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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.
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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 need-ed 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.
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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 wellbeing, 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, 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 (rN) of the population correlation; (c) calculating the variance of the r weighted population coefficient (ơ^2_r); (d) calculating the r variance of sample collection error (ơ^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 ($\hat{r}$) 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 result-ed 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 appre-ciation 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.
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## Appendix A

### Research Sample and Reliability Coefficient Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Study Number</th>
<th>Sample Characteristics</th>
<th>$r_{xy}$</th>
<th>$r_{xx}$</th>
<th>$r_{yy}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>DeConinck, JB and Johnson, J.T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>Sales employees</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Eisenberger, R., Armeli, S., Rexwinkel, B., Lynch, P.D., and Rhoades, L.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Butts, M.M., Vanderberg, R.J., DeJoy, D.M., Schaffer, B.S., Wilson, M.G.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1723</td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Wallace, J.C., Edwards, B.D., Arnold, T., Frazier.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Lynch, D.P., Eisenberger, R., and Armeli.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Lynch, D.P., Eisenberger, R., and Armeli.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Gadot, V.E. and Talmud, I.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>Academic Human Resources</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Chen, K.H., Yien, J.M., Huang, K.P</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>Expatriates</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Logan, M.S. and Ganster, D.C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Logan, M.S. and Ganster, D.C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Dukf, A.B., Treadway, D.C., Goodman, J.M., Breland, J.W.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>Service Employees</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Farh, Jiing-Lih, Hackett, R.D., and Liang, J</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>Supervisors and Subordinates</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Wayne, Sandy, J., Shore, L.M., and Liden, R.C.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Piercy, N.F, Cravens, D.W., Lane, N. Vorhies, D.W</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>Stewards</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Dysvik, A., Kuvaas, B.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>Telecommunication Employees</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Madjar, N., Oldham, G.R., Pratt, M.G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Byrne, Z.S. and Hochwartner, W.A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>Business Introduction Class Graduates</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Byrne, Z.S. and Hochwartner, W.A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Business Introduction Class Graduates</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Shanock, L.R. and Eisenberger, R.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Shanock, L.R. and Eisenberger, R.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>20Watt, J.D. and Hargis, M.B.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Health Industry Employees</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Meta-analysis Results (Two Artefacts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bare-bone Sampling Error Correction</th>
<th>Measurement Error Correction Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population Mean Correlation Estimation</td>
<td>Combined Mean (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population r Variance</td>
<td>.01441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling Error Variance</td>
<td>.003422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Variance Correlation Estimation</td>
<td>.01099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>.1048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interval of Trust</td>
<td>2.09090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling Error Effect (Rel-r)</td>
<td>23.74 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>