

1 Reliability and Validity of the Japanese Version of the Survey of Perceived Organizational Support

2

3 Kiminori Odagami¹, Tomohisa Nagata¹, Hisashi Eguchi², Akiomi Inoue³, Kosuke Mafune², Koji
4 Mori¹

5

6 ¹ Department of Occupational Health Practice and Management, Institute of Industrial Ecological
7 Sciences, University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan, 1-1 Iseigaoka, Yahatanishi-ku,
8 Kitakyushu 807-8555, Japan

9 ² Department of Mental Health, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences, University of Occupational
10 and Environmental Health, Japan, 1-1 Iseigaoka, Yahatanishi-ku, Kitakyushu 807-8555, Japan

11 ³ Institutional Research Center, University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan, 1-1
12 Iseigaoka, Yahatanishi-ku, Kitakyushu 807-8555, Japan

13

14 Correspondence

15 Kiminori Odagami, Department of Occupational Health Practice and Management, Institute of Industrial
16 Ecological Sciences, University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan, 1-1 Iseigaoka,
17 Yahatanishi-ku, Kitakyushu 807-8555, Japan. Tel. +81-93-691-7523; Fax +81-93-692-4590; Email:
18 k-odagami@med.uoeh-u.ac.jp

19

20 Author contributions

21 KO and TN, HE, KosM, KojM designed the study; KO and TN, HE, KojM participated in the
22 development of the Japanese version of the scale; KO and KojM, AI analyzed the data; KO led the
23 writing of the manuscript, and all other authors were involved in the drafting the manuscript. All authors
24 read and approved the final manuscript.

25

26 Running title

27 JAPANESE SPOS RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY

28

29 ABSTRACT

30 Objectives: This study aimed to validate the Japanese version of the Survey of Perceived Organizational
31 Support (SPOS-J) for the Japanese workforce by examining its reliability, factorial, construct, and
32 test-retest validity.

33 Methods: We conducted an online baseline survey with 6,220 employed Japanese individuals, followed
34 by a follow-up survey two weeks later to examine the test-retest reliability of the SPOS-J. The SPOS-J
35 was translated in accordance with the ISPOR Task Force Guidelines. Both confirmatory and exploratory
36 factor analyses were utilized to examine factorial validity. Construct validity was assessed using
37 Pearson's correlation analysis, while internal consistency was determined through the calculation of
38 Cronbach's alpha values. Additionally, test-retest reliability was evaluated with Cohen's weighted kappa
39 and intraclass correlation coefficients.

40 Results: The SPOS-J demonstrated a better fit for a two-factor structure, comprising two subscales -
41 SPOS-J (supported) and SPOS-J (unsupported) – compared to the one-factor structure of the original
42 version. It exhibited high internal consistency, with Cronbach's alpha coefficients of .93 for the overall
43 SPOS-J, .97 for the SPOS-J (supported), and .95 for the SPOS-J (unsupported). Test-retest reliability
44 was found to be good for the overall SPOS-J (.62) and moderate for its subscales, with Cohen's weighted
45 kappa values of .54 for SPOS-J (supported) and .42 for SPOS-J (unsupported). The construct validity
46 was confirmed with significant correlations between the SPOS-J, its antecedents, and outcomes.

47 Conclusions: The SPOS-J is a reliable and valid measure for assessing perceived organizational support
48 among Japanese workers.

49 1. INTRODUCTION

50 Perceived Organizational Support (POS) is a concept proposed by Eisenberger et al.¹ in 1986, and is
51 defined as "global beliefs concerning the extent to which the organization values their contributions and
52 cares about their well-being." A major characteristic of POS is that it focuses not on the company's
53 (management and human resource management department's) point of view, but on the employee's point
54 of view, i.e., how the employees who work there feel about the company. POS is based on social
55 exchange theory, the theory that human beings form and develop relationships through the exchange of
56 various tangible and intangible rewards¹. Therefore, it is based on the idea that the more support an
57 employee feels from the organization, the more favorable the employee feels toward the organization,
58 and the more the employee will make further efforts to contribute to the achievement of the
59 organization's goals. Therefore, POS is seen as a concept with important benefits for both employees and
60 organizations, and research on POS began to increase in the mid-1990s and has progressed rapidly in
61 recent years.

62 Studies have shown a relationship between POS and a variety of health-related indicators.
63 Antecedents of POS include procedural justice² (i.e., one of the sub-concepts of organizational justice),
64 supervisor support^{3,4}, organizational rewards⁵, and job conditions⁶⁻⁸, while outcome factors include
65 emotional commitment to the organization³, job satisfaction⁹, performance^{10,11}, and withdrawal
66 behavior^{4,12}. Many of these antecedent and outcome factors are positively correlated with POS. On the
67 other hand, antecedent factors such as job conditions (role ambiguity⁷, role conflict⁸, size of
68 organization⁷) and organizational politics¹³, and outcome factors such as withdrawal behavior (turnover

69 intentions¹², turnover⁴) and strains are negatively correlated with POS.

70 A representative measure of POS is the Survey of Perceived Organizational Support (SPOS)¹⁴. The
71 SPOS is a 36-question measure developed by Eisenberger et al. in 1986¹. In much of the past literature,
72 the original version of the SPOS was one-dimensional and had high internal reliability, leading to the use
73 of shortened versions such as the 16-item version¹ and the 8-item version⁶. Studies using the SPOS have
74 been conducted mainly in English-speaking countries, European countries, and China, and besides the
75 English version, Malay¹⁵ and Turkish¹⁶ versions of the SPOS have been developed. However, there is
76 currently no Japanese version of the SPOS that has been tested for reliability and validity; therefore,
77 studies have been conducted using original questionnaire items that reflect the POS concept¹⁷, and it has
78 not been possible to compare findings from Japanese studies with those from foreign studies.

