PEOPLE: International Journal of Social Sciences
ISSN 2454-5899

Ozbozkurt et. al., 2022

Volume 8 Issue 1, pp. 138-157

Received: 31st December 2021

Revised: 29th March 2022, 8th April 2022

Accepted: 13th April 2022

Date of Publication: 21st April 2022

DOI- https://doi.org/10.20319/pijss.2022.81.138157

This paper can be cited as: Ozbozkurt, O. B., Ince, M., & Yesilkus, F. (2022). Does Psychological Ownership Affect Green Organizational Behavior? PEOPLE: International Journal of Social Sciences, 8(1), 138-157.

DOES PSYCHOLOGICAL OWNERSHIP AFFECT GREEN ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR?

Onur Basar Ozbozkurt
PhD, Assoc. Prof., Bureau Management and Executive Assistance, Vocational School, Tarsus University, Mersin, Turkey
onurozbozkurt@tarsus.edu.tr

Mehmet Ince
PhD, Prof., Department of International Trade and Logistics, Faculty of Applied Sciences, Tarsus University, Mersin, Turkey
mince@tarsus.edu.tr

Fatma Yesilkus
PhD Candidate, Department of Business Administration, Graduate School, Tarsus University, Mersin, Turkey
fatma_yesilkus@tarsus.edu.tr

Abstract

This paper explores the impact of psychological ownership in an organizational plane on green organizational behavior, which plays a significant role in creating a sustainable environment and helps mitigate ecological issues of the world. The present study aims at being fulfilled the research gap by exploring the impact of psychological ownership on green organizational behavior. To this end, the data was collected from 237 employees working at one of the leading fastener

manufacturers in Turkey by using the convenience sampling method. The data obtained from the questionnaire has been analyzed via "SPSS 26.0". Our findings suggest that psychological ownership has a statistically significant impact on green organizational behavior and contributes to theoretical and practical implications.

Keywords

Psychological Ownership, Green Organizational Behavior, Recycling, Environment, Environmental Sustainability

1. Introduction

During the last decade, management practitioners, scholars, and consultants have concentrated their attention on the psychological ownership phenomenon by employing an array of concepts (Pierce et al., 2001; Pierce et al., 2004). Psychological ownership refers to evince itself in terms of personal feelings of specific ownership, and personal recognition that other individuals may experience a perception of ownership for the same object (Pierce & Brown, 2020). It is seen when individuals experience psychological feelings which are related to tangible and intangible objects that are deeply linked with individuals (Avey et al., 2012).

The increasing awareness of environmental sustainability and protection has led to burgeoning research on green organizational behavior concepts (Wang et al., 2019). Organizations may not survive without being sensitive to environmental issues, regardless of which industry/sector they operate in. Green organizational behavior means employees' behaviors toward protecting the environment in terms of management and employees within the organization (Erbasi, 2019). It includes giving priority to environmental benefits and interests, involving environmental campaigns, policies, and programs, lobbying, and inspiring other co-workers (Norton et al., 2015). It focuses on activities such as saving energy via turning off lights out of the office, using resources efficiently through online audio conference meetings rather than travelling to meetings in an office environment, avoiding waste papers via editing the fundamental documents electronically and recycling through printing drafts on scrap papers (Norton et al., 2017).

The study aims to contribute to the related literature by exploring the impact of psychological ownership in an organizational plane on green organizational behavior which in turn plays a crucial role in creating a sustainable environment. Also, the study helps to understand ecological issues of the world and being fulfilled the clear need for research related to the impact

of psychological ownership on green organizational behavior in the literature. With this study, businesses realize the importance of ecological sustainability in businesses can integrate it into their employees.

2. Conceptual Background

With its focus on the factors that promote employee retention, discretionary effort, performance, innovation, and wellbeing, a fundamental focus in organizational behavior research has been on understanding the ways in which employees relate to, or feel psychologically "attached" to, their organization and their work (Dawkins et al., 2015). A key emerging construct in this area is psychological ownership may integrate with green organizational behavior.

2.1. Psychological Ownership in Organizational Plane

Practices aimed at improving positive organizational behaviors, within the organizational plane, are vital for creating and sustaining a high-performance organizational culture, where individual and organizational strengths are optimized and top talent retained (Van Zyl et al., 2017). Psychological ownership, one form of positive organizational behavior (Avey et al., 2009), includes self-efficacy, accountability, self-identity, and belongingness that are imperative determinants in the improvement of individual performance (Van Zyl et al., 2017).

It alludes to an emotional and cognitive engagement between the object and the individual which in turn modifies the self-perception of the individual and reinforces the behaviors (Ozler et al., 2008). It addresses the question, what can be psychologically owned? The sense of ownership enhances objects that are both materials and non-materials (Pierce & Peck, 2018). It represents the possessive feelings that tie the individual to tangible or intangible objects, explaining itself in such "my" and "mine" possessive expressions (Gray et al., 2020; Matilainen, 2019). When it prevails, the individual experiences being psychologically attached to an object (Pierce & Jussila, 2011).

