

ROLE OF DISRUPTIVE LEADERSHIP IN ENHANCING PSYCHOLOGICAL OWNERSHIP AMONG SUBORDINATES

M. Rahul* and Amit Kumar Sharma*

Abstract

“Engaging people’s hearts and minds is the key to everything” – Jack Welch

Leadership has always been considered to be the conventional act of leading a group of individuals through various managerial functions. But today, the role of a leader has enhanced multi-fold and requires a leader to not only lead, but also to transform his followers into future leaders. Such a transformation among subordinates is possible when the leadership role is performed in a strategically disruptive manner, by making the subordinates develop the feeling of belongingness within the group, and in turn the organization. Such a feeling of belongingness can be more accurately termed as the feeling of ‘Psychological Ownership’ of the employees towards the organization, which has also been defined as a state of mind “in which subordinates feel as though the target of ownership...or a piece of it is ‘theirs’.” (Pierce, Kostova, & Dirks, 2001, p. 299). Through disruptive leadership practice, the job satisfaction and commitment of subordinates shall go up and turnover intention may reduce. This study investigates the role of department head in enhancing the level of psychological ownership among the faculties in north Indian private B-schools. For the purpose of this study, top ten private B-schools will be studied.

Keywords: Disruptive leadership, psychological ownership

INTRODUCTION

Today, both human resource practitioners and academic researchers agree to the fact that the employment relationship has already undergone a sea of change primarily focusing on attraction, motivation and long-term retention of skillful and talented employees (Horwitz, Heng, & Quazi, 2003; Roehling, Cavanaugh, Moyhihan & Boswell, 2000; Turnley & Feldman, 2000). In the present scenario, for examining the portfolio of human resource management practices, employee retention management has started gaining attention in order to reduce voluntary turnover within organizations (Cappelli, 2001; Mitchell *et al.*, 2001; Steel *et al.*, 2002).

Lately, psychological ownership has gained much interest in employment relationship management, which discusses about employee’s interpretation and

* Assistant Professor, School of Business, Lovely Professional University, Phagwara.

evaluation of their relationship with the organization (Rousseau, 1996; 2001; Turnley & Feldman, 1998). In order to have effective retention management, it is argued that a blend of both human resource management practices and the expectations of the employees' from these practices are to be taken into consideration. This makes it clear that the retention practices might turn out to be successful if they are in consonance with what employees' value and what they take into consideration while deciding to stay or leave the organization.

Any higher education institution is built upon three pillars: quality of faculty, good infrastructure facilities and an environment of learning. Manager has a crucial role to play for enhancing the sense of psychological ownership among employees. Likewise, here the head of the department plays the role of manager in enhancing psychological ownership among his/her subordinates.

This study attempts to apply and empirically examine the strategic leadership role of heads of the department in enhancing psychological ownership among the faculties of private B-schools in north India.

LITERATURE REVIEW

According to Dawkins *et al.*, (2015) in the present day scenario psychological ownership is the factor that promotes employee retention, performance, innovation, and employee well-being, which in turn requires focus upon understanding the different ways in which employees relate to the organization. A sense of ownership can develop for both tangible and intangible assets, which results in shaping of a person's individuality (Belk, 1988; Dittmar, 1992), which in turn affects their behavior and attitude (Isaacs, 1933; O'Toole, 1979). A sense of ownership may exist upon the asset without having any formal or legal claim towards such asset (Beggan & Brown, 1994). Considering such omnipresent nature of feelings of possession and ownership (Beaglehole, 1932; James, 1890), one can expect that psychological ownership may develop for different elements of organization, for example, the organization, job, work station, equipments used, team members and so on (Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004). Psychological ownership as defined by Pierce *et al.* (2001) is a "state in which individuals feel as though the target of ownership (material or immaterial in nature) or a piece of it is 'theirs' (i.e., 'it is MINE!')." The purpose of the present study is to focus on strategic role of head of department of private B-schools in Northern India in developing a sense of psychological ownership among the faculty members in their department.

