



NIGERIAN JOURNAL OF PSYCHOLOGY

Volume 23, No.1, 2023 ISSN: 0331-0574 (Print), 2635-3806 (Online)

Published by the Nigerian Psychological Association

NPA JOURNALS - www.npa-journals.org/njp

Psychological Ownership as a Predictor of Organizational Commitment among Employees of National Orientation Agency in North-Central Nigeria

Priscilla Mrumun Gondoaluo¹

Aondoaver Ucho²

ARTICLE INFO

Article History

Received: 22nd April, 2023

Revised: 10th May, 2023

Accepted: 2nd July, 2023

Authors' Affiliation

¹National Orientation Agency,
Nasarawa State Directorate, Lafia,
Nigeria

²Department of Psychology,
Benue State University, Makurdi,
Nigeria
uchoaondoaver@gmail.com

Keywords

Belongingness,

Commitment,

Organizational Ownership,

Self-Identity,

National Orientation Agency.

ABSTRACT

Organizational commitment is considered as an issue of primary importance, especially to the management and owners of organizations. The National Orientation Agency (NOA) in Nigeria which is charged with the responsibility of orientation and re-orientation of citizens on national values needs committed employees in order to achieve its mandate. Consequently, as part of research effort in that regard, this study examined psychological ownership as a predictor of organizational commitment among employees of National Orientation Agency (NOA) in North-Central Nigeria. The cross sectional survey design was adopted. The participants were 257 employees comprising 164(63.81%) males, 93(36.19%) females. Their ages ranged from 24–59 years with the mean age of 41 years. Systematic random sampling technique was used in selecting the participants. Data was collected using the Psychological Ownership Questionnaire and the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire. The hypotheses were tested using standard multiple regression analysis. Results revealed that psychological ownership dimensions (self-efficacy, self-identity, belongingness, accountability and territoriality) jointly influenced overall organizational commitment and each of the three dimensions of organizational commitment (Affective, Continuance and Normative) significantly. The result means that the higher the feeling of organizational ownership, the higher the commitment of the employees. The study concluded that psychological ownership (especially belongingness and self-identity) are important factors that enhance organizational commitment of employees of National Orientation Agency, therefore, the Governing Board and Management of National Orientation Agency should initiate and implement policies that will promote sense of belongingness and self-identity among the employees of the agency among other recommendations.

Introduction

Employee commitment to their organization has received great deal of attention from both managers and researchers (Gallagher & Mclean, 2001; Phuong, Bach, Linh, Ly, Dat, An, & Hung, 2023), and this makes organizational commitment the most developed and matured construct of work (Cohen, 2003; Morrow & McElroy, 1993). Due to the wide research on the topic, there exists an avalanche of definitions of the concept. For instance, Mowday, Porter and Steers (1982) and Hackett, Lapiere and Hausdorf (2001) considered organizational commitment as an employee's belief in the organization's goals and values and an aspiration to remain a member of the organization as well as faithfulness to the organization. The definition emphasizes individual's identification and involvement in the organization, reflects the process by which individuals link themselves to an organization, and focuses on the individuals' actions (Gautam, Van Dick & Wagner, 2004; Mascarenhas, Galvao, & Marques, 2022; Sorour, 2021; VanKnippenberg & Sleebos, 2006). Once identification with the organization begins, individuals are likely to become concerned with the broader interests of the organization including its reputation, survival, and continued success, that generates activity and resource exchange (reflecting enhanced concern between firm and employee) fostering further identification (Rousseau, 1998). Organizational commitment also means complying with the aims and objectives of the organization, organizational principles, rules and norms, and volunteering for their survival (Dominic & Salim, 2018).

One of the most popular typologies of organizational commitment which this study has adopted was given by Allen and Mayer (1991) who differentiated organizational commitment into three components: affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment. Affective commitment refers to an employee's emotional attachment to, identification and involvement in the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1991). Affective commitment means that an employee wishes to stay as a part of the organization. It allows people to work with dedication, accept the goals and objectives of their employers, and contribute to organization's success (Hashmi, Ahmad, & Nawaz, 2021; Ullah, Kamran,

Akram, Nawaz, & Rehman, 2021). Affective commitment is more dependent on characteristics of job rather than personal characteristics (Morrow, 1993) implying that it is more concerned with intrinsic factors such as maintaining good human relations and involvement of staff in policy/decision-making.

Continuance commitment refers to the employee's perceived cost of leaving the organization. It is explained as commitment related with expenses that workers perceive are associated with abandoning the institution. This type of commitment is grounded on the number of investment employees make in their current institutions and absence of job opportunities (Dixit & Bhati, 2012). Continuance commitment is grounded on the benefits the worker has made in an institution (Folorunso, Andewale & Abodunde, 2014). It is the availability of an employee from staff to stay in the organization on account of the venture which incorporate warm association with other employees, benefits, individual funds and obtained work aptitudes which are particular to a specific institution (Khan, Nawaz, & Khan, 2013). Consequently the period of time the worker has been in the institution, involvement in communal activities and additional rewards that make it costly for one to quit working for the organization (Adekola, 2012). Continuance component of commitment is based on the perception of the employees about the losses that would be faced when they leave their current organization.

Normative commitment concerns employees' perceived obligation to remain with their organization (Kell & Motowidlo, 2012; Muhammad, Afridi, Ali, Shah & Alasan, 2021). Normative component develop as a result of socialization experience which depends on the extent to which the employees feeling of obligation. Normative components induced a feeling of obligation to employees to give back for what they had received from the organization. It is based on the feelings of loyalty and obligation.

Psychological Ownership

Generally, it is observed that people become more attached to things they feel that they possess than similar things that they do not feel they possess (VanDyne & Pierce, 2004). This feeling of possession is what has been conceptualized by researchers in organizational context as psychological ownership. In organizational settings, employees that

develop psychological ownership towards their jobs come to experience ownership towards their organization (Peng & Pierce, 2015), and come to see their organization's success as their own success (Dittmar, 1992; Pierce & Rodgers, 2004).

