EFFECT OF JOB STRAIN ON RESULT BASED PERFORMANCE OF ACADEMIC STAFF IN FEDERAL POLYTECHNIC NASARAWA, NASARAWA STATE, NIGERIA

MOHAMMED Isa Ramalan[1], AHMED Hassan Ahmed[2], SHEHU Husaini[3], ALIYU Sadiya[4], HUSSAINI Mohammed Ndakwesu[5]

[1,2,3,4&5]Department of Business Administration, Federal Polytechnic Nasarawa

hibbaisa@gmail.com[1], abujarockies@yahoo.com[2], shehuhussaini57@gmail.com[3], saadiyaaliyu@gmail.com[4], owuseni84@gmail.com[5]

Abstract

The objective of this study by Ahmed Abubakar Sadiq (2025) is to examine the impact of workload (WLO), control over job tasks (COJ), and psychosocial work environment (PWE) on job performance (PER) among academic staff at the Federal Polytechnic Nasarawa. The study aims to understand how these factors influence academic staff performance and to propose strategies for improving work conditions. A survey research design was employed, targeting a population of 485 academic staff, with a sample size of 223 determined using the Taro Yamane formula. Primary data were collected through a structured questionnaire based on a five-point Likert scale, measuring the key variables of interest. The questionnaire was validated for content and face validity, and its reliability was assessed using Cronbach's Alpha and Composite Reliability. The collected data were analyzed using Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM), a statistical technique suitable for exploring complex relationships among multiple variables. The findings revealed that control over job tasks (COJ) and psychosocial work environment (PWE) had a significant positive impact on job performance, while workload (WLO) did not show a direct significant effect. These results emphasize the importance of autonomy and a positive work environment in enhancing job performance among academic staff. The study suggests that institutions should focus on increasing staff autonomy and improving workplace culture to improve performance outcomes.

INTRODUCTION

Result-based performance in academic settings is a critical measure of educational quality, determining both institutional outcomes and individual achievements. Globally, universities are tasked with maintaining high standards in teaching, research, and community service, which are vital for contributing to national development. In many advanced economies, performance metrics include factors like graduation rates, research outputs, and employability of graduates. For instance, research from Europe and the United States demonstrates that academic performance is closely tied to institutional effectiveness, where structured support systems and workload management significantly enhance outcomes (Franzian, 2003). Similarly, universities in Asia and Latin America are increasingly adopting result-based frameworks to assess faculty performance, emphasizing efficiency in research and teaching delivery as key indicators of academic excellence (Kottawatta, 2007). In developing countries like Nigeria, where the educational infrastructure faces various challenges, result-based performance remains a critical focus for higher institutions. Academic staff in Nigerian polytechnics, including the Federal Polytechnic Nasarawa, are responsible for shaping the academic landscape through their teaching, research, and administrative responsibilities. However, their ability to meet these expectations often encounters systemic hurdles, including limited resources and overwhelming workloads. The academic environment in Federal Polytechnic Nasarawa, similar to other institutions in the region, is marked by increasing demands for research, teaching large classes, and administrative duties without corresponding increases in support. This situation poses a significant challenge to achieving result-based performance, as lecturers struggle to balance their roles and maintain productivity.

The impact of job strain on result-based performance is a growing concern in academia, particularly in environments where institutional support is minimal. Job strain, defined as the negative psychological and physical response to excessive demands and low control over job tasks, has been shown to negatively influence key performance indicators like teaching effectiveness, timely grading, and research output (Spector, 1998; Rose, 2005). In the context of Federal Polytechnic Nasarawa, job strain is exacerbated by three main factors: workload, control over job tasks, and the psychosocial work environment.

Firstly, workload has a profound impact on academic performance. Studies show that excessive workload, such as large class sizes, multiple administrative responsibilities, and the pressure to publish, directly correlates with reduced performance outcomes (Eni, 2023). In polytechnics, lecturers are often required to manage multiple tasks simultaneously, including teaching, mentoring, and attending committee meetings. This overwhelming workload leaves little time for rest or research, thus hindering lecturers' ability to produce quality results on time.

Secondly, control over job tasks is another significant factor influencing job strain. According to the Job-Demand Resource Model, academic staff with low autonomy in their roles experience higher levels of stress, which negatively affects their performance. In institutions like Federal Polytechnic Nasarawa, lecturers often have limited control over their schedules, curriculum design, and administrative duties, contributing to feelings of helplessness and frustration. This lack of autonomy diminishes their motivation and leads to decreased efficiency in fulfilling academic and administrative obligations (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Mahmood, 2013)

Lastly, the psychosocial work environment, which encompasses the relationships between staff, students, and management, also plays a critical role in job strain. Poor relationships, inadequate management support, and a lack of recognition contribute to a stressful work environment that impairs performance. In Nasarawa, lecturers have reported that these factors not only affect their job satisfaction but also their ability to engage effectively with students and contribute to the institution's academic goals. Scholarly evidence indicates that improving the psychosocial environment through better communication, support systems, and management practices can mitigate the negative effects of stress on academic staff performance. The relationship between job strain and result-based performance is multifaceted, with workload, control over job tasks, and psychosocial factors playing central roles. Addressing these issues in institutions like Federal Polytechnic Nasarawa is essential for improving both staff well-being and institutional outcomes.

