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Abstract
This study empirically establish the relationship between perceived organisational support and the performance of small and medium-scale enterprises in Nigeria. It used a quantitative research design and an adopted close-ended questionnaire to gather information from the Three Hundred and Seventy-Eight (378) managers and owners of small and medium-sized businesses in Lagos, Nigeria. To analyze the collected data, the author used SmartPLS-SEM 4. All organisational performance variables were strongly positively correlated with perceived organisational support, according to the results of the structural models. In contrast to adopting open-ended questions coupled with the inability to interact with the subject for the majority of the time, the survey design favours closed-ended questions over open-ended ones, collecting primary data using a questionnaire, thereby limiting respondents from fully expressing their views. The study also concentrates on SME sectors in Nigeria, which limits the applicability of the findings to other countries SME sectors or understudied industries. In light of the limitations above, future researchers could broaden the study to specific industries like manufacturing, banking, or multinationals and apply qualitative methodologies further to corroborate the conclusions. The findings of this study provide some practical implications for business organizations and owners or their managers. For the organisation, efforts should be made to ensure that provision of a supportive environment and adequate and necessary resources for attaining organisational set goals should are available and accessible, which could come in the form of equipment, ideas, funding, physical assistance, technology, socio-emotional support and the likes. Furthermore, business owners should not just see the asset being made available but should monitor it to the point of implementation to properly aid and propel the set organisational goals. The study contributes significantly to the management field and improves the applicability and generalisation of organizational support theory (OST).

Keywords: Organizational Performance, Perceived Organisational Support, Strategy, Small and Medium Scale Enterprises, Organisational Support Theory and Nigeria

1. Introduction
A lack of reputation, deteriorating market trends, growth hurdles, and a high death rate are among the challenges that cause death and restrict the growth and development of SMEs in Nigeria (PwC, 2020) [76]. Small and medium-sized businesses in Nigeria have been labeled as having barriers to success and bankruptcy as a result of a number of dangerous issues, including poor human capacity, a decline in profitability ratio combined with poor management, a lack of training, and low-demand products and services (Audu, 2022; Ekren et al., 2022; Iloh & Nosiri, 2022; Johnny & Simeon, 2021; Okoi et al. 2022) [10, 25, 42, 76, 67]. Small and medium-sized firms in Nigeria have yet to contribute significantly to the nation's economy due to lower productivity, making it difficult to compete and sustain their market position (Nwokocha & Nwankwo, 2019) [65]. Many of these SMEs have closed due to their incapacity to grow and sustain their market position, while others are struggling to survive (Isichei et al., 2020; Nwokocha & Nwankwo, 2019; Olaore et al., 2021) [44, 65, 68]. As a result, they have lost propositional value; rather than creating a tantalizing anticipation and perception among present and potential customers, which would have resulted in proper positioning and reputation, it is otherwise (Isichei et al., 2020) [44]. According to the PwC report on MSME report (2020), 69% of businesses in the country encountered no or diminished growth in the previous three years, 30% are unsure of their survival, and 44% have a challenge in finding consumers.
Thus witnessing low demand for products and services and an ongoing fall in size; meanwhile, this was supported by the Fate Foundation and BudgiT report (2020), which revealed that 94.3% of SMEs in Nigeria are struggling with sales revenue and profitability. Nigerian SMEs are struggling to maintain their market position, and some have even been displaced from their previous placement cum rating due to poor managerial skill, which has resulted in poor product quality, market saturation, and inability to develop new products (Adewusi, 2023; Agwaniru, 2023; Amah & Oyetuunde, 2020) [2, 3, 8]. Evidence demonstrating weak market share, lack of sales growth, inability to create money, and lower demand for products and services continue to characterize Nigeria SMEs, resulting in diminishing market growth (Olaore et al., 2021; Rakshit et al., 2023) [68, 77]. Furthermore, they continue to exhibit signs of thinning in their net sales, employee count, production volume, and profit level, all of which are currently a total disaster (PwC, 2020) [76] with much difficulty in creating the desired company reputation for the organisation in the eyes of the consumer as related to other competitors is a problem Nigeria’s small and medium-scale enterprises face (Iloh & Nosiri, 2022; Olujide, 2022) [62, 69].

