

Perceived Organizational Support and Performance: A Meta-Analysis Study

Arri Handayani

Faculty of Educational Sciences
Institute of Teachers Training and Educational Sciences
Indonesian Teachers Association Semarang
(IKIP PGRI Semarang)

This study conducted a meta-analysis in order to see the link between perceived organisational support (POS) and work performance. Organizational Support Theory and Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964) was used as a framework for discussing correlation between POS and work performance. After meta-analysis was conducted to 20 primary study with as many as 6,645 subjects, the result showed that on the average correlation coefficient was .219 ($r^2 = .219$), with the corrected SD being .1048. The differences of various correlations could be caused by, among others, sampling error of 23.75% and 1.42% for the error in measuring either dependent or independent variables. Therefore, hypothesis stating that there is positive correlation between POS and work performance could be accepted.

Keywords: meta-analysis, perceived organizational support, work performance

Studi ini melakukan meta-analisis dengan tujuan melihat keterkaitan antara persepsi terhadap dukungan organisasi dan kinerja. Teori dukungan organisasi dan teori pertukaran sosial digunakan untuk membahas hubungan antara persepsi terhadap dukungan organisasi dan kinerja. Setelah dilakukan meta-analisis terhadap 20 studi primer dengan 6,645 subjek, diperoleh rata-rata koefisien korelasi sebesar .219 ($r^2 = .219$), dengan SD yang dikoreksi sebesar .1048. Perbedaan variasi korelasi dapat disebabkan antara lain kesalahan pengambilan sampel sebesar 23.75% dan kesalahan pengukuran variabel bebas maupun tergantung sebesar 1.42%. Dengan demikian, hipotesis yang menyatakan ada hubungan positif antara persepsi terhadap dukungan organisasi dan kinerja dapat diterima.

Kata kunci: meta-analisis, persepsi terhadap dukungan organisasi, kinerja

Using a sample of sales representatives in the United States of America, a study by Hochwarter et al. (2006) showed an insignificant correlation between social skills and performance when perceived organizational support was low. The low perceived organizational support forced individuals to exploit social skills, in order to gain needed cooperation and sources to fulfill performance needs.

The study conducted by Setton et al. (1996) found that POS did not correlate with performance. In their study of Perceived Organizational Support (POS) and Leader-Member Exchange (LMX), which was based on the social exchange theory, Wayne et al. (1997) concluded that LMX correlated positively with performance and OCB, meaning that

employees would view performance as a responsibility to their superiors and not to the organization. However, POS only showed a significant correlation with OCB, not with performance. Thus, the existence of POS is associated with the fulfillment of employees' responsibility to the organization, especially the fulfillment of tasks outside their work description.

Previous studies showed various results regarding the correlation between perceived organizational support and performance, with several results showing that perceived organizational support does not affect performance. Thus, there is the need to study whether or not perceived organizational support is one of the predictors of performance. Therefore, the hypothesis that this meta-analysis study tests is that there is a positive significant correlation between perceived organizational support and performance.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Arri Handayani, Faculty of Educational Sciences (Educational Psychology and Guidance Study Program). IKIP PGRI Semarang. Jl. Sidodadi Timur No. 24, Dr. Cipto-Semarang 50125. E-mail: arri.hdy@gmail.com

Prior studies showed varying results regarding the correlation between perceived organizational support and performance. While some studies discovered that the two variables were significantly correlated, others found that there was an insignificant, or no correlation between the variables. Therefore, there is the need to further study whether perceived organizational support is one of the predictors of performance.

Method

This meta-analysis study re-analyzed the results of a number of prior studies by subjecting the primary data to statistical processing. The meta-analysis was conducted because the results of previous studies of the same topic often resulted in different, or even opposing, results, making it difficult for the author to make conclusions about the results of the studies.

Meta-analysis was used as the base to accept or reject the hypothesis (Hunter & Schmidt, 2004). This was conducted to correct mistakes in the study, caused by human error or artefacts.

This study used a dependent variable (criterion) and an independent variable (predictor). Performance was the dependent variable and perceived organizational support (POS) was the independent variable. Performance referred to the work that employees perform for their organization, which involve the fulfillment of standard work description (in role performance) in both quality and quantity in a specific period of time. POS is the general belief on the part of the employees that their organization provides them with support and assistance when they need them, such as attention to their well-being, help given to them when they face troubles, and other specific forms of support.

