

Yuwono, S. (2021). Organizational support and job satisfaction: Meta-analysis study. *Indigenous: Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi*, 6(3). 12-22. doi: <http://doi.org/10.23917/indigenous.v6i3.14079>

## Organizational Support and Job Satisfaction: Meta-analysis study

Susatyo Yuwono<sup>1</sup>

Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta<sup>1</sup>  
[sy240@ums.ac.id](mailto:sy240@ums.ac.id)<sup>1</sup>

Submitted: 3 April 2021

Accepted: 3 November 2021

Published: 31 November 2021

**Abstract.** *This study aims to determine the relationship between organizational support and job satisfaction. Using the meta-analysis approach, the hypothesis is proposed that there is a relationship between organizational support and job satisfaction. Previous studies used 19 articles containing 22 research results that have  $F$ ,  $t$ ,  $d$ , and  $r$  values. The total sample obtained was 11,257 samples with various backgrounds. The analysis show that the population correlation coefficient after being corrected by the number of samples is 0.57. Referring to the 95% significance level, the acceptance limit is between  $0.3687 < r < 0.7648$ . Thus the results of 0.57 are at the acceptance limit. Based on these results, it can be concluded that the hypothesis that there is a relationship between organizational support and job satisfaction is acceptable. These results strengthen the relationship between organizational support and job satisfaction.*

**Keywords:** *organizational support, job satisfaction, meta-analysis*

## INTRODUCTION

Job satisfaction as one of the key factors of job performance has been agreed by many researchers (Kim & Back, 2012). The meta-analysis results of 48 journal articles by Davar and RanjuBala (2012) showed a correlation between job satisfaction and job performance by 0.29222 ( $p \leq 5\%$ ). This result means a positive and significant relationship between job satisfaction and job performance.

Job satisfaction is employees' emotional condition and affection in response to specific aspects of their work (Kreitner & Kinicki, 2013). O'Reills states that job satisfaction results from individuals' cognitive process of work, which includes perceptions of work and perceptions of conformity between organizations and themselves (Kim & Back, 2012).

The social information processing theory suggests that work attitudes and behavior are influenced by their social environment (Fritzsche & Parrish, 2005). Thus, how individuals process information, signs, and symbols received will affect work behavior. One social element of individuals in the workplace is the organization, which has various variables, including organizational support. Abraham asserts that organizational support, organizational climate, and self-efficacy are factors that influence job satisfaction (Kim & Back, 2012). Eisenberger et al. (2016) define organizational support as valuing employee contributions and concern for their welfare.

Several job satisfaction measurement tools have been developed for a long time. Brayfield and Rothe (1951) created the Overall Job Satisfaction Scale (OJS), comprising five indicators of job satisfaction: the job itself, wages, promotion opportunities, supervision, and work colleagues.

Hackman and Oldham (1976) mentioned the Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS), which consists of five dimensions of job satisfaction: diversity of skills, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback. Camman et al. (1979) developed a Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (MOAQ) scale that measures job satisfaction consisting of three items. These three items include dislike of work, satisfaction with work, and preference for the workplace (Inoyatova, 2021). The Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS), according to Spector (1985), has nine aspects, including social security, communication, bonus, work itself, workplace conditions, salary, promotion, supervision, and work colleagues. Meanwhile, Bowling and Zelazny (2021) divided all these scales into two categories, global scale (such as OJSS and MOAQ) and composite scale (such as JDS and JSS).

On the other hand, reciprocity theory proposes that employees will pay their organizations for their support through attention and care for the organization and bring out the best performance (Kim & Back, 2012). Eisenberger et al. (1986) affirm that high organizational support for employees will bring positive results for both the organization itself and its employees. Strong organizational support will also meet the socio-emotional needs of employees and encourage them to bring up positive work attitudes, including job satisfaction.

According to Eisenberger et al. (1986), organizational support has four aspects: appreciation, assessment, development, and involvement. Giving awards/appreciation for the achievement of the work can be done, especially if it exceeds the target set. Besides, the assessment is carried out to provide fair and balanced treatment to all employees. The assessment results will be one of the references in the individual development process carried out by the organization. Individuals are also given the opportunity to take a role in the organization's running through involvement in the absorption of aspirations and decision making. The development of measuring instruments, which were later carried out based on Eisenberger's theory, resulted in various versions (Kurniawan & Harsono, 2021).

