2014), Lin *et al*. (2009), and Bowen *et al*. (2014) further highlight the multidimensional nature of social support and its considerable role in shaping employee stress and performance [16].

Job demands and employee performance

The relationship between job demands and employee performance—both psychological and physical—has received sustained attention in occupational health psychology. While numerous studies affirm the link between excessive demands and strain, they differ primarily in the moderating variables they examine. Early research incorporated personal and job-related characteristics [11, 15] as buffers against the negative effects of job demands on employee well-being.

Building on this foundation, a growing body of research has proposed additional job characteristics as potential moderators. One such factor is role clarity, which may help employees better navigate high-demand environments and reduce perceived strain.

Interestingly, prior studies examining the demands–performance relationship have yielded inconclusive or weak associations. Lang *et al*. (2007) reported minimal or no direct correlation between job demands and performance outcomes, suggesting that the omission of key mediating variables might obscure the relationship [23]. Recent investigations, including those by Lang *et al*. (2007) and Sumantri *et al*. (2022), argue that the inclusion of mediators—such as role clarity, organizational support, or job engagement—may be necessary to fully understand how job demands translate into performance outcomes [23, 24].

Lang *et al*. (2007) also sought to examine the association between job demands and performance [23]. A plausible explanation for the frequently weak or non-significant correlation observed in such studies lies in the complex and multifaceted nature of job performance, which may not be adequately captured through self-reported data. Performance is shaped by a constellation of cognitive, emotional, and contextual factors, many of which are difficult to measure using standard survey instruments.

Job control and employee performance

The influence of job control on employee performance has long been a central theme in organizational psychology and management research. Job control refers to the extent to which employees have autonomy over their work activities, including decision-making authority and flexibility in task execution [11]. It is widely regarded as a critical determinant of multiple work-related outcomes, including performance, motivation, and psychological well-being.

A primary theoretical framework supporting this relationship is the Job Demands–Control (JDC) model proposed by Karasek (1979) [11]. The model posits that the most favorable performance outcomes occur when employees face high job demands but also possess high levels of control over how to manage those demands. Under such conditions, employees are more likely to experience reduced strain, enhanced job satisfaction, and increased intrinsic motivation, which together contribute to higher performance levels.

Empirical studies consistently report a positive association between job control and various dimensions of job performance. Employees who are granted greater autonomy and authority over their tasks often demonstrate higher task efficiency, greater creativity, and elevated job satisfaction. Moreover, job control has been shown to mitigate stress and burnout, reinforcing its role as a protective factor that enhances both well-being and output.

However, while the general trend highlights the benefits of job control, this relationship is not universally consistent. Various moderating variables—such as individual personality traits, the nature of the job, and organizational culture—can influence the strength and direction of this association. For instance, the positive effects of job control may be more salient in knowledge-intensive roles, where decision-making and problem-solving are central, than in routine or manual occupations.

In summary, the literature strongly supports the notion that job control positively impacts employee performance. Organizations that promote employee autonomy and empower workers with decision-making capabilities are more likely to foster a productive and engaged workforce. Future research should aim to unravel the contextual and individual boundary conditions that shape this relationship, thereby offering a more nuanced understanding of how and when job control leads to optimal performance outcomes.

Social support within the workplace has been recognized as a critical factor influencing various aspects of employees' professional experiences, including their performance. This section reviews and synthesizes relevant literature to better understand the relationship between social support and job performance. Gaining insight into this dynamic is vital for organizations aiming to promote both employee well-being and productivity.

Social support in the workplace refers to emotional, informational, and instrumental assistance provided by colleagues, supervisors, or the organization itself. It acts as a buffer against job-related stress and contributes significantly to employees' psychological health and job satisfaction. According to Pelin and Osoian (2021), workplace support involves actions and behaviors intended to assist others, and can be delivered by both coworkers and managers [25]. These actions include counseling, emotional encouragement, help with task execution, and the provision of relevant information about organizational systems and processes.

Colleagues often serve as an essential source of this support. For instance, experienced employees frequently assist newly hired or recently promoted individuals by offering practical knowledge and guidance regarding their roles within the organization. This form of peer support has a direct impact on the performance of employees by reducing uncertainty and facilitating task accomplishment.

