Perceptions Effect of Organizational Support on Employees Work Engagement

Friyanka H. D. Sitorus, Cipto Winner Simanjuntak and Irvan

Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Prima Indonesia, Indonesia

Abstract: Human resources are the main capital for a labor-intensive company. One of the potential factors to make human resources a competitive advantage for companies is work attachment. To build work engagement requires a two-way relationship between employees and the company. This study aims to examine the effect of perceived organizational support on employee work engagement using a quantitative approach with convenience sampling technique (involving 201 permanent employees in a labor-intensive company engaged in manufacturing). The data were obtained through a survey method by distributing a scale consisting of work engagement and perceived organizational support. The results of statistical analysis show that perceived organizational support has a significant and positive effect on work engagement. This means that the higher the work attachment to employees, the stronger perceived organizational support. The implication of this research can help the company to increase work engagement by strengthening the support that the organization provides to employees.

1   INTRODUCTION

In this era of globalization, organizations are faced with various challenges in running their business. These challenges can come from various aspects both internal and external, such as economy, socio-culture, politics, law, technology, and infrastructure. In relation to the goals and objectives of the organization, this condition requires the organization to be able to show its best performance so that it can compete and even develop (Adeoye & Elegunde, 2012).

To remain competitive, an organization must have a number of resources. These resources include physical, financial, marketability, and human resources. Of all these resources, human resources are one of the most potential factors to provide a competitive advantage for organizations (Fisher, Schoenfeldt & Shaw, 2006). In an effort to build a strategy that places human resources as a competitive advantage, the ultimate goal that must be achieved is to create employees who have a high level of work engagement (Dale Carnegie & Associates, 2012). Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) argue that organizations that have human resources with high work engagement are able to maintain and

improve performance even though the surrounding conditions are less conducive (Matthews, 2018).

These problems tend to hinder the achievement of optimal company performance. Several complaints that oftenly reflected from customers are product defects, packaging errors and product delivery. The customer complaints (related to product defects, shipping errors and product packaging) indicate less than optimal company performance. This is of course closely related to the human resources owned by the company, especially in labor-intensive companies that depend on their business process journey on their human resources.

According to Markos and Sridevi (2010), human resources in an organization with disengaged employee will result in low commitment, low customer orientation, high percentage of absenteeism and tend to make mistakes in work which then affects performance achievement. organization (Markos & Sridevi, 2010; Bullen, 2018). Even in the findings of (Ibrahim et al, 2020) it is said that employees who do not have work engagement can bring loss and damage to the organization.

Meanwhile, a high level of work engagement will provide positive results on organizational success where an organization that has employees with a high level of work engagement is predicted to

experience an increase in customer satisfaction, productivity, and profitability (Kular, et al, 2008; Johari et al, 2019). Even in unfavorable conditions, employees with high work engagement are able to maintain and improve their work performance (Schaufeli dan Bakker, 2004). Thus, it is important for companies to frequently evaluate the level of work engagement of their employees with human resources as one of the most potential factors to provide a competitive advantage for organizations in order to survive in global market competition. (Fisher, Schoenfeldt & Shaw, 2006; Showkat, 2020).

Robinson, Perryman & Hayday (2004) argued that the organization's treatment of employees is an important factor affecting work engagement. In this case, organizational treatment that can increase employee work engagement is quality management support with indicators of superior concern for employees in the form of encouragement to show their best performance, as well as paying attention to career development. In addition, organizational commitment to employee welfare, as well as fairness in terms of salaries and benefits is also an organizational treatment that can increase work engagement.

Organizational treatment has a great impact on employees and this is known as the perception of organizational support which is also the employee's perception of the extent to which he feels that the organization appreciates his work contribution and cares for his welfare (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison & Sowa, 1986; Kurtessis et al, 2017).

Eisenberger, Malone and Presson (2016) suggest that perception of organizational support is an important factor in efforts to develop work engagement within a company. This construct becomes important in relation to an increasingly competitive environment (making employees more concerned about the extent to which the organization pays attention to their welfare) (Eisenberger et al., 2016).