79 Currently, in many developed countries, including Japan, the working-age population is declining due
80 to the low birthrate and aging population¹⁸. Therefore, companies are faced with the need to make
81 strategic efforts to improve POS by showing active consideration for the well-being of their employees,
82 and to aim at improving corporate performance and curbing employee turnover behavior through
83 improving employee job satisfaction and work engagement. Furthermore, since companies need to build
84 good relationships with diverse employees due to the recent diversification of employee employment
85 patterns and needs, concepts, and indicators that reflect employees' evaluations and opinions of the
86 company, such as POS, are considered useful in verifying the effectiveness of personnel policies that aim
87 to absorb diversity.

88 The purpose of this study is to examine the reliability and validity of the Japanese version of the

89 SPOS (SPOS-J) for the general workforce in Japan. More specifically, we examined its factorial and
90 construct validity as well as its reliability (i.e., internal consistency and test-retest reliability).

91

92 2. METHODS

93 2.1 Participants

94 A baseline online survey was conducted from January 24 to February 3, 2022, among registrants of
95 Cross Marketing Inc. (Tokyo, Japan), a private online survey firm in Japan. As of January 2022, there
96 were approximately 2.95 million registered participants, from which 102,032 were randomly selected to
97 receive participation invitations via e-mail. Of these, 15,676 responded to the preliminary survey and
98 participated in the main survey (baseline survey) if they met all of the screening criteria: (1) age 20–64,
99 (2) currently working, and (3) employed (full-time, contract, temporary, part-time, or casual employee).
100 For this baseline survey, the sample was collected based on data from the 2020 Labor Force Survey
101 (Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications), stratified by gender (men: 54.4%, women: 45.6%),
102 age (20–29: 18.6%, 30–39: 21.1%, 40–49: 27.7%, 50–59: 24.0%, 60–64: 8.7%), and region of residence
103 (Hokkaido: 3.8%, Tohoku: 6.5%, South Kanto: 31.6%, North Kanto/Koshin: 7.4%, Hokuriku: 4.1%,
104 Tokai: 12.2%, Kinki: 15.7%, Chugoku: 5.5%, Shikoku: 2.6%, Kyushu/Okinawa: 10.5%). Responses to
105 this survey were on a first-come, first-served basis, and due to budget constraints, the target number of
106 respondents was set at 6,000, and once the final 6,220 respondents were reached, the recruitment process
107 was closed because the sample was collected at a stratified percentage.

108 In addition, to examine the test-retest reliability of the SPOS-J, a follow-up study using the SPOS-J

109 was conducted two weeks after the baseline study. The follow-up survey was administered to those
110 respondents to the baseline survey who answered "no" to both (1) "changed workplaces within the past
111 two weeks" and (2) "had a significant change in workplaces within the past two weeks" at the time of
112 their follow-up survey responses. As in the baseline survey, responses were on a first-come, first-served
113 basis, and the survey was closed when the number of respondents reached 452. Because the online
114 survey required all questions to be answered, no participants had incomplete responses.

115

116 2.2 Measures

117 2.2.1 SPOS-J

118 The Japanese version of SPOS was prepared in accordance with International Society for
119 Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research (ISPOR) Task Force Guidelines¹⁹. First, permission for
120 Japanese translation was obtained from the original author (Robert Eisenberger), and the original version
121 of SPOS¹ was independently translated into Japanese by four native Japanese-speaking researchers (KO,
122 TN, HE, and KM), and a draft Japanese version was prepared after discussion among the researchers.
123 Next, native experts who had not read the original text were asked to translate the draft Japanese version
124 into English. The original author reviewed the back-translated English version, and the draft Japanese
125 version was revised. Since there is no corresponding Japanese word for "well-being" and the specific
126 image of "well-being" varies from person to person, we consulted with the original author and added the
127 definition from the Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English²⁰, adding that it is in the context of
128 work, "a feeling of being comfortable, healthy, and happy through work" was added as a supplementary

129 explanation. Next, as a cognitive debriefing, we asked five workers of various occupations and ages
130 collected through snowball sampling for their opinions by asking them, "Please advise us if you have
131 any difficulty understanding or answering any questions in Japanese. As a result, minor comments were
132 received, including suggestions for the use of more easily understood verbs and adjectives. The four
133 researchers considered the pros and cons of reflecting these comments in the translation, and adjusted
134 the translation so that it would not affect the meaning when translated into English. The Japanese version
135 of SPOS (SPOS-J) was thus completed.

136 The SPOS-J consists of 36 items, and as in the original version of the SPOS, respondents were asked
137 to respond to each item on a 7-point scale (0 = strongly disagree to 6 = strongly agree). Of the 36 items,
138 18 items asked for positive content, while the remaining 18 items asked for negative content. The
139 scoring of the latter items asking about negative content was reversed, with higher scores for all items
140 indicating a higher POS. Finally, the average score for the 36 items was calculated.

141

142 2.2.2 Relevant Variables

143 In this study, the following indicators were selected based on the fact that existing studies have shown
144 that these indicators have a strong correlation with POS¹⁴ and that valid Japanese language scales are
145 available for use. Role conflict from job conditions and intention to leave from withdrawal behavior
146 were selected as indicators of negative correlation with POS.

