

# Key Factors Shaping Employees' Work Performance

Lences P. Torres, Noel N. Pit

Lourdes College, Inc., Cagayan de Oro City

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.914MG00101>

Received: 16 May 2025; Accepted: 21 May 2025; Published: 26 June 2025

## ABSTRACT

While other employees cannot perform well in an organization, others become productive. Exploring how these employees become productive can help improve the work performance and needed support system in the organization. Although, there are plenty of studies exist concerning organizational productivity and work performance, but research on personal factors and organization culture is limited. The main objective of this descriptive correlational study is to examine the relationship of the individual factors and organizational culture in the work performance of employees in an organization. Data were collected, using adapted questionnaires, from 94 participants who were chosen using partial enumeration procedure. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and Canonical Correlation Analysis (CCA). Results revealed that personal factors such as well-being, motivation, innovation orientation, digital competence along with personal assets heavily associate with work performance. Furthermore, the culture of the organization based on supportive and cooperative values also made a significant association on the performance of the employees. This means that both personal and environmental factors can significantly affect the work performance of employees within the workplace supporting the theories of Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory and the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Model. The findings point to the strengthening of the programs for employee well-being, motivation, innovation and digital competence, and positive organizational culture. Given these findings, it is recommended that future research consider the influence of organizational culture on work performance longitudinally, investigating also the effectiveness of certain organizational interventions, including well-being programs and professional development opportunities.

**Keywords:** Well-being, Motivation, Innovation Orientation, Digital Competence, Organizational culture, Task performance, Contextual performance.

## INTRODUCTION

The significance of work performance has grown in academic institutions, particularly in faith-based settings. Employee performance, which includes both task and contextual performance, plays a crucial role in achieving the mission and vision of higher education institutions. Several factors impact work performance, including individual elements such as well-being, motivation, innovation orientation, and digital competence, as well as organizational culture. Recent studies emphasize the need to consider both personal and environmental factors in shaping employee behavior (Ryff & Keyes, 2021; Gagné & Deci, 2020; Cai & Wu, 2019). This study explores the predictive relationship between these factors and employee performance.

Work performance is conceptualized into two dimensions: task performance and contextual performance (Campbell et al., 1993; Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). Task performance refers to activities directly related to core job duties, while contextual performance involves interpersonal support and organizational citizenship behaviors. Well-being includes aspects such as positive relations, autonomy, purpose in life, and self-acceptance (Ryff, 1989). Motivation, as explained by Deci and Ryan's (1985) Self-Determination Theory, involves intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions. Innovation orientation reflects an individual's openness to new ideas (Cai & Wu, 2019). Digital competence, as defined by DigComp 2.2, includes skills in information processing, communication, safety, and problem-solving in digital environments.

Organizational culture, which refers to shared values and practices (Schein, 1985), influences how employees engage with their tasks. A supportive and strong organizational culture enhances well-being and motivation,

leading to improved performance (Cameron & Quinn, 2020). Theoretical frameworks, such as Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory (1959) and the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007), suggest that both job resources and individual characteristics impact performance outcomes. This study attempted to: 1. Assess the level of well-being, motivation, innovation orientation, and digital competence among employees. 2. Evaluate employees' assessment of organizational culture. 3. Examine the participants correlation of individual factors and organizational culture on work performance.

## METHODOLOGY

This study utilized a quantitative research design with a descriptive-correlational approach. The target population consisted of full-time teaching and non-teaching staff from a faith-based institution, with a sample size of 94 employees. Research instruments were adapted from validated scales. Well-being was measured using Ryff's Psychological Well-Being Scales, motivation using the Work Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation Scale (WEIMS), innovation orientation (Cai & Wu, 2019), digital competence based on DigComp 2.2, organizational culture using Athena Xenikou's (2020) Organizational Culture Questionnaire (OCQ), and work performance using Borman & Motowidlo (1993) and Campbell (1990).

Descriptive statistics, including frequency and percentage, were used to assess the levels of individual factors, organizational culture, and work performance. Canonical Correlation Analysis (CCA) was employed to determine the relationships between independent variables (individual factors and organizational culture) and dependent variables (task and contextual performance). Ethical protocols, such as informed consent and data protection, were observed in accordance with the Belmont Principles of respect for persons, beneficence, and justice.