The core of psychological ownership is to develop a sense of possession, a feeling as though an asset, object or idea is 'MINE' or 'OURS', (Furby, 1978). In an organization, people accept ideas and targets more favorably when they feel a sense of ownership and belongingness for the target (Beggan, 1992), leading to development of positive attitudes about the organization (Nuttin, 1987). Pierce *et*

al. (2001) argues that three basic human needs get satisfied in psychological ownership, i.e., self-identity, efficacy and effectance, and 'home' (having a sense of place).

On the basis of literature about what constitutes ownership and possession, Pierce *et al.* (2001) concludes:

- (a) the feeling of ownership is innately human
- (b) psychological ownership can occur toward both tangible and intangible assets
- (c) psychological ownership has important emotional, attitudinal and behavioral effects on those that experience it

The above stated conclusions clearly indicate that psychological ownership forms the individual factor and serve as a foundation for how psychological ownership is defined and its effects can be strategically utilized by the head of department.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY


1. To examine the role of individual factors of psychological ownership practiced by department heads in developing psychological ownership among subordinates.
2. To identify the factors of psychological ownership that needs disruptive approach from department heads to enhance psychological ownership among subordinates.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Stratified sampling technique was adopted for data collection, as the head of the departments of top ten business schools of north India have been targeted for the purpose of this study (refer Figure-1). A questionnaire was used for collection of data, which was pre-tested and corrected with suitable modifications. The sample size for this study has been calculated on the basis of four broad streams of management (Finance, Marketing, HR, Operations) which would tentatively consist of at least four heads for each stream, hence a sample of 40 respondents has been selected.

The Questionnaire and Pre-testing

A questionnaire was designed consisting of statements enquiring upon the practices of heads of department towards enhancing the sense of psychological ownership among the subordinates. To validate the questionnaire a pilot study was conducted using 10 samples, which assisted in narrowing down the variations in the questionnaire, and make it more suitable for the study.



ZONAL RANKING

Zonal Rank 2015	INSTITUTE	CITY	STATE	GOVT/ PVT	TOTAL SCORE (2,000.0)	OVERALL RANK (2015)
NORTH ZONE						
1	Management Development Institute, Gurgaon	Gurgaon	Haryana	P	1,722.4	5
2	Faculty of Management Studies, University of Delhi	New Delhi	Delhi	C	1,709.4	6
3	International Management Institute, New Delhi	New Delhi	Delhi	P	1,678.0	9
4	Indian Institute of Foreign Trade, New Delhi	New Delhi	Delhi	G	1,641.4	10
5	Institute of Management Technology, Ghaziabad	Ghaziabad	Uttar Pradesh	P	1,607.3	13
6	Department of Management Studies, IIT Delhi	New Delhi	Delhi	G	1,583.0	17
7	Birla Institute of Management Technology, Greater Noida	Greater Noida	Uttar Pradesh	P	1,536.0	20
8	Lal Bahadur Shastri Institute of Management, New Delhi	New Delhi	Delhi	P	1,483.4	28
9	Asia-Pacific Institute of Management, New Delhi	New Delhi	Delhi	P	1,412.5	36
10	Amity Business School, Amity University, Noida	Noida	Uttar Pradesh	P	1,397.8	42
11	Jaipuria Institute of Management, Lucknow	Lucknow	Uttar Pradesh	P	1,386.5	44
12	NIILM Centre for Management Studies, Greater Noida	Greater Noida	Uttar Pradesh	P	1,297.4	56
13	Jagan Institute of Management Studies, New Delhi	New Delhi	Delhi	P	1,294.3	57
14	Fortune Institute of International Business, New Delhi	New Delhi	Delhi	P	1,246.9	64
15	Institute of Rural Management, Jaipur	Jaipur	Rajasthan	P	1,233.6	67
16	Institute of Management Studies, Ghaziabad	Ghaziabad	Uttar Pradesh	P	1,223.0	68
17	School of Management Studies, Motilal Nehru National Institute of Technology, Allahabad	Allahabad	Uttar Pradesh	G	1,220.5	69
18	Indian Institute of Finance, Greater Noida	Greater Noida	Uttar Pradesh	P	1,208.6	70
19	Chitkara Business School, Rajpura	Rajpura	Punjab	P	1,174.5	73
20	Bharati Vidyapeeth University Institute of Management and Research, New Delhi	New Delhi	Delhi	P	1,155.0	76
21	Accurate Institute of Management & Technology, Greater Noida	Greater Noida	Uttar Pradesh	P	1,144.7	79
22	Lovely Professional University, Phagwara	Phagwara	Punjab	P	1,099.9	81
23	Punjab College of Technical Education, Ludhiana	Ludhiana	Punjab	P	1,078.7	85
24	IILM Institute, Gurgaon	Gurgaon	Haryana	P	1,077.9	86
25	G.L. Bajaj Institute of Management and Research, Greater Noida	Greater Noida	Uttar Pradesh	P	1,069.9	87