Pierce, Kostova, and Dirks (2001) define psychological ownership as a cognitive-affective construct that is based on individuals' feelings of possessiveness and of being psychologically tied or attached to objects that are material and immaterial in nature. The core of psychological ownership is the feeling of possessiveness and being psychologically tied to an object (Pierce, Kostova & Dirks, 2001). The feeling of possessiveness has no formal or legal claims (Mayhew, Ashkanasy, Bramble & Gardner, 2007).

Extant literature on this construct has shown that psychological ownership has different dimensions. According to Olckers and Du-Plessis (2012) psychological ownership comprises seven dimensions that impact the extent to which psychological ownership is experienced. These dimensions include self-efficacy, self-identity, belongingness, accountability, autonomy and Self-efficacy constitutes individuals' beliefs in their personal ability to accomplish tasks (Bandura, 1995) and has also been referred to as confidence (Avey *et al.*, 2009). According to Furby (1978), being in control forms an important part of self-efficacy. Therefore, the possibility of being in control and being able to effect a desirable outcome of actions is a psychological component that results in feelings of self-efficacy and in the promotion of psychological ownership.

Self-identity, according to Dittmar (1992), refers to a personal cognitive connection between an individual and an object or target (for example the organization) and reflects the individual's perception of oneness with the target. The object or target of possession is thus seen by individuals as an extension of who they are (Avey *et al.*, 2009). Interaction with their possessions provides people with comfort, autonomy, pleasure and opportunity, all of which facilitate the development and cultivation of their identity.

Belongingness is the feeling of psychological ownership through attachment to a place or an object leading to that place or object becoming 'home' to the individual (Avey *et al.* 2009; Pierce *et al.*, 2001).

Accountability according to Lerner and Tetlock (1999) is the implicit or explicit expectation that one may be called on to justify one's beliefs, feelings, and actions to others. Avey *et al.* (2009) clarified that accountability can be considered a component of psychological ownership through the expected right to hold others accountable and the expectation for one's self to be held accountable. Accountability has to do with accepting responsibility and demonstrating transparency and answerability voluntarily (Wood & Winston, 2007).

Autonomy on its part is defined as the regulation of the self and the extent to which a person needs or is eager to experience individual initiative in performing in the organization (Ryan & Deci, 2006). Mayhew, Ashkanasy, Bramble and Gardner (2007) provide evidence that if employees are empowered and allowed to exercise control over important aspects of their work arrangements, the manifestation of work-related attitudes (job satisfaction and organization-based self-esteem) and other behaviours which improve their sense of ownership are promoted.

Psychological Ownership and Organizational Commitment

Psychological ownership has received increasing attention from scholars and practitioners as a potentially important predictor of employee attitudes and behaviors (Jing, & Yan, 2022; Pierce *et al.*, 2003, 2019; Renz *et al.*, 2020; VanDyne & Pierce, 2004). Brown, Lawrence and Robinson (2005) suggest that: 'the stronger an individual's psychological ownership of an object, the greater the likelihood he or she will engage in territorial behaviour toward that object'. According to Avey *et al.* (2009), territoriality might lead to people becoming too preoccupied with the 'objects of ownership', with the result being that they might not want to share the object (for example, machinery or physical space). This happens at the expense of their performance or other pro-social behaviours. However, despite these potentially negative outcomes, it is possible that feelings of territoriality might promote positive organization outcomes.

Following from above, Pierce, Rubenfeld and Morgan (1991) theorized that psychological ownership can be associated with positive behavioural and psychological consequences and that these associations will hold regardless of the

organizational member's financial ownership and the member's legal status as owner or non-owner.

Psychological ownership has been associated with: greater commitment to the organization (Olekers, 2016; Vandewalle, Vandyne & Kostova., 1995); greater accountability (Vandewalle *et al.*, 1995); better organizational performance (Eli, Edem, & Christopher, 2021); better organization-based self-esteem, organizational citizenship behaviours (Avey *et al.*, 2009; Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004); and the intention to stay in the organization (Avey *et al.*, 2009). Psychological ownership predicted organizational commitment and mediated the relationship between autonomy and work attitudes (Mayhew, Ashkanasy, Bramble & Gardner, 2007).

There has been both theoretical and empirical support for a relationship between psychological ownership and commitment. For example, Lawler (1992) suggests that employees must psychologically feel as if they own the organization in order to develop the organizational commitment characteristic of high-involvement organizations. Similarly, Florkowski (1987), and Pierce *et al.* (1991) propose that psychological ownership is an antecedent to organizational commitment. These propositions have empirical support even in the 21st century. For example, Van Dyne and Pierce (2004) found that psychological ownership was a significant predictor of organizational commitment over a number of samples. Also, Esop and Timms (2019) reported that in an organizational context, the theory of psychological ownership supports the positive relationship between psychological ownership and organizational commitment. Indirect support for this relationship has also been obtained, whereby a reduction in team psychological ownership has been related to reduced levels of organizational commitment (Druskat & Pescosolido, 2002). Furthermore, formal employee ownership plans have been associated with increased loyalty and commitment of organizational members (Long, 1978; Sands, 2002).

Based on Avey and colleagues' study, there is a strong positive relationship between promotion-

oriented psychological ownership and employee commitment (Avey *et al.*, 2009). In similar studies it was also found that psychological ownership positively affects organizational commitment (Boonsiritomachai, Elouadi, 2020; Sud-Onb, & Sudharatana, 2022; Ozler, Yılmaz & Ozler, 2008; Ramaprasad, Lakshminarayanan, & Pai, 2018). The conclusion means that people generally become more attached to things they feel they possess than similar things that they do not feel they possess (VanDyne & Pierce, 2004).

