INFLUENCE OF PSYCHOLOGICAL OWNERSHIP, LOCUS OF CONTROL AND LEADERSHIP STYLES ON DEVIANT BEHAVIOUR AMONG STAFF OF BENUE STATE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

BY

JAMES AONDOAKULA IGBAAKAA
BSU/PSY/PhD/14/7537

BEING A THESIS PRESENTED TO POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL, BENUE STATE UNIVERSITY, MAKURDI, IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (PhD) IN INDUSTRIAL AND ORGANISATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

JULY, 2019

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this research work is an orginal product of my personal efforts and has not been published or presented elsewhere. All works of other authors consulted are duly acknowledged through referencing.

_____

James Aondoakula Igbaakaa   Date
BSU/PSY/PhD/14/7537

CERTIFICATION

We certify that this Thesis titled **"Influence of Psychological Ownership, Locus of Control, and Leadership Styles on Workplace Deviant Behaviour among Staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service"** has been duly presented by **James Aondoakula Igbaakaa (BSU/PSY/PhD/14/7537)** of the Department of Psychology, Faculty of Social Sciences, Benue State University, Makurdi and has been approved by the examiners.

Supervisor:

Signature:_____

Name: **Prof. James Gire**

Date:_____

Head of Department

Signature:_____

Name: **Prof. Elvis Ihaji**

Date:_____

Supervisor

Signature:_____

Name: **Dr. Edward Kuruku**

Date:_____

Having met the stipulated requirements, the thesis has been accepted by the Postgraduate School.

_____

Prof. Toryina Ayati Varvar
Dean
Postgraduate School

_____

Date

DEDICATION

This research work is dedicated to God Almighty in heaven.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My appreciation first and foremost, goes to the Almighty God in heaven who has given me the grace to attain this height in academics. It takes the grace of God for me to have come this far. To God be the glory.

I wish to express my profound gratitude to my supervisors; Prof. James Gire, and Dr. Edward Kuruku whose contribution to the success of this research and indeed to the Ph.D programme generally, cannot be quantified. Thank you for all your time and efforts. May God bless you with more strength and wisdom to continue to impart knowledge. I am grateful to the Head of Department, Prof. Elvis Oblu Ihaji who worked tirelessly to make sure that I graduate at the right time. My appreciation also goes to Prof. Josiah Shindi and Prof. Philemon Agashua for their tutelage during the programme. Others worthy of appreciation include Dr. (Mrs) Ronke G. Awopetu, Dr. Samuel T. Anhange (P.G Cordinator) Dr. Aondoaver Ucho, Dr. (Mrs) Judith Ayangeawam Mase, and Dr. Pauline Atsehe. Also to be acknowledged are Dr. Helen Chinelo Ogwuche, Dr. Alanyi Ajonye, Dr. Kwasedoo Ngbea and Dr. Joyce Terwase.

My special appreciation goes to my life partners Mrs. Blessing Angbiandoo Igbaakaa and Mrs. Catherine Sedondo Igbaakaa for their productive companionship and moral support. My appreciation also goes to my lovely kids Emmanuella Ternadoo Igbaakaa, Emmanuella Mnenge-u-Ter Igbaakaa, James Suur-shater Igbakaa, Benita Surumshima Igbaakaa and Aondoshinam Igbaakaa. Also worthy of appreciation are my uncle Hon. Michael Terlumun Kusah, my siblings Kukase Iornongo, Comfort Msurshima Swende, Magdalene Hemba-ember Igbaakaa, and Thomas Saater Igbaakaa.

These acknowledgements cannot be complete without appreciating my good friends Maxwell Adagi Igba, Henry Aondofa John-Ian, Princesley Ushahemba Vaaseh,

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

CHAPTER THREE: METHOD

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

This study examined the influence of psychological ownership, work-locus of control, and leadership styles on workplace deviant behaviour among Staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service. The cross sectional survey design was adopted in the study. Simple random sampling technique was used in selecting 239 employees of Benue State Internal Revenue Service (BIRS) who participated in the study. They were within the age range of 20 – 50 years with mean age of 32 years (SD=5.86), comprising of 144(60.3%) males, 85(35.6%) females, and 10(4.2%) who did not indicate their sex. Data were collected using the Workplace Deviance Questionnaire, the Psychological Ownership Questionnaire, the Work Locus of Control Scale (WLCS), and the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). Four hypotheses were tested using simple and standard multiple linear regression. The results revealed that both preventive and promotive dimensions of psychological ownership did not significantly influence workplace deviant behaviour among staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service. It was also found that locus of control had significant influence on workplace deviant behaviour where people with external locus of control are less likely to engage in workplace deviant behaviours while those with internal locus of control are more likely to engage in workplace deviant behaviours. The findings further indicated that leadership styles had significant joint influence on workplace deviant behaviour among staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service. Specifically, transformational leadership style had significant positive influence on workplace deviant behaviour, laissez-faire leadership style also had significant positive influence on workplace deviant behaviour, and transactional leadership style significantly and negatively influenced workplace deviant behaviour among staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service. Finally, it was found that psychological ownership, work locus of control and leadership styles had no significant joint influence on workplace deviant behaviour among staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service. Based on the findings of this study, it was concluded that psychological ownership did not have much influence on deviant workplace behaviour while locus of control and leadership styles are significant determinants of deviant workplace behaviour. The study recommends that the management of Benue State Internal Revenue Service should, instead of giving permanent employment especially to the field staff, give employment on contract basis, among other recommendations.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1   Background to the Study

In the current competitive economy, organizations are faced with many obstacles on the road to success and prosperity. Most unfortunate is the fact that the organizations do not just face external obstacles (such as gaining a competitive advantage), but their success can also be threatened by the very people that make up the organisation — the employees. Employees sometimes engage in acts that are detrimental to the development of the organization known in organisational literature as workplace deviant behaviours or simply, workplace deviance. Workplace deviance has become an important issue in organizations and is gaining increasing research attention (Berry, Ones & Sackett, 2007).

Researchers and psychologists originally defined workplace deviance as employee behaviors that flout important organizational norms and threaten to hamper the reputation of organization and/or hurt the members of the organization (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). However, like many other topics in organizational behaviour, the concept also suffers from lack of consensus about operational definition. Bennett and Robinson (2003) defined workplace deviant behaviour as all those actions committed by organizational members that have, or are intended to have, the effect of hurting coworkers, supervisors, or the organization itself. Early research has shown that there are two perspectives of deviant behavior which are organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance, with many studies utilizing this perspective (Robinson & Bennet, 1995). Thus, the recognized deviant behavior includes a wide aspect of minor and major deviance behavior which affects the organization and which affects individuals.

In the recent wake of several corporate scandals, workplace deviant behaviour has become a prevalent problem in organizations across the globe (Pradhan & Pradhan, 2014). The prevalence of deviant behavior such as fraud, theft, withholding effort, aggressive behavior, and sexual harassment in the workplace is a big challenge for organizations (Peterson, 2002). Rioux, Roberge, Brunet, Savoie, and Courcy (2005) also reported high prevalence of these behaviours.

The effects of workplace deviant behaviour have economic, sociological and psychological implications. For example, the financial cost resulting from theft by employees in the United States had been estimated at 50 billion dollars per year (Coffin, 2003). In Nigeria currently, effort is being made to recover funds amounting to billions of Naira that have been plundered by public office holders. Moreover, employees who had been the target of such deviant behaviors have a greater tendency to resign, and develop stress related problems and low morale (O'Leary-Kelly, Griffin & Glew, 1996). They also tend to experience low self esteem, an increase in fear and lack of confidence at work, as well as physical and psychological pain (Griffin, O'Leary & Collins, 1998). In order to impede these negative impacts on organizations and on the whole society, it is crucial to identify the factors that contribute to such behavior.

Alias, Rasdi, Ismail and Samah (2013) proposed three potential groups of workplace deviant behaviour determinants among support personnel. The determinants are individual-related factors, organisational-related factors, and work-related factors. One of the individual factors considered as important among members of every organization is the feeling of ownership, best known in positive organisational scholarship as psychological ownership. Pierce, Rubenfeld and Morgan (1991) defined psychological ownership as the state in which an individual feels as though the target of

ownership is his. According to O'Reilly (2002, p. 19), "when managers talk about ownership, what they typically want to instill is not financial ownership but psychological ownership—a feeling on the part of the employees that they have a responsibility to make decisions that are in the long term interest of the company." Pierce, Kostova, and Dirks (2001) further elaborated ownership as "the feeling of possessiveness and of being psychologically tied to an object."

The idea of psychological ownership for the organization has received increasing attention from scholars and practitioners as a potentially important predictor of employee attitudes and behaviors (Avey, Avolio, Crossley, & Luthans, 2009). Van Dyne and Pierce (2004) demonstrate positive links between psychological ownership for the organization and employee attitudes such as organizational commitment, job satisfaction, organization-based self-esteem, and work behavior such as performance and organizational citizenship. They showed that psychological ownership accounted for the variance in organization-based self-esteem and organizational citizenship behavior (both peer and supervisor observations of citizenship), over and above the effects of job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

Van Dyne and Pierce (2004) suggest that the sense of possession (which allows individuals to satisfy their basic needs for efficacy and effectance, self-identity, and place) is key to work-related attitudes, self-concept, and behaviours. Psychological ownership, thus, is associated with positive motivational, attitudinal and behavioural consequences and could therefore, reduce the occurrence of negative work attitude and behaviours. For instance, they found that individual psychological ownership is likely to result in extended employee roles beyond formal requirements.