The variety of approaches taken to job satisfaction is different from the uniform approach used for organizational support. Fields (2002) states that all approaches to job satisfaction have a strength level of indicators and items that have been tested for validity and reliability. Then, it is essential to examine the relationship between organizational support and job satisfaction based on the previous research. In this regard, this study aims to determine the relationship between organizational support and job satisfaction. The hypothesis developed is that there is a relationship between organizational support and job satisfaction. To test this hypothesis, this study used a meta-analysis method to integrate various studies conducted on these two variables.

## METHOD

### Literature Search

Articles that fit this research theme were obtained through online access to several scientific journal provider sites, including EBSCO, ProQuest, Science Direct, Taylor & Francis, Willey, and Sage Publication. Article searches focused on publications between 2000 – 2014. The keywords used to look for related journals included job satisfaction and perceived organizational support. All of the findings were then selected according to the appropriate criteria for the meta-analysis process to be carried out.

### Article Criteria

The article criteria for this research were articles with perceived organizational support as an independent variable and job satisfaction as the dependent variable. Research conducted in the

article also had statistical data in the form of mean value, standard deviation, r-value, and F-value. The search resulted in 19 articles that met the criteria. There were 22 research results in the 19 articles. One study had an F-value, and the other 21 had a correlation coefficient (r). The existing F-value was then transformed into an r-value for analysis. The total respondents were 11,257 people, consisting of 5,769 workers and 2,758 management.

### Characteristics of Research Samples

This study used 11,257 subjects, with characteristics as in Table 1.

**Table 1.**  
Characteristics of Research Samples

No.	Year	Researcher	Study number	Number (N)	Characteristics
1	2014	Cullen, KL, Edwards, BD, Casper, WC, & I, KR	1	93	Employee
2	2014	Cullen, KL, Edwards, BD, Casper, WC, & I, KR	2	379	Employee
3	2013	Fu, W., Sun, Y., Wang, X, & Yang, LW	1	984	Student
4	2014	Islam, T., Khan, SR, Ahmad, UNU, & Ahmed, I.	1	412	Employee
5	2012	Pathak, D.	1	200	Manager
6	2014	Zorlu, K & Bastemur, C	1	129	Mixed Employees & Managers
7	2014	Fila, MJ, Paik, LS, Griffeth, RW, & Allen, D	1	343	Employee
8	2006	Hemmasi, IMJP (study 1)	1	332	Mixed Employees & Managers
9	2006	Hemmasi, IMJP (study 2)	2	186	Employee
10	2007	Muse, LA, & Stamper, CL	1	263	Employee
11	2010	Paille, P, Bourdeau, L & Galois, I	1	355	Bachelor
12	2015	Paille, P, Grima, F & Dufour, ME	1	704	Employee
13	2009	Butts, MM, Vandenberg, RJ, DeJoy, DM, Schaffer, BS, & Wilson, MG	1	1723	Employee
14	2013	Biswas, S., & Bhatnagar, J.	1	246	Employee
15	2009	Reinardy, S	1	715	Journalist
16	2012	Ohana, M	1	261	Employee
17	2002	Yoon, J & Thye, SR	1	2443	Manager
18	2011	Ladebo, OJ, Abubakar, BZ, & Adamu, CO	1	223	Employee
19	2012	Ibrahim, HI	1	115	Manager
20	2014	Ngo, HY, Foley, S, Ji, MS, & Loi, R	1	591	Employee
21	2003	Allen, DG, Shore, LM, & Griffeth, RW (study 1)	1	215	Salesperson
22	2003	Allen, DG, Shore, LM, & Griffeth, RW (study 2)	2	345	Employee

### Meta-analysis Procedure

The meta-analysis conducted refers to Hunter and Schmidt (2004), namely through stages: 1) transforming the algebraic equation from F-value to r-value; 2) correction of sample errors was done by calculating the population correlation mean, the  $r_{xy}$  variance ( $\sigma^2 r$ ), the sampling error variance ( $\sigma^2 e$ ), and the impact of sampling. Measurement error correction was not carried out due to limited information on the measurement process conducted.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Transforming F-values into t, d, and r values

Only one study had an F-value, so it needed to be transformed into t, d, and r values to be analyzed further. This value transformation used the equation formula:

$$t = \sqrt{F} ; \quad d = \frac{2t}{\sqrt{N}} ; \quad r = \frac{d}{\sqrt{4+d^2}}$$

Correlation  $r_{xy}$  values of all studies, including the transformation results of the F-value, can be seen in Table 2.