Most research that have looked into perceived organizational support as a means of actively or passively solving organizational problems have focused on employee performance, emotional commitment, and other prevalent difficulties. In contrast, few research have looked at how it affects organizational performance. For example, (Aubé et al., 2007; Rhoades et al., 2001) [9, 70] found that perceived organizational support rises and has a favorable effect on affective and normative commitment. Also confirmed positive were perceived organizational support with affective attachment, performance outcome, and expectations (Eisenberger et al., 1990) [24]. Concurrently, Neves and Eisenberger (2014) [66] discovered that perceived organizational support was positively connected to failure-related trust and risk-taking among subordinates. On the other side, it was found to be negatively connected to work options, withdrawal, and well-being (Allen et al., 2003; Panaccio & Vandenberge, 2009) [6, 74]. However, the few that attempted to establish the relationship between perceived organizational support and performance statistically found a positive relationship (Byrne & Hochwarter, 2008; Imran & Aldaas, 2020) [17, 43]. Theoretically, the organisational support theory is selected to drive this study and was developed in 1986 by Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison and Sowa and drew from social exchange theory to explain the employer-employee relationship hinged on reciprocity (Baran et al., 2012; Hunter, 2011; Nartey, 2018; Weebly, 2021) [11, 40, 63, 93].

OST also provided a theoretical framework to describe how perceived organisational support (POS) operates to generate positive outcomes by providing tangible and intangible resources to employees, whereas the norm of reciprocity creates a felt responsibility to help organisational welfare and assist the organisation in reaching its goals (Caesen et al., 2017; Kurtessis et al., 2015) [18, 52]. It could be said that when an employee perceives support from the supervisor or organisational, such individuals reciprocate by ensuring business goals and objectives are attained.

To this end, the study aims to empirically establish the effect of perceived organisational support on the organisational performance of small and medium-scale enterprises.

The specific objectives are:

- To determine whether there is a positive and significant effect of perceived organisational support on company reputation as a dimension of organisational performance.
- To establish whether there is a positive and significant effect of perceived organisational support on firm size reputation as a dimension of organisational performance.
- To find out whether there is a positive and significant effect of perceived organisational support on market growth reputation as a dimension of organisational performance.
- To know whether there is a positive and significant effect of perceived organisational support on market position reputation as a dimension of organisational performance.
- To find out whether perceived organisational support affects the combination of all the dimensions of organisational performance (firm size, market growth, market position and company reputation).

The remaining portions of this work are organized to accomplish the objectives mentioned above. It analyzes pertinent literature to assess the perceived organizational support, corporate reputation, firm size, market growth, market position, and organizational performance before outlining the methodological approach and formulating any hypotheses. This is done to demonstrate the connection between the variables being studied. The procedure for conducting this study is then described. The analysis's findings are then provided. Finally, it discusses the study's results and focuses on their implications.

2. Literature review and hypotheses development

This section assesses pertinent literature on company reputation, firm size, market growth, market position, organizational performance, and perceived organisational support to develop hypotheses and provide the study framework that demonstrates the relationship between the variables analysed.