It consists of four characteristics such as self-identity, efficacy, protective focus, and internal responsibility (Ucar, 2018). Self-identity includes not only self-knowledge but also one's persona as recognized by one's fellows (Porteous, 1976). Efficacy means belief in an individual's skills to encourage the cognitive resources, courses of action, and motivation needed to meet given situational demands. Self-beliefs of efficacy have an impact on the difficulties that are undertaken, the amount of effort expended in an endeavor, the level of perseverance in the face of challenges, and whether thinking patterns take self-aiding or self-impeding forms (Wood & Bandura, 1989).

The protective focus is considered a function to protect and enhance the target ownership (Uçar, 2018). Employees who deeply experience possessions toward their organizations or several organizational aspects tend to sense a responsibility toward the target and show possessive and protective and other altruistic behaviors toward it (Pierce et al., 2001). By the same token, psychological ownership is associated with a sense of responsibility for the target of ownership. This sense of responsibility is likely to manifest itself in the discretionary behaviors that the individual directs toward the target (Pierce & Jussila, 2011). Feelings of possessions toward the organization are attached by an active imposition of the self on the organization, rather than incorporation or internalization of the organization into the self (Wiggins, 2018) and offer various rights, such as the right to self-esteem, accessing information, locus of control, having a voice in the direction of the organization (Spreitzer, 1995).

Psychological ownership creates a culture regarding sustainable behavior by employees in the organizations (Süssenbach & Kamleitner, 2018). Employees sense such responsibilities related to promoting, protecting, fostering, growing, and/or enhancing the organization (Wiggins, 2018). They are concerned about the organization's sustainability and take more actions and initiatives in citizenship behavior toward the environment in support of the organization (Jiang et al., 2019). If employees perceive the organization as "theirs" (i.e., psychological ownership), they precisely respect the identity and culture of the organization as a remarkable part of the self, sense as owners in the organization, feel responsible for the environmental sustainability of the organization, and believe they can successfully achieve it (Jiang et al., 2019).

2.2. Green Organizational Behavior

Today's business environment shows that it is not possible to survive without being sensitive to environmental issues, regardless of which industry/sector they operate in. In other words, it has significance in terms of needing to be competent in managing the organization while preserving a sustainable environment for the future generation. As Erbasi (2019) emphasizes that green organizational behavior is the behaviors that can contribute to protecting the environment in terms of management and employees within the enterprise. Norton et al. (2012) argue that green behavior reflects the employees' behavior toward "green policies" that promote sustainable attitudes and whether work practices represent the organization's environmentally friendly policies, values, and goals. Thus, we proposed:

H_1: *Psychological ownership and its sub-dimensions have a statistically significant impact on green organizational behavior.*

Environmentally sensitive attitudes and oriented behavior imply strong support for green procurement and green organizational behavior. Environmental sensitivity is related to environmental issues and could be classified as environmentally sensitive felt by employees. Also, it reflects a consensus that employees play a role in protecting the organizations' environment (Eurobarometer, 2008). Thus, we proposed:

H_2: *Psychological ownership and its sub-dimensions have a statistically significant impact on environmental sensitivity.*

An organization's future direction concerning environmental policies and practices relies crucially upon whether the management team fosters employees to efficaciously participate in green management initiatives and on management's commitment to green practices (Weng et al., 2015). Environmental participation means the participation of employees in the organization's environmentally friendly practices and rules (Erbasi, 2019). It commits themselves to carrying out environmental improvements, demonstrating such commitment (Londoño & Hernandez-Maskivker, 2016) through green organizational behaviors and being aware of economic sensitivity for environmental sustainability. Thus, we proposed:

H_3: *Psychological ownership and its sub-dimensions have a statistically significant impact on environmental participation.*

H_4: *Psychological ownership and its sub-dimensions have a statistically significant impact on economic sensitivity.*

Green purchasing refers to minimizing negative environmental effects in the organizational process and transportation by using recyclable, reusable, and durable materials (Chin et al., 2015). It is explained as the implementation of an environmentally conscious purchasing practice that reduces sources of waste and supports recycling and reclamation of purchased materials without adversely affecting the performance requirements of such materials (González-Benito et al., 2016; Min & Galle, 2001). Thus, we proposed:

H_5: *Psychological ownership and its sub-dimensions have a statistically significant impact on green purchasing.*

When considered as an organization's practices, technological sensitivity in green organizational behavior is described as the software and/or hardware innovation regarding green

products or processes comprising the innovation in technologies that are involved in pollution-prevention, energy-saving, green product designs, waste recycling, or corporate environmental management (Chen et al., 2006). It also comprises new administrative practices or technical improvements for enhancing natural environmental performance and obtaining the competitive advantage of an organization (Huang et al., 2009). Additionally, it suggests that new or modified practices, systems, processes, and products benefit the environment and contribute to environmental sustainability (Oltra & Saint Jean, 2009). Thus, we proposed:

H_6: *Psychological ownership and its sub-dimensions have a statistically significant impact on technological sensitivity.*

3. Methodology

In this part, the problem statement, scales, the general design of the research, and the methods used for data collection are explained in detail.