Despite its potentials for positive organisational outcomes, it has also been linked with negative organisational behaviours and attitudes. According to Robinson and Bennett (1995), workplace deviant behaviours are another possible outcome of psychological ownership. Pierce, Kostova and Dirks (2001) noted that, like an over-possessive child, an employee may resist sharing or be unwilling to share the target of ownership (tools, computers, work-space) with co-workers, or may want to retain exclusive control over the target. Individuals who are separated against their will from that which they feel strong ownership, may engage in destructive acts such as sabotage, stalking, destruction, or physical harm to prevent others from gaining control, coming to know, or immersing themselves in the target of ownership. This type of behaviour, in turn, will probably impede teamwork and cooperation. Similarly, managers, for example, may resist interventions that empower their subordinates because they feel a high degree of ownership toward the management of the work unit. This may inhibit the implementation of employee involvement programmes, such as self-managed work teams or quality circles that require managers to delegate authority and to share information and control.

Also, locus of control as an individual factor has been shown to be an important variable influencing behavior at work by affecting a number of work related outcomes, including job satisfaction, job performance, turnover and commitment (Oliver, Jose & Brough, 2006). Locus of control represents how a person's decision making ability is influenced; essentially, those who make choices primarily on their own are considered to have internal loci, while those who make decisions based more on what others desire are said to have external loci (Srivastava, 2009).

How individuals attribute causes to events have important consequences both in their social and work life. Some people believe that they can control events that affect

them or, their successes or failures. On the other hand, some think that luck and fate are the main determinants in their life paths. This difference in thinking changes the pattern of many behaviors. While this leads those who believe they can control events to success, people who attribute everything to fate or luck often face failures and psychological problems (Basım, Erkenekli, & Sesen, 2010). When employees believe that they create and govern their own work roles rather than their work roles being defined by their organizations, supervisors, or coworkers, they should feel more psychologically enabled and energized (Ng, Sorenson & Eby, 2006). Hence, internals tend to be more dedicated to the organization with greater affective commitment, working longer hours and showing higher attendance than externals (McIntyre, Srivastava & Fuller, 2009). Thus, one of the interests of this study is to examine the influence of locus of control (both internal and external) on workplace deviant behaviour among staff of Benue State Revenue Services (BIRS).

Part of the determinant factors of workplace deviant behaviour proposed by Alias, Rasdi, Ismail and Samah (2013) is the organisational-related factors and one of such organisational-related factors is leadership styles. According to Yuki (1994), leadership is the process of influencing followers. Therefore, leadership styles could be seen as the different techniques used by leaders in the process of influencing followers/subordinates. Leadership plays an important role in the attainment of organizational goals by creating a climate that would influence employees' attitudes, motivation and behaviour. Many studies have attempted to investigate the effect of leadership styles on organizational outcomes, such as towards organizational performance, employee involvement and employee commitment and the results of such studies have indicated that, leadership is

prevalent and necessary in all organizational cycles ((Bučiūnienė & Škudienė, 2008; Choi & Choi, 2009).

Leadership style plays significant roles within the organizational context and the importance of leadership style as a predictor of organizational behaviour has been well established (Boerner, Eisenbeiss & Griesser, 2007). In many instances, leadership styles which affect employee behavior has been proven to cause employee experience of stress and eventually accompanied by physical and psychological symptoms that are partly reflected in deviant acts (Mayer, Thau, Workman, Dijke, & Cremer, 2012). Research has also shown a significant association between leadership perception and workplace deviant behaviour (Mulki, Jaramillo & Locander, 2006; Myers & Myers, 1986). Based on the purported association between leadership style and workplace deviant behaviour, this study will also investigate into the association.

From the background, it could be seen that deviant workplace behaviours are prevalent in most organizations (both public and private) in recent times. These acts cost the affected organizations huge sums of money as well as affect the coworkers. In view of the huge consequences, research attention has been turned to this phenomenon and its predictors. So many determinants of workplace deviant behaviours including psychological ownership, locus of control and leadership styles have been investigated. However, it is observed that there is paucity of research in these variables among researchers in Nigeria especially among staff of revenue collecting agencies like the Benue State Internal Revenue Service (BIRS). It is against this background that this study is designed to examine influence of psychological ownership, locus of control and leadership styles on workplace deviant behaviours among staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service.

1.2   Statement of the Problem

Despite efforts by the government to control deviant behaviour in Nigerian organisations, studies have shown that theft, fraud, sabotage and different other forms of workplace deviant behaviours have remained some of the fastest growing behaviours among the workgroups in the country in recent years (Fagbohungbe, Akinbode, & Ayodeji, 2012). Currently in Nigeria, there are rampant reports of billions of naira being looted from government coffers by public office holders. Employees of Benue State Internal Revenue Service are not exempted from this act of workplace deviant behaviours because most of these behaviours go unnoticed.

Benue State Internal Revenue Service (BIRS) is a state government agency that is responsible for mobilizing internal revenue for the state and the employees of this agency need to put in more honest efforts especially at this time when the country has found itself in a state of economic dire strait. This is because the effectiveness and efficiency in the process of revenue collection and the amount of revenue generated by the government for the provision of infrastructural facilities determine a country's state of development (Ogbonna & Ebimobowei, 2012).

Because of the negative impact of workplace deviant behaviours and the high rate of its prevalence in the present day organizations, it has become imperative to understand these behaviours and the causative factors. Although much research has already been done in this area, most of the studies were conducted in foreign countries using different categories of employees. Specifically, there is hardly any research that combined psychological ownership, locus of control and leadership styles to study their influence on workplace deviant behaviour. In the light of the above, the researcher wishes to investigate the influence of psychological ownership, locus of control and leadership

styles on workplace deviant behaviours among employees of Benue State Internal Revenue Service (BIRS).

1.3   Aim and Objectives of the Study

The aim of this study is to investigate the influence of psychological ownership, locus of control and leadership styles on workplace deviant behaviours among staff of Benue State Internal Review Service. The specific objectives of the study are to:

i.   Investigate the influence of psychological ownership (promotive & preventive) on workplace deviant behaviour among staff of Benue State Internal Review Service.

ii.   Assess the influence of locus of control (internal & external) on workplace deviant behaviour among staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service.

iii.   Explore the influence of leadership styles (transformational, transactional & laissez faire) on workplace deviant behaviour among staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service.

iv.   Examine the joint influence of psychological ownership, locus of control, and leadership styles on workplace deviant behaviour among staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service.

1.4   Research Questions

The following research questions were raised to guide the study:

i.   To what extent is the influence of psychological ownership (promotive & preventive) on workplace deviant behaviour among staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service?

ii.   What is the extent of the influence of locus of control (internal & external) on workplace deviant behaviour among staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service?

iii. To what extent is the influence of leadership styles (transformational, transactional and laissez faire) on workplace deviant behaviour among staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service?

iv. What is the joint influence of psychological ownership, locus of control, and leadership styles on workplace deviant behaviour among staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service?

1.5 Significance of the Study

Now that the government, both at federal and state level, has placed emphasis on fighting corruption and bringing sanity to government ministries, department and agencies, this study will be of significance to the government, the employees, the citizenry and organisational researchers.

The study will acquaint the government with the necessary information needed to initiate and execute policies that can help reduce workplace deviant behaviour. For instance, when the role of psychological ownership, locus of control and leadership in workplace deviance is ascertained, policy makers will be more informed about the effects of these variables and therefore, tailor their policies towards that direction.

The results of this study will provide a better understanding to the employees of Benue State Revenue Service (BIRS) in terms of variables that influence their involvement in workplace deviant behaviour. They will become more knowledgeable and therefore make more useful demands, during collective bargaining that will prevent them from engaging in these negative behaviours which can also affect their personal image when suspected.

To the citizenry, when workplace deviant behaviours are reduced, the business of revenue collection will be enhanced and more revenue will be generated internally for use

by the State Government. This will hopefully benefit the citizens as more projects will be executed with more available revenue. Thus, this study can also help improve the standard of living of the citizens of Benue State.

Lastly, organisational researchers will also benefit from this study. This is because, the thesis will serve as a reference material to researchers and scholars in their quest for further studies in this area.

1.6   Scope of the Study

The scope of this study includes the time scope, context/ area of study, and content.

Time: This study spanned over a period of two years starting from 2016 – 2018.

Context/ Area of Study: This study was carried out in the offices of Benue State Internal Revenue Service. The Benue State Interal Revenue Service has 46 offices across 23 Local Government Areas of Benue State.

Content: The content of this study are the variables of the study which are: psychological ownership, locus of control and leadership styles which are independent variables, and deviant behaviour which is the dependent variable.

1.7   Operational Definition of Terms

The following terms are operationally defined:

Workplace Deviant Behaviour: These refer to all those actions committed by organizational members that have, or are intended to have, the effect of hurting coworkers, supervisors, or the organization itself such as theft, withholding information, fraudulent behaviour, aggressive behaviour, and sexual harassment as measured by the Workplace Deviant Behaviour Questionnaire.

Psychological ownership: This refers to the feeling of ownership of either part or whole of an organization by an employee which has no legal basis as measured by the Psychological Ownership Questionnaire.

Locus of Control: This refers to how a person's decision making ability is influenced; essentially, it can be internal or external as measured by the Work Locus of Control Scale.

Leadership Style: This refers to the technique used by the leader to influence his/her followers. The leadership styles are transactional, transformational and laissez faire as measured by the Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ).

Transactional Leadership: As used in this study refers to leadership style in which the leader applies influence by setting clear goals, clarifying desired outcomes, providing feedback and exchanging rewards as measured by transactional leadership sub scale of the MLQ.

Transformational Leadership: Refers to leadership style in which leaders exert influence by broadening and elevating followers' goals and providing them with confidence to perform beyond expectations specified in the implicit or explicit exchange agreement as measured by the transformational leadership subscale of the MLQ.

