

**The Relationship Between Perceived Organisational Support and Employee Well-Being Among Employees of PT X in Semarang**  
Rangga Nibras Aufa<sup>1</sup>, Aldani Putri Wijayanti<sup>2</sup>✉

<sup>1,2</sup>Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Diponegoro, Indonesia

**Article Info**

*Keywords:*

*Perceived Organisational Support (POS), Employee Well-Being (EWB), Employee*

**Abstract**

Employees are a valuable asset for a company and contribute to the achievement of its goals. The purpose of this study is to identify the relationship between perceived organisational support and employee well-being among employees. This research aims to validate the identified issues which is encountered through interviews with the HR and management of PT X. Several issues were reported to the researcher, including employee dissatisfaction with team leaders performance, particularly their inability to effectively solve problems and concerns about unfair performance evaluations that influenced competence bonuses. Additionally, employees complained about the production room temperature being excessively hot, creating an uncomfortable working environment. This research employed a quantitative method, using proportionate sampling to ensure that each subgroup of the population was represented in the sample. Participants were employees with a minimum tenure of three months across various divisions, drawn from a total population of 847 employees. The study involved constructing a perceived organisational support scale with 28 items ( $\alpha = 0.920$ ) and adopting an employee well-being scale with 18 items ( $\alpha = 0.827$ ). Data were collected from 266 respondents; Spearman's rho was 0.147 with a significance of 0.008 ( $p < 0.05$ ). The results indicate a weak but significant positive correlation between perceived organisational support and employee well-being, suggesting that higher perceived support is associated with a slight increase in employee well-being.

✉ Correspondence address:  
Faculty of Psychology Universitas Diponegoro  
Jl. Prof. Mr. Sunario, Tembalang, Semarang, 50275  
E-mail: [aldaniwijayanti@lecturer.undip.ac.id](mailto:aldaniwijayanti@lecturer.undip.ac.id)

## INTRODUCTION

It is widely recognised that employees are valuable assets for a company, as they contribute to the achievement of the company's goals. Managing employees effectively as human resources is crucial, as it directly influences their loyalty, discipline, and dedication in fulfilling the tasks and responsibilities given by the company (Arthabawan, 2018). According to Syamsurizal (2016), the primary goal of human resource management is to retain employees so that they can contribute optimally to the company's objectives. To achieve this goal, companies must implement effective employee maintenance strategies, such as clear communication, fair policies, and attention to employee welfare and workplace safety (Arthabawan, 2018).

Human resource management plays a very important role and is closely linked to organisational productivity and performance (Harahap et al., 2023). Examples of human resource management practices include conducting KPI-based performance appraisals, providing compensation for employee achievements, offering orientation programs at the start of employment, and terminating employees who fail to meet the company's targets (Putri et al., 2022). Employees who receive proper attention and appropriate recognition from the company tend to exhibit greater loyalty and improved performance (Harahap et al., 2023). In this context, appropriate salaries and bonuses are also crucial factors (Arthabawan, 2018). Providing a decent salary and fair bonuses can enhance employees' well-being and work motivation, while also reducing absenteeism and turnover rates (Suheny et al., 2021).

Wright and Cropanzano (2000) describe employee well-being (EWB) as a self-reported description of one's happiness and the balance of positive and negative emotions. EWB encompasses all aspects of life for an employed individual, both in the workplace and outside of work. In essence, EWB refers to the overall effectiveness of an employee's psychological functioning (Wright & Cropanzano, 2000). EWB can be enhanced by various factors provided by the company to the employee, for example through facilities or benefits. Welfare programs offered by an organisation can motivate employees to increase their productivity at work (Lumbanraja, 2015).

Socioeconomic factors have a considerable impact on an individual's well-being. High income is associated with better well-being because people with higher earnings can fulfill their needs and desires, and their lives are not solely focused on survival (Livingston et al., 2022). Accordingly, providing adequate wages will improve employees' well-being by enhancing their socioeconomic status, which in turn raises their overall level of employee well-being (Livingston et al., 2022). Beyond socioeconomic determinants, employees' well-being is also shaped by the degree to which they perceive their organisation as valuing their contribution and caring for their welfare. Foundational work by Eisenberger (1986) demonstrates that employees form generalised beliefs about organisational support, and these perceptions strongly influence affective attachment, motivation, and withdrawal behaviours. This line of evidence suggests that even when socioeconomic needs are met through adequate wages, the psychological experience of being recognised and supported by the organisation remains a distinct and influential contributor to well-being.

EWB encompasses multiple aspects of an employee's life, such as physical, psychological, and emotional health. Moreover, an employee's comfort and happiness are also key components of overall well-being (Pradhan & Hati, 2022). Research by Zheng et al. (2015) revealed that EWB consists of three primary components: subjective well-being, workplace well-being, and psychological well-being. These three components are interrelated with one another and together reflect the overall condition of the employee.

Enhancing EWB can improve their job performance. When the relationship between employees and the company is fair and balanced, employees experience many positive outcomes from that relationship: they feel they are treated fairly by the company, they develop greater trust in their coworkers, and they are less frequently absent without a clear reason (Tsui et al., 1997). In addition

to fairness, a study by Zulkifli and Hamzah (2024) found that supervisor support can positively influence employees' psychological well-being, particularly among working mothers.