3.1. Problem Statement

Natural resources will run out in 20 years if the world's economy and population continue to increase at their current rates. To prevent this is need for companies to change their own business models by integrating the employees into the ecosystem. To create this awareness, employees need to embrace the organization as if it is their own home and interiorize green sustainability. From this point of view, the present study aims at being fulfilled the research gap by exploring the impact of psychological ownership on green organizational behavior.

3.2. Measures

"Psychological Ownership (PO)" was measured with the scale developed by Ucar (2018) which has 15 items and four sub-dimensions including "Self-Identity (SI)", "Efficacy (EF)", "Protective Focus (PF)", and "Internal Responsibility (IR)". Respondents were asked to indicate the extent of their agreement with the statements on a 5-point Likert scale (1= strongly disagree, 5= strongly agree).

On the other hand, "Green Organizational Behavior (GOB)" was measured with the scale developed by Erbasi (2019) which has 27 items and five sub-dimensions that are named "Environmental Sensitivity (ES)", "Environmental Participation (EP)", "Economic Sensitivity (ECS)", "Green Purchasing (GP)", and "Technological Sensitivity (TS)". Similarly, respondents

were asked to indicate the extent of their agreement with the statements on a 5-point Likert scale (1= strongly disagree, 5= strongly agree).

3.3. Sample and Data Collection

The data was collected between the period of November 17, 2019, and February 9, 2020, by using the convenience sampling method. The population of the study constitutes one of the leading fastener manufacturers in Turkey. The company was founded in 1979, exports its products to more than 50 countries, makes its high-strength anchors, bolts, studs, threaded rod, and nut productions by considering international quality standards and customer demands for power transmission lines, construction, steel construction, machinery, shipbuilding industries as well as the construction of petrochemical railways and refineries, tunnels, plants, roads, and dams and the wind energy industry. It is a solution partner for global firms and mega projects in the meantime. The company produced anchor bolts that have carried piers of the World's longest suspended bridge, Canakkale 1915 Bridge once completed.

The company is known as the first company in Turkey, which has received significant CE and TUCSA MARK Certificates in the industry and provided the services thereof with its 290 employees and solution-oriented approach in high strength and large-scale production of connection fixtures. In this frame, the questionnaire was distributed to 251 employees during their work. They were informed that their participation was voluntary, and responses would remain anonymous. Out of 251 responses, 248 were considerably returned; however, 237 responses were deemed appropriate for the analysis.

According to the demographic results, 22.8% (n= 54) of participants were between 18 and 25 years, 38.8% (n=92) were between 26 and 35 years, 24.9% (n=59) were between 36 and 45 years, and 13.5% (n=32) were over 46 years. 53.6% (n=127) were male and 46.4% (n=110) were female. 43,9% (n=104) were single and 56,1% (n=133) were married. Also, 22,4% (n=53) had a high-school degree, 62.0% (n=147) had a bachelor's degree, and 15.6% (n=37) had a postgraduate degree. 35.0% (n=83) had job experience between 1 and 5 years, 21.1% (n=50) had between 6 and 10 years, 15,2% (n=36) had between 11 and 15 years, 28.7% (n=68) had over 16 years. Lastly, 23.2% (n=55) were blue-collar workers and 76.8% (n=182) were white-collar workers.

3.4. Data Analysis

In this study, Cronbach's Alpha Analysis has been used to estimate the reliability coefficients of the scales and their sub-dimensions through "SPSS 26.0". Factor analysis, Kaiser-

Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (KMO), and Bartlett Test of Sphericity have been tested to explore adequate samples. Correlation analysis was used to examine the relationship between the scales and their sub-dimensions. Multiple linear regression analysis was utilized to examine the impact of PO and its sub-dimensions on GOB and its sub-dimensions to test the proposed hypotheses. "p" values considerably less than $p \leq .05$ were accepted as statistically significant in this study.

4. Results

The data collected from a sample of 237 respondents were analyzed using IBM SPSS software. Inferential statistics were used for hypotheses testing. The results and findings are presented below.

4.1. Factor Analysis of The Scales

In this study, factor analysis has been used to explore the POS and its sub-dimensions, and the GOBS and its sub-dimensions.

4.1.1. Psychological Ownership Scale (POS)

Table 1 provides the reliability coefficients and factor analysis results of the related scale.