Leisseiz-faire Leadership: This refers to the style of leadership in which the leader avoids getting involved and is not present when needed as measured by the laissez faire leadership subscale of the MLQ.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter centers on the review of related literature on the topic of investigation. The literature is reviewed under three major headings which are: conceptual review, theoretical review, and empirical review. The summary of literature is also given and finally, the hypotheses are stated.

2.1   Conceptual Review

This section deals with discussion on the main variables in this study. These are workplace deviant behaviour, psychological ownership, locus of control and leadership styles.

2.1.1   Workplace Deviant Behaviour

The concept of workplace deviance has received a great deal of attention in past two decades (Robinson and Bennet, 1995; Bennett & Robinson, 2000; Henle, 2005; O'Neill & Hastings, 2011). It is generally conceptualized as destructive (Robinson and Bennett, 1995; Spector & Fox, 2002; 2005; Spector & Fox, 2010), but some researchers have used this concept as a positive phenomenon (Spreitzer & Sonenshein, 2003, 2004; Appelbaum *et al*., 2007), called as constructive deviance (Robbins & Galperin, 2010; Vadera, Pratt & Mishra, 2013). The present study focuses on the destructive perspective of workplace deviant behaviours. Organizational deviant behaviors are the behaviors like lying, slowdown strike, harassment, gambling, disobedience, violence (Demir, 2009), theft, embezzling, mobbing (O'Neill *et al*., 2011) which lead to adversity for organizations.

The amount of research into deviant work behaviours has grown substantially during the last decade; this has led to an overabundance of definitions of workplace

deviant behaviours. Various attempts were made to define deviant workplace behaviour by the earlier researchers. One of such attempts is the one by Robinson and Bennett (1995) who defined Workplace Deviant Behaviour as voluntary behaviour that violates significant organizational norms and in doing so threatens the well-being of an organization, its members, or both. The definition focused on violation of norms, willingly by the employees, in order to harm the organization, its members or both, in the workplace. Employee deviance is considered voluntary, may be because employee either lack the motivation to conform to the normative expectations of the social context or they become motivated enough to violate those expectations (Robinson & Bennett, 1995).

Robinson and Bennet (2000) consider such behaviors as the voluntary acts breaking the organizational norms. Vaguan defines organizational deviance as an activity, situation or formation which deviates from formal goals, normative standards and expectations, and which results in lower outcomes than expected (Brady, 2010). Deviant behaviors emerge disguised as actions like stealing from the office, sharing the confidential information with unauthorized people, ignoring the manager and ratting the working environment (Zhang *et al*., 2008).

To Avc (2008), organizational deviance can be described as the mismatch of employees' behavior with the expectations and rules of the organization. This concept may include various behaviors ranging from the unimportant ones like gossiping or embarrassing the co-workers to the serious ones like theft and sabotage which have important results. Gruys and Sackett (2003) refer to workplace deviance as an intentional behaviour, on the part of an organizational member, which an organization views as contrary to its legitimate interests. Recently, authors defined deviant behaviour with a new term as Insidious Workplace Behaviour (IWB) which is defined as "a form of

intentionally harmful workplace behaviour that is legal, subtle, and low level (rather than severe), repeated overtime, and directed at individuals or organizations" (Edwards & Greenberg, 2010). Importantly, insidious workplace behaviour is viewed as a particular form of several varieties of deviant behaviour.

In literature, the term 'Deviant Workplace Behaviour' has been interchangeably referred to as Counterproductive Work Behaviour or CWB (Fox *et al.,* 1999), Dysfunctional Workplace Behaviour (Griffin *et al.,* 1998), Antisocial Behaviour (Giacolone & Greenberg, 1997), Retaliatory Behaviours (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997), Workplace Aggression (Baron & Neuman, 1996), Organizational Misbehavior (Vardi & Wiener, 1966), or Workplace Deviance (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). Despite the conceptual differences among these various constructs of negative behaviours, they are measured largely in the same way since they are having overlapping items. In spite of their similarities, for the sake of consistency, the present study has adopted the term workplace deviant behaviour or simply workplace deviance.

Robinson and Greenberg (1998) examined the various definitions of workplace deviance constructs and found out some commonalities among them. According to them, the five common characteristics shared by all definitions were:

Perpetrator: This refers to the insiders who are the employees working in the organizations, current or former (Green, 2014). As can be recognized, most definitions include 'organizational members' in their definitions. O'Leary-Kelly *et al.,* (1996) have proposed that organizational insiders initiate much more severe organizational harm than do organizational outsiders.

Intentionality: This second characteristic describing the deviant workplace behaviour definition is also common in most of the definitions (Robinson & Bennett, 1995; Sackett

& DeVore, 2001; Vardi & Wiener, 1996). Thus, any behaviour that cause harm accidentally or without any purposeful goal of doing so is not considered to be a deviant one. Further, Vardi and Wiener (1996) categorized the intentions of the perpetrators into three aspects: (i) intending to benefit oneself, (ii) intending to benefit organization or (iii) inclined to damage or be destructive to both the members of the organization and organization itself.

Target: The target is usually defined as 'all organizational stakeholders' (Robinson & Greenberg, 1998), which includes, besides employees of the organization, former employees, clients of the organization or the public at large. Robinson and Bennett (1995) provided another distinction for the target of deviance. According to them, individuals, the organization itself or other organizations can be targets of deviance at workplaces. Vardi and Wiener (1996) indicated that insiders were found the most prevalent victims of organizational deviant behaviour. They further categorized the insider targets into three parts: (i) the work itself, (ii) the organization's property, resources, symbols or regulations and (iii) other members or co-workers of organization.

Nature and Execution of the Action: The fourth characteristic of the definitions of deviant workplace behaviour was given as the nature and execution of the action along which various definitions differ. In most of the definitions of deviant workplace behaviour, an action is considered to be deviant if it violates societal or organizational norms (Robinson & Bennett, 1995; Vardi & Wiener, 1996). Baron and Neumann (1996) classified nature of actions as (i) direct (actions directed to the target) or indirect (aimed at the target by way of an agent), (ii) active (inflicting harm) or passive (withholding benefits) and as (iii) verbal or physical actions.

Consequence: Consequence or the effect is the last characteristic of deviant workplace behaviour construct which has been differentiated across various definitions. Consequence is an attribute that results from the deviant actions. Most researchers define the action as deviant if the action gives harm to a person or an organization. While some other researchers are interested in the intention of giving damage to a person or the organization. Other interesting point to be noted here is that, the deviant behaviour can result in either positive or negative consequences. There might be some occasions where the deviant workplace behaviour may result in a positive consequence for the person, its co-worker or the organization as a whole (Spreitzer & Sonenshein, 2004).

According to Robinson and Bennett (1995), firstly in order to be labeled "deviant" the behaviour must go against the organization's norms regardless of the society's norms. For example, if an organization dumps its toxic waste into the river, by definition this would not be a deviant behaviour in the eyes of organization because it is not against their organizational norms, but it is against the society's norms as per society. Therefore, the term "deviant" means only that behaviours which deviates from the obvious and assumed norms of the organization. Secondly, the behaviour must threaten the health of an organization, its members, or both. This means that the violations must be relatively serious. Robinson and Bennett (1995) also noted that deviant behaviours may or may not be ethical. As they pointed out, behaviours such as blowing whistle may be viewed as extremely ethical by many, but would also fit the definition of deviance. Lastly, the deviance is voluntary or intentional and is not accidental, means individuals involve in deviant acts intentionally to harm organization. And they believe that they have been wronged by someone can blame somebody at workplace (Aquino *et al.,* 2001).

Robinson and Bennett (1995) noted that although many behaviours might meet one of their above three definitional criteria of workplace deviance (i.e. of voluntary; violations of organizational norms and threatening well-being of organization or members), but they focused only on those behaviours that met all three criteria and were likely to be deviant in most organizational contexts. They also stated that employee deviance excludes minor infractions of social norms, such as wearing a suit of the wrong style to the office that is not directly or usually harmful to the organization or its members. The violation of organizational norms, in context of this definition is the violation of formal and informal organizational policies, rules, and procedures as prescribed by the organization which are not expected to be violated by its members and is specified in the deviance definition because here deviance must be defined in terms of the standards of a specified social group rather than in reference to a system.

Few authors have made good attempts to classify deviant behaviours. The concept of property deviance and production deviance was first introduced by Mangione and Quinn (1974), and later by Hollinger and Clark (1982). However, these mentioned frameworks and classifications do not account for deviant acts of interpersonal nature, such as physical aggression and sexual harassment but only include acts directed against the organizations. Robinson and Bennett (1995) argued that an accurate typology of employee deviance should take into account not only the behaviours directed towards organizations, but also those that are directed towards individuals.

Consequently, Robinson and Bennett (1995) empirically developed a comprehensive typology of deviant workplace behaviour that includes all possible negative behaviours with the aid of multidimensional scaling procedure and thereby

validated potential methods for measuring workplace deviance. The results produced a two dimensional configuration of deviant workplace behaviours.

(1) Minor-Serious (Severity of deviant behaviour): Deviant behaviour on this dimension varied on a continuum from minor forms of deviance like gossiping about co-workers, intentionally working slow, to serious forms of deviant behaviour for e.g. physical abuse or stealing from the office.

(2) Interpersonal-Organizational (Target of deviant behaviour): The dimension ranged from deviant behaviours aimed at the organization (sabotaging equipment, leaving early etc.) to deviant behaviours primarily directed towards members of the organization (verbal abuse, endangering co-workers, blaming etc.)