**Table 2.**  
The  $r_{xy}$  value and F-value transformation

No.	Year	Researcher	N	F	t	d	r
1	2014	Cullen, KL, Edwards, BD, Casper, WC, & I, KR	93				0.44
2	2014	Cullen, KL, Edwards, BD, Casper, WC, & I, KR	379				0.59
3	2013	Fu, W., Sun, Y., Wang, X, & Yang, LW	984				0.57
4	2014	Islam, T., Khan, SR, Ahmad, UNU, & Ahmed, I.	412				0.45
5	2012	Pathak, D.	200	23,428	4.84	0.68	0.32
6	2014	Zorlu, K & Bastemur, C	129				0.696
7	2014	Fila, MJ, Paik, LS, Griffeth, RW, & Allen, D	343				0.57
8	2006	Hemmasi, IMJP (study 1)	332				0.43
9	2006	Hemmasi, IMJP (study 2)	186				0.51
10	2007	Muse, LA, & Stamper, CL	263				0.58
11	2010	Paille, P, Bourdeau, L & Galois, I	355				0.643
12	2015	Paille, P, Grima, F & Dufour, ME	704				0.56
13	2009	Butts, MM, Vandenberg, RJ, DeJoy, DM, Schaffer, BS, & Wilson, MG	1723				0.66
14	2013	Biswas, S., & Bhatnagar, J.	246				0.48
15	2009	Reinardy, S	715				0.695
16	2012	Ohana, M	261				0.52
17	2002	Yoon, J & Thye, SR	2443				0.61
18	2011	Ladebo, OJ, Abubakar, BZ, & Adamu, CO	223				0.56
19	2012	Ibrahim, HI	115				0.49
20	2014	Ngo, HY, Foley, S, Ji, MS, & Loi, R	591				0.49
21	2003	Allen, DG, Shore, LM, & Griffeth, RW (study 1)	215				0.31
22	2003	Allen, DG, Shore, LM, & Griffeth, RW (study 2)	345				0.26

### Sampling Error Correction

This correction was carried out to get the best estimate of the mean correlation from several

studies, obtained by weighting the correlation coefficient of each study with the number of samples (Hunter & Schmidt, 2004).

**Mean of Population Correlation.** The population correlation mean was obtained through the following equation:

$$\hat{r} = \frac{\sum(N_i r_i)}{\sum N_i}$$

The mean calculation step was performed as in Table 3. The mean population correlation after being corrected was  $\hat{r} = 0,57$

**Table 3.**  
Sampling Error Correction

No.	N	$r_i$	$N \times r_i$
1	93	0.44	40.92
2	379	0.59	223.61
3	984	0.57	561.86
4	412	0.45	185.40
5	200	0.32	64.76
6	129	0.696	89.78
7	343	0.57	195.51
8	332	0.43	142.76
9	186	0.51	94.86
10	263	0.58	152.54
11	355	0.643	228.27
12	704	0.56	394.24
13	1723	0.66	1137.18
14	246	0.48	118.08
15	715	0.695	496.93
16	261	0.52	135.72
17	2443	0.61	1490.23
18	223	0.56	124.88
19	115	0.49	56.24
20	591	0.49	289.59
21	215	0.31	66.65
22	345	0.26	89.70
Total	11257		6379.71
Mean			0.57

**Variance  $r_{xy}$  ( $\sigma^2 r$ ).** Variance  $r_{xy}$  or  $\sigma^2 r$  was obtained through the equation formula:

$$\sigma^2 r = \frac{\sum[N_i(r_i - \hat{r})^2]}{\sum N_i}$$

The calculation results of variance  $r_{xy}$  are in Table 4. Based on table 4, the variance  $r_{xy}$  amounted to 0.010209