## RESULTS

Table 1. Summary Table of Individual Factors

Dimensions of Individual Factors	Mean	Interpretation	SD
Well-being	4.48	High	0.48
Motivation	4.16	High	0.56
Innovation Orientation	4.51	Very High	0.43
Digital Competence	4.48	High	0.48
Overall Assessment of Individual Factors	4.41	High	0.47

The results indicate that employees possess strong personal attributes that enhance job performance and workplace engagement. Their very high innovation orientation shows a strong capacity for creativity and adaptability. High levels of well-being and digital competence suggest good mental health and digital readiness. Motivation is also high, though slightly lower than the other factors, indicating variability in individual drive. Employees may benefit from organizational strategies, such as recognition programs, to maintain motivation. Al-Emran et al. (2023) described the growing importance of digital readiness in the modern work environment, especially given the rapid technological advancements in the past few years. Employees with strong digital skills are more capable of leveraging digital tools to improve task performance, streamline communication, and innovate processes. Digital competence also supports continuous learning, a crucial factor in adapting to technological changes West & Farr, 2020.

Table 2. Organizational Culture

Score Range	Interpretation	Frequency	Percentage
4.51 – 5.00	Very high	23	24.47
3.51 – 4.50	High	57	60.64

2.51 – 3.50	Moderate	14	14.89
1.51 – 2.50	Low	0	0.00
1.00 – 1.51	Very low	0	0.00
	Total	94	100
	Mean	4.10	
	Interpretation	High	
	SD	0.57	

A high level of organizational culture contributes to greater employee identification with the institution, improved job satisfaction, and higher performance. The high mean score of 4.10 indicates a strong sense of shared values, purpose, and clear communication within the organization. This implies that employees perceive the organizational culture as being well-established, with shared values and a sense of purpose that aligns with the institution's goals. *Schein (2020)* highlights that a strong organizational culture fosters a sense of belonging, aligning employees' values with the organization's mission. Employees who identify strongly with the organization are more likely to exhibit greater job satisfaction, commitment, and higher performance levels *Cameron & Quinn, 2020*. Align with *West & Farr (2020)*, who argue that a positive organizational culture serves as a foundation for developing a high-performing workforce. A culture that emphasizes collaboration, trust, and transparency can promote open communication and mutual support among employees, leading to enhanced task and contextual performance. Furthermore, *Wong & Hogg (2020)* states that a high organizational culture positively affects employee motivation, making them more willing to engage in discretionary efforts that benefit the organization

Table 3. Work Performance

Score Range	Interpretation	Frequency	Percentage
4.51 – 5.00	Very high	34	36.17
3.51 – 4.50	High	53	56.38
2.51 – 3.50	Moderate	7	7.45
1.51 – 2.50	Low	0	0.00
1.00 – 1.51	Very low	0	0.00
	Total	94	100
	Mean	4.33	
	Interpretation	High	
	SD	0.52	

The participants perceive their organization as promoting ethical conduct, innovation, and respectful relationships. This strong organizational culture likely enhances employee engagement and contributes to higher levels of job satisfaction and performance. *Xenikou (2020)* defined how culture influences how employees act and relate in the workplace. Additionally, *Denison et al. (2017)* highlight that a positive culture aligns individuals with organizational values. Thus, the high culture rating in this study suggests that the institutional environment plays a crucial role in supporting the psychological and professional needs of its employees.

Table 4. Frequency, Percentage, and Mean Distribution of the Employees Contextual performance

Score Range	Interpretation	Frequency	Percentage
4.51 – 5.00	Very high	45	47.87

3.51 – 4.50	High	46	48.94
2.51 – 3.50	Moderate	3	3.19
1.51 – 2.50	Low	0	0.00
1.00 – 1.51	Very low	0	0.00
	Total	94	100
	Mean	4.43	
	Interpretation	High	
	SD	0.52	

The participants have a strong confidence in completing tasks efficiently, maintaining quality, and adapting to changes. This high task performance can be attributed to individual factors such as motivation, digital competence, and well-being, alongside supportive organizational conditions. Koopmans et al. (2021) stated that task performance is directly tied to core job functions and organizational goals, with motivation and well-being playing a significant role. Bakker & Demerouti (2020) also described the role of digital competence and work engagement in enhancing task performance.

Additionally, Moller et al. (2021) highlighted the importance of self-regulation and adaptability in sustaining high performance, especially in dynamic work environments. Furthermore, Tzafilkou et al. (2022) noted that organizational support, including clear communication and leadership, is essential for boosting task performance. Overall, the high task performance observed reflects a combination of individual attributes and organizational conditions that facilitate efficiency and productivity.