Figure 1: India's Best B-Schools Ranking- North Zone

Source: <http://www.businesstoday.in/magazine/cover-story/india-best-b-schools-2015-full-list/story/225560.html>

Reliability Analysis

Using Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient, final scale reliability was tested, which indicated a value of 0.97 indicating high level of reliability of the questionnaire.

Table 1
Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.970	31

Limitations of the Study

This study covers respondents from top ten private business schools of north India region only. Though this sample could be taken as a representation of the population, a study conducted at national level, covering all the private B-schools on India, will be ideal.

FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO PSYCHOLOGICAL OWNERSHIP

In an organization, an employee generates the feeling of psychological ownership based on certain intrinsic factors such as self-identity, self-efficacy, place like home feeling and likewise (Pierce et al., 2001). In addition to these factors, concepts of territoriality, investing self, association with the organization, accountability and controlling also contribute to psychological ownership (Jeswani & Dave, 2012). While these factors are universal in nature, the process in which it is realized differs for each employee, which may result in varying likelihood of developing such feelings of ownership at different points of time during their tenure in the organization. The asset towards which an employee develops a sense of psychological ownership may be as small as a preferred seat, to as large as the organization as a whole.

Self-efficacy: According to Bandura (1997), self-efficacy can be understood as the belief of people that they can implement certain actions and be successful in completion of a particular task. Such a freedom to control the actions is a psychological element which results in self-efficacy. This promotes a sense of psychological ownership towards a particular task or process.

Accountability: In order to be successful, every business majorly focuses upon the concept of accountability. According to Lerner & Tetlock (1999), accountability is “the implicit or explicit expectation that one may be called on to justify one’s beliefs, feelings and actions to others”. Pierce *et al.* (2003) have beautifully described about expected rights and responsibilities, where individuals who experience a deeper feeling of psychological ownership tend to perceive the right to hold others accountable and also hold themselves accountable for what happens to the target of ownership. Here again the target of ownership is seen as an extension of self.

Belongingness: Over the years, social psychologists (Ardrey, 1966; Duncan, 1981) have articulated upon the human need of having a place to dwell as a fundamental need that goes beyond the physical concerns and satisfies the psychological need to belong. Attachment to a particular place or object, becomes a ‘home’ or place for an individual deriving feeling of psychological ownership (Pierce *et al.*, 2001).

Self-Identity: The self-concept domain majorly comprises of two parts namely, social identity and self identity. It has been noted by researchers that groups of people and possession of certain asset often acts as a symbol through which they identify themselves (Belk, 1988; Rousseau, 1998). Individuals have a very strong drive to identify themselves with the settings in which they work (Ashforth & Mael, 1989), which leads to identifying self not only with a job or team, but also the organization and its mission (Rousseau, 1998). Human beings by very virtue are expressive and continuously search for opportunities to establish their self-identity; this makes self-identity an inevitable component of psychological ownership.

Association with Organization: People develop the feeling of ownership for certain objects through a living relationship (James, 1890). According to Sartre (1943) and Furby (1978b), there exists the associational aspect to feeling of ownership. By virtue of association and familiarity to an object, an individual possesses more information about the object resulting in development of more intimate connection. Such a process of association also helps an individual to identify their targets (Beggan and Brown, 1994; Rudmin and Berry, 1987).