Literature related to meta-analysis study was collected by accessing www.ugm.lib.ac.id, EBSCO program, Proquest, and Google Scholar. Keywords used in the search were social support, organizational support, perceived organizational support, performance, work performance, job performance. After the findings from the collected literature were studied, several requirements were met to conduct the meta-analysis of perceived organizational support and performance. The considerations included: Primary studies using surveys to collect information regarding perceived organizational support and performance. The perceived organizational support (POS) variable could be collected from perceived organizational support, organizational support, or social support, while the performance variable could be

collected from performance, work performance, job performance, or job outcome.

The research report in the primary studies provided needed statistical information, such as the average score, standard deviation, *r* score or *F* score. Based on the literature findings, there were 25 studies from 20 literatures, all categorized as survey studies, so there is no need to transform the equations into *t*, *d*, and *r* scores.

While data analysis was conducted using Microsoft Excell 1007, the meta-analysis was carried out as the basis to accept or reject the hypothesis (Hunter & Schmidt, 2004). This meta-analysis study was developed from primary studies on the correlation between perceived organizational support and performance.

Although, as Hunter-Schmidt (2004) has pointed out, there are eleven artefacts that can be tested in meta-analysis, due to the limitations of the researcher this meta-analysis study corrected only two artefacts, which included:

Sampling error/bare bone meta-analysis was conducted by: (a) transforming the correlation coefficient result aside from the *r* score (*d*, *t*, or *F*) into the *r* score; (b) calculate the mean (\bar{r}) of the population correlation; (c) calculating the variance of the *r* weighted population coefficient ($\sigma^2 r$); (d) calculating the *r* variance of sample collection error ($\sigma^2 e$); and (e) the effects of sample collection.

Error of measurement correction was conducted by: (a) calculating the combined average (*A*) obtained from the error of measurement average on both variables; (b) calculating the error of measurement correction on *x* and *y*, which were the real correction from the population; (c) calculating the variance squared coefficient total (*V*); (d) calculating the variance that refers to the artifact variance; (e) calculating the real correlation variance; (f) calculating the trust interval; and (g) and calculating the reliability variance effect.

Results

From 20 primary studies with 25 correlation scores, the correlation coefficient was .08 - .57, with the average score before correction of .264. The perceived organizational support variable reliability coefficient's internal consistency was between .69 to .95, while the performance variable was between .67 to .94, with an average of .856. A more detailed result is available in Appendix A.

In this meta-analysis, correction was conducted on two artefacts, which were sampling error and error measurement. Based on the sampling error data analysis,

the population mean correlation (\bar{r}) was .219 and the population correlation variance ($\sigma^2 r$) was .01441. The variance of sampling error was .01099 with the standard deviation of .1048, while the effect of sampling error was as high as 23.75%.

In order to determine that the correlation between the two variables was positive, the mean of corrected population correlation with corrected standard deviation was compared, with the score of the two standard deviations being higher than zero (Hunter & Schmidt, 2004). The results of the comparison in this meta-analysis was 2.09090 (below zero), therefore the correlation between the perceived organizational support and performance variables was positive. This showed that the hypothesis stating that there was a correlation between perceived organizational support and performance could be accepted.

The second artifact to be corrected was error measurement. The population correlation corrected was error measurement on both the dependent and independent variables, with a score of .0254. The real correlation variance was .0145 with a standard deviation of .12051. The trust interval was 2.1 *SD* and the reliability variance effect was 1.42%. The detailed results are available in Appendix B.

Discussion

From the results of the meta-analysis, correction of the sampling and measurement error was conducted, resulting in the correlation coefficient of .219 with a standard deviation of .1048. This was similar with results of several primary studies. One of them was the result of Byrne and Hochwarter's research (200*0, with the subject of business class graduates (143 samples), resulting in the correlation of .21. Another of Hochwarter's research, with Treadway, Witt, and Ferris, on retail sales representatives (136 samples) resulted in a correlation score of .21. The research by Shanock and Eisenberger (2006) on supervisors resulted in the same correlation score of .21. Therefore, it could be stated that perceived organization support is a predictor for performance. Even though the correlation score was not significant, but the two variables had a significant positive correlation.