The Canonical Correlation Analysis (CCA) shows a significant relationship between organizational culture and work performance ( $R_c = 0.54$ ,  $R_c^2 = 0.29$ ), as well as between individual factors and work performance ( $R_c = 0.72$ ,  $R_c^2 = 0.52$ ). These findings imply that both organizational and individual factors significantly influence employee performance in faith-based institutions. High levels of organizational culture, marked by shared values and support, are associated with better task and contextual performance, aligning with Chalmers and Brannan (2024) and González-Torres et al. (2023).

Table 5. Canonical Correlation Analysis Summary Between Organizational Culture, Individual Factors, and Work Performance

Canonical Loading				$R_c$	$R_c^2$	F	Df <sub>1</sub>	Df <sub>2</sub>	p
Organizational culture	1.00	Work performance		.54	.29	18.85	2	91	<.001
		Task performance	.86						
		Contextual performance	.99						
Individual factors		Work performance		.72	.52	9.94	8	176	<.001
Innovation orientation	-.87	Task performance	-.89						
Digital competence	-.70	Contextual performance	-.98						
Well-being	-.92								
Motivation	-.90								
*Significant at .01 level									

The strong correlation with individual factors, including innovation orientation, digital competence, well-being, and motivation, supports earlier findings by Tesi and Aiello (2020), Bakker and de Vries (2021), and OECD

(2020). These studies revealed that psychological and digital readiness contribute to better performance outcomes. Recent literature (Mazzetti et al., 2021; Cai & Wu, 2019; European Commission, 2022; White et al., 2023) confirms that employee performance improves when both internal strengths and supportive organizational structures are in place. This is especially relevant in religious academic settings, where values and mission alignment play key roles in sustaining employee engagement and success.

## DISCUSSION

Innovation orientation is important in predicting employee performance. Employees who exhibit a strong inclination toward innovation tend to be more proactive, flexible, and solution-oriented in addressing work challenges. According to Al-Emran et al. (2023), orientation allows staff in educational institutions to reframe problems creatively and contribute to performance improvement. In faith-based institutions, innovation extends beyond technology adoption; it includes finding new and meaningful ways to deliver services, improve curricula, and strengthen community involvement. González-Torres et al. (2023) also emphasized that in mission-driven institutions, innovation practices must align with core values to be effective and sustainable.

Motivation and well-being were also important contributors to work performance. Employees who report high motivation and psychological well-being are more engaged and productive, as they are likely to experience a deeper connection to their roles. This is consistent with the Self-Determination Theory (Moller et al., 2021), which states that intrinsic motivation fosters autonomy, competence, and relatedness. These are three psychological needs which are critical for performance. White et al. (2023) affirmed that psychological well-being enhances job satisfaction, which in turn strengthens work performance in value-oriented institutions like religious colleges. These findings align with the view of Ryff and Keyes (2021), who stated that fulfillment and purpose are essential dimensions of well-being. It influences how individuals contribute within organizations.

Additionally, the high contextual performance scores imply that employees demonstrate behaviors such as altruism, collaboration, and conscientiousness beyond their prescribed tasks. These are particularly important in religious higher education, where service and teamwork reflect institutional values. Yıldız et al. (2024) highlighted that contextual performance is enhanced when employees perceive their environment as fair, supportive, and purpose-driven. This finding aligns with Borman and Motowidlo's concept of contextual performance. It is also supported by recent evidence from Chalmers and Brannan (2024), who found that contextual behavior is shaped not only by personality traits but also by the perceived climate of support and mutual respect in the workplace.

The low standard deviations in the performance measures signify consistency in responses among participants, indicating a shared perception of the organizational culture and their individual roles. This implies a strong alignment between institutional goals and personal values. According to Cameron and Quinn (2020), such internal alignment enhances group cohesion and long-term performance. Likewise, Muchiri and Shahid (2023) explained that when employees operate in a culture that reinforces their values and competencies, their engagement and performance are sustained even under complex demands.

These results collectively emphasize that both individual capacities—well-being, motivation, innovation orientation, and digital competence—and organizational conditions—such as a supportive culture—are essential for promoting optimal performance. These factors are significant because performance is not only measured by outcomes but also by the alignment with mission-driven values such as compassion, service, and integrity. Thus, continuous professional development, opportunities for digital skill enhancement, and the promotion of a positive and inclusive culture are key strategies for maintaining high employee performance.