**Table 4.**  
Variance  $r_{xy}$

No.	N	$r_i$	$(r_i - \hat{r})$	$(r_i - \hat{r})^2$	$N (r_i - \hat{r})^2$
1	93	0.44	-0.13	0.0169	1.57
2	379	0.59	0.02	0.0004	0.15
3	984	0.57	0.00	0.0000	0.00
4	412	0.45	-0.12	0.0144	5.93
5	200	0.32	-0.25	0.0606	12.12
6	129	0.696	0.13	0.0159	2.05
7	343	0.57	0.00	0.0000	0.00
8	332	0.43	-0.14	0.0196	6.51
9	186	0.51	-0.06	0.0036	0.67
10	263	0.58	0.01	0.0001	0.03
11	355	0.643	0.07	0.0053	1.89
12	704	0.56	-0.01	0.0001	0.07
13	1723	0.66	0.09	0.0081	13.96
14	246	0.48	-0.09	0.0081	1.99
15	715	0.695	0.13	0.0156	11.17
16	261	0.52	-0.05	0.0025	0.65
17	2443	0.61	0.04	0.0016	3.91
18	223	0.56	-0.01	0.0001	0.02
19	115	0.49	-0.08	0.0066	0.75
20	591	0.49	-0.08	0.0064	3.78
21	215	0.31	-0.26	0.0676	14.53
22	345	0.26	-0.31	0.0961	33.15
Total	11257				114.92
Mean	511.68				

**Sampling Error Variance.** The calculation results of variance  $r_{xy}$  of 0.010209 were not purely variations in population correlations since they still contained variations in sample correlations produced by sampling errors. To get the pure magnitude of variation in population correlation, Hunter and Schmidt (2004) suggest a  $r_{xy}$  variance of 0.010209 to be corrected for sampling error. The calculation process was done through the equation formula:

$$\sigma^2_e = \frac{(1-\hat{r}^2)^2}{(N-1)}$$

The calculation using the formula above resulted in  $\sigma^2_e = (1-0.57^2)^2 / (511.68-1)$ , so the magnitude of  $\sigma^2_e = 0.00089$ .

**Estimation of Population Correlation Variance.** This true variance was obtained through correction of the variance  $r_{xy}$  minus the sampling error variance. The equation formula is as follows:  $\sigma^2_Q = \sigma^2_r - \sigma^2_e$ . The calculation results of the population correlation variance were  $\sigma^2_Q = 0.00932$ .

**Impact of Sampling Error.** The impact of sampling error from this meta-analysis study was calculated using the equation formula:

$$\frac{\sigma^2_e}{\sigma^2_p} \times 100\%$$

The results of this calculation produced an impact sampling error rate of 9.58%. It means that there were 90.42% of other error factors not studied.

**Confidence Interval.** This meta-analysis study's confidence range was calculated using the equation formula =  $\hat{r} \pm 1.96 \text{ SD}$ . The calculation results showed that the standard deviation was 0.10104, and the confidence interval range was  $0.3687 < \hat{r} < 0.7648$ .

### Comparison of Population Correlation Rates Based on Sample Characteristics

This study grouped the sample characteristics in Table 1 into two large groups: the employee and the manager. Research that used mixed samples or outside the two groups was not included in the comparison. The full comparison can be seen in Table 5.

**Table 5.**  
Comparison of Population Correlation Mean of Employee and Manager Samples

Employee				Manager			
Study No.	N	$r_i$	$N \times r_i$	Study No.	N	$r_i$	$N \times r_i$
1	93	0.44	40.92	5	200	0.32	64.76
2	379	0.59	223.61	17	2443	0.61	1490.23
3	412	0.45	185.40	19	115	0.49	56.24
7	343	0.57	195.51				
9	186	0.51	94.86				
10	263	0.58	152.54				
12	704	0.56	394.24				
13	1723	0.66	1137.18				
14	246	0.48	118.08				
16	261	0.52	135.72				
18	223	0.56	124.88				
20	591	0.49	289.59				
22	345	0.26	89.70				
Total	5769		3182.23	Total	2758		1611.23
Mean	443.8		0.55	Mean	919.3		0.58

Based on Table 5, the population correlation mean in the manager's group was greater than the employees' group. It indicates that the relationship between organizational support and job satisfaction was a little stronger in the manager sample.

The analysis results showed the population correlation after being corrected with a sample error obtained of 0.57, with the population correlation variance of 0.00932 and SD = 0.10104. At the 95% significance level, the limit for the range of acceptance of confidence intervals is  $0.3687 < \hat{r} < 0.7648$ . It denotes that this study's hypothesis was acceptable, meaning there was a relationship between organizational support and job satisfaction.