Although psychological ownership is largely positioned as a positive construct (Avey *et al.*, 2009), it is also associated with potentially negative effects, such as territoriality and failure to delegate responsibility. The dark side of ownership stems largely from the notion that people can become motivated not only to enhance, but also to protect and defend that which they hold (even subconsciously) as an external representation of themselves (Brown *et al.*, 2005). The most often-studied negative outcome of ownership is territorialism. Avey and colleagues describe territorialism as the prevention focused form of psychological ownership, which is characterized by preoccupation with external parties infringing on the target and defensive thoughts and behaviors.

Pierce and Jussila (2011) posit that negative outcomes of ownership may also depend on the presence of certain conditions. For example, scholars have predicted that psychological ownership could prompt information hoarding in highly competitive situations while discouraging similar behaviors in collectivistic cultures (Peng & Pierce, 2015). Brown and colleagues (2005) also theorize that certain conditions during organizational change (e.g., ambiguity, perceived infringement) are likely to exacerbate the effects of ownership on displays of territoriality like defensiveness and marking behaviour.

Hypotheses

- i. Territoriality, belongingness, accountability, self-efficacy, and self-identity will jointly predict organizational commitment among employees of National Orientation Agency in North-Central Nigeria.
- ii. Territoriality will significantly predict organizational commitment among

employees of National Orientation Agency in North-Central Nigeria.

- iii. Belongingness will significantly predict organizational commitment among employees of National Orientation Agency in North-Central Nigeria.
- iv. Accountability will significantly predict organizational commitment among employees of National Orientation Agency in North-Central Nigeria.
- v. Self-efficacy will significantly predict organizational commitment among employees of National Orientation Agency in North-Central Nigeria.
- vi. Self-identity will significantly predict organizational commitment among employees of National Orientation Agency in North-Central Nigeria.

METHOD

Design

In order to measure and estimate the influence of psychological ownership on organizational commitment among employees of NOA, a cross-sectional survey design was employed. The design was used because both the predictor and the outcome variables were measured and analysis performed at a particular point in time.

Participants

The participants for this study were 257 employees of the National Orientation Agency in North-Central Nigeria. They were randomly selected from a population of 775 employees available in the zone as at December, 2017. The participants comprised of 164(63.81%) males, 93(36.19%) females.. Their ages ranged from 24 to 59 years with the mean age of 41 years and standard deviation of 8.54. They were sampled across five states in the North-Central zone of Nigeria as follows: 49(19.1%) from Benue State, 44(17.1%) from Kogi State, 56(21.8%) from Nasarawa State, 62(24.1%) from Niger State and 46(17.9%) from Plateau State.

Sample Size Determination

According to the statistics obtained from the office of the Director General of National Orientation Agency, the six states in North-Central Nigeria have a population of 904 employees of National Orientation Agency (NOA) as at December, 2017. However, when Kwara State with the population of 129 employees was excluded in the main study because it was used in the pilot study, the remaining five states had the population of 775 employees. The employees are distributed across the five states as presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Distribution of employees of NOA according to states in North-Central Nigeria

State	No. of employees (%)	No. selected
Benue	144(19%)	49
Nasarawa	173(22%)	56
Kogi	133(17%)	44
Niger	186(24%)	62
Plateau	139(18%)	46
Total	775 (100%)	257

To estimate the representative sample size for the study, Krejcie and Morgan (1970) approach was adopted and a sample of 257 employees was arrived at after which proportional method was used to determine representation from the five states.

Sampling Technique

The researcher used the simple random sampling technique in selecting the participants. A list of randomly generated numbers from the internet-based random number generator was used. The lists were generated according to the sample frame from each of the five participating states in North-Central Nigeria. The questionnaire copies were issued to the participants who completed them and returned to the researcher through the state coordinators.

Instruments

The Psychological Ownership Questionnaire (POQ) by Avey and Avolio (2007) cited in Avey, et al. (2009) was used to assess feeling of organizational ownership. There are two sub-scales for the POQ; Preventative psychological ownership and Promotive psychological ownership. The questionnaire has 16 items in all; Items 1-4 are Preventative psychological ownership also known as feelings of territoriality. Items 5-16 are the four dimensions of promotive psychological ownership. Specifically, items 5-7 are the Self-Efficacy dimension, 8-10 are the Accountability dimension, 11-13 are the Sense of Belongingness dimension, 14-16 are the Self Identify dimension. Avey et al. (2009) reported reliability coefficients as follows: Territoriality .83, Self-efficacy .89, Accountability .86, Sense of belongingness .92 and Self-identity .80 and the overall promotion-oriented psychological ownership

measure .91. The questionnaire, when tested on a sample of employees of National Orientation Agency (NOA) yielded Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .83 while on the subscales, the Cronbach's alpha were: Territoriality=.84; Self-efficacy=.89; Accountability=.90; Belongingness=.84; and, Self-identity=.53. The questionnaire is scored on a 6-point rating scale ranging from 1=Strongly Disagree to 6=Strongly Agree. Higher scores on this scale indicate high psychological ownership while low scores imply low psychological ownership.

The Organizational Commitment Questionnaire developed by Allen and Meyer, (1990) was used to measure OC of NOA employees. The questionnaire has 24 items in all, with eight items each measuring the three components of affective, normative and continuance commitment. Allen and Meyer (1990) provided reliability coefficients as follows: affective commitment scale: 0.87; continuous commitment scale: 0.75; and the normative commitment scale: 0.79. In the present study, the Cronbach's alpha coefficients are: Over all OC = .84, Affective commitment = .81; Continuance commitment = .63; and Normative commitment = .70.

The questionnaire is scored on a 7-point rating scale ranging from 1=strongly disagree, 2=moderately disagree, 3=slightly disagree, 4=neither agree nor disagree, 5=slightly agree, 6=moderately agree, to 7=strongly agree. Item no. 4,5,6,8,9,12,18,19,24 were reverse scored. High scores on this questionnaire

indicate high organizational commitment while low scores imply low organizational commitment.