Empirical research has consistently highlighted the role of social support in improving job performance. Babin and Boles (1996) found that interpersonal relationships, along with support and coordination among colleagues, positively influence job performance [25, 26]. Similarly, Pelin and Osoian (2021) demonstrated that strong support systems within teams are associated with better individual outcomes and overall work effectiveness [25].

Drawing from these findings, it is reasonable to hypothesize that colleague support has a measurable impact on the job performance of university lecturers. Although academic roles are typically well-defined by job descriptions and institutional regulations, lecturers are also expected to undertake tasks assigned by supervisors or institutions. Thus, their ability to perform effectively often depends on the guidance and support of their direct managers. As noted by Foy *et al*. (2019), managerial interaction with employees plays a significant role in shaping work outcomes [27].

Furthermore, according to the Ministry of Education and Training's regulations, the primary responsibility of lecturers is teaching. This involves the transfer of knowledge to students through various methods and tools, and it requires consistent engagement from both the lecturer and the student. Since student learning outcomes, practical application of knowledge post-graduation, and feedback from employers are used as indicators of a lecturer's performance, it becomes evident that support—from both peers and supervisors—contributes meaningfully to the effectiveness of teaching and, consequently, job performance.

As higher education evolves to meet the demands of a globalized and innovation-driven world, universities are under increasing pressure to align academic programs with the expectations of society and the labor market. This means adjusting curricula, course content, and teaching strategies based on feedback from students and, more importantly, from industry. Employers—who ultimately hire graduates—now play an active role in shaping educational content. Their input allows institutions to better prepare students for real-world work environments, while businesses benefit by saving time and resources on post-hiring training. In practice, this collaboration often includes direct support from companies to university faculty, helping them deliver more practical and job-relevant education.

In examining these dynamics, the Job Demands-Control-Support (JDCS) model offers valuable insights. The model highlights how job control—a worker's ability to influence how and when tasks are completed—can lessen the strain caused by high job demands [15]. When employees, such as university lecturers, face significant workload or time pressure, their ability to make autonomous decisions about task management becomes critical. Greater control allows them to structure their workday, prioritize tasks, and implement their own work strategies, which in turn can cushion the negative impact of demanding job

conditions. In this light, when academic staff are given more freedom in how they conduct their work, the effects of heavy job demands on their performance may be reduced.

Based on this, it is reasonable to suggest that job control can serve as a buffer. Thus, this study proposes the hypothesis: job control moderates the effect of job demands on lecturers' performance.

Likewise, social support at work plays an important role in helping employees cope with increasing job pressures. When expectations rise—whether through tighter deadlines, heavier workloads, or heightened quality standards—the presence of supportive colleagues and supervisors can make a significant difference [27]. Peer support can provide guidance on job procedures, share tips on managing responsibilities, or clarify complex tasks. Such interaction enables employees to better understand their duties and perform them more efficiently [15].

Moreover, support from supervisors—such as mentoring, constructive feedback, or sharing workload—also helps reduce the pressure of job demands and encourages better performance. Research continues to emphasize that both peer and managerial support are essential in helping employees adapt to demanding roles.

Therefore, this research also puts forward the following hypothesis: social support moderates the relationship between job demands and lecturers' performance.

Materials and Methods

The researcher conducted a comprehensive review of general and foundational theories, gathering insights from both domestic and international studies relevant to the research topic. This process informed the development of research questions, hypotheses, and a research model.

Table 1. Measurement Scales

Variable	Source
Job Demand	Job Demand Control and Social Support (Karasek, 1979) [11]
Job Control	Job Demand Control and Social Support (Karasek, 1979) [11]
Co-worker Support	Job Demand Control and Social Support (Karasek, 1979) [11]
Supervisor Support	Job Demand Control and Social Support (Karasek, 1979) [11]
Student Support	Adapted from Social Support (Karasek, 1979) [11]
Partner Support	Adapted from Social Support (Karasek, 1979) [11]
Employee Performance	Williams & Anderson (1991) [28]

Table 1 Description: The measurement scales for the model's variables were derived from established theories and prior research. A questionnaire was developed using existing scales, translated from English to Vietnamese, and tailored to suit lecturers as the target respondents. The questionnaire was distributed via Google Forms for convenient delivery and response collection. A pilot survey with 10 lecturers was conducted to refine the questionnaire, ensuring clarity and relevance for accurate responses.

