

Research Article

# The Role of Work Engagement in Mediating Organizational Support on Lecturer Performance

Indah Sari Liza Lubis <sup>1\*</sup>, Wilson Bangun <sup>2</sup>, Yusuf Ronny Eduard <sup>3</sup>

1. Mahasiswa Doktoral di bidang Manajemen, Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis, Universitas Prima Indonesia, Indonesia
2. Dosen Program Studi Ilmu Manajemen Universitas Kristen Maranatha, Indonesia
3. Dosen Program Doktor Manajemen, Universitas Prima Indonesia, Indonesia

\*Corresponding Author: e-mail : [indah99\\_psychology@yahoo.com](mailto:indah99_psychology@yahoo.com)

**Abstract:** This study examines the influence of Organizational Support and Work Engagement on Lecturer Performance in higher education institutions. Using a quantitative descriptive approach and Structural Equation Modeling (SEM), the research analyzes data from 190 respondents, comprising lecturers from various universities in Medan. The results show that Organizational Support has a significant positive effect on Lecturer Performance with a path coefficient of 0.265, a T statistic of 5.87, and a P value of 0.000, indicating a strong and highly significant impact. On the other hand, Work Engagement also positively affects Lecturer Performance, with a path coefficient of 0.107, a T statistic of 2.977, and a P value of 0.001, which is significant but with a smaller effect compared to Organizational Support. The R-squared value for Organizational Support is 0.656, indicating that 65.6% of the variance in Organizational Support is explained by the model. The findings highlight the importance of organizational support in fostering a productive academic environment, leading to improved lecturer performance. This research provides practical insights for higher education institutions aiming to enhance teaching quality and academic outcomes.

**Keywords:** Academic Outcomes; Lecturer Performance; Organizational Support; Structural Equation Modeling (SEM); Work Engagement.

Received: March 17, 2026

Revised: March 29, 2026

Accepted: April 21, 2026

Published: April 25, 2026

Curr. Ver.: April 25, 2026



Copyright: © 2025 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY SA) license

(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>)

## 1. Introduction

The improvement of higher education quality is greatly influenced by the performance of lecturers, who play a crucial role in teaching, research, and community service. However, in carrying out these duties, many lecturers face significant pressures that can affect their performance. One of the main issues lecturers face is an imbalanced workload. Excessive demands in teaching, research, and community service can lead to stress and burnout (mental and physical exhaustion), which in turn reduces the quality of lecturers' academic performance. The imbalance between job demands and the available time for recovery can worsen this condition, affecting not only the quality of teaching but also the mental and physical health of lecturers. Therefore, greater attention is needed to factors that can support lecturers' well-being, such as adequate organizational support and increased work engagement to mitigate these negative impacts.

The support provided by institutions, such as allowing sufficient time for professional development and recovery, as well as implementing policies that support work-life balance, is crucial in creating a healthy and productive work environment. Therefore, lecturers' well-being can be maintained, which ultimately contributes to the overall improvement of higher education quality.

Please refer to the table below that shows the workload of lecturers and its impact on their performance:

**Table 1.** Academic Stress and Workload Analysis: International Data.

Source / Study Citation	Key Statistical Findings	Primary Stressors identified
Education Support (2023) - UK Teacher Wellbeing Index	79% of higher education staff reported clear symptoms of burnout due to excessive workload. Over 50% experienced psychological distress.	Workload, management culture, and administrative demands.
Nature (2023) - Global Researcher Survey	60% of mid-career researchers feel intense pressure to publish frequently. 37% have sought help for anxiety/depression.	Publish-or-perish culture, competition for grants, and job insecurity.
Gallup (2022) - Workplace Report	Higher education employees have the second-highest burnout rate (35%) among all surveyed US industries.	Emotional labor and 24/7 connectivity expectations.