Table 1: *The Factor Analysis of POS*

Items	**SI**	**EF**	**PF**	**IR**
Item6	.771			
Item5	.710			
Item7	.706			
Item8	.682			
Item14		.820		
Item12		.790		
Item13		.719		
Item15		.650		
Item3			.750	
Item2			.740	
Item1			.653	
Item4			.571	
Item11				.813
Item9				.706
Item10				.702
(α)	**(α)**			
.903	.822	.733	.773	.844
	Bartlett's Test			

KMO	Chi-Square	p		df
.895	1710.560	< .001		105

(Source: Author's Own Work)

The estimated KMO value has been seen as .895 and Bartlett's Test has found the sample was adequate (p< .001). As a result of the factor analysis, a four-factor structure emerged. Four items were loaded into SI, four items were loaded into EF, four items were loaded into PF, and three items were loaded into the last factor which is IR.

The reliability coefficient of the PO was .903, SI was .822, EF was .733, PF was.773, and IR was .844. Whilst PO, SI, and IR have a high-reliability coefficient; EF and PF are highly reliable. Table 2 shows descriptive statistics of the POS including the mean, standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis values, and item correlations.

Table 2: *Descriptive Statistics of the PO*

Scales/ Dimensions	M	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis	1	2	3	4	5
1. PO	4.29	.575	-.619	-.381	1				
2. SI	4.18	.709	-.697	-.196	.921**	1			
3. EF	4.28	.676	-.714	.371	.774**	.651**	1		
4. PF	4.24	.729	-1.020	.952	.802**	.630**	.536**	1	
5. IR	4.51	.590	-.286	1.448	.807**	.607**	.538**	.560**	1

***p< .001*

(Source: Author's Own Work)

The mean score for PO was 4.29, SI was 4.18, EF was 4.28, PF was 4.24, and IR was 4.51. The mean score for PO and its sub-dimensions was over the average score of 3 specifying that reflects the participants' PO and its sub-dimensions level was considerably high.

Since skewness and kurtosis are the useful test of normality provided that the limiting variance accounts for the serial correlation in the data (Bai and Ng, 2005), those values are respectively acknowledged as valid if they are between ±1.5 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). Skewness and kurtosis values are valid for a normal distribution of the study.

4.1.2. Green Organizational Behavior Scale (GOBS)

Table 3 signifies the reliability coefficients and factor analysis results.

Table 3: *The Factor Analysis of GOBS*

Items	ES	EP	ECS	GP	TS

Item9	.704				
Item12	.689				
Item21	.656				
Item13	.614				
Item22	.524				
Item11	.554				
Item18		.722			
Item19		.677			
Item16		.604			
Item20		.596			
Item17		.571			
Item1		.538			
Item3		.508			
Item7			.757		
Item8			.719		
Item4			.612		
Item10			.509		
Item25				.733	
Item26				.720	
Item24				.650	
Item27				.630	
Item23				.549	
Item5					.667
Item6					.634
Item14					.569
Item15					.531
Item2					.503
(α)	**(α)**				
.907	.779	.775	.741	.773	.756
	Bartlett's Test				
KMO	**Chi-Square**	**p**		**df**	
.879	2368.279	< .001		351	

(Source: Author's Own Work)

KMO value was found .879 and the results of Bartlett's Test was identified the sample taken from the population was adequate for the factor analysis ($p < .001$). As a result of the factor analysis, a five-factor structure emerged. There were six items were loaded into ES, seven items were loaded into EP, four items were loaded into ECS, five items were loaded into GP, and five items were loaded into TS.

The reliability coefficient of the GOB was .907; ES was .779; EP was .775; ECSwas .741; GP was .773, and TS was .756. Whilst GOB has a high-reliability coefficient; ES, EP, ECS, GP, and TS are highly reliable. Table 4 demonstrates descriptive statistics of the GOB.

Table 4: *Descriptive Statistics of the GOB*

Scales/ Dimensions	**M**	**SD**	**Skewness**	**Kurtosis**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
1. GOB	4.22	.526	-.688	-.134	1					
2. ES	4.39	.570	-1.250	1.431	.811**	1				
3. EP	4.13	.654	-.590	-.379	.852**	.574**	1			
4. ECS	4.32	.600	-1.159	1.393	.686**	.554**	.505**	1		
5. GP	4.15	.622	-.779	.266	.668**	.384**	.514**	.298**	1	
6. TS	4.15	.810	-.947	.297	.706**	.580**	.576**	.556**	.513**	1

***p< .001*
(Source: Author's Own Work)

As reported in Table 4.4, the mean score for GOB was 4.22, ES was 4.39, EP was 4.13, ECS was 4.32, GP was 4.15, and TS was 4.15. The mean score for GOB and its sub-dimensions were over the average score of 3 indicating that on average the participants are paid more attention to GOB and its sub-dimensions. Skewness and kurtosis values of the related scale show that the data has a normal distribution.