147

148 Possible antecedents

149 · Supervisor Support : The corresponding subscale of the New Brief Job Stress Questionnaire (New
150 BJSQ) was used. The New BJSQ has been validated with Japanese workers and found to have
151 acceptable levels of internal consistency, reliability, and construct validity on almost all subscales²¹.
152 Three items from the New BJSQ regarding supervisor support (e.g., How freely can you talk with your
153 supervisor?) were rated using a 4-point scale (1 = extremely to 4 = not at all). The scores were reversed
154 in the analysis to make them more intuitive and easier to understand, and the average score for the three
155 items was calculated. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient for this scale was .88.

156 · Organizational Justice (procedural justice/ interactional justice) : Using the Japanese version of the
157 Organizational Justice Scale²², which is the Japanese version of the modified version of the
158 Organizational Justice Scale²³ developed by Moorman²⁴, we rated each of the two subscales, procedural
159 justice (7 items) and interactional justice (6 items), using a 5-point scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 =
160 strongly agree) and calculated the mean score. Cronbach's alpha coefficients for these subscales were .94
161 and .96 for procedural and interaction justice, respectively.

162 · Role conflict : One item on the New BJSQ ("I receive incompatible requests from two or more people")
163 was rated using the four-point scale (1 = definitely to 4 = not at all), and the scores were reversed in the
164 analysis for easier understanding.

165

166 Possible outcomes

167 · Job Satisfaction : One item ("I am satisfied with my job") from the New BJSQ was used to evaluate the
168 results. This indicator was rated using a 4-point scale (1 = satisfied to 4 = dissatisfied), and the scores

169 were reversed in the analysis for ease of understanding.

170 · Organizational (Affective) commitment : Three items from the Japan Institute of Labour (Current The
171 Japan Institute for Labour Policy and Training) Human Resource Management checklist²⁵ regarding
172 affective commitment (e.g., "I feel as if this company's problems are my own problems") were evaluated
173 using a 5-point scale (1 = not at all true to 5 = very true), and the average score was calculated. The
174 Cronbach's alpha coefficient for this scale was .73.

175 · Turnover intention : A one-question shortened version of the Japanese version of the Turnover Intention
176 Scale²⁶ ("How often have you seriously considered quitting your current job?") was used and rated using
177 a 6-point scale (1 = not at all to 6 = very often).

178

179 2.2.3 Demographic Characteristics

180 Participant demographic items were collected at the time of the baseline survey. In addition to gender
181 (men, women) and age, respondents were asked to provide their final education (junior high school/high
182 school, vocational school/junior college, university/graduate school), household income (< 3.00 million
183 Japanese yen (JPY), 3.00–4.99 million JPY, 5.00–9.99 million JPY, and 10.00 million JPY or greater),
184 and job type (administrative, professional/technical, clerical, sales, service, security,
185 agriculture/forestry/fishing, production process jobs, transportation/machine operation,
186 construction/mining, transportation/cleaning/packaging, and others) based on the Japan Standard
187 Occupational Classification (statistical standard established in December 2009).

188

189 2.3 Statistical Analysis

190 A confirmatory factor analysis was performed using a one-factor model for SPOS-J based on the
191 original version of SPOS¹ by Eisenberger et al. Model fit was evaluated using a combination of
192 goodness-of-fit indices, including χ^2 goodness-of-fit statistic, Root Mean Square Error of Approximation
193 (RMSEA), Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC), Comparative Fit Index (CFI), and Standardized root
194 mean squared residual (SRMR). Acceptable model fit criteria were defined as RMSEA and SRMR <
195 0.08 and CFI > 0.90²⁷. In case the results of the confirmatory factor analysis showed a poor fit of the
196 one-factor model, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted. Exploratory factor analysis (maximum
197 likelihood method, promax rotation) was performed on all 36 items of the SPOS-J, and the number of
198 factors was determined at the junction where the cumulative contribution exceeds 50%. A confirmatory
199 factor analysis was performed on the factor structure supported by the exploratory factor analysis, and
200 the model goodness of fit was compared to the one-factor structure of the original version.

201 To assess construct validity, Pearson's correlation coefficients were calculated for the SPOS-J
202 (including subscales) with the antecedents (supervisor support, organizational justice, and role conflict)
203 and outcome factors assumed above (job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover
204 intention). Following Cohen²⁸, we describe effects as small (0.10), medium (0.30), and large (0.50). To
205 assess internal consistency, we calculated Cronbach's alpha coefficients for the SPOS-J and its subscales.

206 To assess test-retest reliability, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test was first used to check whether the
207 SPOS-J and its subscales, each of the 36 items, followed a normal distribution. Since these were found
208 not to follow a normal distribution, Cohen's linearly weighted kappa coefficients were calculated for

209 each and evaluated using Landis & Koch criteria²⁹ (poor: -1.00 to 0.20; reasonable: 0.20 to 0.40;
210 moderate: 0.41 to 0.60; good: 0.61 to 0.80; and very good: 0.81 to 1.00) . The intraclass correlation
211 coefficient (ICC [1,1]) and standard error of measurement (SEM) were calculated as parametric statistics
212 for test-retest reliability as reference values. Data from 452 individuals who responded to the follow-up
213 survey were used to calculate Cohen's weighted kappa coefficient, ICC, and SEM.

214 The significance level was set at 0.05 (two-tailed). All analyses were performed using IBM SPSS
215 Statistics Version 27.0, Stata version 16.