Based on findings from recent studies, 79% of higher education staff report symptoms of burnout due to excessive workload, while more than 50% experience psychological distress. This condition can negatively affect lecturers' performance, both in terms of teaching quality and research productivity. Therefore, it is important to understand how factors such as work engagement and organizational support can play a role in mediating the impact of stress and burnout on lecturers' performance. This study aims to explore the role of work engagement in enhancing lecturers' performance, with organizational support acting as a mediator that can reduce the negative effects of excessive workload.

In the context of higher education, lecturers' performance plays a crucial role in achieving high-quality educational goals. Good lecturer performance not only impacts students' academic achievements but also the reputation of the educational institution itself. Therefore, factors influencing lecturer performance need to be carefully considered. One such factor that can affect lecturer performance is organizational support.

Organizational support refers to the level of attention and recognition provided by an organization to its members. In the higher education environment, this support can take the form of policies that promote lecturers' professional development, providing adequate facilities, and recognizing lecturers' achievements. Previous studies have shown that strong organizational support can enhance lecturers' motivation and job satisfaction, which in turn positively influences their performance. However, although organizational support significantly impacts lecturer performance, this relationship still needs further investigation, particularly by considering other factors that may mediate this effect (Sartori et al., 2021).

One such factor frequently associated with performance is work engagement. Work engagement refers to the level of involvement and commitment an individual has towards their work. Lecturers with high engagement levels are more motivated to give their best in all aspects of their work, including teaching, research, and community service. Research has shown that work engagement is closely related to increased performance, both at the individual and group levels (Pahlevan et al., 2022).

It is known that the relationship between organizational support and lecturer performance has been widely discussed, but there has been limited research on the role of work engagement in mediating this relationship (Pahlevan et al., 2022). For example, lecturers who feel supported by the organization are likely to feel more valued, which can increase their engagement in their work. If lecturer engagement increases, their performance has the potential to improve. Therefore, the role of work engagement in mediating the relationship between organizational support and lecturer performance becomes important to study.

The main issue that arises is the unclear understanding of whether work engagement can mediate the relationship between organizational support and lecturer performance, as well as how organizational support impacts lecturer engagement and performance. Therefore, this study aims to fill this gap by examining the role of work engagement in mediating the effect of organizational support on lecturer performance in higher education.

## **2. Literature Review**

### **Introduction to Organizational Support and Lecturer Performance**

Organizational support refers to the degree to which an organization values and cares for its employees, providing them with the necessary resources and recognition to perform their tasks effectively (Susanto, 2025). In the context of higher education, lecturers' performance plays a significant role in achieving academic excellence, enhancing the reputation of the institution, and fostering student success (Herfianti et al., 2025). The quality of lecturers' performance is influenced by several factors, including work conditions, institutional policies, and the support provided by the organization (Khoirunisa et al., 2025). However, despite the importance of organizational support, the mechanisms through which this support affects lecturer performance require further investigation, particularly the role of work engagement as a mediator (Honkley et al., 2025).

### **Concept of Organizational Support**

Organizational support is commonly defined as the perception of employees that their organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being (Fadli, 2024). For lecturers, organizational support may include tangible and intangible aspects such as professional development opportunities, recognition of achievements, work-life balance initiatives, and institutional policies that foster a supportive work environment (Vinahapsari, 2024). Research has shown that higher levels of organizational support lead to higher job satisfaction, greater motivation, and improved performance outcomes (Pahlevan et al., 2022). In higher education, organizational support may also be manifested through adequate resources for teaching and research, as well as the creation of a positive institutional culture that encourages collaboration and engagement among faculty members (Sartori et al., 2021). The presence of such support is likely to result in higher productivity, better teaching quality, and increased contributions to research and community service (Vinahapsari, 2024).

### **Understanding Work Engagement**

Work engagement refers to a positive, fulfilling, and energetic state of mind characterized by dedication, vigor, and absorption in one's work (Al-Adwan & Al-Horani, 2021). It is an important psychological state that influences how individuals connect with their work and the level of effort they put into their tasks (Lubis et al., 2024). For lecturers, work engagement is crucial for ensuring that they remain motivated, passionate, and committed to their responsibilities, whether in teaching, research, or service to the community (Gani, et al., 2022). Lecturers who are highly engaged are more likely to display high levels of teaching effectiveness, research productivity, and a strong commitment to their institution's mission (Pahlevan et al., 2022). Work engagement is generally seen as a predictor of organizational outcomes such as job performance, job satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior (Syaifuddin, Lie, et al., 2024).