Procedure for Data Collection

First of all, letters were submitted and former permission was obtained from the various state directorates of the National Orientation Agency for data collection. The researcher with the assistance of the state directors and the local government officers distributed the questionnaire to the affected employees. Participation in the research voluntary and when the questionnaires were completed, the

researcher personally collected them while those who could not complete their copies of the questionnaire were asked to submit later to the State Director through the local government officers. This process was done in all the five states used for the main study.

Data Analysis

Multiple regression analysis was used in testing the influence of psychological ownership and its dimensions on organizational commitment. The results are presented in Table 2.

RESULTS

Table 2: Multiple linear regression showing psychological ownership dimensions (territoriality, self-efficacy, accountability, belongingness, and self-identity) as independent and joint predictors of organizational commitment among employees of National Orientation Agency

DV	IV	R	R ²	df	F	p	β	t	p
Overall org. commitment	Constant							9.140	.000
	Territoriality						.121	1.896	.059
	Self-efficacy	.438	.192	5,206	9.784	.000	.050	.732	.465
	Accountability						-.174	-2.566	.011
	Belongingness						.273	3.293	.001
	Self-identity						.188	2.227	.027
Affective commitment	Constant							5.440	.000
	Territoriality						-.119	-1.904	.058
	Self-efficacy	.421	.177	5,19	9.420	.000	.056	.850	.396
	Accountability						.030	.451	.653
	Belongingness						.312	3.846	.000
	Self-identity						.104	1.253	.212
Continuance commitment	Constant							6.362	.063
	Territoriality						.152	2.447	.015
	Self-efficacy	.351	.123	5,236	6.640	.000	.017	2.447	.800
	Accountability						-.218	-3.297	.001
	Belongingness						.177	2.201	.029
	Self-identity						.153	1.866	.063
Normative commitment	Constant							7.230	.000
	Territoriality						.069	1.095	.275
	Self-efficacy	.313	.098	5,234	5.089	.000	.063	.933	.352
	Accountability						-.146	-2.166	.031
	Belongingness						.214	2.603	.010
	Self-identity						.106	1.272	.204

The results presented in Table 1 revealed that psychological ownership dimensions jointly predicted overall organizational commitment significantly

[$R=.438$, $R^2=.192$, $F(5,206)=9.784$, $p<.01$]. Psychological ownership dimensions jointly accounted for 19.2% of the total variance observed in overall organizational commitment of employees of

National Orientation Agency (NOA). On the independent basis, the results showed that belongingness ($\beta=.273$, $t=3.293$, $p<.01$) and self-identity ($\beta=.188$, $t=2.227$, $p<.01$) made significant independent contribution in the positive direction. This means that employees of NOA who scored high on belongingness and self-identity have corresponding high tendency to be committed to the organization and those with low scores on belongingness and self-identity also have low tendency to be committed to the organization. Accountability ($\beta=-.174$, $t=-2.566$, $p<.01$) made significant negative independent contribution to the prediction of overall organizational commitment meaning that employees of NOA who scored high on accountability have low tendency to be committed to the organization while on the other hand, those who scored low on accountability have high tendency to be committed to the organization. However, territoriality ($\beta=.121$, $t=1.896$, $p>.05$), and self-efficacy ($\beta=.050$, $t=.732$, $p>.05$) made no significant independent contribution to the prediction of overall organizational commitment of the employees of NOA in North-Central Nigeria.

On the dimensions of organizational commitment, the results revealed that psychological ownership dimensions jointly predicted affective commitment significantly among employees of National Orientation Agency [$R=.421$, $R^2=.177$, $F(5,219)=9.420$, $p<.01$]. The result indicated that psychological ownership jointly accounted for 17.7% of the total variance in affective commitment of the employees of NOA. On independent basis, the result showed that among the five dimensions of psychological ownership, only belongingness ($\beta=.312$, $t=.846$, $p<.01$) made significant independent contribution to the model in the positive direction indicating that employees of NOA who scored high on belongingness have a corresponding high tendency to be affectively committed to the organization just as those who scored low on belongingness have low tendency to be affectively committed to the organization. On the other hand, territoriality ($\beta=-.119$, $t=-1.904$, $p>.05$), self-efficacy ($\beta=.056$, $t=.850$, $p>.05$), accountability ($\beta=.030$, $t=.451$, $p>.05$), and, self-identity ($\beta=.104$, $t=1.253$, $p>.05$) made no significant independent contribution to the influence on affective commitment of the employees of National Orientation Agency.

On continuance dimension of organizational commitment, the results showed that psychological ownership dimensions jointly influenced continuance commitment significantly [$R=.351$, $R^2=.123$, $F(5,236)=6.640$, $p<.01$]. Psychological ownership accounted for 12.3% of the total variance observed in continuance commitment. On independent basis, the results showed that territoriality ($\beta=.152$, $t=2.447$, $p<.05$) and belongingness ($\beta=.177$, $t=2.201$, $p<.05$) made significant positive contribution to the influence of psychological ownership on continuance commitment. This means that employees of NOA who scored high on territoriality and belongingness have a corresponding high tendency to be committed to the organization on a continuance basis just as those who scored low on territoriality and belongingness have low tendency to be committed to the organization on a continuance basis. Furthermore, the results indicated that accountability ($\beta=-.218$, $t=-3.297$, $p<.01$) made negative independent contribution meaning that employees of NOA who scored high on accountability have low tendency to be committed to the organization on a continuance basis while those who scored low on accountability have higher tendency to be committed to the organization on a continuance basis. Nevertheless, while self-efficacy ($\beta=.017$, $t=.253$, $p>.05$) and self-identity ($\beta=.153$, $t=1.866$, $p>.05$) made no significant independent contributions to the model.