4.2. Hypotheses Testing

Before testing the impact of PO on GOB, the relationship between PO and GOB was examined. Table 4.5 provides the relationship between variables using correlation analysis.

Table 5: *The Relationship Between PO and GOB*

Scale/Dimensions		**PO**	**SI**	**EF**	**PF**	**IR**
GOB	r	.706**	.654**	.545**	.577**	.553**
	p	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
ES	r	.580**	.522**	.477**	.397**	.537**
	p	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
EP	r	.576**	.543**	.444**	.495**	.410**
	p	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
ECS	r	.556**	.504**	.424**	.406**	.503**
	p	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
GP	r	.624**	.572**	.482**	.519**	.491**
	p	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
TS	r	.513**	.499**	.343**	.498**	.316**

	p	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000

$^{**}p< .001$

(Source: Author's Own Work)

The results indicate that there is a strong positive correlation between GOB and PO (r= .706, p< .001) and moderate positive correlation between GOB and SI (r= .654, p< .001), EF (r= .545, p< .001), PF (r= .577, p< .001), and IR (r= .553, p< .001).

There is a moderate positive correlation between ES and PO (r= .580, p< .001), SI (r= .522, p< .001), and IR (r= .537, p< .001). There is a weak positive correlation between ES and EF (r= .477, p< .001) and PF (r= .397, p< .001). There is a moderate positive correlation between EP and PO (r= .576, p< .001) and SI (r= .543, p< .001). There is a weak positive correlation between EP and EF (r= .444, p< .001), PF (r= .495, p< .001), and IR (r= .410, p< .001).

There is a moderate positive correlation between ECS and PO (r= .556, p< .001), SI (r= .504, p< .001), and IR (r= .503, p< .001). and a weak positive correlation between ECS and EF (r= .424, p< .001) and PF (r= .406, p< .001).

Whilst there is a moderate positive correlation between GP and PO (r= .624, p< .001), SI (r= .572, p< .001), and PF (r= .519, p< .001); there is a weak positive correlation between GP and EF (r= .482, p< .001) and IR (r= .491, p< .001).

There is a moderate positive correlation between TS and PO (r= .513, p< .001). However, there is a weak positive correlation between TS and SI (r= .499, p< .001), EF (r= .343, p< .001), PF (r= .498, p< .001), and IR (r= .316, p< .001). The increase in participants' PO, SI, EF, PF, and IR levels have an impact on increasing the level of GOB, ES, EP, ECS, GP, and TS. Table 6 designates the impact of PO on GOB.

Table 6: *The Impact of PO on GOB*

Variable	***R^2***	***ΔR^2***	***B***	***ß***	***SE***	***t***	***p***	***Tolerance***	***VIF***
Constant	.499	.490	1.486			7.453	.000		
PO[b]→GOB[a]			.646	.706	.042	15.263	.000	.544	1.840
SI → GOB			.266	.358	.052	5.086	.000	.516	1.943
EF → GOB			.086	.111	0.51	1.704	.090	.511	1.958
PF → GOB			.148	.204	.046	3.241	.001	.543	1.843
IR → GOB			.139	.156	.057	2.466	.014	.538	1.858

(Source: Author's Own Work)

Adjusted R^2 was .490 reflecting 49% of the variance between PO and its sub-dimensions and GOB. The model as a whole was statistically significant ($F_{[4,232]}$ =57.710, p< .001).

A variable's tolerance is computed as 1-R^2 of an independent variable. Tolerance values range from 0 to 1; multicollinearity is indicated for a particular variable if the tolerance value is .01 or less (Daoud, 2017; Meyers et al., 2016). VIF is just the inverse of the Tolerance value reflects the correlations between variables. High values of the VIF [(X_1) =1/ (1-Ri^2)] mean that variables within the model are highly correlated. A VIF greater than 10 indicates a multicollinearity problem; while VIF values less than 2 mean that the variables are almost independent (Gordini & Veglio, 2014; Pallant, 2013). All collinearity tolerance values > .01 and VIFs < 2 show that there were no multicollinearity problems.

PO has a positive and strong impact on GOB (ß= .706, p< .001). GOB was weakly influenced by SI (ß= .358, p< .001), PF (ß= .204, p≤ .001) and IR (ß= .156, p= .014, p< .05). However, EF does not have a statistically impact on GOB (ß = .111, p= .090, p> .05). Thus, H_1 was partially supported. Table 7 signifies the impact of PO and its sub-dimensions on ES, EP, ECS, GP, and TS.