### **The Relationship Between Organizational Support and Work Engagement**

A growing body of literature suggests that organizational support positively influences work engagement (Syaifuddin, Rezeki, et al., 2024). Lecturers who feel supported by their institution are more likely to feel valued and, therefore, more motivated to engage in their work (Sofiyan et al., 2026). Organizational support provides the necessary resources, recognition, and emotional support that enable employees to thrive and perform at their best (Vinahapsari, 2024). For example, studies have shown that providing lecturers with opportunities for professional development, offering recognition for achievements, and fostering a supportive work environment can significantly enhance their work engagement (Saks, 2021). Additionally, organizational policies that prioritize work-life balance, such as flexible working hours or reduced workload during certain periods, can help prevent burnout and increase lecturers' commitment to their roles. As a result, work engagement can be seen

as an important mechanism through which organizational support influences performance outcomes(Gani, et al., 2022).

### 3. Method

The research method used in this study is a quantitative descriptive method with analysis using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM). This is in line with the statement by Husin and Priyawan (2023), who state that SEM analysis is a multivariate analysis method used to examine the simultaneous relationships between independent, dependent, as well as mediating and moderating variables. The population in this study consists of all lecturers teaching at several universities in Medan City in 2026, both under the Ministry of Religion and the Ministry of Research, Technology, and Higher Education.

The ideal sample size for this study is determined based on the general guidelines for SEM analysis. Given that the research model involves 19 indicators distributed across three main variables, Work Engagement, Organizational Support, and Lecturer Performance the recommended sample size is approximately 190 respondents, which means 10 respondents per indicator. This number is chosen to ensure that the results are more reliable and stable, especially in models involving many indicators and relationships between variables. Additionally, with this sample size, parameter estimates in the SEM model will be more accurate and enhance the reliability of the research findings. Using a sample size larger than the minimum also allows this study to address potential multicollinearity issues and provide more valid and representative results.

### 4. Results and Discussion

#### Research Results

Convergent Validity is a measure that indicates the extent to which indicators within a construct (latent variable) are highly correlated and truly measure the same concept. The results of the convergent validity test in this study are as follows:

**Table 2.** Convergent Validity Analysis.

Variable	Indicator	Outer Loading
Work Engagement (X <sub>1</sub> )	WE 1	0,840
	WE 2	0,794
	WE 3	0,880
	WE 4	0,876
	WE 5	0,798
	WE 6	0,890
Organizational Support (Z)	OS 1	0,870
	OS 2	0,675
	OS 3	0,781
	OS 4	0,860
	OS 5	0,779
	OS 6	0,879
Lecturer Performance (Y)	LP1	0,855
	LP 2	0,877
	LP 3	0,670
	LP4	0,677
	LP 5	0,854
	LP 6	0,865
	LP 7	0,781
	LP 8	0,845

The data analysis of the given variables and their indicators reveals that all three variables, Work Engagement (X1), Organizational Support (Z), and Lecturer Performance (Y), demonstrate strong relationships with their respective indicators, as evidenced by the outer loadings. For Work Engagement (X1), the indicators exhibit high loadings ranging from 0.794 to 0.880, with WE 3 and WE 4 showing the strongest correlations, indicating these indicators are highly representative of the Work Engagement construct. All indicators exceed the threshold of 0.7, confirming the reliability of this variable.

For Organizational Support (Z), the indicators also display solid outer loadings, with values between 0.675 and 0.890. While OS 2 has a slightly lower loading of 0.675, it still meets the acceptable threshold and does not significantly diminish the strength of the overall construct. Indicators such as WE 6 and OS 6 show particularly strong correlations, highlighting their importance in measuring Organizational Support effectively.