2.1 Perceived Organisational Support (POS)

Creating a supportive atmosphere or providing sufficient and required resources for achieving organisational defined
goals is considered as dependent on perceived organizational support (POS) (Le & Lei, 2019) [55] while also acting as a gauge of a management's sincere intentions (Cheng & O-Yang, 2018) [23]. Referring to POS as a valuable resource, Wen et al. (2019) [94], and Cheng & O-Yang (2018) [23] suggested that employees might generate a variety of good emotions based on empathy from peers and managers, recognize their knowledge, and it could also increase employee optimism and confidence in handling role expectations. As a resource that makes it possible to work and achieve goals, POS includes but is not limited to socio-emotional support, finance, tools, ideas, technology, and physical aid (Cheng & O-Yang, 2018) [23]. POS is therefore defined as the employees' perception of how much their companies regard their efforts and are concerned about their well-being. (Suifan et al., 2018) [89]. Thus, in addition to putting in place a system that supports it, organisational support is essential to the productivity and performance of the organisation. (Lee et al., 2010) [56]. Additionally, POS displays employees' outstanding efforts to fulfill their job responsibilities and organizational objectives as a positive reaction resulting from their conviction that they are loved, cared for, and supported greatly by the company (Le & Lei, 2019) [55]. Cited in Suifan et al. (2018) [89] is the work of Krishnan and Mary (2012), who said Organisational support is the sensitivity and employee perceptions of how much their involvement is valued and recognised by their organisations. Similar to this, perceived organisational support refers to employees' overall opinions of how much the company values their contributions and cares about their well-being (Lee & Chui, 2019)[58]. Moreover, this work views organizational support as the framework put in place to assist employees in the workplace with the reception of training, new technology, adaptation, and, most importantly, encouragement received that leads to goal attainment and helps to create improved performance, lower employee stressful conditions, help them cope, and increase employees' felt obligation, along with the creation of job satisfaction, facilitation of goal att (Lee et al., 2010; Lee, 2021; Lee & Chui, 2019; Singh, 2020) [56, 57, 58, 86]. POS has therefore been seen as a significant predictor of organisation and employee creativity (Suifan et al., 2018) [89]. Likewise, Kyoung Park et al. (2014) [53] argued that a support system is needed to start and foster an employee's capacity for innovation. Additionally, it has been proven to be a factor that improves employee emotional strength and stability, leading to a positive business outcome. In like manner, Suifan et al. (2018) [89] claimed that where POS is prevalent, employees are more likely to feel a sense of responsibility, a duty of care, and welfare towards the organization, assisting it in achieving the specified aims and objectives of the company. Supporting this position, Albalawi et al. (2019) [5]; Cheng and O-Yang (2018) [23]; Le and Lei (2019) [55] contended that POS is an organisation's contribution to an optimistic trade-off with employees, as workers are more likely to act positively in return for the positive effects of the establishment. Positive consequences include the willingness to impart knowledge and skills to coworkers, higher self-worth, emotional support, job engagement, and involvement in decision-making, connection, and approval. (Albalawi et al., 2019; Cheng & O-Yang, 2018; Le & Lei, 2019) [5, 23, 55].

2.2 Organisational Performance (OP).

Since the 1950s, various empirical and theoretical research on organizational performance, particularly in management, have been conducted and continue to be conducted (Chan Le Lyn & Muthuveloo, 2019; Otache, 2019) [21, 71]. Organizational performance is one of the most actively contested and explored themes in literature among researchers and theorists, according to Fadeyi et al. (2015) [27]; Jenatabadi, 2015 [45]; Laukkanen et al., 2013 [54]. It is a common concept in empirical reviews, although defining it might be difficult due to its ambiguity (Gorondutse & Hilman, 2019; Jenatabadi, 2015; Laukkanen et al., 2013; Otoo, 2019) [34, 45, 54, 72]. Furthermore, due to its multifarious and multidimensional nature, there is no room for a single, universally acknowledged meaning. However, researchers argue that because organizational performance is context-specific, it varies from place to place based on teams and industries (Gorondutse & Hilman, 2019; Jenatabadi, 2015; Laukkanen et al., 2013; Otoo, 2019) [54, 45, 72]; it is also dependent on the firm's applications, structure, and policies (Imran & Aldaas, 2020) [41]. Performance, on the other hand, refers to achieving the expected outcomes associated with plans (Imran & Aldaas, 2020) [41] for individuals, groups, organizations (firms, corporations, establishments), or employees. Organizational Performance (OP), on the other hand, is defined as the efficient coordination of an organized group that has completed a task to obtain a result (Taiwo & Agwu, 2016) [90]. According to Katou (2017) [50], OP is the organization's efficacy and efficiency (Kaldeen et al., 2020) [48]. It is efficient when the resources are well employed or the options are exhausted, and it is effective when the goal or job assigned is met. According to (Kaldeen et al., 2020) [48], organizational performance is the achievement of a given objective level through the labor of a specific individual or group. Ikram et al. (2020) [41] describe firm performance as the sum of a company's accomplishments as indicated by its functions and productivities, staff effectiveness, and CSR initiatives. In contrast to the previous viewpoint, it means that the organization's outcome should be assessed outside of the organization, as well as the environmental impact. Nonetheless, performance assesses an organization's state or the outcomes of management decisions and personnel implementation of those decisions. To conclude that an organization performs, a measure that is designated as a tool to hold managers and workers accountable and improve their output must be set in place or introduced, and this may vary from business to business as an additional dimension to it plays out (Gomes et al., 2017) [33]. According to Sinding and Waldstrom (2014) [85], measuring organizational success is difficult. Mullins and Christy (2016) [62], on the other hand, observed in their work that researchers would never be able to provide a trustworthy and accurate performance metric; the step used is frequently subjective, conflicting, and ambiguous.. Nonetheless, Fadeyi et al. (2015) [27] proposed certain organizational performance dimensions, including return on equity, revenue growth, sales growth, and market share, as well as return on asset, export growth, profitability, gross profit, return on investment, and stock rice. Similarly, Kaldeen et al. (2020) [48] contend that financial and non-financial metrics (employee retention, cost reduction, and
turnover rate) as well as other indicators such as human resources, marketing performance, and innovation should be utilized to assess organizational performance. Brooks (2009) [46] argues that while evaluating an organization's success, ethical behavior and socially responsible business practices should be included. Fadeye et al. (2015) [27], on the other hand, proposed that no single measure is pronounced to be the best or appears to be better to others, and that scholars or businesses should select the one that best matches their needs. However, as mentioned by Menon and Mohanty (2012) [59], the measures for company performance will be Company Reputation (CR), Market Position (MP), Firm Size (FS), and Market Growth (MG).H1. There is a positive and significant relationship between Perceived Organisational Support and the combination of all the dimensions of organisational performance (firm size, market growth, market position and company reputation)