The perceptual configuration based on these two dimensions results in four quadrants or four classifications which Robinson and Bennett (1995) referred to as four classes of deviant workplace behaviour namely:

Production Deviance: Behaviours in this category are less severe or harmful, and target the organization. Production deviance refer to behaviour that directly interfere with the work being performed in the organization and effect the performance of the company and its growth, for example like reading a newspaper instead of working, wasting the resources, leaving early, taking excessive long breaks, calling in sick when you are well and so on.

Political Deviance: Behaviours in the political deviance category are relatively less severe, and victims of these behaviours are individuals in the organization. Political deviance refers to milder interpersonal harmful behaviour like showing favoritism towards someone, blaming co-workers, gossiping excessively with co-workers thereby wasting crucial work time and competing non-beneficially with the co-workers.

Property Deviance: Behaviours in this category target the organization and are relatively more harmful. Property deviance refers to employee destroying or misusing an organization's property. Employees might indulge in sabotaging equipment, stealing from organization property, lying about the hours worked, misusing expense accounts and so on. Clearly, these acts bring direct costs for the organization in having to replace the stolen or damaged equipment and thereby hampering the productivity because work cannot be done until replacement equipment arrives.

Personal Aggression: Behaviours targeting the individuals of the organization and relatively harmful comprises personal aggression category of deviance. Personal aggression is more harmful interpersonal behaviour than political deviance as it involves acts like sexual harassment, physical and verbal abuse, endangering co-workers or stealing from co-worker at the workplace.

This typology has been widely used among organizational researches to present and discuss the prevalence of such behaviours in an organized and systematic manner.

Gruys and Sackett (2003) put up on this typology of Robinson and Bennett (1995) and explored workplace deviant behaviours differently along two dimensions; interpersonal-organizational and task relevance. The task relevance dimension varied on a scale starting from behaviours which are relevant to the task being performed, such as quality of work, to those which are less relevant to the direct performance of task, such as theft. Cullen and Sackett (2003) differentiated between initiated and reactive counterproductive behaviours. They showed that individuals may initiate a deviant behaviour (steal from the organization) in order to satisfy motives of pleasure, greed, thrill seeking, risk taking, or attention seeking. While, counterproductive behaviours are reactive when an individual engage in such behaviours in response to some actual or

perceived organizational event, in order to fulfill the motives of retaliation, revenge, release, and or escape.

Interest has been reflected towards more integrative treatments of a range of deviant behaviours (Griffin *et al.,* 1998; Robinson & Greenberg, 1998). As a result, Spector *et al.* (2006) in order to further classify deviant behaviours into specific categories, developed an instrument of 45 items, a checklist named Counterproductive Work Behaviour Checklist (CWB-C) which included the Robinson and Bennett's (1995) organizational and interpersonal dimensions, along with five other categories:

Abuse: Abuse against others consists of harmful behaviours against the co-workers, to inflict physical or psychological harm through threats, inappropriate comments, ignoring or undermining a co-worker's ability to work efficiently.

Production Deviance: The production related deviance being relatively more passive than sabotage include, intentionally not doing the tasks as efficiently as required.

Sabotage: Sabotage behaviour (more active) refers to any physical impairment or destruction of the property belonging to the employer.

Theft: Theft simply relates to the stealing of objects, office supplies and information related with data, processes and so forth, from the employer or co-workers.

Withdrawal: Withdrawal consists of behaviours that involve intentionally working slow and less, remaining absent, arriving late to the workplace and taking more frequent breaks than allowed.

2.1.2 Psychological Ownership

The roots of psychological ownership lie in the psychological and behavioral effects that accompany peoples' feeling of ownership towards objects. These behavioral effects are, especially in western culture, deeply rooted in people from a young age.

Children already feel possession towards different objects in their surroundings which they call "theirs" (Pierce, Kostova & Dirks, 2003). The psychological and behavioral consequences of ownership lead to the state of mind called 'psychological ownership'.

A definition for psychological ownership that is frequently cited by other authors is the one formulated by Pierce, Kostova and Dirks in different articles. According to them psychological ownership is the state of mind "in which individuals feel as though the target of ownership (material or immaterial in nature) or a piece of it is 'theirs'" (Pierce *et al.*, 2001). Psychological ownership results from the psychological tie and feelings of possessiveness towards an object. Objects that a person possesses are becoming part of him and shape his or her identity. Then the feeling of psychological ownership emerges (Pierce *et al.*, 2001). Ownership is often felt towards an object, but it can also be felt towards non-physical targets such as ideas or an organization (Pierce *et al.*, 2003).

According to Pierce *et al.* (2003), legal and psychological ownership are two different constructs which are not always connected to each other. Legal ownership is recognized by society and protected by law, while psychological ownership is recognized by the person feeling it, who is also the one to exhibit the rights associated with it. A target can also be legally owned without the individual feeling psychological ownership towards it or psychological ownership can be felt towards a target that is not legally owned by the individual. The first case applies for a situation in which an individual does not find personal meaning in the target and therefore cannot feel connected to it. An example can be a product than one buys but regrets afterwards. The second case can be found in different situations of everyday life. For example, unmarried couples often feel

ownership and possession towards each other\ referring to '*my*' girl or boyfriend, despite not being owned by each other by any law.

Psychological ownership towards the organization: There are three basic human motives which are fulfilled by the feeling of (psychological) ownership: efficacy and effectance (controlling the target), selfidentity and having a place (possessing a territory or a place). According to Pierce *et al*. (2001), an organization is one of the places where individuals can satisfy these three motives and they cite previous empirical work which shows how individuals indeed develop a feeling of ownership towards their work and/or their organization. This point is also made by Van Dyne and Pierce (2004) and Pierce, O'Driscoll and Coghlan (2004). According to them the targets towards which employees will feel ownership in the organizational context depend on the individual and the situation. Psychological ownership can for example be felt towards one's work, but in other cases also towards the organization itself. This feeling lies behind phrases such as "my job" and "our organization" (Vandewalle, Van Dyne & Kostova, 1995, p.211).

Psychological ownership is interrelated with some other psychological feelings of employees towards their work and organization. Pierce *et al*. (2001) discuss the conceptual distinctiveness of psychological ownership and three other close constructs: organizational commitment, identification and internalization. Psychological ownership differs from these constructs mainly because it is grounded in a possessive feeling for the organization, while the roots of the other constructs are grounded in the desire to stay employed, in the need for social identity and in the need for social membership respectively.

It is important to note that the difference between legal and psychological ownership, which was discussed earlier, also applies when discussing ownership inside

organizations. It is common (especially in Northern America) for employees to formally own part of the organization they work for. These so called 'employee ownership systems' implies that employees get a share in the company, mostly through stock ownership plans. Research suggests that even when formal ownership is given to the employees, it is still the psychological ownership which is most influencing employee job-related attributes such as attitudes towards the work (Pierce, Rubenfeld & Morgan, 1991, p.126) and not the legal ownership itself.

Psychological ownership as a phenomenon was first theorized by Pierce, Rubenfeld and Morgan (1991) in the development of a model of employee ownership (McIntyre, Srivastava & Fuller, 2009). 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. Mayhew, Ashkanasy, Bramble and Gardner, (2007) simply defined psychological ownership as a feeling of possession in the absence of any formal or legal claims of ownership.

Psychological ownership refers to the relationship between an individual and an object in which the object is experienced as connected with the self (Blau & Caspi, 2009). According to Van Dyne and Pierce (2004), psychological ownership asks the question, 'How much do I feel this organization is mine?' Notable indicators of psychological ownership are a strong feeling of possessiveness for/ and a high degree of psychological attachment to the target. Such feelings are believed to cause individuals to protect their object, to take care of it, to nourish it and to seek more information about it (Pierce, *et al.* 2003). Beggan (1992) defined psychological ownership as the state in which individuals feel an object or a piece of one object as "theirs."

Ownership (the state of being an owner and having the right of possession) is found in almost all societies. When people have a sense of ownership, they experience a connection between themselves and various tangible and intangible ''targets'' (Dittmar, 1992). The term ''target'' in the psychological ownership literature is quite broad and refers to whatever the object of attachment represents to an individual or group. These targets may be something as small as a preferred seat in the company cafeteria, or as large as the organization or industry as a whole. For example, in the workplace, a target of ownership for a technician may be a preferred computer program or set of tools, an engineer may feel ownership in a particular product design, an executive may feel ownership in a particular organizational strategic initiative, mission or idea, and a new employee may eventually feel ownership in the entire organization. Such targets of ownership can become so deeply rooted within people's self- identity that they can become viewed as an extension of the self (Dittmar, 1992). Indeed, Brown, Lawrence, and Robinson (2005) argue that ownership and self-identity are so interrelated that people engage in territorial behaviors, such as marking or defending their territory as a way to identify and defend possessions as an extension of themselves. Van-Dyne and Pierce (2004) emphasized that psychological ownership asks the question, ''How much do I feel this organization is mine?'' Thus, the explicit focus on possessiveness is a primary distinguishing factor in psychological ownership.

Based on literature pertaining to what constitutes possession and ownership, Pierce, Kostova, and Dirks (2001) concluded that: (1) the feeling of ownership is innately human, (2) psychological ownership can occur toward both tangible and intangible objects (targets), and (3) psychological ownership has important emotional, attitudinal and behavioral effects on those that experience it.

Extant literature on this construct has shown that psychological ownership has different dimensions. Originally, Pierce *et al.* (2001) based their psychological ownership construct on the three dimensions of self-efficacy, self-identity and belongingness. Avey *et al.* (2009) later expanded on the development of this construct by categorising the dimensions of psychological ownership as either promotion or prevention-orientated and by positing the concepts of territoriality and accountability as additional dimensions of psychological ownership. Having built on the theoretical model of Avey *et al.* (2009) and having reviewed the literature extensively, Olckers and Du Plessis (2012) have suggested that autonomy and responsibility should be included as possible additional dimensions of psychological ownership. Therefore, according to them, psychological ownership is a multi-dimensional construct that comprises seven dimensions that impact the extent to which psychological ownership is experienced. These seven dimensions are discussed in brief below.