According to Eisenberger, Armeli, Rexwinkel, Lynch, and Rhoades (2001), the given treatment by the organization to employees will direct how an employee treat the organization which ultimately affect the level of employee work engagement. Research by Rhoades, Eisenberger & Armeli (2001) shows that employees with positive perceptions of organizational support become more engaged in work and organization in an effort to help the organization achieve its goals.

Similar research was conducted by Rich, Lepine & Crawford (2010) and Ram and Prahbkar (2011) who found that perceived organizational support is

an important predictor of work engagement. Sun (2019) found that perceived organizational support is an important factor that can create good relationships between employees and the organization where they work and motivate employees to work hard. Furthermore, Ahmadi, Tavakoli & Heidary (2014) in their research related to perceptions of organizational support and work engagement also show results where perceptions of organizational support for work engagement have a positive influence. Likewise, Saks (2006) stated the belief that if organizations pay attention and care about their welfare, employees will try to fulfill their obligations by becoming more attached to the company.

Based on the above explanation, the effect of perceived organizational support on the level of work engagement of employees at PT X needs to be tested. Considering that this company is a labor-intensive company that relies on its business process journey on its human resources, it is very important to evaluate the level of employee work engagement in it in an effort to ensure the company's success in facing global market competition.

Employees are one of the main actors in the organizational structure, where their involvement, commitment, and attachment to their work and tasks make the organization competitive (Adeoye & Elegunde, 2012). Employees with a high level of work engagement will find it easier to manage work relationships, manage stress on work pressures and manage change. In this case, work engagement is a form of key work attitudes, namely forms of employee work behavior that can assist management in achieving company performance targets (Kreitner & Kinicki, 2010).

Furthermore, Kreitner and Kinicki (2010) suggest that the interest of company management in knowing and evaluating the level of work engagement of employees in their company is accompanied by the belief that employees with high work engagement are able to give extra effort at work and have more commitment and loyalty to the company. Conversely, if the sense of work attachment is low, then behavior will appear such as: employees work ineffectively and less efficiently, do not show full commitment to their work, are not interested in making changes in the organization, and always feel worried about all forms of evaluation such as performance surveys.

The used concept in this research is work engagement. Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) define work engagement as a condition in which a person feels satisfied and has positive thoughts on their

work which is characterized by high enthusiasm (vigor), dedication and focus / appreciation (absorption) in doing work. Vigor is characterized by a work climate that is full of energy and mental resilience and a willingness to put in more effort to work and survive despite many difficulties. Dedication is characterized by full involvement in his work and feeling the importance, enthusiasm, inspiration, pride, and challenges in his work. Absorption is characterized by a climate that is full of concentration and preoccupation in carrying out work, time passes quickly and it is difficult to get away from the work.

Employees with a high level of work engagement are builders. They know what expectations they want, therefore they can fulfill and achieve them. They naturally have curiosity about the company and the place where they currently work. They consistently do work at a high level using their talents or talents and strengths every day. They work with passion and drive innovation and move the organization forward. The characteristics of employees with a high level of work engagement are enthusiastic, passionate and passionate about work, loyal, motivated, committed, and productive. They have strong emotions and are loyal to their workplaces and driven to succeed.

Conversely, employees with a low level of work engagement tend to concentrate only on tasks rather than goals or results. They just want to know what to do then do it and say they got it done. They focus on fulfilling a task rather than achieving an outcome. Employees with a low level of work engagement tend to feel that their contributions are being neglected, and that their abilities are not beneficial. They are willing to work hard and contribute but lack the drive for achievement and it is likely that it is easy to leave the company if there is a more attractive offer elsewhere.