On normative commitment, the results showed that psychological ownership jointly predicted normative commitment significantly [$R=.313$, $R^2=.098$, $F(5,234)=5.089$, $p<.01$]. Psychological ownership jointly accounted for 9.8% of the total variance observed in normative commitment of the employees of National Orientation Agency (NOA) in North-Central Nigeria. On independent basis, the results showed that among the five dimensions of psychological ownership, accountability ($\beta=-.146$, $t=-2.166$, $p<.05$) made significant negative independent contribution, indicating that employees of NOA who scored high on accountability had low tendency to be normatively committed to the organization while those who scored low on accountability had high tendency to be normatively committed to the organization. Belongingness ($\beta=.214$, $t=2.603$, $p<.01$) made significant positive independent contribution, meaning that employees of NOA who scored high on belongingness had high tendency to be normatively committed to the organization just as those who scored low on belongingness had low tendency to be

normatively committed to the organization. However, territoriality ($\beta=.069$, $t=1.095$, $p>.05$), self-efficacy ($\beta=.063$, $t=.933$, $p>.05$), and self-identity ($\beta=.106$, $t=1.272$, $p>.05$) did not make any significant independent contribution to the model.

From the above results, it could be seen that psychological ownership dimensions jointly and independently predicted overall organizational commitment and all its dimensions significantly. Based on this result, hypothesis one was confirmed.

Discussion of Findings

The findings of this study are discussed according to the hypotheses tested. The first hypothesis stated that there will be a significant independent and joint influence of psychological ownership dimensions (territoriality, belongingness, accountability, self-efficacy & self-identity) on organizational commitment among employees of National Orientation Agency in North-Central Nigeria. The findings indicated that psychological ownership dimensions jointly influenced overall organizational commitment significantly accounting for a significant percentage of the total variance observed. The significant influence applies to the three dimensions of affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. This means that psychological ownership as a whole plays a significant role in determining the level of organizational commitment of employees of National Orientation Agency (NOA) in North-Central Nigeria. Although the ownership is a perceived one and not the actual ownership with legal title, it has great potential for stimulating commitment of the employees. The implication of this finding is that, employees of National Orientation Agency (NOA) who feel they own the organization would consider the problems of the organization as their personal problem, they find great deal of personal meaning being part of the organization, feel moral obligation to remain in the organization and are worried of what would happen if they leave the organization.

This finding is in line with van Dyne and Pierce (2004) who demonstrated positive links between psychological ownership and employee attitudes including organizational commitment. The finding also tallies with Ozler, Yilmaz, and Ozler (2008) who found that psychological ownership increases organizational commitment. Similarly, the finding is

in consonance with Hooreen (2014) who indicated that psychological ownership has a significant role to play in affective commitment, and Ya-chung (2013) who found that collective psychological ownership influenced organizational commitment significantly.

More specifically, it was found that belongingness and self-identity had significant independent positive influence on organizational commitment of the employees of NOA, accountability had significant negative influence, while territoriality, and self-efficacy had no significant independent influence on overall organizational commitment of the employees of NOA in North-Central Nigeria. The results imply that for the management of NOA to keep the employees committed to achieving the goals of their organization, the employees should be given sense of belongingness, and their sense of self-identity should be enhanced.

Perhaps, employees of NOA who are totally comfortable and feel 'at home' in the organization (i.e. sense of belongingness) and those who feel they are being defined by their organization and the success of the organization is also their success (self-identity) are most likely to be psychologically attached to their organization and to remain dedicated to working towards the success of the organization. This finding is in consonance with Pettengill (2016) who also found direct positive relationship between belongingness and organizational commitment. It also tallies with Lam, and Liu (2014) who found significant positive relationship between self-identity and affective commitment.

However, the findings showed that accountability had significant negative influence on organizational commitment as a whole, meaning that employees of National Orientation Agency who have high tendency to challenge wrong doings by other members of the organization and who serve as whistle blowers are less likely to remain committed to the organization. It is not clear why employees with high sense of accountability would be less committed to their organization as indicated by this finding because conventionally, it is expected that employees who want the right things to be done for the benefit of their organization should be more psychologically attached to their organization. However, the researcher suspects that employees with high sense of accountability are often frustrated by some superior employees who would want to perpetrate their wrong

doing without hindrance, especially in the context of Nigerian work settings. Thus, it can weaken the sense of commitment of the employee with high sense of accountability who may be victimized for standing in the way of some stronger employees in the organization. This finding disagrees with Breland, Laird, Bhakta and Zantow (2016) who could not find direct significant relationship between accountability and organizational commitment.

Also from the results, it can be seen that territoriality and self-efficacy had no significant influence on overall organizational. This means that employees of NOA who are highly protective of their ideas, workspace, and office equipment (i.e. territoriality), and those who believe in their ability to make a positive difference and contribute to the organization's success (i.e. self-efficacy) are not predictable in terms of their level of commitment to the organization. Employees who tend to overprotect their 'territories' may not be willing to share responsibility, delegate power and involve in teamwork. They may feel threatened whenever these aspects of work performance are emphasized and would become less energized to stay and work for the collective good of the organization. On the other side, they may be committed to the organization because of their belief that leaving their organization would mean losing their target of territoriality which they would not want to lose. This finding disagrees with Lu, *et al.* (2017) who found a negative relationship between territoriality and organizational commitment. It also contradicts the finding by Lu, Liu, and Zhao (2017) which indicates that territoriality has positive relationship with organizational commitment.

In terms of self-efficacy, such employees who have confidence in their ability to set performance goals, execute them, and make positive difference to the success of the organization may have brighter chances of finding alternative job opportunities and at the same time record high success in their organization, thus, making them much more sellable. They are highly sought after, thus, making them less committed to their organizations. On the other hand, efficacious employees may be committed because, organizations often value them and in most cases, they are given fair treatment that can stimulate their commitment to the organization. the result is contrary to Zeb (2016) who found significant influence of self-efficacy on teachers' organizational commitment. It also contradicts Saleem, Ghayas, and Adil (2012)

who indicated that self efficacy was positively correlated with optimism and organizational commitment.