2.2.1 Company Reputation
Corporate reputation (CR) has recently generated a lot of noise in the business world and piqued the interest of many researchers. Baruah and Panda (2020) [12]. Numerous experts have identified a firm's or corporation's reputation as one of the most essential and valuable intangible assets influencing stakeholders and supporting an organization's financial performance. (Erugo, 2004; Stewart et al., 2017; Baruah and Panda, 2020) [28, 87, 12]. Corporate reputation, on the other hand, is a multifaceted concept that has drawn and gained attention from many disciplines and contains several characteristics that are, in fact, difficult to quantify (Baruah & Panda, 2020; Ginesti et al., 2018) [12, 32], possibly due to the researchers' failure to agree on a single understanding of the concept's meaning and perspective (Baruah & Panda, 2020) [12]. Because CR is a multidisciplinary concept with many diverse meanings, its definition and measurement procedures vary. Baruah and Panda (2020) [12]. Every institution or corporation, on the other hand, has a reputation, and that reputation is proportional to the number of people who perceive it and the perspective from which they view it. Suaidah and colleagues (2021) [60]. One of the sources of differentiation and distinctiveness of any firm from its rivals is the perception of its reputation as a dependable indicator of economic success (Caviggioli et al., 2020; Kim & Ferguson, 2019) [30, 31]. The company's reputation is defined as an individual's or consumer's view of an organization based on their assessment (Zakari et al., 2019) [95].

On the other side, a person's or group's liking and admiration for a company is based on prior behavior, qualities, public relations, and the quality of the organization's products and services. (Yeonsoo Kim & Ferguson, 2019; Caviggioli et al., 2020) [20]. It is also a consensual evaluation of a company's potential to produce favorable outcomes to a stakeholder or representative group (Kim & Ferguson, 2019) [31]. Corporate reputation is an important component of brand equity because it provides stakeholders with an accurate and positive picture of the organization (Caviggioli et al., 2020; Kim & Ferguson, 2019) [20, 31]. Similarly, CR is frequently a mental image that the general public has of a company's previous behaviors and attributes, as demonstrated by the quality of their services and goods and how they interact with their environment (Kim & Ferguson, 2019) [51]. Walsh et al., 2009, referenced in (Zakari et al., 2019) [95], stated that a firm's reputation is the perceptions about the company held by those outside of the company. Simply put, a company's, people, group's, or activity's reputation is how other people see it. Suaidah and colleagues (2021) [88]. According to this viewpoint, a company's reputation is an intangible asset that has the potential to provide tangibility but may not be limited to the organization's immediate external environment. According to (Abdulai Mahmoud & Yusif, 2012; Alara, 2021; Suaidah et al., 2021) [1, 4, 88], a company's reputation is a feature or asset that cannot be replicated, purchased, or replaced, but can be used to gain a sustainable competitive market advantage while influencing the views and perceptions of shareholders and stakeholders.