There are several factors in the emergence of work engagement in an organization. Robinson, Perryman & Hayday (2004) indicate a number of factors below as important factors affecting the level of work engagement, including: a. quality management, characterized by the attitude of managers who care about their employees, informative, provide fair treatment, encourage employees to show their best performance, and pay attention to the career development of their employees; b. two-way communication and open within the organization; c. the effective cooperation between different departments and functions, as well as between management and trade unions; d. focus on employee development; e. organizational commitment to employee welfare; and f. fairness in terms of salaries and benefits that include comparisons both within and outside the organization.

The theory regarding perceived organizational support was originally developed by Eisenberger et al., (1986). The development of the theory of perceived organizational support is based on social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) and reciprocity norm (Gouldner, 1960). This theory deals with the relationship between employees and organizations. In his view, the relationship between employees and the organization is a reciprocal relationship (social exchange theory), where the organization provides employees with appropriate rewards and good working conditions in the hope that this can make employees loyal and provide more work effort (Yin, 2018).

According to Eisenberger et al. (1986), perceived organizational support is defined as employees' perceptions of the extent to which the organization values their contributions and cares for their well-being. The meta-analysis of perceptions of organizational support conducted by Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) describes three aspects of employee perceived organizational support, namely:

(i) Awards from the organization and conditions of work

This aspect shows that recognition of employee contributions will be positively related to perceptions of organizational support. Working conditions and rewards that are considered to be related to perceptions of organizational support, include: recognition, salary and promotion; job security; autonomy of work; training (Shore and Shore, 1995).

(ii) Support from superiors

The term perception of superiors' support is more often used to describe this factor. Kottke and Sharafinski (1988) define perceptions of superiors 'support as employees' belief in the superior's concern for their contributions and welfare. In this case, the subordinates see the superior as an extension of the organization. How companies treat their employees through managerial behavior will strongly influence employees' perceptions of organizational support. This is then considered the organization's informal reward for quality performance which is one way of sending messages to employees about a form of concern for their well-being, the value of their contribution and demonstrating supportive behavior.

(iii) A sense of Justice

Organizational procedural fairness focuses on a sense of fairness (fairness) in the distribution of resources among employees. Repeated experiences with fair decisions in determining the distribution of resources will have an accumulative effect on perceptions of organizational support, because it signals the organization's concern for employee welfare. Types of rewards such as salary, promotion, job enrichment, and influence on organizational policies will also increase the perception of organizational support, which indicates the organization's positive evaluation of employees.

Dabke and Patole (2014) suggest that one of the impacts of perceived organizational support which important for organizations is work engagement. Similar research was conducted by Rich, Lepine and Crawford (2010); Ram and Prahbkar (2011); Burns (2016); Eisenberger, Malone and Presson (2016) who also suggest that perceived organizational support is a predictor in developing employee work engagement within a company. From the previous description, this study has a hypothesis that there is a positive influence on perceived organizational support on work engagement.

2 METHOD

This study uses a quantitative approach with convenience sampling technique for sampling the study. A total of 201 permanent employees at PT. X was involved as a participant. The data collection method used in this study is a survey method by distributing a scale consisting of work engagement and a perceived scale of organizational support, each of which consists of 7 answer choices.

Researchers used 7 answer choices on each research scale with the aim of overcoming the limitations of the midpoint on using the Likert scale in the answer choices. Cummins & Gullone (2000) suggested that the limitation of the midpoint can be reduced by increasing the scale sensitivity which means increasing the number of scale choices. Some researchers have shown that increasing scale sensitivity can decrease the tendency to choose a midpoint (Matell & Jacoby, 1972; Cummins & Gullone, 2000; Tsang, 2012). Furthermore, it is said that the choice of the midpoint tends to occur more frequently on a scale of 3 choices and a scale of 5 choices, but less on a scale of 7 choices.

The work engagement scale consists of 14 items with 7 answer choices ranging from never to always. The reliability of the work engagement scale obtained from the used test using the Cronbach's Alpha method was 0.847 with the construct validity value that moved from the number 0.50 to 0.80.

The perceived organizational support scale consists of 13 items with 7 answer choices ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The reliability of the perceived scale of organizational support obtained from the used test using the Cronbach's Alpha method is 0.839 with the construct validity value that moves from the number 0.570 to 0.889.