Recommendations

- i. The Governing Board and Management of the National Orientation Agency should initiate and implement policies that will promote sense of belongingness and self-identity among the employees of National Orientation Agency. For instance, they could introduce a routine welfare package that would get the employees affectively attached to the organization.
- ii. Also to promote the employees' sense of belongingness and self-identity, and perhaps their psychological ownership generally, there should be joint management-staff input on issues and programme planning.
- iii. The management of National Orientation Agency should identify and discourage territoriality and reward talented employees. For instance, those who are found to exhibit act of territoriality should be encouraged to work in teams and share office items and ideas with each other, while those with high self-efficacy can be made to lead work teams in order to give them more meaning in the job they do.
- iv. The management of National Orientation Agency should put a policy in place to reward employees with high sense of accountability in order to give them confidence in their job. This is because the study has shown that employees with high accountability are less likely to be committed to their organization and it is suspected that this might be due to lack of encouragement they receive from the management.

References

- Adekola, B. (2012). The impact of organizational commitment on job satisfaction. A study of employees at Nigerian University. *International Journal for Human Resource*, 2(2), 7316-7324.
- Allen, N. J. & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The Measurement and Antecedents of Affective, Continuance and Normative Commitment to the

- Organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 1-18.
- Avey, J. B., Avolio, B., Crossley, C. & Luthans, F. (2009). Psychological Ownership: Theoretical Extensions, Measurement, and Relation to Work Outcomes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30, 173-191.
- Avey, J., Avolio, B., Crossley, C., & Luthans, F. (2009). Psychological Ownership: Theoretical Extensions, Measurement, and Relation to Work Outcomes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 30. 173 - 191.
- Bandura, A. (1995). *Self-efficacy in changing societies*. New York: Cambridge University.
- Bashaw, E. R. & Grant, S. E. (1994). Exploring the distinctive nature of work commitments: Their relationships with personal characteristics, job performance, and propensity to leave. *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, 14, 41-56.
- Bass, B.M. (1998). *Transformational Leadership Industrial, military and educational impact*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Becker, H. (1960). Notes on the Concept of Commitment. *American Journal of Sociology*, 66, 32-42.
- Beggan, J. K. (1992). On the social nature of nonsocial perceptions: The mere ownership effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62, 229-237.
- Belk, R. (1988). Possessions and the extended self. *Journal of Customer Research*, 15, 139-168.
- Bernhard, F., M. P. O'Driscoll (2011), "Psychological Ownership in Small Family-Owned Businesses: Leadership Style and Nonfamily-Employees' Work Attitudes and Behaviors", *Group & Organization Management*, 36, 3, 345-384.
- Blau, I., & Caspi, A. (2009). What Type of Collaboration Helps? Psychological Ownership, Perceived Learning and Outcome Quality of Collaboration Using Google Docs, Proceedings of the Chais Conference on Instructional Technologies Research: Learning in the Technological Area.
- Boonsiritomachaia, W., Sud-Onb, P. & Sudharatana, Y. (2022). The effect of psychological ownership on organizational commitment. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences*, 523-530.
- Bouzas, L. B., & Castro, C. C. (1986). El Compromiso Organizacional, *Revista de Economia y Empresa*, 16(15-16), 157-173.
- Brown, G., Lawrence, T. and Robinson, S. (2005). Territoriality in Organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 30(3), 577-594.
- Buchko, A.A. (1993). The effects of employee ownership on employee attitudes – an integrated causal model and path-analysis. *Journal of Management Studies*, 30(4), 633–657.
- Bycio, P., Hackett, R. D. & Allen, J. S. (1995). Further assessments of Bass' (1985) conceptualisation of transactional and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80, 468-478.
- Cohen, A. (1996) On the Discriminant Validity of the Meyer and Allen Measure of Organizational Commitment: How does it Fit with the Work Commitment Construct?, *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 56, 494-503.
- Cohen, A. (2003). *Multiple Commitments in the Workplace: An Integrative Approach*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Davila, M. C. & Garcia, G. J. (2012). Organizational identification and commitment: Correlates of sense of belonging and affective commitment. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 15, 244-255.
- Dello Russo, S., Vecchione, M. & Borgogni, L. (2013). Commitment profiles, job satisfaction, and behavioural outcomes. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 62, 701-719.

- Dirks, K. T., Cummings, L. L., & Pierce, J. L. (1996). Psychological ownership in organizations: Conditions under which individuals promote and resist change. *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, 9, 1-23.
- Dittmar, H. (1992). *The Social Psychology of Material Possessions*. Hemel Hempstead, Hertfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Dixit, V. & Bhatti, M. (2012). A study about employee commitment and its impact on sustained productivity in Indian auto component industry. *European Industry of Business and Social Sciences*, 1(6), 34-51.
- Dominic, E. & Salim, M. (2018). A study on the role of organizational commitment and perception towards organizational justice and fairness in triggering organizational citizenship behavior among school faculty members in Kerala. *Rajagiri Management Journal*, 12(1), 23-42.
- Druskat, V.U. & Pescosolido, A.T. (2002), The Content of Effective Teamwork Mental Models in Self-managing Teams: Ownership, Learning, and Heedful Interrelating, *Human Relations*, 55, 283-314.
- Eli, A. A., Edem, M. A. & Christopher, M. (2021). Predicting task performance from psychological ownership and innovative work behaviour: A cross sectional study. *Cogent Business & Management*, 8, 1-15. DOI: 10.1080/23311975.2021.1917483
- Elouadi, S. (2020). The effects of employee ownership on organizational commitment and job satisfaction: An empirical evidence from French listed companies. *Journal of Organizational Psychology*, 20(6), 69-82.
- Enahoro, E. (2017, April 11). National Orientation Agency: Change thyself first. *Daily Trust*. Retrieved from: <https://www.dailytrust.com.ng/news/opinion/national-orientation-agency-change-thyself-first/195903.html>
- Etzioni, A. (1961) A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations, Free Press, New York.
- Florkowski, G. W. (1987). The organizational impact on profit sharing. *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 622-636.
- Folorunso, O., Andewale, A. J. & Abodunde, S. M. (2014). Exploring the effect of organizational commitment dimensions on employee performances. An empirical evidence from academic staff of Oyo State owned tertiary institution. *Nigeria Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, 4(8), 275-286.
- Fridoon, J. & Nasrin, S. (2009). Three components of organizational commitment and job satisfaction of hospital nurses in Iran. *The Health Care Manager*, 28, 375-380.
- Furby, L. (1978). Possessions: Toward a theory of their meaning and function throughout the life cycle. In P.B., Baltes (Ed.), *Life span development and behavior* (pp. 297-336). New
- Gallagher, D.G & McLean, P. J. (2001) I Pledge Thee my Troth Contingently Commitment and the Contingent Work Relationship, *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 11, 181-208.
- Gautam, T., Van Dick, R. Wagner, U. (2004). Organizational Identification and Organizational Commitment: Distinct Aspects of Two Related Concepts. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 7, 301-315.
- Guarana, C. L. & Avolio, B. J. (2022). Unpacking Psychological Ownership: How Transactional and Transformational Leaders Motivate Ownership. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 29(1), 96-114.
- Gutierrez, A. P., Candel, L.L. & Carver, L. (2012). The structural relationship between organizational commitment, global job satisfaction, development experience, work values, organizational support, and person-organizational fit among nursing faculty. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 54, 1601-1614.
- Hackett, R. D., Lapierre, L. M., & Hausdorf, P. A. (2001). Understanding the links between work