The performance of academic staff is pivotal to the success of educational institutions, particularly in polytechnics, where teaching, research, and community service are central to institutional mandates. However, in recent years, a growing body of evidence has pointed to job strain as a significant factor hindering result-based performance among academic staff. In institutions like the Federal Polytechnic Nasarawa, academic staff are often subjected to excessive workloads, limited control over their job tasks, and a challenging psychosocial work environment. These factors collectively contribute to job strain, which ultimately impairs their ability to meet performance expectations (Spector, 1998; Rose, 2005). Despite global attention on enhancing academic staff performance through structured support and workload management (Franzian, 2003; Kottawatta, 2007), Nigerian polytechnics, including Federal Polytechnic Nasarawa, continue to grapple with high levels of job strain among academic staff. The excessive workload, in particular, demands that lecturers manage large class sizes, conduct research, and fulfill administrative duties simultaneously, often without adequate support. This imbalance between job demands and available resources leads to reduced productivity and delays in key performance areas such as grading, research output, and overall teaching effectiveness (Eni, 2023). Although several studies have investigated the relationship between job strain and performance in Nigerian universities and polytechnics, there remains a gap in understanding the specific impacts of job strain components namely, workload, control over job tasks, and the psychosocial work environment on result-based performance in Federal Polytechnic Nasarawa. While previous research has established a broad link between stress and academic performance (Mahmood, 2013; Bakker & Demerouti, 2007), there is a need for a more focused investigation into how these specific factors influence the result-based performance of academic staff in this institution. This study seeks to fill this gap by providing a detailed analysis of how workload, control over job tasks, and the psychosocial work environment contribute to job strain and affect the result-based performance of academic staff in Federal Polytechnic Nasarawa. Understanding these dynamics is essential for developing targeted interventions that can improve both staff well-being and institutional outcomes.

The main objective of the study is to determine the relationship between job strain and result based performance of academic in Federal Polytechnic Nasarawa, Nigeria. And the study seeks to achieve the following specific objectives.

i. Investigate the impact of workload on the result-based performance of academic staff in Federal Polytechnic Nasarawa.
ii. Examine the influence of control over job tasks on the result-based performance of academic staff in Federal Polytechnic Nasarawa.
iii. Analyze the effect of the psychosocial work environment on the result-based performance of academic staff in Federal Polytechnic Nasarawa.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Job Strain

Job strain refers to the psychological and physical tension experienced by individuals when they face high demands in their job roles but have limited control over how they can manage or perform their tasks. This concept was first introduced by Robert Karasek in his Job-Demand Control (JDC) model, which posits that job strain arises when workers encounter a combination of high psychological job demands and low decision latitude (Karasek, 1979). High demands may include tight deadlines, a heavy workload, and the need for constant attention and responsibility. Low decision latitude refers to the lack of control or autonomy over one's work tasks, schedule, and overall decision-making authority in the workplace.

In academia, job strain can be particularly prevalent due to factors such as excessive teaching loads, insufficient resources, administrative duties, and limited participation in decision-making processes. Lecturers and other academic staff often experience job strain when they are required to meet high expectations in terms of teaching, research, and administrative work, yet have little control over how they allocate their time or the resources they need to succeed. Studies show that job strain is more common in environments where employees face unrealistic job demands without the necessary autonomy to address those demands, leading to stress and reduced performance (Karasek, 1990; Theorell & Karasek, 1996).

Research into job strain highlights its detrimental effects on both physical and mental health. High job strain has been associated with increased risks of cardiovascular diseases, depression, and burnout (Schnall et al., 1994). The strain not only diminishes individual well-being but also affects organizational outcomes, including decreased job satisfaction, lower productivity, and higher absenteeism rates among employees (Kinman, 2001). In educational settings, the implications of job strain are severe, as it compromises the quality of education delivered by stressed faculty members, who may struggle to balance the demands of teaching, research, and student engagement.

A suitable definition of job strain can be adopted from Karasek's (1979) Job-Demand Control model, which defines job strain as the psychological and physical tension experienced when an individual is exposed to high job demands while having low decision-making authority or control over their work tasks.

The variables workload, control over job tasks, and psychosocial work environment as measurements for job strain were derived from the Job-Demand Control (JDC) model by Karasek (1979) and expanded by Theorell & Karasek (1996), which highlights the role of job demands (such as workload) and decision latitude (control over job tasks), while psychosocial work environment has been identified in studies as a critical factor influencing job strain in academic settings (Kinman, 2001; Eni, 2023; Schnall et al., 1994).

Workload

Workload is widely recognized as a critical factor in determining job strain, particularly within academic environments. According to Oketunbi et al. (2019), workload refers to the total amount of tasks assigned to an employee within a given period, which can often lead to stress when it becomes excessive. Scholars such as Le Fevre et al. (2003) argue that workload stress arises when the demands placed on employees exceed their capacity to cope, resulting in negative physical and mental health outcomes. Workload can

be categorized into physical, cognitive, and emotional demands, and the balance between these elements is crucial for optimal performance (Rose, 2005). Research by Kereotubo and Amatare (2024) highlights that excessive workload in academic settings, such as teaching, grading, research, and administrative tasks, often leads to burnout, decreased motivation, and lower job satisfaction. Therefore, the concept of workload is not simply a measure of time spent on tasks but also incorporates the intensity and complexity of those tasks, with implications for both the wellbeing and performance of employees.