Investing the Self: According to Locke (1690) everything that we produce, create or shape, we tend to develop the feeling of owning both the labor exerted towards the creation and the creation itself. Creation in particular involves knowledge, time, energy, and even one's identity and values. The very reason why we identify any "Object" by its creator is because the very creation is attached to the person. The objects derive their being and form from the efforts of their creator. The feeling of ownership towards an object develops based on the involvement of an individual's self with the targets resulting in self becoming an inevitable part of the object itself (Rochberg-Halton, 1980).

Controlling: Any kind of control exercised on any object or target eventually results into the development of feeling of ownership towards the target (Furby, 1978a; McClelland, 1951; Rochberg-Halton, 1980; Sartre, 1943). Furby (1978a) argues in her control model of ownership about how greater levels of control exercised upon a certain object can lead to experience of psychological part of self. Rudmin and Berry (1987) state control forms the core feature of sense of ownership.

Territoriality: Brown et al. (2005) state that self-identity and sense of ownership are so deeply interrelated that people lead to engage themselves in territorial behaviors, such as marking their territory to identify and defend their possessions (physical spaces, roles, relationships, ideas) as an extension of themselves. When an individual develops a bond of ownership over certain objects in the organization, they tend to mark such possessions exclusively for themselves.

DATA ANALYSIS

The questionnaire consisted of consistent five point Likert scale across all 31 items. The questionnaire was designed in light of the literature review and with the intention to understand the practices of department heads in building sense of psychological ownership among the subordinates.

The parameters in the above table indicate that the data seems to be negatively skewed with a skewness score of $-.658$, but that is well within the limits of -1 to $+1$ score. For the purpose of this analysis, the aggregate score of 31 variables for which responses were collected from the respondents has been used. Hence, no transformation is required and it is possible to conduct the proposed analysis of the data.

Table 2
Test of Normality of Data
Statistics

N	Valid	40
	Missing	0
Mean		106.8250
Median		109.0000
Std. Deviation		20.73878
Variance		430.097
Skewness		-.658
Std. Error of Skewness		.374
Kurtosis		.682
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.733

Proportion of variance explained by Principal Components

The Principal Component Analysis followed by a Varimax Rotation extracted 5 components with Eigen values greater than 1. The total variance that got accounted by these 5 components is 92 percent (Table 3).

Table 3
Factor wise Loading Values
Total Variance Explained

<i>Component</i>	<i>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</i>			<i>Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings</i>		
1	17.498	56.446	56.446	13.098	42.251	42.251
2	5.857	18.894	75.339	5.738	18.510	60.761
3	2.615	8.437	83.776	4.836	15.600	76.361
4	1.527	4.927	88.703	2.923	9.429	85.790
5	1.087	3.505	92.208	1.990	6.418	92.208

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

From the above summary of factor analysis, there are five broad factors that are explored, which influence the sense of psychological ownership among the subordinates of the private B-schools in northern region of India. In order to assess as to which factors require more attention from the department heads in the B-schools, the factors have been ranked in the same order as they have been factored together, explaining the relationship between various practices of heads that influences the psychological ownership among the subordinate faculties of their departments.

Table 4
Summary of Factor Analysis of 31 Item Questionnaire on Building Psychological Ownership among Subordinates

<i>FACTORS</i>	<i>Factor Loading</i>
FACTOR I - Accountability & Self-direction	
6. My subordinates have the practice of owning the problems they face in workplace.	.843
7. As a practice, any mistake committed by my team members gets readily accepted by them.	.950
9. Any extra task assigned is readily accepted by my team mates.	
13. The level of involvement of my subordinates in task is always very high.	.950
15. My subordinates do understand about their individual sexual identity.	.915
18. I always get to see active participation from all my team mates.	
19. At any point of time, all my team mates have all the crucial information related to the organization.	.960
21. My teammates are good at creating their own list of responsibilities that they wish to take up.	.948
22. My team members take up every possible responsibility.	
24. I always insist on team members setting their own goals.	.942
25. My team members have the liberty to set their own performance standards.	
26. As a practice I involve my subordinates in reviewing me as their leader.	.948
28. I promote the practice of openly communicating the work territories among my subordinates.	.942
30. If a territory breach takes place within my team members it gets restored by the members themselves.	.942
FACTOR II - Contribution to Organization Effectiveness	.889
8. My team members are aware about the fact that how they individually contribute to the organization objective.	.950
11. I have the practice of helping my subordinates to feel connected to the organization by making them a part of the decision making.	.960
12. My team mates are always able to achieve the desired results as planned by the organization.	
17. My subordinates very well know the organization vision and mission.	.880
20. My subordinates put in their best efforts to sustain the existence of the organization.	.782
27. I allow my team members to construct their individual work territories.	.836
31. I do believe that people develop a psychological value towards their work territory.	.782