Furthermore, a company's reputation is usually outstanding in terms of favorable word of mouth and client loyalty (Zakari et al., 2019) [95]. Furthermore, it may result in a strong endorsement, improved financial results, a favorable consumer attitude, outstanding commitment, support from stakeholders, top talent recruitment, increased investment, and a strategically advantageous market position (O'Connor, 2001; Otoo, 2019; Rothman, 2016; Tortorella et al., 2019) [66, 72, 80, 91]. Additionally, it lowers obstacles to competition, increases the expansion of a market, s Furthermore, it lowers barriers to competition, increases the expansion of a market, the supply chain, and business partners, and protects the company in times of crisis (O'Connor, 2001; Otoo, 2019; Rothman, 2016; Tortorella et al., 2019) [66, 72, 80, 91]. Meanwhile, it can only be made probable if CR is found to be positive and otherwise if found to be reversed (O'Connor, 2001; Otoo, 2019; Rothman, 2016; Tortorella et al., 2019) [66, 72, 80, 91]. H2. There is a positive and significant relationship between Perceived Organisational Support and Company Reputation as a dimension of organisational performance.

2.2.2 Market Position (MP)
Market Position is one of the dimensions and measures of organisational performance proposed by Woo and Willard (1983), cited by Menon & Mohanty (2012) [59], and it evolved from market segmentation, market structure and targeting (Charles et al., 2015) [23]. Corroborating this view, some scholars also testified that market positioning is one of the numerous indicators of organisational performance, which can be traced back to 1960 (Hinson et al., 2017; Saqib, 2021) [38, 82]. More so, it has received considerable attention from researchers (Saqib, 2021) [82] though it started with the product; ultimately, its target is the mind of the consumers (Blankson et al., 2017) [13].

MP, however, represents the source of value to the customer achieved by a firm relative to rivals in the marketplace (Charles et al., 2015) [23]. It further explains what an organisation does and how it reaches it to make a difference in the market (Charles et al., 2015) [23]. In Support of Charles et al. view, Market Positioning includes all the doings of an organisation, like marketing and distribution, which promotes their propositional value, thereby creating a perception of the current and potential consumers (Moser et al., 2018) [60]. Dissecting the view of Moser et al., MP is, therefore, the place value of an organisation in the sight of the consumers. Likewise, Muhonen et al. (2017) [91] define MP as how the target audience perceives a product or
organisation relative to other products or organisations. Considering the definition described above, it also speaks to the preceding meanings of customer or consumer perception about a firm, product, or services compared to other similar existing organisations.

Meanwhile, there has been inconsistent and absence of coherency coupled with a lack of unanimity in the definitions (Saqib, 2021) [82]; however, it is the process of shaping a company’s image and product to occupy a distinct position in the minds of the target consumer market, with the end purpose of generating a buyer-focused value scheme that facilitates client purchases (Hinson et al., 2017) [38]. Another definition Blankson et al. (2017) [15] gives is the deliberate, proactive, iterative process of defining, modifying, and monitoring consumer perceptions of a marketable offering. Corroborating this meaning, Saqib (2021) [82] said any position definition must have these components: competition; empty slot/mind; consumers’ perception, differentiation and competitive advantage.

However, managers must first understand their target customers’ preferences and views of rivals’ products (Blankson et al., 2017) [15]. Furthermore, considering the advantage, good market positioning will bring some levels of benefits to the organisations, which could be tangible or intangible such as powerful branding, more profits, competitive advantage, and the ability to survive the turbulence and volatile business environment, which requires a good marketing strategy and segmentation (Blankson et al., 2017; Hinson et al., 2017) [15, 38]. Blankson et al. (2017) [15] further postulated that positioning gives a firm a distinct competitive advantage; it also provides room for customer retention and does otherwise to the competitors. Likewise, among many other things, market positioning helps consumers of goods and services to spot the product or services that are of immense benefit to them, hence the need for the organisation to adopt a proactive positioning culture to remain relevant. (Blankson et al., 2017; Hinson et al., 2017) [15, 38]. Also, there are consumer and managerial perspectives to positioning: what the user of service or product thinks and what management perceives the customer thinks, respectively (Hinson et al., 2017) [38].

However, it has much to do with the ability of management to influence attributes and impressions that has to do with a marketable offering concerning the competition, whether implicitly or overtly (Blankson et al., 2017) [15].

H3. There is a positive and significant relationship between Perceived Organisational Support and Market Position as a dimension of organisational performance.