In meta-analysis study, the variation of artefacts often affect the real results. Even so, this study resulted in the difference of correlation variance caused by the sampling error (23.75%) and independent and dependent measurement errors (1.42%). The independent

and dependent variable measurement error showed the possibility of a bias, because the measurement mistake was insignificant. There was a possibility for bias on the sampling error, because the error was close to 25%.

According to organizational support theory, employees develop POS to fulfill their socioemotional needs and affect their organization's readiness to increase its appreciation towards its employees (Eisenberger, 1986; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Shanock & Eisenberger, 2006).

POS emphasizes the importance of the support that employees and their organization give to each other. Organizational support can be interpreted by employees as commitment. In return, employees feel the responsibility to return the support with a high commitment to their organization (DeConinck & Johnson, 2009). POS is affected by forms of organizational support given to the employees (Hochwarter, Treadway, Witt, & Ferris, 2006; Shanock & Eisenberger, 2006). Forms of organizational support include fairness, support from supervisors, appreciation from the organization, and comfortable working conditions. Employees with positive perceived organizational support will have positive work behavior, contributing more to their organization. As Eisenberger, Armeli, Rexwinkel, Lynch, & Rhoades (2001) have stated regarding organizational support theory, POS has a positive effect on employees' attitude and behavior. If they have positive perceived organizational support, they will also show more efforts, resulting in better performance.

According to social exchange theory, which is based on exchange norms, employees contribute their efforts and dedication to their organization in return for incentives (salary) and the fulfillment of needs, such as socioemotional needs, which include pride, approval, and care (Blau, 1964; Eisenberger, 1986). Therefore, it could be concluded that by fulfilling the needs of its employees, an organization shows its support to them. This organization support, in turn, will improve the employees' performance.

Conclusion

This study conducted meta-analysis on 20 previous researches about the correlation between perceived organizational support and performance. After the meta-analysis, the correlation coefficient average was .219 with a corrected SD of .1048. The difference of correlation scores could be caused by sampling error (23.75%) and independent or dependent variable measurement error (1.46%).

It could be concluded this meta-analysis study lent empirical support to the variation found in the results of previous studies on perceived organizational support and performance. It showed that there was a positive correlation between perceived organizational support and performance.

Even though perceived organizational support was one of the predictors of performance, it could be specific, such as fairness, support from superiors, organizational appreciation, and comfortable working conditions. For future researches, the form of perceived organizational support should be more specific, the better to determine which organizational support affects performance the most.

References

Articles marked with an asterisk indicate studies in the meta-analysis.

- Aritonang, K.T., 2005. Kompensasi kerja, disiplin kerja Guru, dan kinerja guru SMP Kristen BPK Penabur Jakarta. *Jurnal Pendidikan Penabur*, 4(4), 1-16
- Armely, S., Eisenberger, E., Fasolo, P., & Lynch. (1998). Perceived organizational support and police performance: The moderating influence of socioemotional needs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(2), 288-297
- Blau, P., 1964. *Exchange and power in social life*. New York : Wiley.
- Borman, W.C., & Motowidlo, 1993. Expanding the criterion domain to include element of contextual performance. In N.Schmitt & W.C.Borman (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp71-98). San Fransisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- *Byrne, Z.S., & Hochwarter, W.A.(2008). Perceived organizational support and performance relationships across levels of organizational cynicism. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(1), 54-72.
- *Butts, M.M., Vanderberg, R. J., DeJoy, D.M., Schaffer, B.S., & Wilson,M.G. (2009). Individual reactions to high involvement work processes: Investigating the role of empowerment and perceived organizational support. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 14(2), 122-136.
- Chien, C. & Hung (2008). Goal orientation, service behavior and service performance. *Asia Pacific Management Review*, 13(2). 513 – 529.
- *Chen, K. H., Yien, J. M., & Huang, K. P. (2011). Social support, overseas adjusments and work performance of foreign labor in Taiwan. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(22), 9231-9239.
- *DeConinck, J. B., & Johnson, J. T., (2009) The effect of perceived support, perceived organizational support, and organizational justice on turnover among salespeople. *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, 29(4), 333-350.
- Djati, S. P., & Darmawan, D. (2005). Pengaruh kinerja karyawan terhadap kepuasan, kepercayaan, dan kesetiaan pelanggan. *Jurnal Manajemen & Kewirausahaan*, 7(1), 48-59.
- *Dysvik, A., & Kuvaas, B. (2010). Exploring alternative relationship between perceived investment in employee development, perceived organizational support and employee outcomes. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 20(2), 138-156.
- *Dukf, A. B., Treadway, D. C., Goodman, J. M., & Breland, J.W. (2009). Perceived organizational support as a moderator of emotional labor/outcomes relationships. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 39,(5), 1013-1034.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 500-507.
- *Eisenberger, R., Armeli, S., Rexwinkel, B., Lynch, P. D., & Rhoades, L. (2001). Reciprocation of organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(1), 42-51.
- Erdogan, B., & Enders, J., (2007). Support from the top: Supervisors' perceived organizational support as a moderator of leader-member exchange to satisfaction and performance relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(2), 321-330.
- Feng, W. C. (2010). An empirical study of the performance of university teachers based on organizational commitment, job stress, mental health and achievement motivation. *Canadian Social Science*, 6(4), 127-140.
- *Farh, Jiing –Lih, Hackett, R.D., & Liang, J. (2007). Individual-level cultural values as moderators of perceived organizational support-employee outcome relationship in China: Comparing the effect of power distance and traditionality. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(3), 715-729.
- *Gadot, V.E., & Talmud, I. (2010). Organizational politics and job outcomes: The moderating effect of trust and social support. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 40(11), 2829-2861.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review*, 25b(2), 161-178.
- Hunter, J. E., & Schmidt, F. L.(2004). *Methods of meta-analysis: Correcting error and bias in research findings*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- *Hochwarter, W. A., Treadway, D. C., Witt, L. A., & Ferris, G. R. (2006). The interaction of social skill