Table 7: *Regression of Associations Between PO and GOB's Sub-Dimensions*

Variable	***R^2***	***ΔR^2***	***B***	***ß***	***SE***	***t***	***p***
Constant			1.486		.199	7.453	.000
PO[b] →ES[a]	.359	.348	.575	.580	.053	10.913	.000
SI → ES			.199	.248	.064	3.116	.000
EF→ ES			.116	.138	.062	1.876	.002
PF→ ES			-.006	-.007	.056	-.103	.062
IR→ ES			.300	.311	.069	4.337	.918
Constant			1.734		,199	7.098	.000
PO[d]→EP[c]	.341	.330	.655	.576	.284	10.794	.000
SI→ EP			.294	.319	.061	3.947	.000
EF→ EP			.093	.096	.074	1.285	.200
PF→ EP			.200	.223	.072	3.083	.002
IR→ EP			.040	.036	.065	.499	.618
Constant			1.477			5.199	.000
PO[f] → ECS[e]			.581	.556	.057	10.252	.000

SI → ECS	.320	.308	.220	.260	.069	3.173	.002
EF→ ECS			.057	.064	.067	.841	.401
PF→ ECS			.043	.052	.061	.709	.479
IR→ ECS			.284	.279	.075	3.780	.000
Constant			1.278			4.917	.000
PO[h]→ GP[g]	.391	.380	.676	.624	.055	12.243	.000
SI→ GP			.259	.295	.068	3.807	.000
EF→ GP			.091	.099	.066	1.377	.170
PF→ GP			.171	.200	.059	2.881	.004
IR→ GP			.150	.142	.074	2.036	.043
Constant			1.467		4,066		.000
PO[j] →TS[i]	.308	.296	.723	.513	.079	9.155	.000
SI→ TS			.395	.346	.095	4.183	.000
EF→ TS			-.023	-.019	.092	-.254	.800
PF→ TS			.364	.327	.082	4.410	.000
IR→ TS			-.091	-.066	.102	-.886	.376

(Source: Author's Own Work)

Adjusted R^2 was .348 means that 34.8% of the variation in ES was explained by the PO and its sub-dimensions. The model as a whole was statistically significant ($F_{[4,232]}$ =32.517, p< .001).

PO (ß= .580, p< .001), SI (ß= .248, p= .002, p< .05), and IR (ß= .311, p< .001) have a positive and weak impact on ES. EF (ß= .138, p= .062, p> .05) and PF (ß= -.007, p= .918, p> .05) do not have a statistically impact on ES. Thus, the H_2 was also partially supported.

Adjusted R^2 was .330 reflects that 33% of the variance between EP and PO and its sub-dimensions. The model as a whole was statistically significant ($F_{[4,232]}$ =30.019, p< .001). EP was statistically influenced by PO (ß= .576, p< .001), self-identity (ß= .319, p< .001), and PF (ß= .223, p= .002, p< .05); it was not influenced by EF (ß= .096, p= .200, p> .05) and IR (ß= .036, p= .618, p> .05). H_3 was partially supported for the study.

The value of adjusted R^2 was .308 signifies that 30.8% of the variance between ECS and PO and its sub-dimensions. The model as a whole was statistically significant ($F_{[4,232]}$=27.262, p< .001). PO (ß= .556, p< .001), SI (ß= .260, p= .002, p< .005), and IR (ß=,279, p< .001) have a

positive and weak impact on ECS. EF (ß= .064, p= .401, p> .05) and PF (ß= .052, p= .479, p> .05) do not have a statistically impact on ECS. Thus, H_4 was also partially supported.

The value of adjusted R^2 was .380 reflects 38% of the variation in GP was explained by PO and its sub-dimensions. The model as a whole was statistically significant ($F_{[4,232]}$=37.179, p< .001). PO (ß= .624, p< .001), SI (ß= .295, p< .001), PF (ß= .200, p= .004, p< .05), and IR (ß= .142, p= .043, p< .05) have a positive and weak impact on GP. EF (ß= .099, p= .170, p> .05) does not have a statistically impact on GP. H_5 was partially supported.

Adjusted R^2 was .296 signifies 29.6% of the variation in TS was explained by the PO and its sub-dimensions. The model as a whole was statistically significant ($F_{[4,232]}$=25.809, p< .001). Whilst PO (ß= .513, p< .001), SI (ß= .346, p< .001) and PF (ß= .327, p< .001) have a positive and weak impact on TS, EF (ß= -.019, p= .800, p> .05) and IR (ß= -.066, p= .376, p> .05) do not have a statistically impact on TS. H_6 was also partially supported as well as other hypotheses.

5. Concluding Discussion

As a result of the analysis, PO, SI, PF, and IR have a statistically significant impact on GOB and GP; however, EF does not have a statistically impact on these variables. PO may enable the link of green policies and GOB in employees' green work climate perceptions that are related to their organizations' and co-workers' ES. Since employees who feel PO have a perception of responsibility toward their organizations to protect and altruistic behaviors (Pierce et al., 2001), a higher level of PO felt by employees may reveal employees' embedded feelings and behaviors regarding GOB and GP.