A correlation score of 0.57 indicates a moderate relationship between organizational support and job satisfaction (Sprinthall, 2014). This moderate relationship shows that there was a moderate



influence of organizational support received on perceived job satisfaction. It is consistent with Eisenberger et al. (1986) that the support provided by the organization will bring about changes in socio-emotion in employees so that it will affect their attitudes towards work, including increased job satisfaction. Appreciation, assessment, development, and involvement in the organization will also be felt like a positive thing in the employee to create a feeling of satisfaction at work.

Moreover, the assessment has been done to provide fair and balanced treatment to all employees. An appraisal is also a tangible form of organizational support for employees because a sense of attention and need will appear. The effect of valuation is, of course, the rewards in various forms. Giving awards for the achievement of work results, especially if it exceeds the target set, shows that there is real support from the organization to employees so that they always try to work optimally. Rewards in the form of salaries, bonuses, promotions, and so on will also increase satisfaction with what they get from their work. In this case, financial satisfaction is one of the main indicators of job satisfaction (Bowling & Zelazny, 2021; Inoyatova, 2021).

Individuals are also given the opportunity to take a role in the organization by absorbing aspirations and decision-making. It facilitates the needs of employees so that the programs will be in line with employee expectations. It is also the beginning for the organization to make employees work totally. Bright ideas are expected to appear more in decision-making forums that involve employees. The feeling of being involved will encourage the emergence of a sense of belonging and satisfaction with the work being done.

The meta-analysis results also uncovered that the correlation between organizational support and job satisfaction was a little stronger in the manager sample (0.58) than the employee sample (0.55). However, this difference was not large, and the two groups were in the same category of moderate relationships (mean correlation > 0.5). It is consistent with the overall results, showing a moderate correlation between organizational support and job satisfaction.

## CONCLUSION

This study's hypothesis was accepted that there was a moderate relationship between organizational support and job satisfaction. These results have implications for organizations that organizational support is vital for job satisfaction of employees and managers, which will further have implications for job performance. For this reason, the organization needs to provide a system of adequate organizational support for employees and managers. The next researcher is expected to explore the various characteristics of the sample that can be assessed from various existing studies, for example, differences in types of measuring instruments, cultural background, age, and tenure.

## REFERENCES

- Allen, DG, Shore, LM, & Griffeth, RW. (2003). The role of perceived organizational support and supportive human resource practices in the turnover process. *Journal of Management*, 29 (1), 99–118. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063\(02\)00222-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063(02)00222-2)
- Biswas, S., & Bhatnagar, J. (2013). Mediator analysis of employee engagement: Role of perceived organizational support, p-o fit, organizational commitment and job satisfaction. *Vikalpa The Journal for Decision Makers*, 38(1), 27-40. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0256090920130103>
- Brayfield, AH & Rothe, HF. (1951). An index of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 35, 307-311. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0055617>



- Bowling, N., & Zelazny, L. (2021). Measuring general job satisfaction: Which is more construct valid—global scales or facet-composite scales? *Journal of Business and Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-021-09739-2>
- Butts, MM, Vandenberg, RJ, DeJoy, DM, Schaffer, BS, & Wilson, MG. (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. <https://doi.apa.org/doi/10.1037/a0014114>
- Camman, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, D., & Klesh, J. (1979). The michigan organizational assessment questionnaire. *Paul Spector: Industrial and organizational psychology*. Retrieved from <https://paulspector.com/assessments/assessment-archive/job-attitudes/michigan-organizational-assessment-questionnaire-moaq/>
- Cullen, KL, Edwards, BD, Casper, WC, & Gue, KR. (2014). Employees adaptability and perceptions of change-related uncertainty: Implications for perceived organizational support, job satisfaction, and performance. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 29, 269–280. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1007/s10869-013-9312-y>
- Davar, S. C., & RanjuBala. (2012). Relationship between job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 48(2), 290–305. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23509839>
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500–507. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.500>
- Eisenberger, R., Malone, G. P., & Presson, W. D. (2016). Optimizing perceived organizational support to enhance employee engagement. *Society for Human Resource Management and Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology (SHRM-SIOP) Science of HR Series*. Retrieved from <https://www.shrm.org/hr-today/trends-and-forecasting/special-reports-and-expert-views/Documents/SHRM-SIOP%20Perceived%20Organizational%20Support.pdf>
- Fields, D. L. (2002). Job satisfaction. In *Taking the measure of work: A guide to validated scales for organizational research and diagnosis* (pp. 1–42). California: SAGE Publications, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452231143.n1>
- Fritzsche, B. A., & Parrish, T. J. (2005). Theories and research on job satisfaction. In S. D. Brown & R. W. Lent (Eds.), *Career development and counseling: Putting theory and research to work* (2nd Edition, pp. 180–202). New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Fu, W., Sun, Y., Wang, X., & Yang, L.W. (2013). Improving job satisfaction of Chinese doctors: the positive effects of perceived organizational support and psychological capital. *Public Health*, 27, 946–951. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhe.2012.12.017>
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16(2), 250–279. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073\(76\)90016-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(76)90016-7)