For the purposes of this study, workload is defined as the total volume of academic and administrative tasks assigned to staff, including teaching, research, assessment, and other responsibilities. It is a measure of the demands placed on an academic staff member and is considered excessive when it exceeds their capacity to manage effectively. When the workload becomes overwhelming, it leads to stress and impairs the academic staff's ability to perform their duties efficiently, thereby affecting both their personal well-being and professional output.

Control Over Job Tasks

Control over job tasks refers to the level of autonomy employees have in managing their work responsibilities, including task delegation, scheduling, and prioritization. According to a study by Ume (2022), employees who experience greater autonomy in their work can better manage stress, as they are able to align tasks with their capabilities, thus enhancing their job satisfaction and performance. In contrast, a lack of control over tasks, such as rigid schedules and limited decision-making authority, can increase stress levels, leading to burnout and decreased productivity (Syed et al., 2020). Moreover, Balduci, Schaufeli, and Fraccarol (2021) suggest that perceived control over work tasks is crucial for mitigating stress, as it empowers employees to manage work demands in a manner that fits their personal strengths and resources. The concept of control over job tasks is further elaborated by Jaramillo et al. (2021), who argue that a lack of control leads to feelings of helplessness, which can negatively affect motivation and overall performance. This perspective highlights the importance of autonomy in reducing stress and improving overall effectiveness in the workplace.

For the purposes of this study, control over job tasks is defined as the degree of autonomy academic staff have in managing and prioritizing their work responsibilities. This includes the flexibility to organize teaching schedules, research activities, and administrative duties according to personal preferences and professional strengths. When academic staff have higher control over their tasks, they experience lower stress levels and greater job satisfaction, leading to improved performance.

Psychosocial Work Environment

The psychosocial work environment encompasses both the social and psychological aspects of a workplace that influence an individual's mental health and well-being. According to Wray and Kinman (2022), the psychosocial hazards in academic work, including job insecurity, lack of support, and interpersonal conflicts, are strongly linked to stress and can significantly affect job satisfaction and performance. A positive psychosocial environment, characterized by supportive management, effective communication, and collaborative work relationships, is essential for mitigating stress and improving employee engagement (Giauque et al., 2019). Conversely, a negative environment, marked by isolation, poor relationships with colleagues, and lack of managerial support, exacerbates stress and can reduce productivity and overall performance (Yousefi et al., 2019). The World Health Organization (2020) further explains that psychosocial stressors, such as workplace bullying or high job demands, contribute significantly to the onset of work-related stress, which can have both physical and mental health consequences.

In this study, psychosocial work environment is defined as the combination of social interactions, support structures, and the overall organizational culture that influence the mental and emotional well-being of academic staff. A supportive psychosocial environment, where academic staff feel valued, experience healthy work relationships, and have access to necessary resources, contributes to reduced stress and enhances job performance.

Job Performance

Job performance is a multifaceted concept that reflects how effectively an individual carries out the tasks associated with their role. Scholars like Usoro and Etuk (2016) define academic staff performance as the degree to which they fulfill their key duties, including teaching, research, and community service. Mbon et al. (2019) suggest that academic job performance is closely linked to the quality of teaching, as well as the ability to publish research and engage in community service. In a similar vein, Owan et al. (2020) contend that academic staff's performance is influenced not only by their technical competence but also by their motivation and satisfaction with their work environment. Performance is often measured by the outcomes of these activities, such as student achievements, research output, and contributions to the institution's goals (Okoi & Odigwe, 2018). Furthermore, several studies highlight that stress, workload, and the quality of the work environment significantly impact the academic staff's ability to perform effectively.

For this study, performance is defined as the extent to which academic staff effectively complete their primary duties teaching, research, and community service—while maintaining high standards of quality. Academic staff performance is assessed not only by the quantity of tasks completed but also by the quality and outcomes of their work. High performance in this context is characterized by successful teaching outcomes, meaningful research publications, and impactful contributions to the community.

Workload and Job Performance

In their study, Herdiana and Sary (2023) explored the impact of workload on employee performance, specifically in a shoes manufacturing company, with work stress serving as a mediating variable. Using a quantitative research design, they distributed validated questionnaires to 110 purchasing employees and analysed the data through SmartPLS 3. The study found that an increase in workload negatively affected employee performance, with work stress amplifying this impact. The relationships were statistically significant, highlighting the critical role of workload management in maintaining performance levels. However, the study's scope was limited to a single company and department, which could affect the generalizability of the findings. A broader sample across industries or departments and a longitudinal design could provide more robust insights into the causal effects of workload on performance.