PO, SI, and IR have a statistically significant impact on ES and ECS; yet, EF and PF do not have a statistically significant impact on these variables. Subsequently, as Bohlmann et al. (2018) argue that stricter environmental regulations and guidelines, as well as customers expecting and valuing sustainable products and services, organizations' environmental performance, becomes increasingly important. In this frame, psychological ownership may environmentally foster friendly behavior of employees and constitute employees' green tendencies specifically being more sensitive toward environmental issues that directly promote the economic performance and profits of organizations.

Whilst PO, SI, and PF have a statistically significant impact on EP and TS, EF and IR do not have a statistically significant impact on these variables. Due to the usage of the green concept

as new technology and new products that have a sustainable impact on nature and the environment (Simula et al., 2009), PO that has been strongly felt by employees may serve to increase productivity and domains of recycling via reducing energy usage, the volume of hazardous wastes, or the use of raw materials and preventing pollution with other proactive green technology efforts. It aids in advancing the subjective initiative of environmental participation in GOB.

In sum, the practical contributions of the present study emphasize the significant impact of psychological ownership on GOB. Taking into consideration the results of this study, the recommendations are twofold: for organizations and researchers. Organizations need to be aware of the process that has long-term conditions and continuous efforts since green is oriented toward the productivity and sustainable development of the organizations. Due to the importance of these findings for both organizations and employees aiming to increase organizational performance and obtain high profits, organizations should constitute an environmentally friendly work climate for the psychological ownership of the employees. It has been recommended that the organizations should concentrate more on shaping the sense PO and encourage green responsibility missions that can be interiorized by the employees. Besides, researchers should focus on quantitative studies regarding the relationship between PO and GOB in different populations by adding mediator and/or moderator variables since none of the studies quantitatively investigated together. The limitation of this study is the data was obtained from only one company. In the future, it is recommended that researchers investigate these research topics with a larger sample group in different companies in different industries.

6. Declaration of Conflict of Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest.

REFERENCES

Avey, J. B., Avolio, B. J., Crossley, C. D. & Luthans, F. (2009). Psychological ownership: Theoretical extensions, measurement, and relation to work outcomes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 30*(2), 173-191. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.583

Avey, J. B., Wernsing, T. S. & Palanski, M. E. (2012). Exploring the process of ethical leadership: The mediating role of employee voice and psychological ownership. *Journal of Business Ethics, 107*(1), 21-34. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1298-2

Bai, J. & Ng, S. (2005). Tests for skewness, kurtosis, and normality for time series data. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, *23*(1), 49-60. https://doi.org/10.1198/073500104000000271

Bohlmann, C., Van D. B. J. & Zacher, H. (2018). The relative importance of employee green behavior for overall job performance ratings: A policy-capturing study. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management, 25*(5), 1002-1008. https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.1516

Chen, Y.-S., Lai, S. B. & Wen, C. T. (2006). The influence of green innovation performance on corporate advantage in Taiwan. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *67*(4), 331–339. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-006-9025-5

Chin, T. A., Ab Malik, N. F. I. & Dawei, Z. (2015). Green purchasing practices for corporate environmental performance. 1st International Conference on Educational Studies (ICES2015), 1-11.

Daoud, J. I. (2017). Multicollinearity and regression analysis. In *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, *949*(1), 1-7. https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/949/1/012009

Dawkins, S., Tian, A. W., Newman, A., & Martin, A. (2015). Psychological ownership: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *38*(2), 163–183. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2057

Erbasi, A. (2019). Yeşil örgütsel davranış ölçeği: Bir ölçek geliştirme çalışması. *Istanbul Management Journal*, *86*, 1-23. http://doi.org/10.26650/imj.2019.86.0001

Eurobarometer, S. (2008). Attitudes of European citizens towards the environment report. *European Commission*, 1-295.

González-Benito, J., Lannelongue, G., Ferreira, L. M. & Gonzalez-Zapatero, C. (2016). The effect of green purchasing on purchasing performance: the moderating role played by long-term relationships and strategic integration. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, *31*(2), 312–324. https://doi.org/10.1108/jbim-09-2014-0188

Gordini, N. & Veglio, V. (2014). Customer relationship management and data mining: A classification decision tree to predict customer purchasing behavior in global market. In *Theory and practical applications* (pp. 1362-1401). IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-4666-4450-2.ch001

Gray, S. M., Knight, A. P. & Baer, M. (2020). On the emergence of collective psychological ownership in new creative teams. *Organization Science*, *31*(1), 141-164. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2019.1307

Huang, Y. C., Ding, H. B. & Kao, M. R. (2009). Salient stakeholder voices: Family business and green innovation adoption. *Journal of Management & Organization*, *15*(3), 309–326. https://doi.org/10.1017/s1833367200002649

Jiang, M., Wang, H. & Li, M. (2019). Linking Empowering Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior Toward Environment: The Role of Psychological Ownership and Future Time Perspective. *Frontiers in Psychology, 10*, 1-13. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02612

Londoño, M. L. & Hernandez-Maskivker, G. (2016). Green practices in hotels: the case of the GreenLeaders Program from TripAdvisor. *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Sustainable Tourism, 7*, 1, 1-13. https://doi.org/10.2495/ST160011

Matilainen, A. (2019). *Feelings of psychological ownership towards private forests*. Academic Dissertation, HU.