Promotion-Orientated Psychological Ownership: Six promotion-orientated psychological ownership dimensions have been identified: self-efficacy, self-identity belongingness, accountability, autonomy and responsibility (Avey *et al.*, 2009; Olckers & Du Plessis, 2012a; Pierce *et al.*, 2001).

Self-efficacy: 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), self-identity refers to a personal cognitive connection between an individual and an object or target (for example the organisation) 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 (Kron & Saunders, as cited in Pierce, Kostova & Dirks, 2003). The motivation for psychological ownership is thus, in part, grounded in self-identity.

Belongingness: Feelings of psychological ownership through attachment to a place or an object lead to that place or object becoming 'home' to the individual (Pierce *et al.,* 2001). Avey *et al.* (2009) state that employees who experience a sense of ownership at work are more positive and report that they occupy a place in the organisational context where they belong. The need of the individual to belong in their place of work can be satisfied by a particular job, work team, division or even an organisation as a whole (Avey *et al.*, 2009).

Accountability: Accountability is defined as the implicit or explicit expectation of the perceived right to hold others and oneself accountable for influences on one's target of ownership (Lerner & Tetlock, 1999). Accountability has to do with accepting responsibility and demonstrating transparency and answerability voluntarily (Wood & Winston, 2007). According to Pierce *et al*. (2001), individuals who experience increased feelings of psychological ownership will act as the conscience of others and will call others to account for influences on their target of ownership.

Autonomy: Ryan and Deci (2006) define autonomy 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 organisation. 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 organisation-based self-esteem) and other behaviours which improve their sense of ownership are promoted.

Responsibility: Feelings of ownership are accompanied by a felt responsibility for the target of ownership and the implicit right to control associated with ownership also leads to a sense of responsibility (Pierce *et al.*, 2001). Pierce *et al.* (2001) further state that when the individual's self is closely linked to the organisation, as in the case of psychological ownership, a desire to maintain, enhance and protect that identity will result in an enhanced sense of responsibility for the target of these ownership feelings.

Prevention-orientated psychological ownership: Prevention-orientated psychological ownership is characterised by only one dimension, namely that of territoriality.

Territoriality: Brown, Lawrence and Robinson (2005, p. 580) 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 organisation outcomes. Avey *et al.* (2009) illustrate this by means of the following example: If the individual's work is less team-based and more based on being an individual contributor, for example, a sales agent who 'owns a particular territory', then a territorial orientation may lead to

positive outcomes. (p.176). Therefore, territorial psychological ownership might have positive consequences despite its having a typically negative connotation.

The idea of psychological ownership for the organization has received increasing attention from scholars and practitioners as a potentially important predictor of employee attitudes and behaviors (Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004). Pierce, Rubenfeld and Morgan (1991) have theorised that psychological ownership can be associated with positive behavioural and psychological consequences and that these associations will hold regardless of the organisational member's financial ownership and the member's legal status as owner or non-owner.

Promotion-orientated psychological ownership has been associated with greater commitment to the organisation (Vandewalle, Vandyne & Kostova., 1995); greater accountability (Vandewalle *et al.*, 1995); greater job satisfaction (Avey *et al.*, 2009; Mayhew *et al.*, 2007; Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004); better organisational performance (Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004; Wagner, Parker & Christianson, 2003); better organisation-based self-esteem (Avey *et al.*, 2009; Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004); organisational citizenship behaviours (Avey *et al.*, 2009; Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004); improved extra-role behaviour (Vandewalle *et al.*, 1995); and the intention to stay in the organisation (Avey *et al.*, 2009; Buchko, 1993).

Psychological ownership predicted job satisfaction and organizational commitment and mediated the relationship between autonomy and these work attitudes (Mayhew, Ashkanasy, Bramble & Gardner, 2007). Other outcomes of psychological ownership are stewardship, promotion of organisation change, personal risk-taking, self-sacrifice and caring and protective behaviours directed toward the target of ownership (Dirks, Cummings & Pierce, 1996; Pierce *et al.*, 2001).

Psychological ownership is believed to be a key to organizational competitiveness because it induces employees to put more effort in the organization and the job (Pierce *et al.*, 2001, p.298), resulting from their feelings of identity with the target. Literature citations by Vandewalle *et al.* (1995) and Pierce *et al.* (2004) show that psychological ownership is believed to have almost only positive behavioral consequences for organizations. A deep theoretical overview of these organizational consequences of psychological ownership is proposed by Pierce *et al.* (2001) in an often cited article. According to them, the starting points of understanding the effects of psychological ownership are the psychological consequences of possession. These, in turn, result in a feeling of closeness and being one with the target of ownership.

Employees who feel psychological ownership are therefore expected to feel responsibility and a sense of burden towards the organization and the work output in order to protect and maintain their closeness to the target. More specifically, this feeling leads to stewardship and citizenship behavior as well as to personal sacrifice, risk taking and investing in the development of the target. According to Pierce *et al.* (2001), psychological ownership also influences the promotion or resistance of change under employees. When change is self initiated, evolutionary and additive, employees who feel psychological ownership will promote change. When this is the other way around, resistance is expected.

Limited empirical research has been performed on the effects of employees' psychological ownership feelings towards the job and the organization they work for. The first substantial empirical evidence for the positive effects of psychological ownership on the behavior of organization members was found by Vandewalle *et al.* (1995), who investigated the link between psychological ownership and extra-role behavior. Extra-role

behavior (a term close to organization citizenship) describes the case in which individuals take voluntarily, mostly positive actions which benefit the organization and for which there is no formal compensation (contrary to in-role behavior which is expected from individuals by being members of the organization).

Vandewalle *et al*. (1995) do not explain in detail why psychological ownership influences extra-role behavior, but this process is explained in other empirical work (see below). The organization that the authors investigated is also not a firm but a university housing cooperative although they do not perceive that as a big disadvantage, though. The results of Vandewalle *et al*. (1995) show a significant positive relationship between psychological ownership and extra-role behavior and, as expected, no relationship with in-role behavior. Their results also show that organizational commitment mediates the relationship between psychological ownership and extra-role behavior.

Positive organizational behavior as a consequence of psychological ownership was also found by Van Dyne and Pierce (2004). They performed an extensive empirical research among 822 employees and few hundreds of peers and supervisors in a variety of organizations and jobs in the United States and founded almost completely supporting results. Psychological ownership for the organization was found to explain organizational commitment, job satisfaction and organization citizenship. The results failed to support a positive effect of psychological ownership on employee performance. According to the writers, this shows that psychological ownership has a stronger effect on employees' voluntarily behavior (extra-role behavior) than on behavior that is expect by their role in the organization (in-role behavior). Table 2.2 below summarizes the results found by Van Dyne and Pierce (2004) and explains the psychological reasons for each type of behavior. The managerial implications of the results are that increasing the feeling of ownership

towards the job and the organization is expected to result in positive behavior by the employees.

According to Pierce *et al*. (2001), psychological ownership can under some (extreme) circumstances also lead to dysfunctional behavior of employees. Negative behavior takes place when the personality of the employee combined with circumstances leads to the type of psychological ownership which satisfies a need for pure control and not for identity and association. The negative behavior can take different forms, such as refusing cooperation and information sharing, frustration, stress and in extreme cases even sabotage.

The psychology of possession identifies three fundamental outcomes associated with feelings of possession: positive attitudes toward the target, enhanced self-concept, and a sense of responsibility (Furby, 1978). In work organizations, it is suggested that this sense of possession (which allows individuals to satisfy their basic needs for place, efficacy and effectance, and self-identity) is key to work-related attitudes (commitment and satisfaction), self-concept (organizational-based self-esteem), and behaviors (performance and organizational citizenship).

Control exercised over an object eventually gives rise to feelings of ownership for that object (Rochberg-Halton, 1980). In her control model of ownership, Furby (1978a) argues that the greater the amount of control a person can exercise over certain objects, the more they will be psychologically experienced as part of the self. To develop this proposition, she builds upon the work of White (1959) and McClelland (1951). White's (1959) work focused on the motive for environmental exploration, control, and subsequent feelings of efficacy.

McClelland (1951) developed the idea that much like parts of the body and control over them, material objects that can be controlled come to be regarded as part of the self. While recognizing individual differences in terms of importance of possessions for personal identity, Prelinger (1959) provided support for the proposed relationship between self and control over objects. Specifically, he found that objects over which the respondent had control, could manipulate, or objects by which she/he could be affected, were more likely to be perceived as parts of the self than objects for which neither was the case. Similar findings have been provided by Dixon and Street (1957).

Control also was found to be a core feature of ownership by Rudmin and Berry (1987) in their studies of ownership semantics. They found that ownership means the ability to use and to control the use of objects. While causality was not explicitly addressed, their work seems to suggest a causal path. Those objects over which individuals exercise the most control are the ones most likely to be perceived as theirs. This is consistent with the thinking of Furby (1978), and Tuan (1984). Similarly, Lewis and Brook (1974) and Seligman (1975), in their earlier work in human development, have argued that through the exercise of control objects become associated with the self, and those objects which are controlled by others or those which cannot be controlled are not a part of the individual's sense of self.

Those objects which are habitually used by an individual become assimilated into the user's self. As noted by Furby (1978a) use of an object can be seen as the exercise of control over that object. Furthermore, access to use of an object gives a person control over others and their access to the object." That over which I exercise ... control becomes a part of my sense of self" (Furby, 1978).