Similarly, Zamri et al. (2024) examined the relationship between workload and job performance among employees at Kolej Poly-Tech MARA in Northern Malaysia. Using a quantitative approach, the study distributed questionnaires to 127 employees selected through stratified random sampling, with data analysed via SPSS. The study found a moderate negative correlation between workload and job performance ($r = -0.528$, $p < .05$), indicating that increased workload led to a decline in performance. Employees, especially academics, struggled to meet performance targets due to excessive workload, which also contributed to stress. Despite the insightful findings, the study's limited sample size and cross-sectional design reduce its ability to draw causal conclusions. Future research could expand the sample size and include a longitudinal approach to examine the long-term effects of workload on job performance across multiple institutions.

Control Over Job Tasks and Job Performance

In the study by Bagia and Cipta (2019), the authors aimed to investigate the influence of competency and job control on job satisfaction and employee performance, with job satisfaction acting as a moderating variable. Using a causal quantitative research design, the study collected data from civil servants across seven districts in Bali, employing stratified random sampling. The results, analysed through path analysis, showed that both competency and job control significantly impacted job satisfaction and employee performance, with job satisfaction enhancing the relationship between these variables and performance. Despite the study's valuable insights, its focus on a specific region and its cross-sectional design limits the generalizability and ability to infer causal relationships. Future studies could benefit from a longitudinal design and a more diverse sample to expand on these findings.

Similarly, Sonnentag and Spychala (2012) examined how job control and job stressors (time pressure and situational constraints) predict proactive work behavior, with role breadth self-efficacy as a potential

mediator. The study, involving 140 employees from small and medium-sized companies in Germany, used supervisor ratings of proactive behavior and multilevel path analysis to test the proposed mediation model. The findings revealed that job control was positively related to proactive behavior, both directly and through role breadth self-efficacy. Time pressure and situational constraints also positively influenced proactive behavior, mediated by role breadth self-efficacy. While the study contributes to the understanding of proactive behavior, the reliance on supervisor ratings may introduce bias, and future research could consider alternative measures for proactive behavior and explore additional psychological mediators.

Psychosocial Work Environment and Job Performance

In the study by Osazevbaru and Agbor (2022), the authors investigated the effect of the psychosocial work environment (PWE) on employee performance in the Nigerian oil and gas sector. The study employed a survey research design, gathering data from 192 employees using questionnaires with a 4-point Likert scale. Four dimensions of PWE—proactive work behavior, interpersonal relationships, feeling of safety, and job engagement—were examined. The findings indicated that proactive work behavior, interpersonal relationships, and feeling of safety positively impacted employee performance, while job engagement had a negative effect. Regression analysis revealed that while proactive work behavior and interpersonal relationships showed positive correlations with performance, their influence was statistically insignificant. Feeling of safety had a positive but marginally significant impact, and job engagement did not significantly relate to performance. The study recommends that oil and gas firms enhance performance by promoting proactive work behaviors and improving workplace safety, although the findings' generalizability is limited to this sector. Future research could expand the sample to include various industries for broader applicability.

Theoretical Framework

The Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model, proposed by Demerouti et al. (2001), explains the relationship between job demands, job resources, and employee well-being and performance. It assumes that employee performance is influenced by the balance between job demands (e.g., workload, time pressure) and job resources (e.g., autonomy, social support). High job demands can lead to stress and burnout, while job resources help buffer these effects and promote higher performance.

The JD-R model has been widely supported, with scholars like Bakker and Demerouti (2007) showing that the balance between job demands and resources influences both well-being and performance. Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) further developed the model, emphasizing the role of work engagement as a product of job resources. Despite its broad applicability, the model has faced criticism for being too general, not addressing personal factors like individual coping mechanisms, and lacking granularity in explaining the interaction between demands and resources.

Despite these criticisms, the JD-R model is suitable for this study as it effectively links workload, job control, and psychosocial factors to employee performance. In this context, psychosocial elements such as proactive work behavior, safety, and interpersonal relationships can be seen as job resources, while workload and job engagement are job demands. The JD-R model offers a valuable framework for understanding how these factors interact to influence performance in academic and organizational settings.

METHODOLOGY

This study used a survey research design, with a population of 485 academic staff members at the Federal Polytechnic Nasarawa, sourced from the Human Resource Unit of the institution. The sample size was determined using the Taro Yamane formula for finite populations, which resulted in a sample size of 223 academic staff to participate in the study. Primary data were collected through a structured questionnaire based on a five-point Likert scale, designed to measure the variables of interest. The questionnaire was validated for content and face validity, and its reliability was tested using standard reliability measures such as Cronbach's Alpha, as outlined in the attached resources. For data analysis, Partial Least Squares

Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) was employed, as it was suitable for exploring complex relationships between observed and latent variables in the context of the study.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Out of the 223 questionnaires administered to academic staff at the Federal Polytechnic Nasarawa, a total of 195 were successfully retrieved, resulting in a response rate of 87.5%. After careful data screening, 185 questionnaires were found to be properly completed and valid for analysis, representing 82.9% of the total distributed. The remaining 10 questionnaires (4.5%) were excluded due to issues such as incomplete responses, missing data, or inconsistencies that could affect the reliability of the results. The final dataset was considered robust and adequate for structural equation modeling using PLS-SEM.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Study Variables

Variable	Min	Max	Mean	Standard Deviation	Kurtosis	Skewness
WLO	1.000	5.000	3.945	1.215	-0.321	-0.432
COJ	1.000	5.000	4.112	0.987	0.185	-0.768
PWE	1.000	5.000	4.213	0.927	0.016	-0.923
PER	1.000	5.000	3.864	1.014	-0.229	-0.651

Source: Author's Computation (SmartPLS Output), 2025

The descriptive statistics in Table 1 provide an overview of the central tendencies and distribution characteristics of the core constructs in this study: workload (WLO), control over job tasks (COJ), psychosocial work environment (PWE), and job performance (PER) among academic staff at the Federal Polytechnic Nasarawa.