Meyers, L. S., Gamst, G. & Guarino, A. J. (2016). *Applied multivariate research: Design and interpretation*. Sage.

Min, H. & Galle, W. P. (2001). Green purchasing practices of US firms. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, *21*(9), 1222–1238. https://doi.org/10.1108/eum0000000005923

Norton, T. A., Parker, S. L., Zacher, H. & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2015). Employee green behavior: A theoretical framework, multilevel review, and future research agenda. *Organization & Environment, 28*(1), 103-125. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1086026615575773

Norton, T. A., Zacher, H. & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2012). On the importance of pro-environmental organizational climate for employee green behavior. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 5(04), 497–500. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-9434.2012.01487.x

Norton, T. A., Zacher, H., Parker, S. L., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2017). Bridging the gap between green behavioral intentions and employee green behavior: The role of green psychological climate. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *38*(7), 996-1015. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2178

Oltra, V. & Saint Jean, M. (2009). Sectoral systems of environmental innovation: An application to the French automotive industry. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 76*(4), 567–583. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2008.03.025

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.

Pallant, J. (2013). *SPSS survival manual*. McGraw-Hill Education.

Pierce, J. L. & Brown, G. (2020). *Psychological ownership and the physical environment in organizations.* In *Organizational behavior and the physical environment* (pp. 67-95) Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315167237-4

Pierce, J. L. & Jussila, I. (2011). *Psychological ownership and the organizational context: Theory, research evidence, and application*. Edward Elgar Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4337/9780857934451

Pierce, J. L., & Peck, J. (2018). The history of psychological ownership and its emergence in consumer psychology. In J*Psychological ownership and consumer behavior* (pp. 1-18). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-77158-8_1

Pierce, J. L., Kostova, T. & Dirks, K. T. (2001). Toward a Theory of Psychological Ownership in Organizations. *The Academy of Management Review*, *26*(2), 298. https://doi.org/10.2307/259124

Pierce, J. L., O'driscoll, M. P. & Coghlan, A. M. (2004). Work environment structure and psychological ownership: The mediating effects of control. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *144*(5), 507-534. https://doi.org/10.3200/SOCP.144.5.507-534

Porteous, J. D. (1976). Home: The territorial core. *Geographical Review*, *66*(4), 383. https://doi.org/10.2307/213649

Simula, H., Lehtimäki, T., & Salo, J. (2009). Managing greenness in technology marketing. *Journal of systems and Information Technology, 11*(4), 331-346. https://doi.org/10.1108/13287260911002486

Spreitzer, G. M. (1995). Psychological, empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement and validation. *Academy of Management Journal, 38*(5), 1442–1465. https://doi.org/10.2307/256865

Süssenbach, S., & Kamleitner, B. (2018). Psychological ownership as a facilitator of sustainable behaviors. In *Psychological ownership and consumer behavior* (pp. 211-225). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-77158-8_13

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics*. Pearson.

Uçar, Z. (2018). Psikolojik sahiplik olgusunu örgütsel düzlemde ölçmek için ölçek geliştirme çalışması. *İAD, 10*(3), 640-654. https://doi.org/ 10.20491/isarder.2018.492

Van Zyl, L., Van Der Vaart, L., & Stemmet, L. (2017). *Positive psychological interventions aimed at enhancing psychological ownership.* In *Theoretical orientations and practical applications of psychological ownership* (pp. 119-134). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-70247-6_7

Wang, L., Zhang, G., Shi, P., Lu, X. & Song, F. (2019). Influence of awe on green consumption: The mediating effect of psychological ownership. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *10*, 1-11. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02484

Weng, H. H. R., Chen, J. S. & Chen, P. C. (2015). Effects of green innovation on environmental and corporate performance: A stakeholder perspective. *Sustainability*, *7*, 4997-5026. https://doi.org/10.3390/su7054997

Wiggins, J. (2018). *Can consumers perceive collective psychological ownership of an organization?* In *Psychological ownership and consumer behavior* (pp. 177-194). Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-77158-8_11

Wood, R. & Bandura, A. (1989). Impact of conceptions of ability on self-regulatory mechanisms and complex decision making. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *56*(3), 407-415. https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.56.3.407