- Hunter, J. E., & Schmidt, F. L. (2004). *Methods of meta-analysis: Correcting error and bias in research findings* (ed.2). California: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Iaffaldano, MT & Muchinsky, PM. (1985). Job satisfaction and job performance: A meta analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 97(2), 251-273. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.97.2.251>
- Ibrahim, HI. (2012). A study on the relationship between perception of supervisor support, organizational support and job satisfaction: perceptions of part-time mba students. *International Journal of Arts & Sciences*, 5(1), 73–83. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5430/ijba.v6n5p82>
- Inoyatova, S. (2021). The job satisfaction: A review of widely used measures and indexes. *PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology*, 18(2), 456–464. Retrieved from <https://archives.palarch.nl/index.php/jae/article/view/6411>
- Islam, T., Khan, S. R., Ahmad, U. N. U., & Ahmed, I. (2014). Exploring the relationship between pos, olc, job satisfaction and ocb. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 114, 164 – 169. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.12.678>.
- Johnson, HM. (2004). *The story behind service with a smile* (Master's thesis, University of South Florida, Florida). Retrieved from <http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd/1097>
- Kim, Y., & Back, K.-J. (2012). Antecedents and consequences of flight attendants' job satisfaction. *The Service Industries Journal*, 32(16), 2565–2584. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02642069.2011.593169>
- Kreitner, R., & Kinicki, A. (2013). *Organizational behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Kurniawan, I. S., & Harsono, M. (2021). Perceived organizational support: Antecedents, processes, outcomes. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Organisasi (JMO)*, 12(1), 67–80. Retrieved from <https://journal.ipb.ac.id/index.php/jmo/article/view/34092/21633>
- Ladebo, OJ, Abubakar, BZ, & Adamu, CO. (2011). Nigerian agriculture workers' outcomes from perceived organisational support and protestant work ethics: Job satisfaction as a mediator. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 37(1), 89-96. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v37i1.861>
- Muse, LA, & Stamper, CL. (2007). Perceived organizational support: Evidence for a mediated association with work performance. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 19(4), 517-535. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40604585>
- Ngo, HY, Foley, S, Ji, MS, & Loi, R. (2014). Work satisfaction of Chinese employees: A social exchange and gender-based view. *Social Indicator Research*, 116, 457–473. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-013-0290-2>
- Ohana, M. (2012). Perceived organisational support as mediator of distributive justice and job satisfaction: The mediating role of group commitment. *Journal of Applied Business Research*, 28(5), 1063-1072. <http://dx.doi.org/10.19030/jabr.v28i5.7246>
- Paille, P, Bourdeau, L & Galois, I. (2010). Support, trust, satisfaction, intent to leave and citizenship at organizational level. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 18(1), 41-58. <https://doi.org/10.1108/19348831011033203>

- Price, J.L. & Mueller, C.W. (1981). A causal model of turnover for nurses. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 24(3), 543-565. <https://doi.org/10.2307/255574>
- Reinardy, S. (2009). Beyond satisfaction: journalists doubt career intentions as organizational support diminishes and job satisfaction declines. *Atlantic Journal of Communication*, 17, 126–139. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15456870902873192>
- Spector, P. E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the job satisfaction survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 13(6), 693–713. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00929796>
- Sprinthall, R. C. (2014). *Pearson new international edition: Basic statistical analysis* (ed.9). London, England: Pearson
- Yoon, J & Thye, S.R. (2002). A dual process model of organizational commitment job satisfaction and organizational support. *Work and Occupations*, 29(1), 97-124. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0730888402029001005>
- Zorlu, K & Bastemur, C. (2014). A mediator role of perceived organizational support in workplace deviance behaviors, organizational citizenship and job satisfaction relations: a survey conducted with artificial neural network. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science (IJRBS)*, 3(3), 18-36. <https://doi.org/10.20525/ijrbs.v3i3.106>