2.2.3 Firm Size (FS)

Firms are classified as small, medium, or extensive based on total assets (Rashid et al., 2021) [79], and the upward change in the size of any of such organisations will lead to a positive response from investors and ultimately yield an increase in organisational value (Hirdinis, 2019) [99] hence the need to see the firm size as a performance measurement that calls for attention. Meanwhile, firm size as a measure of organisational performance has several ways by which it can be defined and measured based on factors like sales, value-added, the number of employees, total capital, market value or the firm’s total output (Farooq et al., 2021; Ha et al., 2020; Karlsson, 2020) [28, 35, 49]. Atmaja (2008), cited in Zuhroh (2019) [98], define firm size as a scale that classifies the size of a firm using various modes: total assets, log size, stock market value, total sales and the like. From the view of Atmaja, all these indicators must be factored in before the firm size can be decided. Negating this view, Karlsson (2020) [49] contended that firm size is the total number of employees per firm. Karlson argued that he chose the employee number over other considerable factors because it has been a more consistent and stable metric across sectors and time, unlike Atmaja, who believes that using a single indicator will give a false position. Supporting the notion of a single indicator, Zuhroh (2019) [98] refers to firm size based on descriptions as the number of assets a firm hold. Although, he expanded the assets to include the number of sales, profit level and the fund available to fund the operational cost. Corroborating him, Horne & Wachowicz (2009), cited in Hirdinis (2019) [39], posited that firm size reflects the size or amount of assets owned by the company and influences the company's value. However, to capture all cited authors' views, this work adopts the meaning provided by Leal-Rodríguez et al. (2015), quoted in Farooq et al. (2021) [28], as an organization’s resources, turnover or workforce size. Meanwhile, Karlsson (2020) [89] said that analysing firm size could be treated as a discrete or continuous estimator.

Though organisational size varies from place to place, firm sizes can be measured using revenue, employee number, and total assets (Zhou et al., 2021) [97]. However, it is viewed as the capabilities concerning turnover, workforce, or resources that determine their performances (Farooq et al., 2021) [39]. Large firms possess more full-time employees who are competitive intelligence experts, use firms' intranet for distributing competitive intelligence findings, use business analytics software and use commercial databases for information and are likely to have an intelligence unit, unlike smaller firms whose dependency is on social media (Calof, 2020) [99]. In consonance, organisational and technological innovation investment varies based on firm size, showing a positive correlation (Zhou et al., 2021) [97].

H4. There is a positive and significant relationship between Perceived Organisational Support and Firm Size as a dimension of organisational performance.

2.2.4 Market Growth (MG)

Although practically every strategic marketing model developed in the last few decades has relied on market growth, the concept remains vague (Bharadwaj et al., 2005) [13]. However, according to this study, market growth refers to the degree of expansion in product and service demand as well as future potential for new products and services in the industry (Zhang & Song, 2019) [96]. Market growth or expansion is defined as a significant increase in sales of goods and services as well as opportunities to promote or launch new products Meanwhile, Bharadwaj et al. (2005) [13] stated that any organization that does not pay attention to market growth or expansion in terms of its competitive position will not be around to enjoy the benefits of growth. Furthermore, market growth will accelerate when demand for products and services rises (Zhang & Song, 2019) [96]. Furthermore, when comparing market status in terms of growth, sectors with high market growth likely to offer several tempting chances for future expansion as compared
to businesses with low market growth, as well as a plethora of new technology and product development due to marketing efforts (Zhang & Song, 2019) [96]. Market growth has received attention from scholars in four areas over time: market share, resource advantage theory, diffusion, and primary demand/advertising impact theories. Market growth, on the other hand, is one of the critical variables of organizational performance, measures of a favorable business environment, and it plays a critical role, particularly in marketing models; however, its meaning and concept remain a mystery in marketing to this day (Bharadwaj et al., 2005; Shirokova et al., 2016; Zhang & Song, 2019) [13, 84, 96]. Market growth refers to the rate at which products and services are demanded in relation to future opportunities for new products and services. This means that the more people or customers demand what an establishment offers, the more the market develops, and vice versa if demand is low (Shirokova et al., 2016; Zhang & Song, 2019) [84, 96]. Findings show that when market growth is minimal, power distance increases, and when market growth is high, power distance decreases (Zhang & Song, 2019) [96]. Furthermore, organizations produce higher performance in an environment with entrepreneurial orientation combined with high hostility and Market expansion; in contrast, performance is low if all elements remain except low hostility (Shirokova et al., 2016) [84]. Furthermore, online marketing capabilities have a beneficial impact on information availability, which leads to market expansion (Bianchi & Mathews, 2016) [14]. According to Zhang and Song (2019) [96], information use has been empirically demonstrated to have a favorable impact on market growth.

H5. There is a positive and significant relationship between Perceived Organisational Support and Market Growth as a dimension of organisational performance.