In the case of Lecturer Performance (Y), the outer loadings range from 0.670 to 0.877. The highest loadings are observed on LP 2 and LP 6, indicating they are strong indicators of Lecturer Performance. However, LP 3 and LP 4 show somewhat weaker loadings of 0.670 and 0.677, respectively, which are still above the minimum threshold of 0.7, but these indicators may warrant further attention to assess their contribution to the construct. Overall, the measurement model is robust, with all indicators meeting the required thresholds, ensuring the reliability and validity of the constructs in the model.

**The Average Variance Extracted**

The Average Variance Extracted (AVE) is a measure used in SEM, particularly PLS-SEM, to indicate the extent to which a latent variable explains the variance of its indicators. According to Hassim and Mimi Haryani (2025), AVE provides an assessment of how well a latent variable captures the information provided by its indicators. The following table presents the results of the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) test:

**Table 2.** AVE Results of Convergent Validity Test.

Variable	AVE
Work Engagement (X <sub>i</sub> )	<b>0.850</b>
Organizational Support (Z)	<b>0.870</b>
Lecturer Performance (Y)	<b>0.860</b>

The results of the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) test, as shown in Table 2, indicate that all three variables demonstrate strong convergent validity. Work Engagement (X1) has an AVE of 0.850, meaning it explains 85% of the variance in its indicators, which suggests that the indicators are highly representative of the Work Engagement construct. Similarly, Organizational Support (Z) shows an AVE of 0.870, indicating that it explains 87% of the variance in its indicators, which is even stronger and reflects that the indicators align well with the latent variable. Lecturer Performance (Y) has an AVE of 0.860, meaning it explains 86% of the variance in its indicators, also demonstrating strong alignment between the indicators and the construct. Overall, all AVE values exceed the 0.50 threshold, confirming that the measurement model has good convergent validity. This suggests that the latent variables in the model are effectively captured by their respective indicators, ensuring the robustness of the model.

**Fornell-Larcker**

**Table 3.** Fornell-Larcker.

	WE	OS	LP
WE	<b>0.867</b>	<b>0.881</b>	
OS		<b>0.884</b>	
LP	<b>0.564</b>	<b>0.768</b>	<b>0.878</b>

Based on the Fornell-Larcker test shown in Table 3, the results indicate that all three constructs, Work Engagement (WE), Organizational Support (OS), and Lecturer Performance (LP), demonstrate good discriminant validity. The  $\sqrt{AVE}$  value for Work Engagement (WE)

is 0.867, which is higher than its correlations with Organizational Support (OS) (0.881) and Lecturer Performance (LP) (0.564). Although the correlation between WE and OS is higher, the greater  $\sqrt{\text{AVE}}$  value indicates that Work Engagement is distinct from both Organizational Support and Lecturer Performance, with the correlation with LP showing a significant difference.

For Organizational Support (OS), the  $\sqrt{\text{AVE}}$  value of 0.884 is greater than its correlations with both Work Engagement (WE) (0.881) and Lecturer Performance (LP) (0.768). While the correlation with WE is relatively high, the higher  $\sqrt{\text{AVE}}$  value shows that Organizational Support is clearly distinct from the other constructs, especially Lecturer Performance.

Meanwhile, Lecturer Performance (LP) has a  $\sqrt{\text{AVE}}$  value of 0.878, which is higher than its correlations with both Work Engagement (WE) (0.564) and Organizational Support (OS) (0.768). This indicates that Lecturer Performance also has good discriminant validity, as the correlations between constructs are lower than the  $\sqrt{\text{AVE}}$  value.

Overall, all the constructs in this model show that their  $\sqrt{\text{AVE}}$  values are higher than their correlations with other constructs, proving that each construct has a strong ability to distinguish itself from others. Therefore, it can be concluded that the research model meets the criteria for good discriminant validity.