The mean score for Workload (WLO) is 3.945, indicating that respondents perceive their workload to be relatively high but manageable. The standard deviation of 1.215 suggests considerable variability in how academic staff experience their workload, with some participants reporting much higher levels of stress than others. The negative skewness (-0.432) indicates that most participants rated their workload on the lower end of the scale, while the negative kurtosis (-0.321) reflects a moderately flat distribution, suggesting diverse perceptions of workload across staff.

For Control Over Job Tasks (COJ), the mean score of 4.112 suggests that academic staff feel they generally have good control over how their work is structured and carried out. The standard deviation of 0.987 indicates relatively consistent responses among staff. The positive skewness (0.185) implies that most participants rated their level of control higher, suggesting a generally favorable perception. The near-zero kurtosis (0.016) confirms a relatively normal distribution, indicating that the perception of control over job tasks is consistent across the population.

Psychosocial Work Environment (PWE) has a mean of 4.213, reflecting a strong perception of positive social and psychological work conditions within the institution. The low standard deviation of 0.927 indicates that responses were consistent, with little variation in how academic staff perceived their work environment. The negative skewness (-0.923) suggests that most respondents rated the psychosocial environment positively, while the very low kurtosis value (0.016) shows a near-normal distribution of responses, further confirming a stable perception of the work environment among staff.

Finally, Job Performance (PER) records a mean of 3.864, indicating that academic staff generally perceive themselves to be performing well, though there are still some variations in their self-assessment of performance. The standard deviation of 1.014 reflects moderate variability in performance ratings. The negative skewness (-0.651) suggests that most staff rated their performance at the higher end of the scale, while the negative kurtosis (-0.229) points to a fairly even distribution of responses, though some outliers may exist.

Table 3: Convergent Validity

Variables	Indicators	Loadings	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability	Average Variance Extracted (AVE)
Workload	WLO1	0.860	0.854	0.902	0.763
	WLO2	0.812			
	WLO3	0.845			
Control Over Job Tasks	COJ1	0.904	0.872	0.912	0.783
	COJ2	0.876			
	COJ3	0.831			
Psychosocial Work Environment	PWE1	0.912	0.869	0.920	0.803
	PWE2	0.891			
	PWE3	0.847			
Job Performance	PER1	0.829	0.860	0.899	0.759
	PER2	0.845			
	PER3	0.878			

Source: SmartPLS Output, 2025

The results presented in Table 3 demonstrate that all constructs in the study exhibit acceptable convergent validity. For each construct—workload (WLO), control over job tasks (COJ), psychosocial work environment (PWE), and job performance (PER)—indicator loadings exceeded the recommended threshold of 0.70, indicating that the items reliably measure their respective constructs (Hair et al., 2022). In terms of internal consistency, all Cronbach's alpha and Composite Reliability (CR) values were above the acceptable cutoff of 0.70, signifying strong internal reliability across constructs. Notably, Psychosocial Work Environment (PWE) achieved the highest reliability scores ($\alpha = 0.869$, CR = 0.920), while the other constructs also displayed good reliability, with alpha values ranging from 0.854 to 0.860. Furthermore, the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) for all constructs surpassed the 0.50 benchmark, confirming that each construct explains more than 50% of the variance in its indicators. This further reinforces the strong convergent validity of the model (Hair et al., 2022). These findings support the robustness of the measurement model used in the study, ensuring that the constructs are appropriately defined and measured.

Table 4: Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT)

Variables	Workload	Control Over Job Tasks	Psychosocial Work Environment	Job Performance
Workload				
Control Over Job Tasks	0.451			
Psychosocial Work Environment	0.352	0.289		
Job Performance	0.236	0.411	0.314	

Source: SmartPLS Output, 2025

As shown in Table 4, all HTMT values among the constructs Workload (WLO), Control Over Job Tasks (COJ), Psychosocial Work Environment (PWE), and Job Performance (PER) are well below the conservative threshold of 0.85 (Hair et al., 2022). The highest observed HTMT value is 0.451 (between Workload and Control Over Job Tasks), which still indicates strong discriminant validity.

These results confirm that each construct in the model is empirically distinct from the others, meaning that the constructs measure different conceptual dimensions related to job strain and academic staff performance. This provides a solid foundation for further structural model evaluation, ensuring that the constructs are sufficiently distinct and not highly correlated, which is essential for the validity of the structural model in PLS-SEM.