Kanyumba et al. (2024) showed that when employees have poor well-being, it negatively affects their contribution to the company: such employees tend to feel stressed and exhausted, and ultimately the turnover rate in the company increases, which can hinder the company's operations. Employees with low well-being often also have low perceived organisational support; this is indicated by signs such as a lack of motivation at work, low commitment, decreased productivity, and dissatisfaction with their job (Alkasim & Prahara, 2019). Based on these findings, research on the relationship between POS and EWB is important, since EWB affects organisational performance and is itself influenced by the support provided by the company.

Organisational support theory, as proposed by Eisenberger et al. (1986), posits that employees develop perceptions regarding the extent to which their employer values their contributions and cares about their well-being; this perception is commonly termed perceived organisational support (POS). POS reflects the overall perception employees have of how much their company appreciates their dedication and cares about their welfare. POS can be strengthened through favourable organisational practices for employees, such as ensuring justice, providing supervisor support, and offering training and development opportunities (Eisenberger et al., 2024). In particular, Eisenberger et al. (1986) found that POS significantly reduces absenteeism and enhances employees' commitment, especially among individuals with a strong exchange ideology, who are more likely to reciprocate fair and supportive treatment. These findings align with the broader understanding that organisational care functions as a socioemotional resource that complements material or economic resources, thereby exerting an additional and meaningful effect on overall EWB.

Previous studies have demonstrated connections between POS and various employee outcomes, including job satisfaction, performance, commitment, and well-being. For instance, Mustika and Martdianty (2023) found that POS, total reward systems, and work-life balance all positively and significantly influence EWB and job performance. Structural analysis in their study indicated that POS has a significant positive effect on EWB, and that POS had the greatest impact on improving EWB in the company compared to the effects of the total reward system or work-life balance. Consistent with research by Dimas and Pratiwi (2022), which showed that POS has a significant relationship with EWB, such that higher POS corresponds to higher EWB. However, in their study on POS and EWB at PT. X Majalaya, the sample was drawn only from the production department, which limits the generalisability of the results to the company's entire workforce (Dimas & Pratiwi, 2022).

No prior research has specifically examined the relationship between POS and EWB among employees of a furniture manufacturing company in Indonesia. This gap is important because the manufacturing sector, particularly furniture production, is characterised by physically demanding tasks, production pressures, hierarchical work structures, and strict output targets, all of which may shape employees' perceptions of organisational support and their overall well-being in distinctive ways. In many manufacturing settings, employees are exposed to repetitive work, environmental stressors, and limited autonomy, making organisational support a potentially critical resource for maintaining both psychological and physical well-being. Therefore, the present study was conducted to determine whether similar results would be obtained for the POS-EWB relationship among employees in a furniture manufacturing context, compared to findings from other types of manufacturing companies, and to clarify whether sector-specific working conditions influence this relationship.

The aim of this research is to ascertain the relationship between POS and EWB among employees of PT X. A gap exists in the literature, as no prior studies have investigated the relationship between POS and EWB in the context of Indonesian furniture manufacturing companies. The high workloads and demanding targets experienced by employees in the furniture manufacturing industry often require overtime work, making this setting highly relevant for research on POS and EWB. This

study is expected to fill a gap in the literature regarding the application of POS and EWB theory in Indonesia, and thereby serve as a reference for future research, particularly in similar industrial sectors or in other sectors. Ethical approval for this research was obtained from the KEPPU, Psychology Research Ethics Committee of Universitas Diponegoro under certificate number 19/SERTIF/KEPPU/I/2025. In addition, the company provided written consent for the inclusion of its name in this study.

## METHOD

This study used a quantitative approach with a correlational design. The research included two variables: perceived organisational support and employee well-being. For the purposes of this study, POS is defined as an employee's perception of the appreciation and attention that the organisation provides as a form of recognition for the employee's work. This perception is manifested when employees feel they are treated fairly by the company, receive support and assistance from their supervisors in carrying out their jobs, and feel that the bonuses and working conditions provided by the organisation are adequate. We measured perceived organisational support using a self-constructed scale consisting of 28 items, based on the POS theory of Eisenberger et al. (1986). The validity and reliability of the self-constructed scale were evaluated using JASP software (version 0.18.1.0), as shown in Table 1. A total of 36 items were initially constructed, of which 28 met the criteria for validity and reliability. The item discrimination indices for this scale ranged from 0.289 to 0.724, with a reliability coefficient ( $\alpha$ ) of 0.920, these results indicate that the self-constructed POS scale meets the criteria for validity and reliability and suitable for use in this research. The POS scale employed a Likert response format with four options ranging from 1 ("strongly inappropriate") to 4 ("strongly appropriate").