216

217 3 . RESULTS

218 3.1 Characteristics of participants

219 Table 1 shows the number of participants in the baseline and follow-up surveys and the characteristics
220 of the participants. In the baseline survey, participants had the same gender and age distribution as in the
221 data from the 2020 Labor Force Survey (Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications), and
222 participants' annual household income of 5.00–9.99 million JPY was the highest (43.2%), and 50.5% of
223 participants had a college degree or higher as their final education level. The most common occupations
224 were clerical, professional/technical, and service, in that order. There were no significant differences in
225 gender, age, final education, or occupation between baseline and follow-up.

226

227 3.2 Factorial validity

228 Based on the original version of the SPOS, a confirmatory factor analysis was performed on the

229 SPOS-J with a one-factor model, and the model fit was significantly lower ($\chi^2 = 85197$; $P < 0.001$,
230 RMSEA = 0.151, SRMR = 0.245, CFI = 0.511, AIC = 85341), so an exploratory factor analysis was
231 performed. The number of factors was determined at the boundary point where the cumulative
232 contribution exceeds 50%, and the number of factors was set to 2. The results of exploratory factor
233 analysis (maximum likelihood method, promax rotation) under the assumption of two factors are shown
234 (Table 2). The results indicate that the SPOS-J has a two-factor structure, with the first factor being items
235 asking for supportive content (e.g., my organization values my opinion) and the second factor being
236 items asking for non-supportive content (e.g., my organization shows little interest in my interests).
237 Therefore, the first factor was designated SPOS-J (supported), and the second factor was designated
238 SPOS-J (unsupported). A confirmatory factor analysis was performed on the 2-factor model, and the
239 model fit was higher than the 1-factor ($\chi^2 = 24706$; $P < 0.001$, RMSEA = 0.081, SRMR = 0.067, CFI =
240 0.861, AIC = 24852), but not sufficient in terms of the acceptable model fit criteria set in this study
241 (RMSEA, SRMR < 0.08 , CFI > 0.90) (Table 3).

242

243 3.3 Construct validity

244 Table 4 shows the correlations between the SPOS-J and its two subscales, SPOS-J (supported) and
245 SPOS-J (unsupported), and all study variables, including antecedents (supervisor support, organizational
246 justice [procedural and interactional], and role conflict) and outcome factors (job satisfaction,
247 organizational commitment, and turnover intention). The two subscales showed a small negative
248 correlation with role conflict, a small to medium negative correlation with turnover intention, and small

249 to high positive correlations with other antecedents and outcome factors.

250

251 3.4 Reliability (internal consistency and test-retest reliability)

252 Table 5 shows the Cronbach's alpha coefficients, Cohen's weighted kappa coefficients, ICCs, and
253 SEM for SPOS-J, SPOS-J (supported), and SPOS-J (unsupported). Cronbach's alpha coefficients for
254 SPOS-J, SPOS-J (supported), and SPOS-J (unsupported) showed high consistency (.93, .97, and .95,
255 respectively). In addition, Cohen's weighted kappa coefficients and ICCs showed good test-retest
256 reliability for SPOS-J and moderate test-retest reliability for SPOS-J (supported) and SPOS-J
257 (unsupported) in the 2-week interval test-retest.

258

259 4 . DISCUSSION

260 4.1 Reliability and validity

261 This study created the SPOS-J and verified its reliability and validity. To assess factorial validity,
262 confirmatory and exploratory factor analyses were conducted, and to assess construct validity, the
263 SPOS-J was examined in relation to antecedent and outcome factors identified from existing research.
264 Furthermore, internal consistency and test-retest reliability were examined to assess the reliability of the
265 SPOS-J.

266 Regarding Factorial validity, the two-factor structure consisting of two subscales, SPOS-J (supported)
267 and SPOS-J (unsupported), was a better fit than the one-factor structure in the original version. SPOS-J
268 (supported) items asked for supportive content, while SPOS-J (unsupported) items asked for

269 non-supportive content. This result may be related to the cultural background of the Japanese. While the
270 West has an independent construal of self, Japan is known to have a predominantly interdependent
271 construal of self, and a culture shaped by an interdependent construal of self will tend toward self-critical
272 self-evaluation, focusing on its own weaknesses and problems in comparison to the ideal role image by
273 society³⁰. In fact, it has been reported that in Japan, there is a self-critical tendency to evaluate oneself
274 lower or more negatively than others³¹. This tendency toward self-criticism may be the result of low
275 self-estimation as well as high estimation of others, and Endo³² reported the possibility that Japanese
276 people are simultaneously lowering their self-estimation and raising their evaluation of others. In the
277 SPOS-J survey, respondents were asked to evaluate their own organizations, and from their perspective,
278 the organizations to which they belonged could be considered as others. Therefore, it is possible that
279 respondents gave stronger positive evaluations of their own organizations and weaker negative
280 evaluations of others, resulting in a two-factor structure that eliminates the one-dimensionality of the
281 results.

282 In this validation, the model fit was not necessarily sufficient even for the two-factor model. One
283 reason for this is that the present validation was conducted using all 36 items of the SPOS-J. These items
284 may include questions that are inappropriate or meaningless depending on the country's culture,
285 employment system, or specific industries (e.g., civil servants and other industries with high
286 employment security). In fact, when examining the reliability and validity of the SPOS for teachers,
287 Dolma et al.¹⁶ excluded items from the 36 items of the SPOS that were not appropriate for their
288 employment environment as teachers. The original version of the SPOS¹ by Eisenberger et al. was

289 basically developed to understand POS for U.S. workers. To develop POS research in Japan in the future,
290 it is necessary to improve the scale to make it more suitable for Japanese workers by removing items that
291 do not fit Japanese culture and labor practices.