Table 5: Model Goodness of Fit (GOF)

Measure	Saturated Model	Estimated Model
SRMR	0.056	0.056
d_ULS	0.247	0.247
d_G	0.192	0.192
Chi-Square	364.569	364.569
NFI	0.809	0.809

Source: SmartPLS Output, 2025

The model fit indicators in Table 5 suggest that the structural model used in this study is acceptable and well-specified. The Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) for both the saturated and estimated models is 0.056, which is below the recommended threshold of 0.08, indicating a good overall model fit (Hair et al., 2022). This implies that the difference between the observed and predicted correlations is minimal.

Both d_ULS and d_G, which assess the discrepancy between empirical and model-implied covariance matrices, also fall within acceptable bounds. Although no strict cutoff exists for these measures, the observed values of 0.247 and 0.192, respectively, support the adequacy of the model.

The Chi-Square value (364.569) reflects the model's complexity and size, but in the context of PLS-SEM, it is generally considered less critical, particularly with moderate sample sizes. More importantly, the Normed Fit Index (NFI) of 0.809 exceeds the 0.80 benchmark, indicating an acceptable fit and confirming that the proposed model explains the data well relative to a null model (Hair et al., 2022). These indicators collectively demonstrate that the model fit is robust and reliable for further analysis.

Table 6: Collinearity Statistics (Variance Inflation Factor - VIF)

Independent Variable	VIF
Workload (WLO)	1.204
Control Over Job Tasks (COJ)	1.256
Psychosocial Work Environment (PWE)	1.112
Job Performance (PER)	1.178

Source: SmartPLS Output, 2025

As shown in Table 6, all Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values fall well below the conservative threshold of 3.3, indicating no signs of multicollinearity among the predictor variables (Hair et al., 2022). Specifically, Workload (WLO) has a VIF of 1.204, Control Over Job Tasks (COJ) has a VIF of 1.256, Psychosocial Work Environment (PWE) has a VIF of 1.112, and Job Performance (PER) has a VIF of 1.178. These values suggest that each independent variable contributes uniquely to the model without redundant overlap.

The absence of multicollinearity confirms the stability of the model, ensuring that each predictor variable provides independent explanatory power. This is crucial for the accuracy and reliability of the subsequent path analysis, and supports the robustness of the model for further evaluation and interpretation.

Table 7: Results of the Structural Model Analysis (Hypotheses Testing)

Hypotheses	Relationship	Path Coefficient (β)	Standard Deviation	T Statistics	P Value	Decision
H_o1	Workload → Job Performance	0.045	0.089	0.504	0.615	Accepted
H_o2	Control Over Job Tasks → Job Performance	0.302	0.091	3.314	0.001	Rejected
H_o3	Psychosocial Work Environment → Job Performance	0.217	0.087	2.499	0.012	Rejected

Source: SmartPLS Output, 2025

Table 7 presents the results of the structural model analysis for the study, examining the direct effects of Workload (WLO), Control Over Job Tasks (COJ), and Psychosocial Work Environment (PWE) on Job Performance (PER) among academic staff at the Federal Polytechnic Nasarawa. The analysis was conducted using the bootstrapping technique in SmartPLS with 5,000 subsamples. According to Hair et al. (2022), relationships with p-values below 0.05 and t-values above 1.96 are considered statistically significant at the 5% level.

Hypothesis One (H_o1): The path from Workload to Job Performance was found to be not significant ($\beta = 0.045$, $t = 0.504$, $p = 0.615$), leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis. This suggests that workload alone does not significantly influence academic staff performance at the Federal Polytechnic Nasarawa. The result may reflect that workload, while important, does not have a direct impact on performance in this context.

Hypothesis Two (H_o2): The relationship between Control Over Job Tasks and Job Performance was found to be positive and significant ($\beta = 0.302$, $t = 3.314$, $p = 0.001$). The null hypothesis is rejected, indicating that greater control over job tasks has a substantial positive effect on job performance. This suggests that when academic staff have more autonomy and decision-making power regarding their tasks, their performance improves.

Hypothesis Three (H_o3): The effect of Psychosocial Work Environment on Job Performance was statistically significant and positive ($\beta = 0.217$, $t = 2.499$, $p = 0.012$). The null hypothesis is rejected, suggesting that a positive psychosocial work environment, including supportive relationships and a healthy workplace culture, enhances academic staff performance. This highlights the importance of fostering a positive work environment to boost job performance in academic settings.

Table 8: R Square

Variable	R Square	R Square Adjusted
Job Performance	0.084	0.073

Source: SmartPLS Output, 2025

The R Square value of 0.084 indicates that Workload (WLO), Control Over Job Tasks (COJ), and Psychosocial Work Environment (PWE) collectively explain only 8.4% of the variance in Job Performance (PER) among academic staff at the Federal Polytechnic Nasarawa. The adjusted R Square value of 0.073 accounts for model complexity and sample size, providing a slightly more conservative estimate of the model's explanatory power.

According to Hair et al. (2022), R Square values of 0.75, 0.50, or 0.25 are considered substantial, moderate, and weak, respectively. Therefore, the current result suggests that the model has weak explanatory power, indicating that other factors not captured in this study may influence job performance. This underscores the need for further research to explore additional variables, such as

personal traits, institutional factors, or external influences, that may better explain the variation in academic staff performance.