**Table 1.** Validity and reliability test (POS Scale)

Item	If item dropped	Item-rest correlation
	Cronbach's $\alpha$	
X1	0.918	0.460
X2	0.913	0.744
X3	0.917	0.513
X5	0.913	0.722
X6	0.916	0.574
X8	0.916	0.599
X9	0.917	0.544
X10	0.919	0.422
X11	0.916	0.609
X12	0.916	0.569
X13	0.914	0.700
X15	0.915	0.688
X16	0.916	0.593
X18	0.920	0.342
X19	0.918	0.437
X20	0.918	0.479
X21	0.917	0.586
X22	0.918	0.464
X24	0.918	0.495
X25	0.916	0.590
X26	0.920	0.324
X27	0.917	0.525

X28	0.919	0.415
X29	0.917	0.558
X31	0.919	0.415
X33	0.918	0.434
X35	0.917	0.493
X36	0.921	0.280

EWB refers to a condition in which an employee feels prosperous or has a high level of satisfaction in both work and life, indicated by well-being achieved in psychological, life, and workplace domains. EWB was measured using a scale adapted by Rahmi et al. (2021) based on the EWB framework proposed by Zheng et al. (2015). This EWB scale consisted of 18 items, with item discrimination indices between 0.280 and 0.574 and a reliability coefficient ( $\alpha$ ) of 0.827. The EWB scale used a Likert format with six response options ranging from 1 (“strongly disagree”) to 6 (“strongly agree”).

A proportionate stratified sampling model was used in this study. In a proportionate sampling procedure, the proportion of subjects in each subgroup or stratum of the population must first be determined (Azwar, 2017). This proportion is then used to allocate the appropriate number of samples to each subgroup (Azwar, 2017). In this research, the total sample size was determined using Isaac and Michael’s sample size table with a 5% margin of error. Based on this table, a sample of 266 respondents was required from the population of 847 employees (this population size was rounded up to 850 for the table). To allocate the sample across each division, we applied proportionate stratified sampling using the formula:

$$ni = \frac{Ni}{N} \times n$$

- ni : sample size of each subgroup
- Ni : population size of each subgroup
- N : total population size
- n : total sample size

The data were analysed using a non-parametric statistical approach, namely Spearman’s rank correlation test. All analyses were carried out with the aid of JASP software (version 0.18.1.0).

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

According to Table 2, a linearity test (ANOVA) yielded an F-value of 5.644 for the relationship between perceived organisational support and employee well-being, with a significance level of  $p = 0.018$ . This result indicates that the relationship can be considered linear.

**Table 2.** Result ANOVA

Variable	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Y*X      Linearity	381.601	1	381.601	5.644	0.018

Table 3 shows that the p-value for the correlation is below 0.05, which means the two variables have a significant association. Thus, the hypothesis of this study that there is a positive relationship between perceived organisational support and employee well-being is supported. Moreover, Spearman’s rho was found to be 0.147, indicating a positive but weak correlation between the two

variables. This finding suggests that the higher the perceived organisational support provided by the organisation, the only slightly higher the employee well-being in that company.

**Table 3.** Result of hypotheses testing

Scale	Spearman rho	p-value
POS - EWB	0.147	0.008

Descriptive statistics in Table 4 indicate that the POS scale had a minimum score of 28, a maximum of 112, a mean of 70, and a standard deviation of 14. The EWB scale showed a minimum score of 18, a maximum of 108, a mean of 63, and a standard deviation of 15. These data were used to categorise participants into several groups for each variable.

**Table 4.** General description of variables scores' result

Variable	Statistic	Hypothetic	Empiric
Perceived Organisational Support (X)	Minimum	28	59
	Maximum	112	112
	Mean	70	84.528
	Standard Deviation	14	7.003
Employee Well-Being (Y)	Minimum	18	39
	Maximum	108	102
	Mean	63	84.445
	Standard Deviation	15	8.811

After performing the categorisation as shown in Table 5, it was found that 90.94% of the employees of PT X perceived the organisational support provided by the company to be in the high category. Additionally, 6.79% of the employees felt the support was in the very high category, and 2.26% of respondents reported low organisational support. This distribution suggests that, at a collective level, employees largely experience the organisation as responsive, appreciative, and attentive to their needs. Such a pattern is noteworthy because high perceived organisational support indicates that employees generally believe the company values their contributions and cares about their well-being: two perceptions central to the development of affective commitment (Eisenberger, 1986). The near absence of "very low" scores may also reflect the presence of consistent managerial practices or organisational policies that are broadly interpreted as fair and supportive across divisions.

From a theoretical standpoint, this predominance of high POS scores signifies that the socioemotional resources offered by the organisation are well internalised by employees, which may buffer them from work-related strain and foster a more positive psychological climate. Moreover, the relatively small proportion of employees reporting low support (2.26%) indicates pockets of variability that may reflect differences in supervisory practices, departmental culture, or workload distribution as factors known to influence perceptions of support.

**Table 5.** Categorisation and distribution of subjects on the perceived organisational support variable

Category	Very Low	Low	High	Very High
N	N = 0	N = 6	N = 241	N = 18
Percentage (%)	0%	2.26%	90.94%	6.79%

According to Table 6, employees of PT X generally had EWB levels that were high or very high, comprising 33.58% and 58.49% of the sample respectively. By contrast, employees with moderate levels of well-being made up only 7.55% of the sample, and 0.38% of subjects had very low well-being. This distribution offers a compelling indication that the majority of employees experience a favourable psychological and emotional state in relation to their work, suggesting that the organisational environment provides conditions conducive to sustaining high levels of well-being. The

dominance of the “very high” category implies that a substantial proportion of employees not only feel satisfied with their work and personal functioning but also experience consistently positive affective and cognitive evaluations of their job and life circumstances.