To address translation-related ambiguities, the questionnaire included clear terms and a description of its purpose. Based on pilot feedback, revisions were made:

- Question 3 (Partner Support): Modified from "Business partners are willing to support me in teaching activities" to include support for scientific research and other work activities.
- Question 6 (Job Demand): Changed from "My job faces conflicts in job requirements" to "I encounter numerous conflicts in job requirements" after expert consultation for clarity.

The revised questionnaire was distributed using a convenience sampling method to collect data quickly and randomly. Lecturers shared the questionnaire with peers, resulting in 153 valid responses, sufficient for the next phase of analysis.

Data were coded, checked for missing values, and subjected to exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). For EFA, the minimum sample size should be 5 times the number of variables, with 10 or 20 times being preferable. With 4 variables in the model, a minimum of 20 valid responses was required, with 40 or 80 being optimal. The 153 responses collected exceeded these requirements, ensuring robust EFA, CFA, and regression analysis. Data analysis was performed using SPSS 24.

Results and Discussion

Frequency analysis

Descriptive statistical analysis was conducted to summarize the sample's demographic characteristics in terms of counts and percentages. The analysis focused on respondents' personal information, as detailed below.

Table 2. Sample Demographics

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

Table 2 Description: The demographic profile of the 153 respondents shows 51 males (33.3%) and 102 females (66.7%).

Table 3. Education Levels of Respondents

Education Level	Number	Percentage
Undergraduate	0	0%
Master	90	58.8%
PhD	63	41.2%
Total	153	100%

Table 3 Description: The educational attainment of respondents includes 90 lecturers with a Master's degree (58.8%) and 63 with a PhD (41.2%).

Table 4. Work Experience

Experience Range	Number	Percentage
Under 1 year	0	0%
1 to <5 years	7	4.6%
5 to <10 years	25	16.3%
10 years and above	121	79.1%
Total	153	100%

Table 4 Description: The majority of lecturers (121, or 79.1%) have 10 or more years of experience, followed by 25 lecturers (16.3%) with 5 to less than 10 years, and 7 lecturers (4.6%) with 1 to less than 5 years of experience.

Table 5. Reliability Analysis

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 Description: Data were analyzed using SPSS, and the reliability test results showed Cronbach's Alpha values ranging from 0.798 to 0.950, all exceeding the acceptable threshold of 0.7, indicating reliable measurement scales.

Factor analysis suitability

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett's tests were conducted to assess the suitability of factor analysis. The KMO value of 0.795 (greater than 0.5) and a Bartlett's test significance of 0.000 (less than 0.05) confirm that the dataset is well-suited for factor analysis techniques.

The results of the exploratory factor analysis (EFA) indicate that 36 observed variables were grouped into 7 principal components with Eigenvalues all exceeding 1. The smallest Eigenvalue was 1.145, corresponding to the seventh factor. The total variance explained by these factors reached 69.726%, surpassing the 50% threshold and thereby confirming the adequacy of the extraction.

Further analysis showed that all factor loadings were above 0.5, demonstrating that the extracted factors met the requirements for both convergent and discriminant validity. These seven factors represent the core constructs of interest in the study: Job Demand, Job Control, Support from Colleagues, Support from Superiors, Support from Students, Support from Businesses, and Job Performance. These constructs were then subjected to confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using AMOS software.

The CFA results revealed that all scales exhibited composite reliability values greater than 0.7 and average variance extracted (AVE) values above 0.5. These findings confirm that the scales are both reliable and suitable for structural equation modeling (SEM). Additionally, both standardized and unstandardized coefficients exceeded 0.5, while AVE values consistently surpassed the 0.5 threshold, reinforcing the presence of convergent validity across the model.