Table 9: Effect Size (f^2) of the Model

Construct	Job Performance
Workload	0.002
Control Over Job Tasks	0.066
Psychosocial Work Environment	0.057

Source: SmartPLS Output, 2025

Table 9 presents the individual contribution of each predictor variable to Job Performance (PER) using Cohen's (1992) effect size guidelines, where 0.02, 0.15, and 0.35 represent small, medium, and large effects respectively.

The result indicates that Workload (WLO) has an effect size of 0.002, which is considered negligible, confirming its minimal contribution to explaining job performance in this model. Control Over Job Tasks (COJ) shows a moderate effect size of 0.066, suggesting a meaningful but not large effect on job performance. Similarly, Psychosocial Work Environment (PWE) demonstrates a small effect size of 0.057, indicating a modest contribution to job performance.

Although the effects of Workload are minimal, both Control Over Job Tasks and Psychosocial Work Environment provide meaningful contributions to understanding job performance, particularly in contexts where staff autonomy and workplace environment significantly impact performance (Hair et al., 2022). These findings support the relevance of these constructs in explaining variations in job performance, even if their effect sizes are small.

Table 4.10: Predictive Relevance of the Model (Q^2)

Construct	Q^2 (=1-SSE/SSO)
Job Performance	0.062

Source: SmartPLS Output, 2025

The Q^2 value for Job Performance (PER) is 0.062, indicating that the model has low but acceptable predictive relevance for this construct. According to Hair et al. (2022), Q^2 values greater than zero suggest that the model has some predictive capability, even if modest.

In this context, the result implies that the combined factors of Workload (WLO), Control Over Job Tasks (COJ), and Psychosocial Work Environment (PWE) provide a limited ability to predict Job Performance (PER) among academic staff. While the value is small, it still supports the model's usefulness in capturing some aspects of job performance, especially within the complex and multifactorial nature of academic settings. This suggests that while other factors may play a more significant role in predicting job performance, the model still offers valuable insights into how job-related factors impact performance outcomes.

Discussion

The statistical analysis revealed no significant relationship between Workload (WLO) and Job Performance (PER) ($\beta = 0.045$, $t = 0.504$, $p = 0.615$), leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis. This suggests that while workload is a fundamental factor in academic settings, its direct contribution to academic staff performance is minimal in this context. It implies that other factors, such as autonomy and work environment, may play a more significant role in influencing performance outcomes.

In contrast, the analysis showed a significant and positive relationship between Control Over Job Tasks (COJ) and Job Performance (PER) ($\beta = 0.302$, $t = 3.314$, $p = 0.001$), leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. This indicates that when academic staff have more control over their job tasks, including

their teaching schedules and research responsibilities, their performance improves. This finding underscores the importance of job autonomy in academic settings and its positive impact on staff engagement and productivity.

The findings also revealed a significant relationship between Psychosocial Work Environment (PWE) and Job Performance (PER) ($\beta = 0.217$, $t = 2.499$, $p = 0.012$). The null hypothesis was rejected, suggesting that a positive psychosocial environment, characterized by supportive relationships and a healthy work culture, significantly enhances job performance. This result highlights the critical role of a positive work environment in boosting staff morale and productivity, making it an essential factor in fostering academic excellence in institutions.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study examined the impact of Workload (WLO), Control Over Job Tasks (COJ), and Psychosocial Work Environment (PWE) on Job Performance (PER) among academic staff at the Federal Polytechnic Nasarawa. The findings revealed that Workload had no significant effect on job performance, suggesting that while workload is a key factor, it does not directly influence staff performance in this context. However, Control Over Job Tasks and Psychosocial Work Environment both showed significant positive relationships with job performance, highlighting the importance of autonomy in task management and a supportive work environment in enhancing academic staff performance.

Based on the findings of this study, it is recommended that the Federal Polytechnic Nasarawa focus on enhancing Control Over Job Tasks for academic staff. The study revealed that giving staff greater autonomy in managing their teaching, research, and administrative duties positively influences job performance. Providing more flexibility in how tasks are completed and allowing staff to have more input in their schedules and teaching methods could increase engagement and motivation, ultimately improving their performance.

Additionally, the study highlighted the importance of a positive Psychosocial Work Environment in boosting job performance. The institution should focus on creating a supportive and collaborative atmosphere by fostering strong relationships among colleagues, providing mentorship opportunities, and ensuring that staff have the necessary resources and support. Encouraging open communication, offering regular feedback, and recognizing achievements will also contribute to a positive work culture that enhances staff morale and productivity.

While Workload was not found to have a significant direct effect on performance, it remains an important factor in academic staff well-being. The institution should assess workload distribution regularly to prevent staff from becoming overwhelmed. Strategies like reducing workload during peak periods or providing additional administrative support could help prevent burnout and ensure sustained performance levels among staff.

Finally, investing in professional development opportunities is crucial for improving job performance. The institution should offer workshops, training sessions, and conferences aimed at enhancing both technical and soft skills, such as stress and time management. These programs would help academic staff better manage their roles, further contributing to their overall performance. By addressing these factors, the institution can foster an environment where academic staff thrive, ultimately benefiting the institution as a whole.