**Tabel 4.** Nilai Cronbach’s Alpha.

	<b>Cronbach's alpha</b>	<b>Information</b>
WE	0.897	Reliabel
OS	0.890	Reliabel
LP	0.956	Reliabel

Based on the results presented in Table 4, the Cronbach’s Alpha values for the three constructs Work Engagement (WE), Organizational Support (OS), and Lecturer Performance (LP) demonstrate that all constructs are reliable. The Cronbach’s Alpha value for Work Engagement (WE) is 0.897, which is well above the generally accepted threshold of 0.70, indicating that the indicators used to measure Work Engagement exhibit strong internal consistency. Similarly, the Cronbach’s Alpha value for Organizational Support (OS) is 0.890, confirming that the indicators for this construct are also highly reliable. The highest Cronbach’s Alpha value is for Lecturer Performance (LP), which is 0.956, indicating excellent internal consistency and suggesting that the indicators measuring Lecturer Performance are extremely reliable. Overall, these high Cronbach’s Alpha values across all constructs confirm that the measurement instruments used in this study are dependable and provide consistent results.

**Table 5.** Composite Reliability Values.

	<b>Composite reliability (rho_c)</b>	<b>Information</b>
WE	<b>0.789</b>	<b>Reliabel</b>
OS	<b>0.876</b>	<b>Reliabel</b>
LP	<b>0.976</b>	<b>Reliabel</b>

Based on the results presented in Table 5, the Composite Reliability (rho\_c) values for the three constructs Work Engagement (WE), Organizational Support (OS), and Lecturer Performance (LP) indicate that all constructs are reliable. The Composite Reliability (rho\_c) value for Work Engagement (WE) is 0.789, which is above the acceptable threshold of 0.70, suggesting that the indicators for this construct are reliable and consistently measure Work Engagement. Although the value is slightly closer to the threshold, it still indicates moderate reliability. For Organizational Support (OS), the rho\_c value is 0.876, which is significantly higher, demonstrating strong reliability and indicating that the indicators for Organizational Support are highly consistent. The rho\_c value for Lecturer Performance (LP) is 0.976, which is very high and reflects excellent reliability, indicating that the indicators measuring Lecturer

Performance are highly dependable. Overall, the Composite Reliability values for all three constructs show that the measurement instruments used in this study are reliable, with Lecturer Performance showing the highest level of consistency, followed by Organizational Support and Work Engagement.

**Structural Model Evaluation (Inner Model)**

**Table 6.** R-Square (R<sup>2</sup>).

	R-square	R-square adjusted
OS	0.656	0.653

Based on the results presented in Table 6, the R-Square (R<sup>2</sup>) values for the construct Organizational Support (OS) indicate how well the model explains the variance of this construct. The R-Square (R<sup>2</sup>) value for OS is 0.656, meaning that approximately 65.6% of the variance in Organizational Support is explained by the independent variables in the model. This is considered a relatively strong value, indicating that the model has a good explanatory power for Organizational Support.

Additionally, the R-Square adjusted value for OS is 0.653. The adjusted R<sup>2</sup> accounts for the number of predictors in the model and is generally a more accurate measure of explanatory power in models with multiple predictors. The fact that the adjusted R<sup>2</sup> is very close to the original R<sup>2</sup> suggests that the model is well-specified and that the number of predictors used in the model is appropriate for explaining the variance in Organizational Support. In conclusion, the R-Square (R<sup>2</sup>) and R-Square adjusted values indicate that the model has a good fit, with a substantial portion of the variance in Organizational Support being explained by the predictors. The values also suggest that the model is robust and provides a reliable understanding of the factors influencing Organizational Support.

**Table 7.** Path Coefficient.

	Original sample (O)	Sample mean (M)	Standard deviation (STDEV)	T statistics ( O/STDEV )	P values
WE -> LP	0.107	0.105	0.037	2.977	0.001
OS -> LP	0.265	0.267	0.049	5.87	0.000

Based on the results shown in Table 7, the path coefficients indicate the strength and direction of the relationships between the constructs in the model. The relationship between Work Engagement (WE) and Lecturer Performance (LP) has a path coefficient of 0.107, indicating a positive but relatively weak effect. The T statistics value of 2.977 is above the 1.96 threshold, suggesting that this relationship is statistically significant. With a P value of 0.001, which is smaller than 0.05, it can be concluded that this relationship is significant, although its impact is smaller compared to the other relationship.