The CFA summary indicates that the measurement model demonstrates good fit, with all variables achieving adequate levels of convergent validity, discriminant validity, and reliability. Based on these results, the model is deemed appropriate for further analysis using the SEM approach.

Subsequently, the structural model and research hypotheses were tested using SEM. The findings showed that all relationships within the model were statistically significant, with p-values less than 0.05. This supports the acceptance of all proposed hypotheses and confirms the robustness of the theoretical model.

Table 6. Path coefficient

Hypothesis	Paths			(Regression Weights)	S.E.	C.R.	P-value	(Standardized Weights)
H1	J.P.	<---	JD	-,134	,051	-2,657	,008	-,169
H2	JP	<---	JC	,420	,134	3,135	,002	,281
H3a	JP	<---	SS1	,211	,093	2,262	,024	,233
H3b	JP	<---	SS2	,177	,073	2,437	,015	,203
H3c	JP	<---	SS3	,214	,095	2,259	,024	,145
H3d	JP	<---	SS4	,160	,081	1,968	,049	,151
H4a	JP	<---	M1	,130	,064	2,037	,042	,137
H4b	JP	<---	M2	,256	,104	2,458	,014	,166

Table 6 shows the results of the standardized model indicate 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:

$$JP = -0,169JD + 0,281\ JC + 0,233\ SS1 + 0,203\ SS2 + 0.145\ SS3 + 0,151\ SS4 + 0,137\ JC*JD + 0,166\ SS*JD + e \quad (1)$$

The analysis revealed that Job Demand has a negative effect on job performance, with a standardized regression weight of -0.169. In contrast, the remaining variables demonstrated a positive influence on job performance. Specifically, Job Control had the strongest positive impact (β = 0.281), followed by Co-worker Support (β = 0.233), Supervisor Support (β = 0.203), Student Support (β = 0.145), and Business Support (β = 0.137).

Additionally, both Job Control and Social Support were found to moderate the relationship between Job Demand and Job Performance. Job Control had a moderating effect of 0.137, while Social Support moderated this relationship with a weight of 0.166. These findings highlight the buffering role that autonomy and interpersonal support play in mitigating the adverse effects of high job demands.

Lecturer performance is a critical concern for both academic staff and institutional leadership. Performance outcomes serve as key indicators for individual lecturer effectiveness, which in turn contributes to overall organizational performance. To improve institutional outcomes, it is essential to focus on enhancing each lecturer's job performance.

This study proposed a conceptual model to identify work-related factors influencing lecturer performance. Data were collected through a survey of 153 lecturers and analyzed using structural equation modeling. The results support the hypothesis that Job Demand negatively affects lecturer performance. Conversely, Job Control has a positive and significant impact, reinforcing the importance of autonomy and decision-making freedom in academic roles.

The study further conceptualized Social Support as comprising four dimensions: support from colleagues, supervisors, students, and business partners. Each of these support types was hypothesized to positively influence lecturer performance. Analysis of the data confirmed this hypothesis, with all forms of social support contributing positively to professional outcomes.

Moreover, the study explored moderating effects and confirmed that Job Control significantly moderates the relationship between Job Demand and performance. That is, when lecturers experience greater control over their work, the negative impact of high job demands on performance is reduced. Similarly, Social Support—in its collective form—was found to moderate this relationship positively, indicating that interpersonal and organizational support systems help lecturers better manage demanding workloads.

In summary, the findings underscore the importance of both structural (e.g., job control) and relational (e.g., social support) factors in enhancing lecturer job performance, especially under conditions of high job demand. These insights offer valuable implications for university management seeking to improve academic staff effectiveness through targeted organizational support and empowerment strategies.

In terms of impact intensity, among the independent variables affecting lecturers' professional performance, job control exerts the strongest influence, followed by support from colleagues and support from supervisors. Conversely, job demands, along with business support and student support, are the variables with the least impact on lecturers' performance outcomes.

Regarding moderating effects, the influence of social support on the relationship between job demands and performance is stronger than that of job control. This indicates that interpersonal and institutional support systems play a more significant buffering role than individual autonomy in managing the adverse effects of job demands.