## CONCLUSION

This study provides important insights into how individual factors, such as well-being, motivation, innovation orientation, and digital competence, interact with organizational culture to influence work performance, particularly in the context of a faith-based higher education institution. A strong, supportive organizational culture, coupled with high levels of motivation and well-being, is essential for enhancing both task and



contextual performance among employees.

This study contributes to a deeper understanding of fostering a conducive work environment and cultivating the right individual attributes. It can lead to improved organizational outcomes. Moreover, it is important to align personal development with organizational culture, especially in faith-based institutions where values play a central role in shaping behaviors and attitudes. Indeed, this research indicates the need for a holistic approach to improving work performance. Institutions should focus not only on the organizational culture but also on the well-being, motivation, and digital competence of their employees. In this manner, they can create an environment that supports high performance, innovation, and a strong sense of commitment to the institution's mission and values.

## REFERENCES

1. Al-Emran, M., Al-Sharafi, M. A., & Shaalan, K. (2023). Digital transformation and employee performance: A systematic review. *Computers in Human Behavior Reports*, 9, 100273.
2. Bakker, A. B., & de Vries, J. D. (2021). Job Demands–Resources theory and self-regulation: New explanations and remedies for job burnout. *Anxiety, Stress, & Coping*, 34(1), 1–21.
3. Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In *Personnel Selection in Organizations* (pp. 71–98). Jossey-Bass.
4. Cai, W., & Wu, X. (2019). Analyzing the relationship between individual innovation and employee performance: A framework based on innovation orientation. *Technology in Society*, 59, 101196.
5. Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R. E. (2020). *Diagnosing and Changing Organizational Culture: Based on the Competing Values Framework* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
6. Campbell, J. P. (1990). Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 687–732). Consulting Psychologists Press.
7. Chalmers, D., & Brannan, M. (2024). Organizational culture and employee outcomes in higher education. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 45(1), 23–40.
8. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behavior*. Springer.
9. Denison, D. R., Hooijberg, R., Lane, N., & Lief, C. (2017). *Leading culture change in global organizations: Aligning culture and strategy*. John Wiley & Sons.
10. European Commission. (2022). *The Digital Competence Framework 2.2*. Publications Office of the European Union.
11. Gagné, M., & Deci, E. L. (2020). Self-determination theory and work motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26(4), 331–362.
12. González-Torres, A., Rodríguez-Sánchez, J. L., & Pelechano-Barberá, M. (2023). Organizational culture and employee engagement in higher education institutions. *Sustainability*, 15(3), 1234.
13. Herzberg, F. (1959). *The Motivation to Work* (2nd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
14. Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C. M., Hildebrandt, V. H., Schaufeli, W. B., de Vet, H. C., & van der Beek, A. J. (2021). Conceptual frameworks and measurement instruments for individual work performance. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 47(3), 222–233.
15. Mazzetti, G., Guglielmi, D., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2021). Same actors, different roles: The contribution of personal resources and demands to work engagement and burnout in different contexts. *Current Psychology*, 40(1), 144–156.
16. Moller, A. C., Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2021). Self-determination theory and public policy: Improving human functioning on a national scale. *Political Psychology*, 42(S1), 135–154.
17. OECD. (2020). *Digital Economy Outlook 2020*. OECD Publishing.
18. Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(6), 1069–1081.
19. Ryff, C. D., & Keyes, C. L. M. (2021). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 62(1), 1–16.
20. Schein, E. H. (1985). *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. Jossey-Bass.
21. Schein, E. H. (2020). *Organizational Culture and Leadership* (5th ed.). Wiley.
22. Tesi, A., & Aiello, A. (2020). Job demands-resources model and work engagement: A meta-analytic

- study. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 35(7), 529–546.
23. Tzafilkou, K., Perifanou, M., & Economides, A. A. (2022). Enhancing employee performance through workplace digital transformation: A comprehensive model. *Journal of Business Research*, 142, 453–463.
  24. West, M. A., & Farr, J. L. (2020). *Innovation and Creativity at Work: Psychological and Organizational Strategies*. John Wiley & Sons.
  25. White, L., Khan, A., & Lee, C. (2023). Supporting digital competence in the workplace: A conceptual framework. *Journal of Organizational Computing and Electronic Commerce*, 33(1), 45–61.
  26. Wong, P. T. P., & Hogg, M. A. (2020). Organizational identification and work-related outcomes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 41(5), 385–403.
  27. Xenikou, A. (2020). *Organizational Culture and Organizational Effectiveness: A Psychological Perspective*. Routledge.