James (1980) suggested that through a living relationship with objects, individuals come to develop feelings of ownership for those objects. Supporting the notion that feelings of ownership emerge from a lived relationship with objects, by knowing an object (person or place) passionately (intimately) it becomes part of the self. People come to find themselves psychologically tied to things as a result of their active participation or association with those things.

Consistent with the above, Beggan and Brown (1994); Rudmin and Berry (1987) suggested that through the process of association we come to know objects. The more information possessed about the target of ownership the more intimate becomes the connection between the individual and that target. According to James (1890), a part of our feelings about what is ours stems from living close to, getting to know, and experiencing things around us. Thus, the more information possessed about the target of ownership, the more things are felt thoroughly and deeply and in the process the self becomes attached to (one with) the object. Along the same lines, Beggan and Brown's (1994) research found that individuals tend to frame issues of ownership as a function of an association between themselves and the object.

Rudmin and Berry (1987) noted that "ownership is linguistically an opaque concept," its meaning is difficult to grasp outside of looking intra-individually --"After all, a stolen apple doesn't look any different from any other" (Snare, 1972). They suggested that attachment provides part of the meaning of ownership and that attachment breeds familiarity and knowledge. Thus, psychological ownership reflects an intimate relationship or a psychological proximity of the owner to the owned. Citing Horwicz (1878), they noted that we tend to prefer our own possessions to others, even others of a

similar kind (Beggan, 1992; Nuttin, 1987) because "we know them better, realize them more intimately, feel them more deeply."

Rochberg-Halton (1980), among others, provides us with insight into the relationship between work and psychological ownership. As part of his political philosophy, Locke (1690) argued that we own our labor and ourselves, and therefore, we are likely to feel that we own that which we create, shape, or produce. Through our labor, we not only invest our time and physical effort but also our psychic energy into the product of that labor. Sartre (1943) even suggested that buying an object was simply another form of creating an object as it too stems from the fruits of our labor. Thus, that which stems from our labor, be it our work or the widget that we make, much like our words, thoughts, and emotions are representations of the self. The most obvious and perhaps the most powerful means by which an individual invests him/herself into an object is to create it. Creation involves investing time, energy, and even one's values and identity. "Things" are attached to the person who created them because they are his/her product, they derive their being and form from his/her efforts; hence, the individual who has created them owns them in much the same way as he/she owns him/herself (Durkheim, 1957). The investment of an individual's self into objects causes the self to become one with the object and to develop feelings of ownership towards that object (Rochberg-Halton, 1980). This sense of ownership can develop between workers and their machines, their work, and the products of their labor (Beaglehole, 1932). In other vocations, individuals may feel ownership for the products they create through scholarly pursuits (academics), organizations they found (entrepreneurs), or bills they draft (politicians). The investment of the self allows an individual to see their reflection in the target and feel their own effort in its existence.

Lastly, it is expected that responsibility for a target, either perceived or real, leads to feelings of ownership. As the person is held or feels responsible for a target he/she begins to invest him/herself into that target through the energy, care, and concern expended. A mentor-protégé relationship is one example of this phenomenon. The mentor feels responsible for the protégé's development, and hence invests their energy, time, emotion, and even their own values, in the protégé. For better or worse, this is likely to result in the mentor coming to think of the other person in terms of 'their' protégé. Social recognition of this relationship tends to further reinforce the fact that people see themselves in the target.

While there have been many attempts to identify the targets to which individuals become psychologically tied (cf. Kamptner, 1991; Rochberg-Halton, 1980; Rudmin & Berry, 1987), there does not appear to be a 'theory of ownership targets,' nor widespread acceptance of a particular classification scheme of ownership targets. What has emerged from this work is the recognition that culture and personal values shape what can and cannot be owned (Furby, 1976); the nature and character of the most valued possessions changes throughout the individual's life-span (Kamptner, 1991); males tend to identify with objects that involve physical interaction and activity, while females are more inclined to associate with more contemplative, expressive and symbolic objects (Kamptner, 1991; Rochberg-Halton, 1980).

The target must be manipulable because only then will it be capable of potentially serving the need for efficacy and effectance. It needs to be attractive, socially esteemed, and self-revealing if the individual is going to employ it to serve the self-identity motive. Finally, the target needs to be open (available, receptive, hospitable) to the individual because only then will it enable the individual to find a home within it. Furthermore,

viable targets of ownership are those whose attributes can facilitate the acts of individuals controlling, coming to know, and/or investing the self into them (i.e., the routes to psychological ownership). For example, from the 'control' perspective, it may be more difficult for an academic to develop feelings of ownership for the entire university than for one's research program, as the latter is more subject to one's control. Similarly, it is unlikely that professors will feel the same level of psychological ownership for undergraduate versus doctoral students, simply because of the different degree to which they come to know these two groups of students and the amount of themselves invested in them.

As argued above, the individual is ready for psychological ownership due to the innate motives for efficacy and effectance, self-identity, and having a place to dwell. While these motives are universal, we anticipate that there will be individual differences in this process. First, individuals will differ on the strength of motives, both across individuals and within individuals across times. This will result in varying likelihood of developing feelings of ownership across individuals, or even within a single individual at different points in time. Second, personality will have an impact as well. Based on Winter, Steward, Klohen, and Duncan's (1998) argument that traits channel the operation of motives toward differential behavior, we suggest that traits will affect how an individual goes about pursuing relationships with ownership objects, and the types of objects deemed suitable. For example, extroverts may prefer to pursue targets through social means compared to introverts. Or, people high on the 'openness to experience' dimensions of personality may be more willing to consider a greater variety of targets compared to those low on this dimension. Individuals with Machiavellian and authoritarian personalities may prefer to pursue targets via the exercise of control and

power, rather than through the development of a close and intimate relationship or through an investment of the self. Finally, people with a strong sense of self (i.e., high self-esteem and/or actualized individuals) may pursue intrinsic targets, while those with a weaker self-concept may be more prone to seek materialistic targets (Kasser & Ryan, 1993).

Personal values make certain objects more-or-less esteemed (Pelham, 1991). Different attributes are important for different people and different types of objects are 'sought' by individuals, as a result. From the perspective of the self-concept, individuals may strive to increase feelings of self-worth by attempting to legally or psychologically possess items of greatest importance to them. Ownership is one means to boost self-evaluations and self-esteem; hence, individuals are likely to feel ownership over those objects considered to be most important according to their personal values. For example, individuals whose perceptions of selfworth are predicated on intellect, or who are part of cultures that value intellect, may seek to feel ownership over targets that reinforce this attribute (books, pieces of art). Finally, and as noted earlier, an individual may legally own some object, but not feel a sense of ownership for it. This condition may exist when the object is not a source of effectance and efficacy, is not associated with one's self-identify, and/or a place within which to dwell, even though it might have been purchased with hard earned cash and is controlled and known.

In reality, the process by which psychological ownership emerges is associated with a complex interaction between all the elements of our theory discussed above – roots, routes, target factors, and individual factors. While the full examination of all possible interactions between these elements is beyond the scope of our paper, here we offer some ideas of these complexities. The first question along these lines concerns the relationship

among the three roots of psychological ownership (i.e., efficacy and effectance, identity, and having a home). While we examined these intraindividual functions served by the psychological state of ownership as conceptually distinct, we suggest that they are not totally independent of one another. Thus, the need for a place to dwell, although independent from the need for efficacy and effectance or self-identity, once satisfied, may reinforce the others. For example, an individual may well feel more efficacious within the confines of one's 'home' than in less familiar surroundings. Similarly, an individual's self-identity can be served (defined, communicated to others, and/or maintained) through expressions of one's 'home,' a relationship acknowledged by Mehta and Belk (1991). They suggest that immigrants tend to cherish possessions because they simultaneously provide the individual with a feeling of security (a need satisfied by having a familiar place in which to 'dwell'), while simultaneously serving to reinforce continuity in their identity.

Furthermore, we suggest that the three roots of psychological ownership are complementary and additive in nature. Thus, ownership may emerge as the result of any one, or any subset, of these needs. For example, an individual may feel ownership when he/she has a strong efficacy and effectance motive, even though the identify motive might be non-active. Consequently, stronger and a more intense sense of ownership is likely to emerge when two or more of the three roots are active and served. Similarly, we suggest that the three routes to psychological ownership (i.e., control, intimate knowing, and investment of self) are distinct, complementary and additive in nature. Any single route can result in feelings of ownership independent of the others. However, the feelings of ownership for a particular target will be stronger when an individual arrives at this state as a result of traveling multiple routes (intimate knowing and controlling) rather than just

one route. The routes do not have a multiplicative relationship, as that would imply if any one of the routes does not occur, then ownership would not emerge.

At present, it is not clear whether some routes are more effective at generating psychological ownership than others. We speculate that the routes of control and investing self in the target have the potential to be most effective. One reason is that the research and theory reviewed earlier suggests that these routes tend to be particularly effective at bringing the target within the self region. A second reason is that, among other effects, controlling and investing self have the potential to also result in coming to know intimately. Said differently, a by-product of controlling an object or investing the self in that object is coming to know the properties of that object. For example, the writing of a manuscript, crafting a sculpture, or building a house is likely to result in a detailed and in-depth understanding of the product of one's creation. We note that this does not mean that coming to know is not independent of the other routes; one can come to know an object intimately without either creating or controlling it. Hence, because investing self and controlling can lead to the other route, and because we posit that the routes have additive effects, we believe that the former may have a greater overall effect than simply coming to intimate knowing of the target.