- commitment constructs. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 58, 392-413.
- Hashmi, A., Ahmad, M. A., & Nawaz, M. A. (2021). The role of coordination, decision making and special data infrastructure on the disaster management in Pakistan: Moderating role of information system. *Review of Applied Management and Social Sciences*, 4(1), 79-91.
- Huang, C.-C., You, C.-S. & Tsai, M.-T. (2012). A multi-dimensional analysis of ethical climate, job satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Nursing Ethics*, 19, 513-529.
- Jing, J. & Yan, J. (2022). Effect of employees' perceived organizational support, psychological ownership, and turnover intention: A case of China's employee. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 19(10), 6016. <https://www.mdpi.com/journal/ijerph>
- Katzenbach, J. R. (2000). *Peak performance, aligning the hearts and minds of your employees*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kell, H. J., & Motowidlo, S. J. (2012). Deconstructing Organizational Commitment: Associations Among its Affective and Cognitive Components, Personality Antecedents, and Behavioral Outcomes, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 42, 1, 213-251.
- Khan, I., Nawaz, A., & Khan, M. S. (2013). Determining the organizational commitment of academicians in public sector universities of developing countries like Pakistan. *International Journal of Academic Research in Accounting Finance and Management Sciences*, 3(1), 248-260.
- Krejcie, R.V., & Morgan, D.W., (1970). Determining Sample Size for Research Activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30, 607-610.
- Lawler, E. E III. (1992). The ultimate advantage: Creating the high-involvement organization. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lee, K. S. (2005). Studying Organizational Commitment with the OCQ in the Korean retail context: Its dimensionality and relationship with satisfaction and work outcomes. *The International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research*, 15, 375-399.
- Leong, S. M., Randall, D. M. & Cote, J. A. (1994). Exploring the organizational commitment-performance linkage in marketing: A study of life insurance salespeople. *Journal of Business Research*, 29, 57-63.
- Lerner, J.S., & Tetlock, P.E. (1999). Accounting for the effects of accountability. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125(2), 255-275.
- Levy, P.L. (2003). *Industrial/ Organizational Psychology: Understanding the work place*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Long, R. J. (1978). The effects of employee ownership on organizational identification, employee job attitudes, and organizational performance: A tentative framework and empirical findings. *Human Relations*, 31, 29-48.
- Luthans, F. (2002). The need for and meaning of positive behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(6), 695-706.
- Mascarenhas, C. Galvao, A. R. & Marques, C. S. (2022). How perceived organizational support, identification with organization and work engagement influence job satisfaction: A gender-based Perspective. *Administrative Science*, 12, 66. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci12020066>
- Mathieu, A., Bruvold, N. T. & Ritchey, N. (2000). Subcultural research on organizational commitment with the 15 OCQ invariant instrument. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 20, 129-138.
- Mathieu, J. E. & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational

- commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, 171-194.
- Mayer, R. C. & Schoorman, F. D. (1992). Predicting participation and production outcomes through a two-dimension model of organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35, 671- 684.
- Mayhew, M.G., Ashkanasy, N. M., Bramble, T., & Gardner, J. (2007). A Study of Antecedents and Consequences of Psychological Ownership in Organizational Settings. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 147(5), 477-500.
- Meyer, J. P. & Allen, N.J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1, 61-89.
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J. & Smith, C. (1993). Commitment to Organizations and Occupations: Extension and Test of a Three-component Conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 538-551.
- Meyer, J. P., Kam, C., Gildenberg, I. & Bremner, N. L. (2013). Organizational commitment in the military: Application of a profile approach. *Military Psychology*, 25, 381-401.
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L. & Topolnysky, L. (2002). Affective, Continuance and Normative Commitment to the Organization: A Meta-analysis of Antecedents, Correlates, and Consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61, 20-52.
- Meyer, J.P. & Allen, N.J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*. 1, 61-89.
- Meyer, J.P. & Allen, N.J. (1997) Commitment in the Workplace, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks.
- Meyer, J.P., Allen, N.J. & Smith, C.A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three component conceptualization, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 538-551.
- Morrow, P.C. & McElroy, J.C. (1993). Introduction: understanding and managing loyalty in a multi-commitment world, *Journal of Business Research*, 26, 1-2.
- Morrow, P.C. (1993). *The theory and measurement of work commitment* Greenwich, C.T. JAI Press Persian.
- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W. & Steers, R. M. (1982). *Employee-organization linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover*. New York: Academic Press.
- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M. & Porter, L. W. (1979). The Measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14, 224-247.
- Mowday, R.T., Steers, R. M. & Porter, L.W. (1992). *Employee-organization linkages. The psychology of commitment, absenteeism and turnover*. New York: Academic press.
- Muhammad, S., Afridi, F. K., Ali, M. W., Shah, W. U., & Alasan, I. I. (2021). Effect of training on employee commitment: Mediating role of job satisfaction. *Pakistan Journal of Society, Education and Language (PJSEL)*, 7(1), 28-37.
- Northcraft, T. & Neale, H. (1996). *Organization Behaviour*. London: Prentice-Hall.
- O'Driscoll, M., Pierce, J. & Coghlan, A. (2006). The psychology of ownership: Work environment structure, organizational commitment, and citizenship behaviours. *Group and Organization Management*, 31(3), 388-416.
- Olckers, C. & Du Plessis, Y. (2012). The Role of Psychological Ownership in Retaining Talent: A Systematic Literature Review. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 10(2), 345-351.
- Olckers, C. (2016). Exploring the Role of Psychological Ownership in the Coaching Process. In: van Zyl, L., Stander, M.,