**Table 6.** Categorisation and distribution of subjects on the employee well-being variable

Category	Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Very High
N	N = 1	N = 0	N = 20	N = 89	N = 155
Percentage (%)	0.38%	0%	7.55%	33.58%	58.49%

To further enrich the findings of this study, additional analyses were conducted on the data. These analyses involved difference tests based on various demographic and job-related factors, including gender, age, division, and salary range. The difference tests employed were the non-parametric Mann-Whitney U and Kruskal-Wallis tests.

Table 7 presents the results of the gender-based difference test using the Mann-Whitney U. Although the mean POS score for female employees was marginally higher than that for male employees, and the mean EWB score for male employees was slightly higher than that for female employees, no significant differences were observed between the two groups ( $p > 0.05$ ). In other words, there was no statistically meaningful distinction between men and women in terms of either POS or EWB. This absence of significant difference suggests that organisational practices, supervisory treatment, and workplace conditions are likely experienced in a relatively uniform manner across genders within PT X. The consistency of these perceptions may reflect an organisational environment in which support and resources are distributed equitably, irrespective of gender.

From a broader theoretical standpoint, the lack of gender-based variation challenges assumptions that men and women systematically differ in how they interpret organisational treatment or experience workplace well-being (Deniz & Kocabaş, 2024). In some organisational contexts, differential access to resources, role expectations, or gendered divisions of labour may contribute to disparities in perceived support or levels of strain (Deniz & Kocabaş, 2024; Mascarenhas et al., 2022). However, the present findings indicate that such patterns are not prominent in this setting.

**Table 7.** Results of the gender-based difference test

Group	N	Mean Rank		Significance		
		Perceived Organisational Support	Employee Well-Being	Perceived Organisational Support	Employee Well-Being	
Gender	Male	179	83.939	84.788	0.093	0.125
	Female	86	85.756	83.733		

Based on the additional statistical analyses presented in Table 8, the age-based difference test using the Mann-Whitney U technique, as shown above, revealed no significant differences between the two age groups. This finding is indicated by significance values ( $p$ ) greater than 0.05, demonstrating that there is no statistically significant difference between the adult group and the pre-elderly group in both variables. The absence of significant differences across age groups suggests that employees, irrespective of whether they belong to the adult or pre-elderly category, tend to evaluate organisational support and their own well-being in a relatively similar manner. This uniformity implies that the organisational environment at PT X may provide a comparable level of support, resources, and managerial treatment across different age cohorts. Such consistency is important, as age-based disparities in support or well-being often arise in environments where job design, workload intensity, or leadership expectations differ systematically across age groups.

**Tabel 8.** Results of the age-based difference test

Group	N	Mean Rank		Significance	
		Perceived Organisational Support	Employee Well-Being	Perceived Organisational Support	Employee Well-Being
Age	Adult	212	84.698	84.764	0.338
	Pre-elderly	53	83.849	83.170	

Based on the results presented in Table 9, the Mann–Whitney U division-based difference test indicated that no significant differences were found between the administrative and field divisions on the POS variable. Interestingly, a significant difference was identified for the EWB variable, with the administrative division showing a mean rank of 84.333 and the field division showing a mean rank of 80.250. The significance value for employee well-being was 0.008, indicating a statistically significant difference between the administrative and field divisions, as the p-value is below 0.05.

The absence of divisional differences in POS suggests that employees across administrative and field roles generally interpret organisational care, fairness, and recognition in a similar manner. This pattern indicates that organisational support systems such as: supervisory practices, communication structures, and reward mechanisms may be applied consistently across divisions. However, the significant difference in EWB reveals that employees' lived experiences diverge once factors beyond organisational support are considered. Administrative employees, who typically work in more controlled environments with lower physical demands, may experience greater comfort, stability, and work-life balance, contributing to higher well-being. In contrast, field employees often face physically demanding tasks, environmental stressors, production pressures, and variable shift patterns, all of which are known to reduce well-being even when perceived support remains high. This finding reinforces the view that employee well-being is shaped not only by socioemotional support from the organisation but also by structural and job-specific conditions inherent to different divisions within the company.

**Tabel 9.** Results of the division difference test

Group	N	Mean Rank		Signifikansi	
		Perceived Organisational Support	Employee Well-Being	Perceived Organisational Support	Employee Well-Being
Division	Admin	24	84.333	80.250	0.365
	Field	241	84.548	84.863	

Additionally, we also conducted salary range difference test (Table 10). In this study, salary range refers to the grouping of employees based on their monthly income expressed in million Rupiah (e.g., range 1–2 million, 2–3 million, and so forth). Based on the Kruskal-Wallis difference test presented in the Table 9, no significant differences were found between groups on the POS variable, as indicated by significance values greater than 0.05. However, for the EWB variable, a significant difference was identified between salary range groups one and two, with a p-value of 0.017. This indicates that employee well-being differs significantly between employees in salary range one and those in salary range two, as the significance value is below 0.05.