The data analysis method used to test the hypothesis in this study is statistical analysis in the form of simple regression using the help of the SPSS version 16 for windows program.

3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Morrow and McElroy (1987) divided the tenure into three stages, namely the establishment stage, advancement stage, and maintenance stage with a service period of under 2 years, 2-10 years, and above 10 years, respectively. The general description of the research subjects obtained from the personal data or identities of the 201 subjects listed on the research scale, including: establishment stage, advancement stage, and maintenance stage are 3%, 30.8%, and 66.2%, respectively. The rules of the Law of the Republic of Indonesia, that the applicable working age in Indonesia is 15 - 64 years old. Super (1990) suggests the stages of career development are divided into five, namely: the growth stage (0-14 years), the exploration / exploration stage (15-24 years), the establishment stage (25-44), the maintenance stage / maintenance (45-64) and decline stage (65+). In this study, the subjects were in the exploration stage, determination and decline were 4.5%, 61.2%, and 24.3%, respectively.

The hypothesis of this study is that there is a positive influence on perceived organizational support on work engagement. Hypothesis testing is done using simple regression analysis. From the results of the simple regression statistical test between the effect of perceived organizational support (X) and work engagement (Y), it is found that perceptions of organizational support have a significant positive effect on work engagement. The results of the regression model for perceived organizational support for work engagement found

an F value of 65,362 with a significance level (p) of 0.000. Thus, it can be concluded that perceived organizational support has a significant effect on work engagement. To find out the magnitude of the influence of perceived organizational support on work engagement, the R determination test was carried out with the results as shown in Table 1, where OSP is Organizational support perceptions on work engagement, ARS is Adjusted R Square, RSE is Std. Error of the Estimate.

Table 1: Results of the Determination R Perception of Organizational Support.

Model	R	R^2	ARS	RSE
OSP	0.497	0.247	0.243	11.6

The results also show that perceived organizational support has a positive and significant effect on work engagement. This means that the stronger the organizational support perceived by employees, the higher the level of work engagement.

Based on Table 1, it can be seen that the R value of 0.497 is positive, which means that there is a positive influence between the perception of organizational support and work engagement, meaning that the stronger organizational support is perceived by the research subject, the higher the level of work engagement.

The results of the hypothesis testing above are supported by the results of research from the value of the determinant coefficient (adjusted R square) which is 0.243, meaning that the contribution of the perception variable of organizational support to work engagement is 24.3% while the remaining 75.7% is explained by other causes outside the research model. . Thus, from the above explanation it can be concluded that the hypothesis in this study is accepted, perceptions of organizational support have a positive and significant effect on work engagement.

An overview of the perceived score of organizational support for employees at PT. X can be seen through the difference between the empirical mean and the hypothetical mean of the perceived organizational support scale score as in Table 2. Based on Table 2, the empirical mean perceived organizational support is 57.11 with a standard deviation of 13.54. Meanwhile, the hypothetical mean is 52 with a standard deviation of 13. From the comparison between the empirical mean and the hypothetical mean of the perceived organizational support score, it can be seen that the empirical mean

is greater than the hypothetical mean (57.11> 52). This shows that in general the organizational support perceived by the research subjects is stronger than the organizational support perceived by the study population.

Table 2: Hypothetical and Empirical Means of Job Engagement.

	Hipotetik				Empirik			
	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Mean	SD
OSP	13	91	52	13	15	88	57.11	13.54
OA	6	42	24	8	6	41	28.65	7.39
SS	3	21	12	4	3	21	13.33	4.04
Fn	4	28	16	5.3	4	27	15.13	5.28

In norming the scores on each study scale, three categories were selected. The work engagement scale has an average value of 57.94, where this score belongs to the high category, which means that most of the respondents have a high level of work engagement. The scale of perceived organizational support has an average of 57.11 where this score belongs to the medium category, which means that most research subjects perceive the support provided by the company to be in the medium category.