contd. table

<i>FACTORS</i>	<i>Factor Loading</i>
FACTOR III - Sense of Belongingness & Conception	.836
10. My subordinates feel esteemed to be a part of my team.	
14. My team members have high level of confidence upon other members in the team.	
16. All my subordinates have the conception of being a crucial part of the team as one single body.	.749
29. My team members maintain their own territories.	
FACTOR IV - Self-Efficacy	.922
1. My subordinates view challenging tasks as opportunities to master problems.	.922
2. My team members develop a deeper interest in all the tasks assigned to them.	.924 .922
3. I believe my subordinates have a strong sense of commitment towards their team.	.961
23. My subordinates have the freedom to define their own responsibilities.	.691
FACTOR V - Resilience	.590
4. My team members are capable of quickly recovering from setbacks.	.961
5. My team members always try to seek the complete information, be it success or failure.	.697 .772

Table 5
Ranking of Factors

<i>Factor</i>	<i>Name of Factor</i>	<i>Ranking</i>
I	Accountability & Self-direction	1
II	Contribution to Organization Effectiveness	2
III	Sense of Belongingness & Conception	3
IV	Self-efficacy	4
V	Resilience	5

As we can see, the practice of making subordinates accountable and self-directed is a widely practiced phenomena among the department heads, which surely adds to the organization effectiveness; the focus upon making subordinates develop a sense of belongingness and conception; evolve with a feeling of self-efficacy; and developing a resilient behavior needs more attention. The employees in an organization should not only be made accountable and self-directed for their responsibilities, but they should also be assisted in realizing their individual importance in the large body called organization. By doing so, the institutions will also be able to retain such employees for fairly longer period of time. Thus, the disruptive approach of department heads should primarily focus upon the practices

to develop stronger sense of belongingness, improved self-efficacy, and undefeated resilience. For this to take shape in reality, the top management needs to support the department heads in adopting the disruptive approach of managing work, assigning responsibilities and decision making power among subordinates. As a result of such practice, the subordinates will feel empowered and develop the tendency of owning the decisions that they make for the performance effectiveness of the institution, and also have a stronger bonding with the organization, leading to long term association with the institution.

CONCLUSION

The department heads of private B-schools in north India do have the practice of developing the sense of psychological ownership among their subordinates, but considering the pace at which organizations and institutions are growing, they also need to empower their employees not by just making them accountable, but by taking a disruptive approach of giving major decision-making control in the hands of the self-managed and self-directed employees. This shall surely result towards development of B-schools that are more independent in terms of developing innovative ways of teaching, boosting employee morale, and increasing their participation in crucial decisions of the institution.

References

- Ardrey, R. (1966). *The territorial imperative: A personal inquiry into the animal origins of property and nations*. New York: Dell.
- Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 20-39.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.
- Beaglehole, E. (1932). *Property: A study in social psychology*. New York: Macmillan.
- Beggan, J. K. (1992). On the social nature of nonsocial perception: the mere ownership effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62, 229-237.
- Beggan, J. K., & Brown, E. M. (1994). Association as a psychological justification for ownership. *Journal of Psychology*, 128, 365-379.
- Belk, R. W. (1988). Possession and the extended self. *The Journal of Consumer Research*, 15, 139-168.
- Brown, G., Lawrence, T.B., Robinson, S.L. (2005). Territoriality in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 30: 577-594.
- Cappelli, P. (2001). A market-driven approach to retaining talent. *Harvard Business Review on finding and keeping the best people* (pp. 27-50). Boston : Harvard Business School Press.
- Dawkins, S., Tian, A. W., Newman, A., and Martin, A. (2015) Psychological ownership: A review and research agenda. *J. Organiz. Behav.*, doi: 10.1002/job.2057.
- Dittmar, H. (1992). *The social psychology of material possessions: To have is to be*. Hemel Hempstead, England: St Martin's Press.