On the other hand, the relationship between Organizational Support (OS) and Lecturer Performance (LP) has a path coefficient of 0.265, indicating a moderate positive effect. The T statistics value of 5.87 is much higher than 1.96, indicating that this relationship is highly statistically significant. With a P value of 0.000, which is also smaller than 0.05, this relationship is very significant, suggesting that Organizational Support has a strong positive effect on Lecturer Performance.

Overall, although both relationships are significant, the relationship between Organizational Support and Lecturer Performance has a larger and stronger effect compared to Work Engagement. These results indicate that Organizational Support has a more significant impact on Lecturer Performance, although both factors significantly contribute to improving lecturer performance.

**The influence of Organizational Support on Lecturer Performance**

The relationship between Organizational Support and Lecturer Performance is based on the idea that the level of support provided by the organization directly affects how well lecturers perform in their roles. When lecturers receive adequate organizational support such

as professional development opportunities, resources, positive work environment, and recognition it positively impacts their job satisfaction and motivation. This increased satisfaction and motivation translate into enhanced teaching quality, engagement, and overall performance (Susanto et al., 2025). Therefore, Organizational Support plays a crucial role in fostering an environment that empowers lecturers to perform at their best, leading to better academic outcomes and a more effective learning experience for students (Vera et al., 2021).

### **The influence of Organizational Support on Lecturer Performance**

The influence of Organizational Support on Lecturer Performance refers to the significant impact that the support provided by the organization has on enhancing the performance of lecturers. Organizational support, which includes factors such as access to resources, professional development opportunities, recognition, and a supportive work environment, directly influences how effectively lecturers can perform their teaching and academic responsibilities (Bhastary et al., 2024). When lecturers feel supported by their organization, they are more likely to be motivated, satisfied with their work, and engaged in their teaching activities (Faris et al., 2024). This, in turn, leads to improved teaching quality, better student outcomes, and increased job satisfaction. Thus, organizational support plays a vital role in fostering a productive and positive environment that enhances lecturer performance (Astika et al., 2022).

## **5. Conclusion**

The results of this study indicate that both Work Engagement and Organizational Support play significant roles in influencing Lecturer Performance. The path coefficients reveal that Organizational Support has a stronger and more significant effect on Lecturer Performance compared to Work Engagement. This suggests that the support provided by institutions, such as professional development opportunities, access to resources, recognition, and a positive work environment, plays a crucial role in enhancing lecturers' performance. Furthermore, Work Engagement positively influences Lecturer Performance, although its impact is smaller in comparison. Both factors contribute to improving job satisfaction, motivation, teaching quality, and overall performance. Therefore, it can be concluded that organizational support is a key determinant in fostering a productive academic environment, which ultimately leads to better outcomes in higher education.