Furthermore, based on the mean and standard deviation values, categorization is carried out based on hypothetical values as in Table 3. Based on the categorization of Table 3, it can be seen that most of the research subjects perceive the support provided by the company to be in the moderate category, namely 119 people (59.2%). While 61 people (30.3%) perceived that the support provided was in the strong category and the rest perceived the support provided by weak companies, namely as many as 21 people (10.5%). Based on the categorization of Table 4, it can be seen that most of the research subjects had a relatively high level of work engagement, namely 118 people (58.7%). Meanwhile, only 4 people (2%) were classified as low and the rest were in the moderate category, namely 79 people (39.3%).

Table 3: Categorization of Organizational Support Perceptions Scores (V is variables, VR is value range, C is category, and f is frequency).

V	VR	C	f
OPS	X > 65	Strong	61
	39 < X < 65	Medium	119
	X < 39	Weak	21
Total			201

Table 4: Categorization of Job Engagement Scores (WE is work engagement).

	VR	C	f
WE	X > 56	High	118
	28 < X < 56	Medium	79
	X < 28	Low	4
Total			201

Perceptions of organizational support are employees' beliefs about the extent to which the organization values their contributions and cares for their well-being. This perception reflects the belief that the organization intends to reward the efforts of its employees, the organization appreciates the employees' contribution in achieving organizational goals and pays attention to the welfare of its employees. (Eisenberger et al., 1986).

Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) suggest that the relationship formed between employees and organizations is a reciprocal relationship. In this case, organizations that create favorable conditions for their employees will benefit from a positive attitude that will be given by their employees. Employees who perceive the support provided by a strong organization will feel obliged to help the company achieve its goals.

In line with the results found, the company has rewarded employees' contributions, paid attention to welfare, built employee perceptions about the treatment the company has given. This in turn creates an employee's obligation to repay the treatment that has been received by fostering a positive attitude towards work quality which is then called work attachment.

Research by Dai and Qin (2016) found that if employees get strong support in the form of emotional, financial or career development, they will foster a sense of belonging. This refers to Maslow's hierarchy of needs where everyone feels the need to be cared for and appreciated. This condition will then foster a sense of belonging in employees so that the attachment to the organization will be even higher.

Other studies have also confirmed that work engagement with employees is a significant impact generated by perceived organizational support. When employees feel that their welfare is considered and their contribution is appreciated by the organization, their enthusiasm, dedication and appreciation in work will increase (Biswas & Bhatnagar, 2013; Saks, 2006). This is in line with Rubel and Kee (2013) where perceptions of organizational support for work engagement have a positive and significant effect. In this case the perception of organizational support can stimulate employees to be more attached to their roles in work. This condition makes employees strive to achieve organizational goals by showing a high level of work engagement.

4 CONCLUSIONS

Based on the results obtained in this study, it can be concluded that the perception of organizational support has a positive and significant effect on work engagement among employees. This means that the stronger the support from the company that is perceived by the employees, the higher the level of employee work engagement.

SUGGESTION

Based on this research, it can be seen that the average employee still perceives that organizational support from the company is still at the medium category level and there are even some employees who perceive it as weak. This shows that the company still has room to raise perceived organizational support by increasing its support for employees. Types of rewards such as salary, promotion, job enrichment, and influence on organizational policies that are fairly given will reinforce perceptions of organizational support, which indicates the organization's positive evaluation of employees.

REFERENCES

Adeoye, A. O., & Elegunde, A. F., 2012. Impacts of external business environment on organisational performance in the food and beverage industry in Nigeria. British Journal of Arts and Social Sciences, 6(2), 194-201.

Ahmadi, S. A., Tavakoli, S., & Heidary, P. R., 2014. Perceived organizational support and employee engagement. International Journal of Information Technology and Management Studies, 1(1) 54-66.

Biswas, S., & Bhatnagar, J., 2013. Mediator analysis of employee engagement: Role of perceived organizational support, P-O fit, organizational commitment and job satisfaction. VIKALPA, 38, 27-40.