- and organizational support on job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(2), 482-489.
- Kuncoro, A. K., & Acin, E. (2009). Pengaruh effort, support dan ability terhadap kinerja karyawan, *Jurnal Manajemen*, 1(1), 37- 49.
- *Logan, M.S., & Ganster, D. C. (2007). The effect of empowerment on attitudes and performance: The role of social support and empowerment beliefs. *Journal of Management Studies*, 44 (8), 1523-1550.
- *Lynch, D.P., Eisenberger, R., & Armeli. (1999). Perceived organizational support: Inferior-versus-superior performance by wary employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84, 467- 483
- *Madjar, N., Oldham, G. R., Pratt, M. G. (2002). There's no place like home? The contributions of work and non-work creativity support to employees' creativity performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(4), 757-767.
- Meyer, J., Stanley, D., Hercovitch, L., & Topolnysky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61, 20- 52.
- Moorman, R. H., Blakely, G. L., & Niehoff, B. P. (1998). Does perceived organizational support mediate the relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior? *Academy of Management Journal*, 41, 351-357.
- *Muse, L. A., & Stamper, C. L. (2007). Perceived organizational support: Evidence for a mediated association with work performance. *Journal of Managerial Issue*, 19(4), 517-535.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- *Piercy, N. F, Cravens, D. W., Lane, N., Vorhies, D. W. (2006). Driving organizational citizenship behavior and salesperson in role behavior performance: The role of management control and perceived organizational support. *Academy of Marketing Science Journal*, 34(2), 244-262.
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 698-714.
- Settoon, P. R., Bennet, N., & Liden, R. C. (1996). Social exchange in organizations: perceived organizational support, leader-member exchange, and employee reciprocity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(3), 219-227.
- *Shanock, L. R., & Eisenberger, R. (2006). When supervisors feel supported: Relationships with subordinates' perceived supervisor support, perceived organizational support, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(3), 689-695.
- Shore, L. M., Coyle-Shapiro, J.A. (2003). New developments in the employee-organization relationship. *J. Organ. Behav*, 24, 443-450.
- Tell, S. R. (2003). *Relationships among perceived organizational support, teacher efficacy and teacher performance* (Unpublished dissertation). The Faculty of The California School of Professional Psychology.
- *Wallace, J. C., Edwards, B. D., Arnold, T., & Frazier (2009). Work stressors, role-based performance, and the moderating influence of organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(1), 254-262.
- *Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., & Liden, R. C. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*. 40(1), 82-111.
- *Watt, J. D., & Hargis, M. B. (2010). Boredom proneness: Its relationship with subjective underemployment, perceived organizational support, and job performance. *J Bus Psychol*, 25, 163-174.
- *Witt, L.A., & Carlson, D. S. (2006). The work-family interface and job performance: Moderating effect of conscientiousness and perceived organizational support. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 11(4), 343-357.