292 Regarding construct validity, this study examined the relationship between supervisor support,
293 organizational justice [procedural and interactional], and role conflict as antecedents of the SPOS-J. The
294 SPOS-J was highly correlated with supervisor support ($r = .52$). Several studies examining supervisor
295 support as a variable affecting POS have confirmed a highly positive relationship between supervisor
296 support and POS^{3,4,33}, which is consistent with the results of this study. Regarding organizational justice,
297 this study confirmed the relationship between the SPOS-J and procedural and interactional justice. We
298 found a high positive correlation ($r = .57$) between procedural justice and SPOS-J, which is consistent
299 with the finding of Moorman et al.². Interactional justice has also been reported to be positively
300 correlated with POS³⁴. The results of a meta-analysis by Rhoades & Eisenberger¹⁴ also reported a high
301 correlation between interactional justice and POS, consistent with the results of this study ($r = .59$).
302 Stressors are another antecedent of POS, but research on POS has focused primarily on the effects of
303 stressors related to their role in the organization. Regarding role conflict, a role-related stressor, several
304 studies^{8,35} have shown that role conflict and POS are negatively correlated, but the strength of the
305 correlation ranges ($r = -.20$ to $-.64$). The results of this study showed a medium negative correlation ($r =$
306 $-.23$), which was close to the results of Hutchison et al.³⁵.

307 We examined the relationship between job satisfaction, organizational (affective) commitment, and
308 turnover intention as outcome factors on the SPOS-J. Job Satisfaction has been empirically found to

309 have a medium positive correlation with POS⁹ and was generally consistent with the results of this study
310 ($r = .46$). Based on social exchange theory and the idea of reciprocity norms, Eisenberger et al.¹ argue
311 that POS can foster a sense of obligation to the organization and increase affective commitment to the
312 organization. The results of this study also showed that POS had a middle positive correlation ($r = .43$)
313 with affective commitment, and many existing studies^{5,10,36} found a positive relationship between POS
314 and affective commitment, although the strength of the correlation varied ($r = .38$ to $.81$) . This variation
315 may have been caused by differences in the target population. In a meta-analysis by Rhoades &
316 Eisenberger¹⁴, among withdrawal behaviors (turnover intentions, turnover, and other withdrawal
317 behaviors), the strongest relationship with POS was found for turnover intentions, and turnover
318 intentions have been empirically shown to have a middle negative correlation with POS¹². This result
319 was consistent with the results of this study ($r = -.39$).

320 The SPOS-J (unsupported), a subscale of the SPOS-J, had weaker correlations with all antecedent and
321 outcome factors than the SPOS-J or another subscale, the SPOS-J (supported). This result may be due to
322 the tendency of Japanese people to evaluate negative evaluations of other organizations more weakly
323 because of their cultural background^{30,31}.

324 For reliability, the internal consistency of SPOS-J, SPOS-J (supported), and SPOS-J (unsupported)
325 was sufficient with Cronbach's alpha coefficients (.94, .92, and .87, respectively), and SPOS-J (36 items)
326 was equivalent to the original version (36 items)¹. Test-retest reliability was confirmed to be good for
327 SPOS-J and moderate for SPOS-J (supported) and SPOS-J (unsupported), as indicated by Cohen's
328 weighted kappa coefficient and ICC. To the best of our knowledge, we could not find any studies that

329 examined test-retest reliability abroad, but this study suggests that, at least for the SPOS-J, it has a
330 certain level of test-retest reliability.

331

332 4.2 Practical Implications

333 In recent years, there has been a great deal of research on the relationship between work engagement,
334 which has received attention as a predictor of physical and mental health³⁷ and job performance³⁸, and
335 POS, and work engagement has been found to be positively related to POS³⁹. The concept of
336 strategically working to improve POS by showing active consideration for employee well-being, and
337 aiming to improve corporate performance and curb employee turnover by improving employee job
338 satisfaction and work engagement, is highly compatible with the concept of health and productivity
339 management⁴⁰ that is gaining popularity in Japan. Therefore, making SPOS-J available as an evaluation
340 indicator for organizations may contribute to the further development of occupational health practice and
341 health and productivity management in Japan through the provision of a new evaluation indicator.

342

343 4.3 Limitations

344 This study has several limitations. First, this study is an Internet-based survey and may not represent
345 the general population of Japanese workers, since those who do not have Internet access or are not
346 registered with an online survey firm are omitted from the target population. However, since this study is
347 based on data from a labor force survey conducted by a public agency, and the sample was collected
348 stratified by gender, age, and region of residence to reduce sampling bias, the generalizability of the

349 study's results is considered sufficient. Second, this study is based on survey data from self-reports, and
350 the present results should be replicated in the future using objective measures (e.g., measures related to
351 performance, leaving a job, and other behaviors). Third, this study did not assess known-groups validity,
352 criterion validity, cross-cultural validity, or responsiveness.

353

354 5 . CONCLUSION

355 In conclusion, this study confirms that the Japanese version of SPOS (SPOS-J) can adequately
356 measure POS and can be used in a Japanese context.

357

358 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

359 This study was initiated with the permission of the original author, Dr. Robert Eisenberger, for the
360 preparation of SPOS-J and was completed after his review. He subsequently passed away and we were
361 unable to obtain confirmation of this paper. We thank Dr. Robert Eisenberger for his expert assistance as
362 the original author in the process of developing the Japanese version of the scale.