The finding that job demands negatively affect performance is consistent with prior studies [29]. Specifically, increased workload, tighter deadlines, and pressure to achieve high-quality outcomes tend to hinder lecturer performance. Furthermore, job demands that include capacity-building expectations—such as acquiring new knowledge, developing skills, and applying creativity—also contribute to performance decline when they exceed manageable levels.

In the context of Vietnamese universities, it is essential to clarify job performance expectations for lecturers. Different roles come with varying requirements and outcomes. Clearly defined job factors—through job descriptions that outline responsibilities, authority, and required deliverables—enable lecturers to better understand their roles and perform effectively.

To enhance performance monitoring and professional development, institutions should implement a comprehensive work management system. This system should allow for documentation and tracking of scientific research, training activities, fieldwork, and institutional engagements. When aligned with the university's KPI framework, such a system enables real-time performance reporting and helps lecturers manage workload and resources efficiently.

Leadership also plays a vital role in supporting junior lecturers. Department heads and senior faculty should provide guidance through training, mentoring, and knowledge sharing. Sharing best practices, effective teaching strategies, and academic experiences contributes to improved performance and professional growth.

Moreover, fostering student engagement is equally important. Lecturers can enhance participation by adopting learner-centered teaching approaches. Active learning strategies not only improve student academic outcomes but also encourage lecturers to continuously develop their knowledge, critical thinking, and creativity—thereby enhancing their overall job performance.

The importance of business partner support is confirmed in the research model and accepted hypotheses. In the context of educational innovation and internationalization, universities are increasingly aligning their training objectives with the needs of society. This includes the development of curricula, course content, and teaching methods based on feedback from learners and, notably, from businesses—future employers of graduates. Collaboration with the business sector ensures that educational programs remain relevant and responsive to labor market demands.

Limitations

First, this study was limited to surveying lecturers at six universities in Hanoi. However, within university structures, there is a significant number of academic support staff—such as those working in training departments, research administration, libraries, academic support centers, and health services—whose roles, while distinct, indirectly influence the performance of lecturers and student outcomes. Future research should therefore consider evaluating the contributions and performance of these supporting staff.

Second, variations in the working environment and institutional conditions across universities may result in differing perceptions and outcomes. Therefore, future studies should expand the scope to include a broader range of universities, enabling comparative analyses that can help identify tailored solutions suited to specific institutional contexts.

Third, the current study’s sample comprised 153 respondents from universities in Hanoi. Further research should include a larger and more diverse sample across Vietnam to more comprehensively assess the factors influencing lecturers’ job performance.

Conclusion

This study highlights that assessing the performance of university lecturers requires a multidimensional approach. Performance should be evaluated not only based on the quantity and quality of work completed—as defined in the lecturer's job description—but also in terms of their core responsibilities: teaching, research, and professional development. Additionally, lecturer performance should be viewed through a behavioral lens, recognizing that professional behaviors indirectly shape overall performance outcomes.

Given the unique nature of academic roles, it is essential to examine job performance within the context of lecturers' work environments. Internal organizational factors—such as job characteristics, managerial support, and collaboration with colleagues—play a critical role in influencing lecturer performance.

Understanding the factors that affect lecturers' performance provides valuable insights for universities and academic administrators. It enables institutions to identify challenges faced by faculty members, and to develop strategies and policies aimed at enhancing professional performance. Ultimately, improving lecturer performance contributes to increased organizational effectiveness and supports the achievement of institutional 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 Organ Psychol. 2015;88(1):126-54.
2. Murphy K. Dimensions of job performance. In: 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. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press; 1990. p. 687-732.
4. Armstrong M. A handbook of human resource management practice. London: 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;64:361-88.
7. Muhammad S, Khan I, Hameed F. The impact of performance management system on employees performance. Int J Bus Manag Sci. 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 RA Jr. Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: Implications for job redesign. Adm Sci Q. 1979;24:285-308.
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 LM. 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. Studia Univ Babes-Bolyai Oeconomica. 2021;66(2):74-86.
26. 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.
27. 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.
28. 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.
29. 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.