(appendices follows)

Appendix A

Research Sample and Reliability Coefficient Characteristics

No	Year	Author	Study Number	Sample	Characteristics	r_{xy}	r_{xx}	r_{yy}
1	2009	DeConinck, JB and Johnson, J.T	1	384	Sales employees	.30	.83	-
2	2001	Eisenberger, R., Armeli, S., Rexwinkel, B., Lynch, P.D., and Rhoades, L.	1	413	Employees	.12	.77	.93
3	2009	Butts, M.M., Vanderberg, R.J., DeJoy, D.M., Schaffer, B.S., Wilson, M.G.	1	1723	Employees	.17	.94	.72
4	2009	Wallace, J.C., Edwards, B.D., Arnold, T., Frazier.	1	215	Employees	.32	.95	.67
5	1999	Lynch, D.P., Eisenberger, R., and Armeli.	1	300	Employees	.14	.90	.87
	1999	Lynch, D.P., Eisenberger, R., and Armeli.	2	221	Employees	.13	.89	.88
6	2010	Gadot, V.E. and Talmud, I.	1	142	Academic Human Resources	.61	.69	.87
7	2011	Chen, K.H., Yien, J.M., Huang, K.P	1	213	Expatriates	.46	.89	.89
8	2007	Logan, M.S. and Ganster, D.C	1	68	Managers	.52	.78	.92
	2007	Logan, M.S. and Ganster, D.C	2	68	Managers	.57	.87	.87
9	2007	Muse, L.A. and Stamper, C.L.	1	263	Supervisors	.14	.93	.94
10	2009	Dukf, A.B., Treadway, D.C., Goodman, J.M., Breland, J.W.	1	338	Service Employees	.11	.87	-
11	2007	Farh, Jiing-Lih, Hackett, R.D., and Liang, J	1	163	Supervisors and Subordinates	.13	.84	.84
12	2006	Witt, L.A. and Carlson, D.S.,	1	136	Employees	.26	.92	.86
13	1997	Wayne, Sandy, J., Shore, L.M., and Liden, R.C.	1	252	Employees	.36	.93	.92
14	2006	Piercy, N.F., Cravens, D.W., Lane, N. Vorhies, D.W	1	214	Stewards	.34	.89	.92
15	2010	Dysvik, A., Kuvaas, B.	1	331	Telecommunication Employees	.08	.84	.80
16	2002	Madjar, N., Oldham, G.R., Pratt, M.G	1	265	Employees	.20	-	.70
17	2006	Hochwarter, W.A., Treadway, D.C., Witt, L.A., Ferris, G.R	1	136	Retail Sales Representatives	.21	.93	.88
	2006	Hochwarter, W.A., Treadway, D.C., Witt, L.A., Ferris, G.R	2	115	Retail Sales Representatives	.24	.94	.85
18	2008	Byrne, Z.S. and Hochwarter, W.A	1	256	Business Introduction Class Graduates	.26	.86	.82
	2008	Byrne, Z.S. and Hochwarter, W.A	2	143	Business Introduction Class Graduates	.22	.93	.83
19	2006	Shanock, L.R. and Eisenberger, R.	1	135	Employees	.10	.87	.90
	2006	Shanock, L.R. and Eisenberger, R.	2	41	Supervisors	.21	.87	.90
20	2010	Watt, J.D. and Hargis, M.B.	1	110	Health Industry Employees	.46	.85	.90

Appendix B

Meta-analysis Results (Two Artefacts)

Bare-bone Sampling Error Correction		Measurement Error Correction Methods	
Population Mean Correlation Estimation	.219	Combined Mean (\hat{A})	.863
Population r Variance	.01441	Corrected Population Correlation (ρ)	.254
Sampling Error Variance	.003422	Squared Variance Coefficient Total (V)	.003256
Population Variance Correlation Estimation	.01099	Artefact Variation Variance (σ^2_2)	.00015642
Standard Deviation	.1048	True Variance Correlation (true score)	.0145
Interval of Trust	2.09090	Standard deviation	.12051
Sampling Error Effect (Rel-r)	23.74 %	Interval of trust	2.1
		Reliability Variation Effect	1.42