363

364 AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

365 KO and TN, HE, KosM, KojM designed the study; KO and TN, HE, KojM participated in the
366 development of the Japanese version of the scale; KO and KojM, AI analyzed the data; KO led the
367 writing of the manuscript, and all other authors were involved in the drafting the manuscript. All authors
368 read and approved the final manuscript.

369

370 DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

371 The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon
372 reasonable request.

373

374 STUDY FUNDING

375 This study has been funded by Japanese Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare (21K21155), and the
376 HASEKO Corporation.

377

378 DISCLOSURE

379 Ethical approval: This study was approved by the Ethics Committee of Medical Research,
380 University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan (reference No. R3-030).

381 Informed Consent: Informed consent was obtained in the form of the website. Registry and
382 the Registration: No. of the study/trial: N/A, Animal Studies: N/A, Conflict of Interest: The
383 authors declare no conflicts of interest in relation to this article.

384

385 REFERENCES

- 386 1. Eisenberger R, Huntington R, Hutchison S, Sowa D. Perceived organizational support. *J Appl*
387 *Psychol.* 1986;71(3):500-507.
- 388 2. Moorman RH, Blakely GL, Niehoff BP. Does Perceived Organizational Support Mediate the
389 Relationship between Procedural Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior? *AMJ.*
390 1998;41(3):351-357.
- 391 3. Maertz CP, Griffeth RW, Campbell NS, Allen DG. The Effects of Perceived Organizational Support
392 and Perceived Supervisor Support on Employee Turnover. *J Organ Behav.* 2007;28(8):1059-1075.
- 393 4. Eisenberger R, Stinglhamber F, Vandenberghe C, Sucharski IL, Rhoades L. Perceived supervisor
394 support: contributions to perceived organizational support and employee retention. *J Appl Psychol.*
395 2002;87(3):565-573.
- 396 5. Hutchison S, Garstka ML. Sources of perceived organizational support: Goal setting and Feedback1.
397 *J Appl Soc Psychol.* 1996;26(15):1351-1366.
- 398 6. Eisenberger R, Cummings J, Armeli S, Lynch P. Perceived organizational support, discretionary
399 treatment, and job satisfaction. *J Appl Psychol.* 1997;82(5):812-820.
- 400 7. Dekker I, Barling J. Workforce size and work-related role stress. *Work & Stress.* 1995;9(1):45-54.
- 401 8. Andrews MC, Kacmar KM. Discriminating among organizational politics, justice, and support. *J*

- 402 *Organ Behav.* 2001;22(4):347-366.
- 403 9. Allen DG, Shore LM, Griffeth RW. The role of perceived organizational support and supportive
404 human resource practices in the turnover process. *J Manage.* 2003;29(1):99-118.
- 405 10. Eisenberger R, Fasolo P, Davis-LaMastro V. Perceived organizational support and employee
406 diligence, commitment, and innovation. *J Appl Psychol.* 1990;75(1):51-59.
- 407 11. Chen Z, Eisenberger R, Johnson KM, Sucharski IL, Aselage J. Perceived organizational support and
408 extra-role performance: which leads to which? *J Soc Psychol.* 2009;149(1):119-124.
- 409 12. Guzzo RA, Noonan KA, Elron E. Expatriate managers and the psychological contract. *J Appl*
410 *Psychol.* 1994;79(4):617-626.
- 411 13. Hochwarter WA, Kacmar C, Perrewé PL, Johnson D. Perceived organizational support as a
412 mediator of the relationship between politics perceptions and work outcomes. *J Vocat Behav.*
413 2003;63(3):438-456.
- 414 14. Rhoades L, Eisenberger R. Perceived organizational support: a review of the literature. *J Appl*
415 *Psychol.* 2002;87(4):698-714.
- 416 15. Rozdi ZM, Othman S, Ahmad CNC, Mohamed Z. Translation, validity and reliability of perceived
417 organizational support. *Int J Acad Res Bus Soc Sci.* 2017;7(10). doi:10.6007/ijarbss/v7-i10/3390
- 418 16. Dolma Ö, Torun AA. Psychometric study of the Turkish survey of perceived organizational support

- 419 (SPOS). *Pamukkale Univ J Soc Sci Inst.* 2017;2017(28):271-295.
- 420 17. Mori K, Mori T, Nagata T, et al. Workplace vaccination opportunity against COVID-19 contributed
421 to high perceived organizational support of employees in Japan: A prospective cohort study. *J*
422 *Occup Health.* 2022;64(1):e12365.
- 423 18. United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division. *World*
424 *Population Ageing 2019 (ST/ESA/SER.A/444).*; 2020. Accessed October 1, 2023.
425 [https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/publications/pdf/ageing/WorldPopulationAgei](https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/publications/pdf/ageing/WorldPopulationAgeing2019-Report.pdf)
426 [ng2019-Report.pdf](https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/publications/pdf/ageing/WorldPopulationAgeing2019-Report.pdf)
- 427 19. Wild D, Grove A, Martin M, et al. Principles of Good Practice for the Translation and Cultural
428 Adaptation Process for Patient-Reported Outcomes (PRO) Measures: report of the ISPOR Task
429 Force for Translation and Cultural Adaptation. *Value Health.* 2005;8(2):94-104.
- 430 20. Longman. (2022). well-being. In Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English. Accessed
431 September 24, 2022. <https://www.ldoceonline.com/jp/dictionary/well-being>
- 432 21. Inoue A, Kawakami N, Shimomitsu T, et al. Development of a Short Questionnaire to Measure an
433 Extended Set of Job Demands, Job Resources, and Positive Health Outcomes: The New Brief Job
434 Stress Questionnaire. *Ind Health.* 2014;52(3):175-189.
- 435 22. Inoue A, Kawakami N, Tsutsumi A, et al. Reliability and validity of the Japanese version of the
436 Organizational Justice Questionnaire. *J Occup Health.* 2009;51(1):74-83.