The absence of salary-based differences in POS suggests that employees across all income levels perceive organisational support in a relatively similar manner, indicating consistent organisational practices or uniform supervisory treatment. In contrast, the significant difference in EWB between salary groups one and two implies that income level may shape employees' psychological and life

satisfaction more strongly than their perceived support. Employees in higher salary brackets may experience reduced financial strain, greater autonomy, or better access to personal resources, all of which can enhance well-being independently of organisational support. This pattern reinforces the argument that well-being is a multidimensional construct influenced not only by organisational factors but also by material and socioeconomic conditions that differ across salary groups.

**Tabel 10.** Results of the salary range difference test

Group	Significance		
	Perceived Organisational Support	Employee Well-Being	
Salary Range (in million Rupiah)	1-2	0.813	0.017
	1-3	0.933	0.443
	1-4	1.000	0.702
	2-3	0.994	0.999
	2-4	0.994	0.095
	3-4	0.981	0.229

This study was conducted with the aim of examining the relationship between POS and EWB at PT X. Data analysis employed a non-parametric Spearman correlational test which produced a significance value of 0.008 ( $p < 0.05$ ) with a correlation coefficient of 0.147. Based on these results, it was established that perceived organisational support and employee well-being are positively related in a weak yet statistically significant manner. In line with these findings, it can be concluded that the hypothesis proposed in this research is supported. This suggests that while organisational support plays a role in shaping employees' psychological functioning, it contributes only modestly to well-being within the context of PT X.

Although this study and previous research both demonstrate a significant positive relationship between POS and EWB, the positive relationship identified here is weak, whereas earlier studies have reported stronger associations. For example, Dimas and Pratiwi (2022), in their study conducted at PT X Majalaya, found a strong and significant positive relationship between perceived organisational support and employee well-being. This finding is further supported by research from Mustika and Martdianty (2023), which identified perceived organisational support as the most influential factor shaping employee well-being. In addition to aligning with the findings of Dimas and Pratiwi (2022) and Mustika and Martdianty (2023), the present study is consistent with Wattoo et al. (2018), who demonstrated that employee well-being is strongly dependent on the extent of support and appreciation provided by the organisation; such organisational support not only reduces work–family conflict but also enhances positive perceptions of work–life balance. The divergence between the results of this study and previous studies prompted the researcher to conduct additional analyses. This research is also relevant to the findings of Andriany et al. (2023), who reported that higher perceived organisational support predicts higher levels of subjective career success among teachers, with organisational support contributing approximately 26.2% to subjective career success. Additional literature from international contexts further strengthens the present findings. For instance, Wattoo et al. (2018) reported that perceived organisational support is positively associated with employee well-being by reducing work–family conflict and enhancing positive feelings associated with balancing professional and family life. A review by Eisenberger et al. (2024) similarly emphasised that organisational concern for employees has measurable effects on enhancing both well-being and performance. Furthermore, Zulkifli and Hamzah (2024), in the context of low-income working mothers in Malaysia, found that supervisory support positively influences both job outcomes and psychological well-being.

A meaningful aspect emerging from this study is the contrast between the empirical data and the issues identified during the preliminary exploration. Prior to data collection, employees raised

concerns related to fairness in KPI assessments, inadequate supervisory problem-solving, and discomfort in production areas due to high temperatures. The absence of these issues in the final results suggests that organisational conditions may have improved between September 2024 and May 2025. This temporal shift highlights how organisational improvements, such as revised managerial practices or changes in workplace infrastructure, can substantially alter employees' perceptions of support and well-being. It also underscores the dynamic nature of organisational experiences, where employee attitudes and well-being are sensitive to changes in policy, communication, workload, and environmental conditions.

Additional analyses were conducted by performing difference tests across employee subgroups based on age, gender, division, and salary range. A difference test is a statistical procedure used to compare two or more groups to determine whether meaningful differences exist between them (Sugiyono, 2020). According to Malay (2022), for non-parametric testing, difference tests are performed using the Mann–Whitney U and Kruskal–Wallis techniques. Based on the results of these tests, a significant difference was found between employees in the administrative and field divisions on the employee well-being variable, with a significance value of 0.008 ( $p < 0.05$ ). Furthermore, a significant difference was also found between salary range groups one and two on employee well-being, with a significance value of 0.017 ( $p < 0.05$ ). Based on the difference tests performed, the researcher concludes that the discrepancies between this study's findings and previous studies arise because of significant differences within certain subgroups. These differences include variations between administrative and field divisions, as well as differences between employees in salary range groups one and two. These variations correspond to issues identified in the company during the initial problem exploration phase. For example, workload differences at PT X vary considerably depending on position and division. Furthermore, the company's salary policy adjusts to employees' responsibilities and workload levels, creating a competitive work environment. Although employees receive monetary bonuses as a form of appreciation for their performance, some nevertheless feel entitled to greater recognition than their colleagues within the same department.