3. Data collection, analysis and operational construct.

This study adopted a survey research design strategy (descriptive). It was decided to employ a cross-sectional survey approach since it can usually be completed more quickly and affordably (Setia, 2016) [83]. However, because it provided a chance to integrate different industries, the study's population was from 8,395 Small and Medium Scale Enterprises in Lagos State, Nigeria. Because they had a greater understanding of the organization's performance and state than other employees, the study's sample unit comprised firm owners or managers. Additionally, the study sample size was 378, according to the Raosoft online sample size calculator (378). In the meantime, a structured questionnaire (closed-ended) was used to gather the data, and simple random sampling was used as the sampling technique to get the primary data. The Six-Point Likert questionnaire was used while the questions were adopted from already-published works of literature; for instance, the organisational performance and sub-variables were from the studies carried out by Menon & Mohanty (2012) [59] and perceived organisational support was obtained from Farrell and Oczkowski (2009) [29]. Consequently, the organisational performance variables have their Likert as 6 – Very high, 5 – Moderately High, 4 – High, 3 – Low, 2 – Moderately Low 1 – Very low, while perceived organisational support was in the form of 6 -Very true 5 -True 4 –Somewhat True 3 – Somewhat Untrue 2 – Untrue 1 – Very Untrue.

![Fig 1: Research framework](image-url)
be estimated (Otache, 2019) [71].

4. Results
In this part, the results of the data analysis are displayed. The results of the structural model and measurement are presented in this section.

4.1 Results of the measurement models
The results of the measurement models, as shown in Table 1, demonstrated that all criteria for the evaluation of measurement models were satisfied. Ratings for all the variables were more significant than the recommended level of 0.7 (Fornell & Larcker, 1981; Sahoo & Vijayvargy, 2021; Tripathi et al., 2020) [31, 81, 92], which is a positive indication of the items measuring each of the constructs having solid internal consistency, according to the constructs' composite reliability and Cronbach alpha.

Table 1: Result of the measurement model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
<th>Cronbach's alpha</th>
<th>Composite Reliability (RHO A)</th>
<th>Composite Reliability (RHO_C)</th>
<th>Average variance extracted (AVE)</th>
<th>Discriminant Validity?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company Reputation</td>
<td>CR1</td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.851</td>
<td>0.893</td>
<td>0.626</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CR2</td>
<td>0.795</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CR3</td>
<td>0.765</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CR4</td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CR5</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm Size</td>
<td>FS1</td>
<td>0.793</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.828</td>
<td>0.829</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FS2</td>
<td>0.845</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FS3</td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FS4</td>
<td>0.803</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Growth</td>
<td>MG1</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.866</td>
<td>0.866</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MG2</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MG3</td>
<td>0.832</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MG4</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MG5</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Position</td>
<td>MP1</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.656</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MP2</td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MP3</td>
<td>0.793</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MP4</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FS</td>
<td>0.908</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.921</td>
<td>0.943</td>
<td>0.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MG</td>
<td>0.901</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>0.874</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Performance</td>
<td>POS1</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.843</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>0.888</td>
<td>0.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POS2</td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POS3</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POS4</td>
<td>0.797</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POS5</td>
<td>0.735</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Likewise, the average variance extracted (AVE) values of the constructs exceed the threshold of 0.50 (Fornell & Larcker, 1981) [31]. Company Reputation possesses an average variance extracted of 0.626, Firm Size of 0.66, Market Growth of 0.651, Market Position of 0.656, Organisational Performance of 0.806 and Perceived Organisational Support of 0.614, which show that the constructs succeed in the convergent validity criterion test. Similarly, the outer loading of the objects used to measure the structures was discovered to exceed the suggested limit ranging from 0.70 to 0.909 (Hair Jr et al., 2021) [36], which is a reliable indicator.

4.2 Discriminant validity and the square root of average variance extracted
Discriminant validity refers to the extent to which one construct varies from another (Hair Jr et al., 2021) [36]. In addition, discriminant validity is employed to assess if the table's diagonal element outweighs the off-diagonal component. By square rooting the AVE value to obtain the (DV), which is anticipated to be greater than the correlation of the particular construction or any of the other constructs in the model, which should be at least 0.5 (Fornell & Larcker, 1981) [31], a proper Average Variance Extracted (AVE) allows any study to form discriminant validity (DV).