An important question regarding the emergent process concerns the amount of time that it takes for this psychological state to develop. At the cognitive level, we suggest that an individual may come to recognize that a particular target is 'theirs,' rather quickly. Consider the case of acquiring a puppy and the amount of time it takes to come to the realization that there are additional responsibilities. Yet, for this feeling to fully develop and blossom to the point where it manifests itself as a complete

cognitive/affective state integrated into the self-concept, the process may well be lengthy, dynamic, and reiterative in nature.

Herein lies one of the distinctions between legal and psychological ownership. While individuals become legal owners of a piece of property at the very moment they acquire it, it may take quite some time before people begin to feel this property as theirs. Although there may be exceptions, sufficient control, intimate knowing, and/or investment of the self are unlikely to emerge quickly. For example, one of the authors observed that truck drivers in a local mine did not feel ownership for the trucks that they operated until a new company policy was implemented, which assigned each driver to a particular truck. Only after that, and with the passage of time, did the drivers begin to change their attitudes and behaviors towards the trucks--from use and abuse to care and maintenance. They gradually began to refer to their trucks as 'my' truck, to clean its interior, and to attend to mechanical maintenance. One driver even named his truck and spent his own money to have this name painted on the doors. As this example shows, psychological ownership can emerge in the absence of legal ownership. It most likely emerges through a lengthy and iterative process. Investing the self into the target eventually gives rise to feelings of ownership for that target.

Feelings of ownership lead the individual to make personal sacrifices on behalf of the target, which, in turn, generates even stronger feelings of ownership. We note, however, that legal ownership may facilitate and speed-up the emergence of psychological ownership because it allows the individual to explore the three routes leading to this state. It provides the right to control or change the target, more-or-less, at one's own will, the right to explore and to come to intimately know, and the right to invest the self into the target of possession. The lack of legal ownership may in some

cases provide a more precarious form of ownership, as an individual has to avoid violation of the law (physical barriers, customs and social practices) in order to exercise one or more of the three routes to psychological ownership. In the absence of legal ownership, one may also have to contend with a greater fear of separation, claim of ownership by the legal owner, and loss of the object.

Another means by which the process of psychological ownership is further facilitated are the 'possession rituals' in which people engage. According to McCracken (1986), rituals such as displaying, showing off, using, and personalizing possessions facilitate the movement of the culturally prescribed meaning of objects to the individual's self-identity. Accompanying these acts, the individual frequently 'claims' the object as theirs. Claiming is both an "assertion of territoriality through ownership" and an "attempt to draw from the object the qualities that have been given to it" by society as part of one's selfidentity (McCracken, 1986: 79). Through such rituals, especially those of using, spending time with, reflecting upon, and displaying, the individual may find it a comfortable place in which to dwell, and ultimately claim it as 'mine.'

Finally, it is noted that feelings of ownership for a particular target do not necessarily last forever. They can dissipate, as people no longer feel a sense of ownership for some targets that were once integrated into the self-concept. We suggest that this decoupling process is associated with the same forces that produced the psychological state of ownership. Thus, the origin for the decoupling is to be found in changes in the roots, routes, characteristics of the target, the individual, and the interaction among them. For example, a change in an underlying motive (a redirected sense of efficacy and effectance, a change in self-identity, or the emergence of a new place in which to dwell) may serve as a catalyst for the removal of a target from the citadel of the self. The

disappearance of one or more of the routes to ownership (loss of control, increased unfamiliarity, withdrawal of the self from the target) will contribute to such decoupling as well.

Similar decoupling effects will emerge as targets become less visible, attractive, manipulable, open, or receptive. Finally, individuals may go through a number of formal rituals (estrangement, divorce, devaluation, hostility, depersonalization) in an effort to decouple one's cognitive and emotional attachment to certain previous targets of psychological ownership.

Up to this point the emergence of psychological ownership has been described void of context, yet it is reasonable to suggest that situational forces influence this process and the end state. It was noted that there are substantial cross-cultural differences in orientation to land and ownership among Scandinavians of a North Germanic heritage from that of their Sami brethren to the far north. Furthermore, cross-cultural psychology highlights differences in the conceptualization of the self across people and regions of the world (Markus & Kitayama, 1991), as well as differences in socialization practices that result in collectivistic versus individualistic ownership experiences (Furby, 1976).

Finally, O'Driscoll, Pierce, and Coghlan (2001) report significant differences in feelings of ownership as a function of work environment structure. They suggest that our conceptualization of psychological ownership may serve as a foundation for a more systematic examination of contextual factors. While we anticipate that a wide variety of contextual elements will have an effect on the emergence of psychological ownership, we focus our discussion on two main aspects –structural and cultural. Structural aspects of the context, such as laws, norms, rules, and hierarchy may promote or prevent individuals from developing feelings of ownership in several ways. Some insights into the structural

aspects of context and its implications for the operation of the motives discussed earlier can be gained by employing a framework presented by Mischel (1973). His work speaks to the role of the situation and an individual's dispositional state in the determination of individual behaviors. From a social-psychological perspective, structural factors operate creating 'strong' or 'weak' situations (Mischel, 1973), which in turn impact the emergence and display of individual differences and attitudes. To help understand the interaction of individual differences and situational factors, Mischel (1973) suggested that 'strong' situations constrain or homogenize behavior thereby restricting the expression of individual differences. As a consequence, individual differences as revealed by one's dispositional state are likely to play a limited role in determining whether and how psychological ownership will develop. Weak situations, on the other hand, will afford the individual with greater opportunity to define the meaning of events, generate responses, and to reveal oneself and engage in such behaviors. Thus, it is reasoned that the motives for psychological ownership will be less likely to express themselves and psychological ownership will be less likely to emerge under strong (highly structured) as opposed to weak situations.

2.1.3 Locus of Control

Over several decades, psychological research has focused on locus of control (LOC), which is a personality trait that represents the extent to which people believe that the rewards they receive in life can be controlled by their own personal actions (Lefcourt, 1984; Rotter, 1966). Van der Sluis, Van Praag and Van Witteloostuijn (2004) describe WLOC in relation to a personality construct.

Locus of control refers to one's belief in his or her abilities to control life events (Strauser, 2002). In other words, locus of control is defined as one's thoughts of his/her

belief that his/her own power or forces out of his/her control are influential in any positive or negative situation occurring during his/her life (Sardogan, 2006). The belief of locus of control is related to what reinforcements have happened throughout the individuals' lives, namely the results, prizes, their success or failures, refer to. These attributions refer not only to chance, fate, and powerful people out of one's control, but also to the results of his/her own attitudes (Basım & Sesen, 2006). While one's control on his/her own life dependent on chance, fate and powerful people is explained as external control; maintaining the individual control over one's life on his/her own is described as the internal control (Rotter, 1966). When environmental conditions are not sufficient to explain individuals' success or failures, locus of control can facilitate in making these situations clear. For instance, individuals may sometimes perceive good and bad events in different ways. To mention that these different ways are based on external and internal forces (Taylor, 2006).

Some individuals believe that they can control what happens to them, while others believe that what happens to them is controlled by outside forces such as luck and opportunities. Locus of control is a " generalized belief that a person can or cannot control his own destiny or a person's perspective on the events whether he able to control behavior that happened to him or not (Rotter, 1966). Brownell (1982) suggested that locus of control is how far one accepts personal responsibility for what happens to them. Furthermore, Robbins (2003) defined locus of control as a person's perception of his fate source.

The term locus of control simply refers to the extent to which one believes that events in one's life are contingent on one's own behaviour. According to the internal-external locus of control construct, persons with internal expectancies for control of

reinforcement believe that their own behaviour determine the reinforcement they receive. These persons are called internals. A person with internal locus of control attributes change to himself and to his actions. They believe and act as if they control their own futures and see themselves as effective agents in determining the occurrence of reinforcing events in life. In contrast, a person who believes in external control of reinforcements attributes their outcomes to chance, luck, fate, powerful others, and so on. These people are called externals. A person with external locus of control attributes changes to external sources, and believes that powerful forces such as fate, luck, chance, powerful others, social constraints ,or instructions are important factors determining the occurrence of reinforcing events in his life. A person with external locus of control believes that reinforcement does not depend on his actions or behaviour, but is "the result of luck, chance, fate, as under the control of powerful others or is unpredictable because of great complexity of forces" (Rotter, 1966). The implication of this is that individuals with internal locus of control may likely change their behaviour following reinforcements than those individuals with external locus of control.

The key concept embedded in the construct on locus of control is one's perception of control and external influences or reinforcements (Galejs, & Hegland, 1982). The effect of locus of control on the performance of high-level managers was significantly stronger than its impact on the performance of lower-level managers (Frucot, & Shearon, 1991). When environmental conditions are not sufficient to explain individuals' success or failures, locus of control can facilitate in making these situations clear. For instance, individuals may sometimes perceive good and bad events in different ways. To mention that these different ways are based on external and internal forces (Taylor, 2006).

The individuals, who have the internal locus of control, think that they have a big role on affecting the events which influence their lives. Furthermore, they assess themselves as possessing the power for the attitude they want to display by having the positive ego concept, and they believe that they can direct their lives whatever way they desire (Gulveren, 2008). The individuals with external locus of control relate the events affecting their lives to perceptions such as chance, fate, and fortune which are out of control. Additionally, they believe that the events affecting their lives cannot be predicted and controlled (Kucukkaragoz, 1998). Individuals with internal locus of control are careful, alert, dominant, focused on success, self-confident, and ingenious. On the other hand, the individuals with external locus of control are careful, affected by the group members, easily influenced by external forces, less self-confident, and they display unsteady performances (Rotter, 1975). According to MOW (1987) an employee who attaches importance to work will show greater performance, likely to be more committed to work and the organisation and experience greater job satisfaction. Previous researches have also pointed to the fact that those who are high in work centrality are more incline to their job, probably have more affective bound with their organisation and show greater effort doing their job.