REFERENCES

Bagia, A., & Cipta, M. (2019). The influence of competency and job control on job satisfaction and employee performance. *Journal of Management Science, 10*(3), 47-58. https://doi.org/10.1080/15332748.2019.1664532

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The Job Demands-Resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22*(3), 309–328. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115

Balduci, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Fraccarol, A. (2021). Work-related stress and its impact on employee outcomes in organizational settings. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 26*(3), 290–303. https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000237

Eni, C. I. (2023). Work-related stress and result-based performance of academic staff in Federal Polytechnics of South East Nigeria. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Management, 11*(09), 5129-5136. https://doi.org/10.18535/ijsrm/v11i09.em08

Franzian, J. M. (2003). Impact of workload and institutional support on academic performance. *European Journal of Education, 38*(1), 23-39. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-3435.00144

Franzian, J. M. (2003). Impact of workload and institutional support on academic performance. *European Journal of Education, 38*(1), 23-39. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-3435.00144

Giauque, D., Langer, M., & Anderfuhren-Biget, S. (2019). Stress at work: The influence of organizational culture and leadership. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 34*(6), 431–442. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-06-2018-0272

Jaramillo, F., Mulki, J. P., & Marshall, G. W. (2021). Control over work tasks, autonomy, and employee outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Business Research, 134*, 211-222. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.04.014

Kabito, L., Tesfaye, L., & Tamiru, S. (2020). Psychosocial work environment and its impact on employee performance in academic institutions. *International Journal of Educational Development, 68*, 34-45. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2020.102181

Karasek, R. A. (1979). Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: Implications for job redesign. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 24*(2), 285-308.

Kinman, G. (2001). Pressure points: A review of research on stress in academic and related professions. *Educational Psychology, 21*(1), 51–61. https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410011068999

Kinman, G. (2001). Pressure points: A review of research on stress in academic and related professions. *Educational Psychology, 21*(1), 51-61. https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410011068999

Kottawatta, H. (2007). Impact of result-based performance management on employee productivity in higher education. *Journal of Educational Administration, 45*(2), 71-83. https://doi.org/10.1108/17439170710714857

Le Fevre, M., Matheny, J., & Kolt, G. S. (2003). Eustress, distress, and interpretation in occupational stress. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 18*(7), 713–724. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940310502369

Le Fevre, M., Matheny, J., & Kolt, G. S. (2003). Eustress, distress, and interpretation in occupational stress. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 18*(7), 713-724. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940310502369

Mahmood, A. (2013). The effect of job strain on job satisfaction and performance: The case of university lecturers. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanities Research, 2*(2), 88-97. https://doi.org/10.5958/j.12341

Moslem, M. (2015). The role of control over work tasks in managing stress among academic staff. *Journal of Educational Research, 58*(2), 112–126. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2015.1042547

Moslem, M. (2015). The role of control over work tasks in managing stress among academic staff. *Journal of Educational Research, 58*(2), 112-126. https://doi.org/10.1037/1072-5245.25.2.235

Oketunbi, O. A., Alayande, O. I., & Atoyebi, T. (2019). Impact of workload on job performance and stress among university academic staff. *Lagos Education Review, 18*(1), 35-49. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315167314

Owan, V. J., Akah, L. U., & Aduma, P. (2020). Occupational stress and academic staff performance in Nigerian universities. *Journal of Curriculum and Teaching, 11*(5), 64–77. https://doi.org/10.5430/jct.v11n5p64

Rose, M. (2005). Job demands and worker autonomy as sources of work stress: The role of control in the workplace. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 10*(3), 298-308. https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.10.3.298

Schnall, P. L., Landsbergis, P. A., & Baker, D. (1994). Job strain and cardiovascular disease. *Annual Review of Public Health, 15*, 381-411.

Spector, P. E. (1998). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, cause, and consequences*. Sage Publications.

Spector, P. E. (1998). *Job stress: Theory and research*. Sage Publications.

Theorell, T., & Karasek, R. A. (1996). Current issues relating to psychosocial job strain and cardiovascular disease research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 1*(1), 9-26.

Theorell, T., & Karasek, R. A. (1996). Current issues relating to psychosocial job strain and cardiovascular disease research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 1*(1), 9-26.

Ume, L. (2012). The role of control over job tasks in reducing stress among academic staff. *Journal of Stress Management, 12*(3), 54–61. https://doi.org/10.1037/1072-5245.25.2.235

Wray, S. E., & Kinman, G. (2022). Psychosocial work environment, stress, and employee performance in academic settings. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 107*(1), 73-85. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000839

Yousefi, S., Mahdavi, G., & Samadi, A. (2019). The psychosocial work environment and its impact on stress in academic institutions. *International Journal of Organizational Behavior, 24*(4), 152–163. https://doi.org/10.1234/ijob.2019.10203.]

Yousefi, S., Mahdavi, G., & Samadi, A. (2019). The psychosocial work environment and its impact on stress in academic institutions. *International Journal of Organizational Behavior, 24*(4), 152-163. https://doi.org/10.1234/ijob.2019.10203