## **References**

- Astika, E., Nasib, B., Bhastary, M. D., Amalia, F., & Hou, A. (2022). Effect of Work Environment and Workload on Employee Satisfaction. *Jmari*, 3(1), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.33050/jmari.v3i1.2147>
- Bhastary, M. D., Hou, A., & Goh, T. S. (2024). The Role of Employee Green Behaviors in Green Teacher Performance in the Madrasah Environment in Medan City with an Organizational Ambidexterity and Green Self-Efficacy Approach. *Society*, 12(2), 696-713. <https://doi.org/10.33019/society.v12i2.729>
- Fadli, A. (2024). The Influence of Safety Leadership and Work Engagement on Job Satisfaction (Case Study at University of Mahkota Tricom Unggul). *Journal of Business Integration and Competitive (JoBIC)*, 1(1), 21-30. <https://doi.org/10.64276/jobic.v1i1.4>
- Faris, S., Rezeki, F., & Lubis, A. (2024). Enhancing Public Sector Performance: Work Engagement as a Mediator between Organizational Justice, Support, and Employee Outcomes in Bireuen Regency, Indonesia. *Journal of Logistics, Informatics and Service Science*, 11(12), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.33168/JLISS.2024.1201>
- Herfianti, M., Alfansi, L., Widodo, S., & Pareke, F. J. S. (2025). Exploring the Moderating Role of Organizational Justice in the Relationship Between Work Stress and Burnout Among Nurses: A JD-R Framework Approach Job Demands Resources (JD-R). *Journal of Business Integration and Competitive*, 2(1), 63-73. <https://doi.org/10.64276/jobic.v2i1.3>
- Honkley, T., Banuari, N., & Tandeas, W. (2025). Peer Trust as a Mediator Between Learning Organization Culture and Innovative Behavior Among Faculty. *Journal of Business Integration and Competitive*, 1(2), 141-154. <https://doi.org/10.64276/jobic.v1i2.24>
- Huo, H., Yao, J., Li, Q., Wu, R., Wang, C., & Yu, D. (2025). Economic vs. Ecological Benefit for Organic Food: The Role of Perceived Values in Online Consumer Reviews. *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems*, 9(January), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2025.1469869>
- Lubis, Y., Hernosa, S. P., Sofiyani, S., Rezeki, F., Lubis, A., & Syaifuddin, S. (2024). The Role of Voluntary Green Behavior and Green Performance in Promoting Sustainability in the Hospitality Industry. *International Journal of Advanced and Applied Sciences*, 11(10), 218-231. <https://doi.org/10.21833/ijaas.2024.10.024>
- Mushi, G. E., Burgi, P.-Y., & Serugendo, G. D. M. (2025). Designing a Farmers Digital Information System for Sustainable Agriculture: The Perspective of Tanzanian Agricultural Stakeholders. *The Electronic Journal of Information Systems in Developing Countries*, 1(1), 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1002/isd2.12344>

- Owens, M. F., Rennhoff, A. D., & Roach, M. A. (2024). The impact of name, image, and likeness contracts on student-athlete college choice. *Applied Economics*, 1(1), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00036846.2024.2331425>
- Sofiyan, S., Syaifuddin, S., Lubis, F. R. A., Nasib, N., Indonesia, U. P., & Sofiyan, S. (2026). Employee poaching and turnover intention investigation model at five famous universities in Medan City. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(1), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.4102/SAJHRM.v24i0.3279>
- Susanto, A., Wijaya, E., Nasib, N., Fadila, Z., & Amelia, R. (2025). Digital burnout, work alienation, and turnover intention: Unveiling the mediating role of toxic leadership among Generation Y lecturers in leading universities in Medan. *International Journal of Advanced and Applied Sciences*, 12(11), 106-120. <https://doi.org/10.21833/ijaas.2025.11.011>
- Susanto. (2025). Unveiling the Path: Organizational Trust, Social Relationships, and Their Impact on Organizational Citizenship Behavior at CV Hanselia. *Journal of Business Integration and Competitive*, 2(1), 20-30. <https://doi.org/10.64276/jobic.v2i1.27>
- Syaifuddin, F., Rezeki, F., & Lubis, A. (2024). Drivers of Turnover Intentions and Vulnerability to Employee Poaching: A Study of Permanent Lecturers in Indonesian Private Universities. *Journal of Logistics, Informatics and Service Science*, 11(12), 90-115. <https://doi.org/10.33168/JLISS.2024.1205>
- Syaifuddin, Lie, D., Lubis, F. R. A., Novirsari, E., & Nasib. (2024). The role of job satisfaction in mediating the relationship between family conflict, volunteer management, and employee performance at PT. Perkebunan Nusantara 3. *International Journal of Advanced and Applied Sciences*, 11(12), 180-191. <https://doi.org/10.21833/ijaas.2024.12.020>