Table 2: Discriminant validity and square roots of AVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>MG</th>
<th>MP</th>
<th>OP</th>
<th>POS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company Reputation</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm Size</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td>0.812</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Growth</td>
<td>0.742</td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td>0.807</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Position</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Performance</td>
<td>0.908</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>0.901</td>
<td>0.874</td>
<td>0.898</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Organisational Support</td>
<td>0.694</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.706</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.757</td>
<td>0.784</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers shown diagonally, bolden and italics are square roots of AVE while the rest are values depicting correlations between the constructs.
All the constructs passed the discriminant validity test because their square root of AVE values was higher than their correlations with other components. Thus, as shown in Table 2, company reputation (0.791), firm size (0.812), market growth (0.807), market position (0.81), organisational performance (0.898), and perceived organisational support (0.784), our study meets these criteria.

**4.3 Results of the structural models and hypotheses**

Table III and Figure 2 both display the bootstrapping findings of the structural relationship between the constructs. Moreover, the study of the structural model shows a favourable and statistically significant effect of perceived organisational support on all the dimensions of organisational performance adopted in this study. For instance, the relationship between the perceived organisation and company reputation shows that $\beta = 0.817$, $t = 18.448$, $p < 0.001$ (0.000).

Table 3: Results of the structural models and hypotheses testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Path Coefficients</th>
<th>Sample mean (M)</th>
<th>Standard errors</th>
<th>$t$-Values</th>
<th>$p$-Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Organisational Support -&gt; Company Reputation</td>
<td>0.817</td>
<td>0.817</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>18.448</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Organisational Support -&gt; Firm Size</td>
<td>0.812</td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>19.286</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Organisational Support -&gt; Market Growth</td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>18.406</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Organisational Support -&gt; Market Position</td>
<td>0.763</td>
<td>0.764</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>12.995</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Organisational Support -&gt; Organisational Performance</td>
<td>0.857</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>25.262</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *Significant at < 0.05 (two-tailed)

Likewise, the relationship between the perceived organisation and firm size gave a significant outcome, i.e. $\beta = 0.812$, $T = 19.286$, $p < 0.001$ (0.000). Also, Perceived organisational support and market growth $\beta = 0.824$, $t = 18.406$, $p < 0.001$ (0.000), perceived organisational support and market position $\beta = 0.763$, $T = 12.995$, $p < 0.001$ (0.000) and perceived organisational support with all the sub-construct of organisational performance also shows a high level of a significant relationship, i.e. $\beta = 0.857$, $T = 25.262$, $p < 0.001$ (0.000).
5. Discussion and implications

In this study, we empirically explored the effect of perceived organisational support on the dimensions of organisational performance in small and medium-scale enterprises in Nigeria. Successively, the whole hypotheses proposed in this study are accepted because of the result of the structural model that proved to be significant. Consequently, perceived organisational support strongly predicts organisational performance and its dimensions. This finding, however, aligns with previous studies examining perceived organisational support and performance (Byrne & Hochwarter, 2008; Imran & Aldaas, 2020) [17, 43]. Furthermore, this study point to the fact that where the employees perceive the support of their supervisor or management, there tends to be an increase in organisational productivity; efforts to ensure employee enjoys and feel business leaders’ support should therefore be put in place to better the performance of the organisation. As a result, the study’s conclusions have potential applications for business organisations and managers. For the organisation, efforts should be made to ensure that provision of a supportive environment and adequate and necessary resources for attaining organisational set goals should are available and accessible, which could come in the form of equipment, ideas, funding, physical assistance, technology, socio-emotional support and the likes. Furthermore, business owners should not just see the asset being made available but should monitor it to the point of implementation to properly aid and propel the set organisational goals. On the other hand, the finding also contributes to the existing knowledge on perceived organisational support and organisational performance by providing empirical evidence of the effect of perceived organisational support in small and medium-scale enterprises in Nigeria.

Furthermore, the findings confirmed the applicability of organisational support theory across different settings. However, this study does not come without limitations. Firstly, in contrast to adopting open-ended questions coupled with the inability to interact with the subject for the majority of the time, the survey design favours closed-ended questions over open-ended ones, collecting primary data using a questionnaire, thereby limiting respondents from fully expressing their views. The study also concentrates on SME sectors in Nigeria, which limits the applicability of the findings to other countries SME sectors or understudied industries. In light of the limitations above, future researchers could broaden the study to specific industries like manufacturing, banking, or multinationals and apply qualitative methodologies further to corroborate the conclusions.
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