- Duncan, N. G. (1981). Home ownership and social theory. In S. Duncan (Ed.), *Housing and identity: Crosscultural perspectives* (pp. 98-134). New York: Holmes & Meier.
- Furby, L. (1978). Possession in humans: an exploratory study of its meaning and motivation. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 6, 49-65.
- Furby, L. (1978a). Possessions: Toward a theory of their meaning and function throughout the life cycle. In P. B. Baltes (Ed.), *Life Span Development and Behavior* (1, pp. 297-336). New York: Academic Press.
- Furby, L. (1978b). Possession in humans: An exploratory study of its meaning and motivation. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 6(1), 49-65.
- Horwitz, F. M., Heng, C. T., & Quazi, H. A. (2003). Finders, keepers? Attracting, motivating and retaining knowledge workers. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 13(4), 23-44.
- Isaacs, S. S. (1933). *Social development in young children: A study of beginnings*. London, UK: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- James, W. (1890). *Principles of psychology*. New York: Macmillan.
- Jeswani, S., & Dave, S. (2012). A Study on the Impact of Predictors of Psychological Ownership on Turnover Intention among Faculty Members. *International Journal of Engineering and Management Research*, Vol.2(2).
- Lerner, J. S., & Tetlock, P. E. (1999). Accounting for the effects of accountability. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125, 255-275.
- Locke, J. (1690). *Two treatises of government*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McClelland, D. (1951). *Personality*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Mitchell, T. R., Holtom, B.C., & Lee, T. W. (2001). How to keep your best employees: Developing an effective retention policy. *Academy of Management Executive*, 15(4), 96109.
- Nuttin, J. M. Jr. (1987). Affective consequences of mere ownership: the name letter effect in twelve European languages. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 17, 381-402.
- O'Toole, J. (1979). The uneven record of employee ownership. *Harvard Business Review*, 57, 185-197.
- Pierce, J. L., Kostova, T., & Dirks, K. T. (2001). Toward a theory of psychological ownership in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 26, 298-310.
- Pierce, J.L., Kostova, T., & Dirks, K.T. (2003). The state of psychological ownership: Integrating and extending a century of research. *Review of General Psychology*, 7, 84-107.
- Rochberg-Halton, E. (1980). *Cultural signs and urban adaptation: The meaning of cherished household possessions*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 40(8-A), 4754-4755.
- Roehling, M. V., Cavanaugh, M. A., Moynihan, L. M., & Boswell, W. (2000). The nature of the new employment relationship : A content analysis of the practitioner and academic literatures.
- Rousseau, D. M. (1996). Changing the deal while keeping the people. *Academy of Management Executive*, 10(1), 50-58.
- Rousseau, D. M. (1998). Why workers still identify with organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 19, 217-233.

- Rousseau, D. M. (2001). The idiosyncratic deal: Flexibility versus fairness? *Organizational Dynamics*, 29(4), 260-273.
- Rudmin, F. W., & Berry, J. W. (1987). Semantics of ownership: A free-recall study of property. *The Psychological Record*, 37, 257-268.
- Sartre, J. P. (1943/1969). *Being and nothingness: A phenomenological essay on ontology*. New York: Philosophical Library/London: Methuen.
- Steel, R. P., Griffeth, R. W., & Hom, P. W. (2002). Practical retention policy for the practical manager. *Academy of Management Executive*, 18(2), 149-169.
- Turnley, W. H., & Feldman, D. C. (1998). Psychological contract violation during corporate restructuring. *Human Resource Management*, 37(1), 71-83.
- Turnley, W. H., & Feldman, D. C. (2000). Re-examining the effects of psychological contract violations: unmet expectations and job dissatisfaction as mediators. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, 25-42.
- Van Dyne, L., & Pierce, J. L. (2004). Psychological ownership and feelings of possession: Three field studies predicting employee attitudes and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 439-459.