- 437 23. Elovainio M, Kivimäki M, Vahtera J. Organizational justice: evidence of a new psychosocial
438 predictor of health. *Am J Public Health*. 2002;92(1):105-108.
- 439 24. Moorman RH. Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship
440 behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *J Appl Psychol*.
441 1991;76(6):845-855.
- 442 25. *Development of Scales and Checklists to Support Employment Management Operations -HRM*
443 *(Human Resource Management) Checklist* - . Japan Institute of Labour ; March,1999.
- 444 26. Spector PE, Dwyer DJ, Jex SM. Relation of job stressors to affective, health, and performance
445 outcomes: a comparison of multiple data sources. *J Appl Psychol*. 1988;73(1):11-19.
- 446 27. Hu L, Bentler PM. Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional
447 criteria versus new alternatives. *Struct Equ Modeling*. 1999;6(1):1-55.
- 448 28. Cohen J. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. Academic Press; 2013.
- 449 29. Ashby D. Practical statistics for medical research. Douglas G. Altman, Chapman and Hall, London,
450 1991. No. of pages: 611. Price: £32.00. *Stat Med*. 1991;10(10):1635-1636.
- 451 30. Kitayama, S., Markus, H. R., Matsumoto, H., & Nor asakkunkit, V. Cultural psychology of
452 Japanese self - Causal attri button n of success and failure-. *Japanese Psychological Review*.
453 1995;38(2):247-280.

- 454 31. Kitayama S, Markus HR, Matsumoto H, Norasakkunkit V. Individual and collective processes in
455 the construction of the self: self-enhancement in the United States and self-criticism in Japan. *J*
456 *Pers Soc Psychol.* 1997;72(6):1245-1267.
- 457 32. Endo Y. Relationship-enhancement and relative self effacement. *Japanese Journal of Psychology.*
458 1997;68(5):387-395.
- 459 33. Shanock LR, Eisenberger R. When supervisors feel supported: Relationships with subordinates'
460 perceived supervisor support, perceived organizational support, and performance. *J Appl Psychol.*
461 2006;91(3):689-695.
- 462 34. Masterson SS. A trickle-down model of organizational justice: relating employees' and customers'
463 perceptions of and reactions to fairness. *J Appl Psychol.* 2001;86(4):594-604.
- 464 35. Hutchison S. A path model of perceived organizational support. *J Soc Behav Pers.*
465 1997;12(1):159-174.
- 466 36. Miceli MP, Mulvey PW. Consequences of Satisfaction with Pay Systems: Two Field Studies.
467 <https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers><https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers>. Published online July
468 20, 2001. Accessed October 9, 2023. <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=241804>
- 469 37. Demerouti E, Bakker AB, Nachreiner F, Schaufeli WB. The job demands-resources model of
470 burnout. *J Appl Psychol.* 2001;86(3):499-512.

- 471 38. Schaufeli WB, Taris TW, Bakker AB. Dr Jekyll or Mr Hyde? On the differences between work
472 engagement and workaholism. *Research companion to working time and work addiction*.
473 2006;366:193-217.
- 474 39. Caesens G, Stinglhamber F. The relationship between perceived organizational support and work
475 engagement: The role of self-efficacy and its outcomes. *Eur Rev Appl Psychol*. 2014;64(5):259-267.
- 476 40. Mori K, Nagata T, Nagata M, et al. Development, Success Factors, and Challenges of
477 Government-Led Health and Productivity Management Initiatives in Japan. *J Occup Environ Med*.
478 2021;63(1):18-26.
- 479

Table 1. Demographics of participants at 1st survey and 2nd survey

Demographic Characteristics	Baseline		Follow-Up*	
	n (%)		n (%)	
Total	6220		452	
Gender				
Men	3382	(54.3)	248	(54.9)
Women	2838	(45.6)	204	(45.1)
Age				
20-29	1131	(18.2)	59	(13.1)
30-39	1281	(20.6)	66	(14.6)
40-49	1684	(27.1)	142	(31.4)
50-59	1455	(23.4)	108	(23.9)
60-64	669	(10.8)	77	(17.0)
Annual household income (million yen)				
<3.00	1073	(17.3)	74	(16.4)
3.00–4.99	1658	(26.7)	128	(28.3)
5.00-9.99	2689	(43.2)	185	(40.9)
≥10.00	800	(12.9)	65	(14.4)
Final Education				
Junior high or high school	1748	(28.1)	128	(28.3)
Vocational school or college	1331	(21.4)	91	(20.1)
University or graduate school	3141	(50.5)	233	(51.6)
Job type				
Administrative	402	(6.5)	35	(7.7)
Professional and technical	1095	(17.6)	67	(14.8)
Clerical	1702	(27.4)	123	(27.2)
Sales	616	(9.9)	46	(10.2)
Service	842	(13.5)	54	(12.0)
Security	91	(1.5)	7	(1.6)
Agriculture, forestry, and fishing	16	(0.3)	3	(0.7)
Production process jobs	459	(7.4)	42	(9.3)
Transportation and machine operation	115	(1.9)	8	(1.8)
Construction and mining	91	(1.5)	4	(0.9)
Transportation, Cleaning, Packaging	217	(3.5)	19	(4.2)
Others	574	(9.2)	44	(9.7)

* Follow-up sample was used only to examine the test-retest reliability.