Recent theoretical developments also highlight the role of organisational dehumanisation perceptions as an important psychological pathway linking POS to well-being. Caesens et al. (2017) demonstrated across two studies that higher POS reduces feelings of being dehumanised by the organisation, and that this reduction mediates the relationship between POS and EWB indicators such as job satisfaction, emotional exhaustion and psychosomatic strain. These findings emphasise that POS matters not only because it signals appreciation, but also because it communicates that employees are treated as full human beings rather than as mere instruments of productivity. Within the context of this study, the predominance of high EWB scores may reflect low levels of dehumanisation across groups; however, structural differences between divisions and salary brackets could introduce differential exposure to exhaustion or strain, thereby weakening the overall strength of the POS–EWB relationship. This interpretation aligns with the broader view that organisational support must be evaluated in tandem with the quality of interpersonal treatment and dignity at work (Caesens et al., 2017).

The categorisation results further emphasise that employees generally experience high POS and very high EWB. This pattern indicates that the organisation provides a wide range of socioemotional and instrumental resources that employees perceive as supportive. However, the weak correlation between POS and EWB suggests that additional factors, such as job autonomy, workload distribution, interpersonal climate, or individual psychological resources, may exert a more prominent role in shaping well-being. The literature supports this interpretation; several studies highlight that employee well-being is shaped by multiple drivers, including supervisor support (Zulkifli & Hamzah, 2024), psychological capital (Le et al., 2023), and fulfilment of psychological contracts (Aselage & Eisenberger, 2003). Thus, while POS forms an important foundation, EWB appears to be strengthened through a broader constellation of workplace and personal factors.

Although preliminary observations indicated that employees at PT X did not exhibit overt problems related to employee well-being, this does not diminish the importance of systematically examining the factors that sustain such favourable conditions. High well-being levels warrant empirical investigation because they may mask underlying structural disparities, such as workload imbalances, production pressures, and divisional differences that are common in the manufacturing sector. Understanding why well-being is high, and whether organisational support meaningfully contributes to this pattern. Therefore it is essential for ensuring the sustainability of these outcomes, particularly in an industry characterised by physically demanding tasks, strict output targets, and fluctuating work demands. Furthermore, the apparent absence of well-being problems highlights the value of conducting confirmatory research to determine whether strong well-being is the result of effective organisational practices or whether it persists despite contextual challenges. Such examination provides organisations with evidence-based insight into which practices should be maintained, strengthened, or adjusted to preserve employee well-being over time.

The findings of this study can also be interpreted through emerging evidence demonstrating that POS strengthens employees' psychological resources beyond the work domain. Le et al. (2023) showed that familial support enhances employee well-being through increases in psychological capital, and that this indirect effect becomes significantly stronger when POS is high. This suggests that organisational support acts as an important contextual amplifier, enabling employees to better utilise external support systems and personal strengths to maintain well-being. In relation to the present study, the weak POS–EWB correlation may indicate that employees' exceptionally high well-being is also supported by other psychosocial resources, such as family support or personal resilience, which may reduce the proportion of well-being attributable solely to POS. These findings collectively point to the need to conceptualise EWB as the product of multiple interacting resource systems rather than organisational support alone (Le et al., 2023).

Differences identified through subgroup analyses provide further insight into why this study diverges from previous findings. Significant differences in EWB were observed between administrative and field employees and between employees in the first and second salary ranges. These findings correspond with known organisational realities at PT X, where workload intensity, physical working conditions, and remuneration structures differ substantially across divisions and job levels. Employees in field or production areas often experience higher physical demands and environmental stressors, whereas administrative employees may have more stable working conditions and better access to resources. Similarly, salary differences often reflect variations in job demands and responsibilities, which can shape perceptions of fairness, achievement, and satisfaction. The existence of these structural disparities likely weakens the direct POS–EWB relationship by introducing additional intervening variables that differentially influence employees' well-being.

In addition to the findings that differ slightly from previous research, the present study identified that the data distribution of the two scales used was not normal. This was caused by differences in the number of Likert response options between the scales: the perceived organisational support scale had four response options, whereas the employee well-being scale had six. Participants completed the POS scale first, followed by the EWB scale. On the POS scale, respondents became accustomed to response formats such as S (*sesuai*) or TS (*tidak sesuai*), and this response pattern appeared to carry over when they completed the EWB scale, which included options such as AS (*agak sesuai*) and KS (*kurang sesuai*). According to Pallant (2020), the type of response format selected can influence the results of statistical analysis. Therefore, differences in response options between scales may have caused confusion among respondents. For some participants, this may have been their first experience completing a questionnaire, making it essential to provide clear instructions and ensure that no confusion occurred during the process (Pallant, 2020). Because the data were not normally distributed, the results of this study cannot be generalised. Finally, methodological considerations contribute to the interpretation of these findings. The use of different Likert response formats across scales may have created response inconsistencies, particularly among respondents unfamiliar with psychometric instruments. This

methodological artefact explains the non-normal data distribution, which limits generalisability and may attenuate observed relationships.