- Odendaal, A. (eds) *Coaching Psychology: Meta-theoretical perspectives and applications in multicultural contexts*. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31012-1_6 Retrieved on 24/04/2023.
- O'Reilly, C.A. & Chatman, J. (1986) Organizational Commitment and Psychological Attachment: The Effects of Compliance, Identification and Internalization on Prosocial Behavior, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 492-499.
- Ozler, H., Yilmaz, A., & Ozler D. (2008), Psychological ownership: an empirical study on its antecedents and impacts upon organizational behaviors, *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 6 (3), 38-47.
- Peng, H. & Pierce, J. (2015). Job- and Organization-Based Psychological Ownership: Relationship and Outcomes. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 30(2), 151-168.
- Phuong, N. T. M., Bach, T. Q., Linh, T. T., Ly, P. T. C., Dat, V. N., An, N. T. K., & Hung, T. Q. (2023). Impact of organizational commitment factors on business performance of enterprises in the context of digital transformation: A case study of private enterprises in Vinh City, Nghe An Province, Vietnam. *Modern Economy*, 14, 76-88
- Pierce, J. and Rodgers, L. (2004). The Psychology of Ownership and Worker-Owner Productivity. *Group & Organization Management*, 29(5), 588-613.
- Pierce, J. L., & Furo, C. A. (1990). Employee ownership: Implications for management. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18(3), 32-45.
- Pierce, J. L., Kostova, T. & Dirks, K. T. (2001), Toward a Theory of Psychological Ownership in Organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(2), 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.
- Pierce, J.L., Rubenfeld, P.S., & Morgan, S. (1991), Employee ownership: A Conceptual model of process and effects, *Academy of Management Review*, 16, 121-144.
- Pierce, Jon & Jussila, Iiro & Cummings, Anne. (2009). Psychological ownership within the job design context: Revision of the Job Characteristics Model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 30. 477 - 496.
- Pierce, Jon & Jussila, Iiro. (2011). Psychological ownership and the organizational context: Theory, research evidence, and application. *Psychological Ownership and the Organizational Context: Theory, Research Evidence, and Application*, 1-319.
- Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59, 603-609.
- Rabl, T. & del Carmen Triana, M. (2013). How German employees of different ages conserve resources: Perceived age discrimination and affective organizational commitment. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24, 3599-3612.
- Ramaprasad, B. S., Lakshminarayanan, S., & Pai, Y. P. (2018). The relationship between developmental HRM practices and voluntary intention to leave among IT professionals in India: The mediating role of affective commitment. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 50(6), 285-304.
- Robinson, S.L., & Bennett, R.J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(2), 555-572.
- Rousseau, D. M. (1998). Why workers still identify with organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 19, 217-233.
- Ryan, R.M., & Deci, E.L. (2006). Self-regulation and the problem of human autonomy: Does psychology need choice, self-determination,

- and will? *Journal of Personality*, 74(6), 1557–1585.
- Sands, J. (2002). Is employee ownership key to future success? *Design Week*, 17(22), 12.
- Sorour, A. (2021). *Understanding the impact of organizational identification on enhancing work/employee engagement and promoting organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) in the light of the social identity theory and the self-determination theory (SDT)*. <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/understanding-impact-organizational-identification-enhancing-sorour>.
- Tella A (2004). Work motivation in relation to job satisfaction and organization commitment among the librarians in selected libraries in Oyo State. Masters Degree Thesis, Department of Library, Archive and Information Studies, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.
- Ullah, M., Kamran, H., Akram, S., Nawaz, M. & Rehman, F. (2021). Organisational antecedents and talent turnover: A relational analysis of credit cards department of banks. *Management Science Letters*, 11(4), 1211-1220.
- van Dick, R. (2001). Identification in organizational contexts: Linking theory and research from social and organizational psychology. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 3, 265-283.
- Vandewalle, D., Vandyne, L. & Kostova, T. (1995). Psychological Ownership: An Empirical Examination of Its Consequences. *Group and Organization Studies*, 20, 2, 210-226.
- VanDyne, L. & Pierce, J. (2004). Psychological Ownership and Feelings of Possession: Three Field Studies Predicting Employee Attitudes and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(4), 439-459.
- VanKnippenberg, D. & Sleebos, E. (2006). Organizational identification versus organizational commitment: self-definition, social exchange, and job attitudes. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 27(5), 571-584
- Wagner, S., Parker, C. & Christiansen, N. (2003). Employees That Think and Act Like Owners: Effects of Ownership Beliefs and Behaviors on Organizational Effectiveness. *Personnel Psychology*, 56(4), 847-871.
- Wayne, J. H., Casper, W. J., Matthews, R. A., & Allen, T. D. (2013). Family-supportive organization perception and organizational commitment: The mediating role of work-family conflict an enrichment and partner attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98, 606-622.
- Wood, J. A., & Winston, B. E. (2007). Development of three scales to measure leader accountability. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 28(2), 167–185.