Table 2. Items, means, standard deviations, and exploratory factor analysis with maximum likelihood method and promax rotation (N=6,220)

Variable	Mean	SD	Factor Loadings		Communality
			1	2	
Item_25	2.88	1.35	0.87	0.06	0.75
Item_10	2.68	1.34	0.87	0.05	0.75
Item_9	2.62	1.34	0.86	0.06	0.73
Item_21	2.63	1.34	0.85	0.05	0.73
Item_20	2.84	1.31	0.82	0.00	0.68
Item_27	2.71	1.28	0.82	0.00	0.68
Item_36	2.67	1.33	0.82	0.05	0.67
Item_8	2.81	1.38	0.82	0.02	0.67
Item_4	2.67	1.37	0.81	0.04	0.65
Item_1	2.69	1.46	0.79	0.08	0.63
Item_33	2.76	1.28	0.79	-0.04	0.63
Item_35	2.39	1.31	0.73	0.02	0.53
Item_13	3.06	1.38	0.72	-0.09	0.53
Item_18	2.57	1.30	0.72	-0.05	0.52
Item_29	2.84	1.31	0.70	-0.09	0.51
Item_5	3.02	1.51	0.68	-0.04	0.46
Item_30	2.38	1.41	0.68	0.03	0.46
Item_24	2.73	1.42	0.67	-0.01	0.45
Item_17	3.11	1.45	0.12	0.82	0.68
Item_23	3.21	1.39	0.09	0.81	0.66
Item_7	3.28	1.34	0.09	0.79	0.62
Item_6	3.43	1.41	0.15	0.79	0.63
Item_32	3.07	1.41	0.05	0.76	0.58
Item_3	3.18	1.46	0.08	0.76	0.58
Item_15	3.48	1.29	-0.01	0.74	0.54
Item_14	3.45	1.33	-0.04	0.72	0.52
Item_12	3.27	1.37	-0.09	0.70	0.51
Item_19	2.83	1.48	-0.06	0.69	0.48
Item_16	2.77	1.65	-0.01	0.68	0.46
Item_22	3.65	1.39	0.02	0.67	0.45
Item_28	2.94	1.44	-0.10	0.67	0.47
Item_34	3.35	1.44	-0.04	0.65	0.43
Item_2	3.11	1.53	-0.08	0.64	0.42
Item_31	3.10	1.40	-0.15	0.61	0.40
Item_26	3.82	1.34	0.00	0.59	0.35
Item_11	3.49	1.44	-0.03	0.59	0.35
Inter-factor correlations		1	1		
		2	-0.04	1	
Eigenvalues			11.11	9.07	

Table 3. Results of confirmatory factor analyses: Comparison of goodness-of-fit indices among one-factor and two-factor models (N=6,220)

	χ^2	df	P	RMSEA (90%CI)	SRMR	CFI	AIC
One-factor model	85197	594	<.001	0.151 (0.150 - 0.152)	0.245	0.511	85341
Two-factor model	24706	593	<.001	0.081 (0.080 - 0.082)	0.067	0.861	24852

RMSEA: root mean square error of approximation; SRMR: standardized root mean square residual; CFI: comparative fit index; AIC: Akaike's Information Criterion

482

483

484

Table 4. Means, standard deviations and correlations of variables used in the study (n=6,220)

	Mean	SD	1	1-1	1-2
1. SPOS-J	2.99	0.73			
1-1 SPOS-J (supported)	2.72	1.07	.71**		
1-2 SPOS-J (unsupported)	3.25	1.03	.68**	-.03*	
2. Supervisor Support	2.68	0.81	.52**	.45**	.27**
3. Organizational justice (procedural)	3.13	0.81	.57**	.45**	.33**
4. Organizational justice (interactional/relational)	3.23	0.91	.59**	.50**	.32*
5. Role Conflict	2.34	0.85	-.23**	-.21**	-.12*
6. Job Satisfaction	2.54	0.83	.46**	.40**	.24*
7. Organizational Commitment	2.80	0.83	.43**	.46**	.13**
8. Turnover intention	2.69	1.38	-.39**	-.35**	-.20**

Note; *p<.05, **p<.01

485

Table 5. Means, standard deviations, Minimum, Maximum, Cronbach's α coefficients, Cohen's weighted κ coefficients intraclass correlation coefficients, and standard error of measurement for the SPOS-J and its subscales

	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Cron- bach's α	Cohen's Weighted κ (95% CI)	ICC (95% CI)	SEM (95% CI)
SPOS-J	2.99	0.73	0	6	0.93	0.62 (0.58-0.67)	0.81 (0.77 - 0.84)	0.44 (0.41-0.48)
SPOS-J (supported)	2.72	1.07	0	6	0.97	0.54 (0.49-0.59)	0.73 (0.68 - 0.77)	0.68 (0.62-0.73)
SPOS-J (unsupported)	3.25	1.03	0	6	0.95	0.42 (0.36-0.48)	0.51 (0.44 - 0.57)	0.84 (0.78-0.90)

ICC: intraclass correlation coefficients, SEM: standard error of measurement

CI: Confidence interval.

Note; Mean, SD, Min, Max, and Cronbach's α were calculated using all responses in the baseline survey.