Broader theoretical perspectives also help explain these findings. According to organisational support theory (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Eisenberger et al., 2024), POS enhances affective commitment and reduces strain by signalling that the organisation values its employees. However, the theory also acknowledges that POS operates within a wider set of social-exchange and reciprocity mechanisms. In settings where workload, salary distribution, and environmental conditions vary, employees may place greater weight on these contextual factors than on organisational support alone when evaluating their overall well-being.

The strategic significance of POS is further reinforced by studies conducted in diverse organisational settings. Dutta (2025) found that among Indian MSMEs, POS significantly enhances EWB and serves as a vital moderator that strengthens the effects of work engagement and telecommuting satisfaction. In a similar vein, research by Viot and Benraiss-Noailles (2025) demonstrated that POS promotes both positive well-being and reduced negative well-being, which in turn decreases employees' intentions to leave and increases their likelihood of recommending the organisation. Together, these studies highlight that organisational support plays a pivotal role in fostering employee retention, loyalty, and advocacy. These insights are particularly relevant given the structural differences observed in this study between administrative and field employees, indicating that disparities in work conditions may limit the extent to which POS can effectively enhance well-being and retention intentions across all groups.

Finally, disparities in workload or compensation can reduce resource gain, thereby weakening the influence of POS. Nevertheless, the overall pattern of results remains meaningful: while employees perceive high support and experience high well-being, the two constructs are not tightly coupled within this organisational context. Instead, well-being appears to be shaped by a wider set of organisational, interpersonal, and individual-level factors, highlighting the need for a more holistic approach to EWB in the manufacturing sector.

## CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, this study found a significant but weak positive relationship between perceived organisational support (POS) and employee well-being (EWB) among the employees of PT X. The correlation coefficient was 0.147 with a p-value of 0.008 ( $p < 0.05$ ), supporting the research hypothesis. The majority of employees reported high levels of POS and very high levels of EWB, indicating favourable perceptions of organisational support and workplace well-being. However, the comparatively weak relationship observed in this study (versus the strong relationships reported in prior research) is explained by significant differences across certain subgroups: particularly between administrative and field employees, and among employees in specific salary ranges. Additionally, the divergence in findings was influenced by methodological factors such as a non-normal data distribution resulting from different Likert scale formats used in the measures. Consequently, the results of this study cannot be fully generalised, although the study still offers an empirical contribution to understanding the relationship between POS and EWB.

It is recommended that future researchers exercise strict supervision during questionnaire administration to ensure that each participant completes the questionnaire correctly and consistently. Moreover, to avoid respondent confusion due to differing Likert scale formats, researchers should consider using a uniform Likert scale throughout the questionnaire or provide very clear instructions on how to respond before the questionnaire begins. These measures are expected to yield data that are more normally distributed, satisfy statistical assumptions, and potentially result in a stronger positive relationship in the findings.

## REFERENCES

- Alkasim, M. A., & Prahara, S. A. (2019). Perceived organizational support dengan employee engagement pada karyawan. *Psikoislamedia Jurnal Psikologi*, 4, 1–10.
- Andriany, D., Lembang, A. D., & Ingarianti, T. M. (2023). Peran perceived organizational support terhadap subjective career success pada guru. *Intuisi: Jurnal Psikologi Ilmiah*, 15 (2).
- Aselage, J., & Eisenberger, R. (2003). Perceived organizational support and psychological contracts: A theoretical integration. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24(5), 491-509. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.211>
- Arthabawan, I. W. (2018). Pemeliharaan sumber daya manusia menjadi faktor penting dalam perusahaan. *Jurnal Kajian Ekonomi dan Bisnis*, 11(1), 206–213.
- Azwar, S. (2017). *Metode penelitian psikologi* (2 ed.). Pustaka Pelajar.
- Caesens, G., Stinglhamber, F., Demoulin, S., & De Wilde, M. (2017). Perceived organizational support and employees' well-being: The mediating role of organizational dehumanization. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 26(4), 527-540. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2017.1319817>
- Deniz, Ü., & Kocabaş, C. (2024). Understanding the relationship between perceived organizational support and psychological well-being: Perspectives of Turkish faculty members. *Higher Learning Research Communications*, 14(1), 51–67. <https://doi.org/10.18870/hlrc.v14i1.1441>
- Dimas, W., & Pratiwi, E. A. (2022). Hubungan antara perceived organizational support dengan employee wellbeing pada karyawan di PT. X Majalaya. *Jurnal Psikologi Insight*, 6(2), 93–102.
- Dutta, D., Kannan Poyil, A., & Vedak, C. (2025). Examining HRM practices emerging out of COVID-19 in the MSME sector: Impact of employee engagement, perceived organizational support and well-being. *Employee Relations*, 47(7), 1088-1105. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-07-2024-0383>
- 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., Shanock, L. R., & Wen, X. (2024). Annual review of organizational psychology and organizational behavior perceived organizational support: why caring about employees counts. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 17, 22. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012119>
- 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*. <https://www.siop.org/Portals/84/docs/SIOP-SHRM%20White%20Papers/SHRM-SIOP%20POS.pdf>
- Harahap, A., Safitri, F., & Fitriyani, R. (2023). Dampak manajemen sumber daya manusia (SDM) terhadap kinerja organisasi: Kemajuan dan prospek. *Jurnal Kajian Ilmiah Interdisipliner*, 7(12), 1–15.
- Hartoyo, L. A. K., & Oktaria, Y. (2025). Dampak regulasi K3 terhadap produktivitas dan kesejahteraan pekerja. *Indonesian Journal of Public Health and Nutrition*, 5 (1), 51–62.
- Kanyumba, B., Daweti, B., Mathews, M. P., & Khumalo, N. (2024). Strategies to enhance employee wellbeing in an institution of higher learning in South Africa. *Journal of Management and Business Education*, 7(2), 261–276. <https://doi.org/10.35564/jmbe.2024.0015>
- Le, H., Gopalan, N., Lee, J., Kirige, I., Haque, A., Yadav, V., & Lambropoulos, V. (2023). Impact of work and non-work support on employee well-being: The moderating role of perceived organizational support. *Sustainability*, 15(22), 15808. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su152215808>
- Livingston, V., Jackson-Nevels, B., & Reddy, V. V. (2022). Social, cultural, and economic determinants of well-being. *Encyclopedia*, 2(3), 1183–1199. <https://doi.org/10.3390/encyclopedia2030079>
- Lumbanraja, H. D. (2015). Pengaruh program kesejahteraan karyawan terhadap motivasi kerja karyawan pada perguruan tinggi Advent Surya Nusantara Pematangsiantar. *Jurnal Akuntansi dan Manajemen*, 2(10), 60–78.
- Malay, M. N. (2022). *Analisis data dengan SPSS dan JASP*. CV. Madani Jaya.
- Mascarenhas, C., Galvão, A. R., & Marques, C. S. (2022). How perceived organizational support, identification with organization and work engagement influence job satisfaction: A gender-based perspective. *Administrative Sciences*, 12(2), 66. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci12020066>