Blau, P. M., 1964. Exchange and power in social life. New York: John Wiley.

Burns, K. L., 2016. Perceived organizational support and perceived supervisor support as antecedents of work engagement. (Tesis). San Jose State University.

Cummins, R. A., & Gullone, E., 2000. Why we should not use 5-point Likert scales: The case for subjective quality of life measurement. Paper presented at the Proceedings, Second International Conference on Quality of Life, Singapore: National University of Singapore.

Dabke, D., & Patole, S., 2014. Predicting employee engagement: Role of perceived organizational support and perceived superior support. Tactful Management Research Journal, 3(1), 1-8.

Dai, K., & Qin, X., 2016. Perceived organizational support and employee engagement: Based on the research of organizational identification and organizational justuce.Open Journal of Science, 4, 46-57.

Dale Carnegie & Associates., 2012. What drives employee engagement and why it matters. Dale Carnegie Training White Paper, 1-6.

Eisenberger, R., Armeli, S., Rexwinkel, B., Lynch, P. D., & Rhoades, L., 2001. Reciprocation of perceived organizational support. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86, 42–51.

Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D., 1986. Perceived organizational support. Journal of Applied Psychology, 71(3), 500-507.

Eisenberger, R., Malone, G.P. & Presson, W.D., 2016. Optimizing perceived organizational support to enhance employee engagement. SHRM-SIOP Science of HR Series, 1-22

Fisher, C. D., Schoenfeldt, L. F., & Shaw, J. B., 2006. Human resource management (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Gouldner, A. W., 1960. The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. American Sociological Review, 25, 161-178.

Kottke, J. L., & Sharafinski, C. E., 1988. Measuring perceived supervisory and organizational support. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 48, 1075–1079.

Kreitner, R. & Kinicky, A., 2010. Organization behavior (9th ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.

Kular, S., Gatenby, M., Rees, C., Soane, E., & Truss, K., 2008. Employee engagement: A literature review. Working Paper Series. Kingston Bussiness School, 1-33.

Markos, S., & Sridevi, M.S., 2010. Employee engagement: The key to improving performance. International Journal of Bussiness and Management, 5, 89-96.

Matell, M. S., & Jacoby, J., 1972. Is there an optimal number of alternatives for likert scale effects of tesing time and scale properties? Effects of testing time and scale properties. Journal of Applied Psychology, 56(6), 506-509.

Ram, P., & Prabhakar, G., 2011. The role of employee engagement in work-related outcomes. Interdisciplinary Journal of Research in Business, 1(3), 47-61.

Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R., 2002. Perceived organizational support. A review of the literature. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87(4), 698–714.

Rhoades, L., Eisenberger, R., & Armeli, S., 2001. Affective commitment to the organization: The contribution of perceived organizational support. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86, 825–836.

Rich, B. L., Lepine, J. A. & Crawford, E. R., 2010. Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance. Academy of Management Journal, 53, 617-635.

Robinson, D., Perryman, S., & Hayday, S., 2004. The drivers of employee engagement. UK: The Institute for Employment Studies.

Rubel, M. R. B. & Kee, D. M. H., 2013. Perceived support and employee performance: The mediating role of employee engagement. Life Science Journal, 10, 2557-2567.

Saks, A., 2006. Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21(7), 600-619.

Shore, L. M., & Shore, T. H., 1995. Perceived organizational support and organizational justice. In R. S. Cropanzano & K. M. Kacmar (Eds.), Organizational politics, justice, and support: Managing the social climate of the workplace (pp. 149–164). Westport, CT: Quorum.

Schaufeli, W. & Bakker, A., 2004. Utrecht work engagement scale. Utrecht University : Occupational Helath Psychology Unit.

Schaufeli, W. B. & Bakker, A. B., 2004. Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 25, 293-315.

Tsang, K.K., 2012. The use of midpoint on likert scale: The implications for educational research. Hong Kong Teacher's Centre Journal, 11, 121-130.