- Mustika, M. I., & Martdianty, F. (2023). Factors Influencing employee's well-being and job performance: The perspective of state-owned enterprise employee. *IJHCM (International Journal of Human Capital Management)*, 7(1), 86–103. <https://doi.org/10.21009/ijhcm.07.01.7>
- Pallant, J. (2020). *SPSS survival manual a step by step guide to data analysis using IBM SPSS* (7 ed.). [www.routledgetextbooks.com/textbooks/9781760875534](http://www.routledgetextbooks.com/textbooks/9781760875534)
- Pradhan, R. K., & Hati, L. (2022). The measurement of employee well-being: Development and validation of a scale. *Global Business Review*, 23(2), 385–407. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0972150919859101>
- Putri, E. Y., Putri, A., Rahma, A., & Maolani, F. M. (2022). Penerapan praktek manajemen sumber daya manusia dan hubungannya dengan kinerja karyawan. *Jurnal Ekobis: Ekonomi, Bisnis & Manajemen*, 12, 343–356. <http://ejournal.stiemj.ac.id/index.php/ekobis>
- Rahmi, T., Agustiani, H., Harding, D., & Fitriana, E. (2021). Adaptasi employee well-being scale (EWBS) versi bahasa indonesia. *Jurnal Psikologi*, 17, 93–101. <https://doi.org/10.24014/jp.v14i2.13112>
- Sugiyono. (2020). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta.
- Suheny, E., Kusumawati, R. R., & Handayani, I. (2021). Pengaruh beban gaji, upah dan kesejahteraan karyawan terhadap model altman z-scores. *Jurnal Revenue: Jurnal Ilmiah Akuntansi*, 1(2), 171–181. <https://doi.org/10.46306/rev.v1i2.21>
- Syamsurizal. (2016). *Peranan manajemen sumber daya manusia dalam organisasi*.
- Tsui, A. S., Pearce, J. L., Porter, L. W., & Tripoli, A. M. (1997). Alternative approaches to the employee-organization relationship: Does investment in employees pay off? In *Source: The Academy of Management Journal* (Vol. 40, Nomor 5).
- Viot, C., & Benraiss-Noailles, L. (2025). Advocacy versus depart: How perceived organizational support influences employee well-being and shapes their intentions. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 31(1), 195-214. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2024.60>
- Wattoo, M. A., Zhao, S., & Xi, M. (2018). Perceived organizational support and employee well-being: Testing the mediatory role of work–family facilitation and work–family conflict. *Chinese Management Studies*, 12(2), 469–484. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CMS-07-2017-0211>
- Wright, T. A., & Cropanzano, R. (2000). Psychological well-being and job satisfaction as predictors of job performance. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(1), 84–94. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.5.1.84>
- Zheng, X., Zhu, W., Zhao, H., & Zhang, C. (2015). Employee well-being in organizations: Theoretical model, scale development, and cross-cultural validation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36(5), 621–644. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1990>
- Zulkifli, S. S., & Hamzah, H. (2024). The importance of supervisor support for the work outcomes and psychological well-being of Malaysian low-income working mothers. *Psikohumaniora: Jurnal Penelitian Psikologi*, 9(1), 159–178. <https://doi.org/10.21580/pjpp.v9i1.20756>