In other words, locus of control (Rotter, 1966) refers to the individuals' beliefs about whether they control the outcomes in their lives (i.e., internal locus of control) or the outcomes are controlled by factors such as luck and other people (i.e., external locus of control). Spector (1988) operationalized the notion of locus of control in a work context by developing the work locus of control scale (WLCS) for job-related events such as promotions, salary increases and disciplinary measures. The results of Spector's (1988) study indicate that the WLCS is more appropriate for studies in organizational settings

than the general scale of locus of control developed by Rotter (1966). A sense of psychological control is regarded as an important dispositional factor for workplace behaviors (Hoffi-Hofstetter & Mannheim, 1999). A number of studies have shown that LOC correlates both with job satisfaction (Spector, 1982) and organizational commitment (Kinicki & Vecchio, 1994). All of these studies reportedthat individuals with an internal LOC are more likely to be satisfied and committed to the organization than those with an external LOC.

The WLOC is further divided into two sub-constructs, which oppose each other. Adas (1999) highlights the importance of the internal and external WLOC and refers to these constructs as the perceived source of control over behaviour. As summarised by Bilgin (2007), people with a high internal locus of control (internals) believe that the promotions or penalties they get at work are due to their own actions and performance. On the other hand, people with a high external locus of control (externals) believe that those events at work are beyond their control and are the result of fate, chance, luck or decisions made by the authority.

Thomas, Sorensen and Eby's (2006) perspective of WLOC has important research implications: they indicate that the WLOC is related to various organisational elements and thus future research should not minimise the contributions made. Research has consistently demonstrated the importance of traits in achieving organisational objectives; for example, based on a study conducted by Thomas *et al*. (2006), it was found that internal LOC was positively associated with desirable work outcomes, such as greater job motivation. However, Thomas *et al*. (2006) highlight that the increased attention given to the role of personality at work is often limited to certain traits such as the 'Big Five personality traits of extraversion, neuroticism, conscientiousness, agreeableness, and

openness to experience' and those 'personality traits outside of the Big Five taxonomy often receive less research attention, such as the work locus of control'.

Some individuals believe that they can control what happens to them, while others believe that what happens to them is controlled by outside forces such as luck and opportunities. Locus of control is a " generalized belief that a person can or cannot control his own destiny or a person's perspective on the events whether he is able to control behavior that happened to him or not (Rotter, 1966). Brownell (1982) suggested that locus of control is how far one accepts personal responsibility for what happens to them. Furthermore, Robbins (2003) defined locus of control as a person's perception of his fate source.

Locus of control refers to one's belief in his or her abilities to control life events (Strauser, 2002). In other words, locus of control is defined as one's thoughts of his/her belief that his/her own power or forces out of his/her control are influential in any positive or negative situation occurring during his/her life (Sardogan, 2006). The belief of locus of control is related to what reinforcements have happened throughout the individuals' lives, namely the results, prizes, their success or failures, refer to. These attributions refer not only to chance, fate, and powerful people out of one's control, but also to the results of his/her own attitudes (Basım & Sesen, 2006). While one's control on his/her own life dependent on chance, fate and powerful people is explained as external control; maintaining the individual control over one's life on his/her own is described as the internal control (Rotter, 1966). When environmental conditions are not sufficient to explain individuals' success or failures, locus of control can facilitate in making these situations clear. For instance, individuals may sometimes perceive good and bad events in

different ways. To mention that these different ways are based on external and internal forces (Taylor, 2006).

In other words, Locus of control refers to the individuals' beliefs about whether they control the outcomes in their lives (i.e., internal locus of control) or the outcomes are controlled by factors such as luck and other people (i.e., external locus of control) (Rotter, 1966). Spector (1988) operationalized the notion of locus of control in a work context by developing the work locus of control scale (WLCS) for job-related events such as promotions, salary increases and disciplinary measures. The results of Spector's (1988) study indicate that the WLCS is more appropriate for studies in organizational settings than the general scale of locus of control developed by Rotter (1966).

A sense of psychological control is regarded as an important dispositional factor for workplace behaviors (Hoffi-Hofstetter & Mannheim, 1999). A number of studies have shown that LOC correlates both with job satisfaction (Spector, 1982) and organizational commitment (Kinicki & Vecchio, 1994). All of these studies reported that individuals with an internal LOC are more likely to be satisfied and committed to the organization than those with an external LOC.

Framework of social learning theory and was first defined as a personality attribute and used by Rotter (1966). Locus of control belief refers to how individuals attribute their reinforcements, i.e. the outcomes of their experiences or rewards, or their achievements or failures. These attributes can be made to luck, powerful acquaintances, fate and similar factors beyond their control as well as their own behavior (Solmus, 2004). In brief, locus of control refers to one's belief in his or her abilities to control life events (Strauser *et al.*, 2002).

While some people have a high locus of control, some cannot correlate their behavior to the events that happen to them. According to the theory developed by Rotter (1966), people's perceptions about the underlying main causes of events in his/her life differ. This difference in locus of control belief also leads to dissimilarities in people's perceptions and assessments of events that happen to both themselves and others. In a sense, in cases where environmental circumstances fail to bring a certain explanation to individual's successes or failures or his or her other experiences, locus of control belief comes out as a method to explain these and is basically divided into two categories (Taylor *et al.*, 2006):

External locus of control: It refers to the individual's perception that a reinforcement or outcome is guided by fate, luck, or other external circumstances beyond his/her control. Besides, an individual may see big and complex forces surrounding him/her as causes of events. Individuals, who believe that his/her behavior or events happen to him/her, are mainly determined by external forces rather than himself/herself are defined as people with external locus of control (Rotter, 1990).

Internal locus of control: It can be defined as an individual's belief that events result primarily from their own behavior or relatively permanent traits and actions (Rotter, 1990). Individuals with internal locus of control are more responsive to environmental stimuli or changes, which they believe will be helpful in determining their future behavior, compared to individuals with external lotus of control; They are more enthusiastic in changing environmental conditions and they ascribe more importance to their abilities, achievements or failures (Solmus, 2004).

While individuals with internal locus of control believe that they can change their dissatisfaction with any dimension of their life with their own efforts, individuals with

external lotus of control tend to suffer from despair in determining the direction of their life. They believe that some rewards in their life path are not the outcomes of their efforts. In their belief, these are merely coincidences, being in the right place at the right time and (Solmus, 2004).

Many studies have revealed that individuals with internal locus of control have less difficulty in expressing their feelings; they have more self-confidence and are less in need of others' approval; they take more care of their physical and mental health than those with external locus of control do. It was also found that compared to those with internal locus of control, people with external locus of control experience more anxiety, stress and depression, thinking that they cannot prevent favorable events from happening (Ashby *et al*., 2002; Solmus, 2004).

Numerous studies that focused on internal and external locus of control as a personal trait indicate that the effects of internal locus of control orientation on the personality are more positive compared to external locus of control orientation. On the other hand, external locus of control belief refers to low self-esteem, depression, headaches, other psycho-physiological disorders and psychopathology. Strickland (1989) maintained that individuals who attribute outcomes of events to their behavior are more determined to change unpleasant events that happen to them, while those attributing to external forces such as luck or fate are less insistent and less striving. Internals believe that the probability of goal attainment is directly proportional to their efforts and their ability to learn from repeated experience. On the other hand, externals do not see the relationship between their efforts and the ultimate results of these efforts. External-locus-of-control individuals attribute a high probability to luck as a determinant for significant events also set goals that are more difficult for themselves (Bernardi, 2001).

Another difference between these two different locuses of control manifests itself in their causal attributions to successes and failures (Solmus, 2004). Internal-locus-of-control people accept responsibility for events and external-locus-of-control individuals blame their environment for failures (Bernardi, 2001). While Anderson (1977) asserts that internal-locus-of-control individuals display more active behavior against problem-solving, Silvester *et al.* (2002) state that individuals, who attribute the causes of their failures to themselves and controllable behavior have a higher level of job motivation and development.

The most apparent differences between the job behavior of internals and externals appear in organizational factors such as job satisfaction, job involvement, motivation and stress. Many studies have found that employees, who attribute causes of good performance to their own control; confident with their efficiency and competence; capable of making decisions to solve problems and taking necessary steps, i.e. internal-locus-of-control individuals, have a higher level of job satisfaction, job involvement and motivation (Solmus, 2004). Likewise, Spector (1988) maintain that the level of job satisfaction of internal locus-of-control employees is higher; they hold their job for a longer period of time; they are usually paid more and they have a higher status.

It has been found that WLOC is related to various important work-related outcomes including psychological capital (Babalola, 2009), happiness (Carrim, Basson & Coetzee, 2006), job satisfaction (Salazar, Hubbard & Salazar, 2002), organisational citizenship behaviour (O' Brein, 2004), turnover intentions (Lu, Kao, Cooper & Spector, 2000) and job performance (Chen & Silverthorne, 2008). Thus, WLOC has been related to positive outcomes and a positive strength-based approach. Furthermore, literature dating back to Phares (1976) notes that internals are more sensitive than externals to

information relevant to self-worth. The 'stronger expectancy of the effort-outcome relationship for internals should be associated with those variables in the work domain that reflect one's work motivation, such as motivation to learn and sense of empowerment' (Thomas *et al.*, 2006).

Bosman, Buitendach and Rothman (2005) note that: it is evident that the locus of control construct is based on the cause and consequence relationship and therefore future expectations (for example, anticipation of redundancy) can be construed in terms of current behaviour. The LOC certainly has implications within a work setting as indicated by a study in the call centre environment in South Africa: Carrim (2006) notes that internals tend to exert increased control as compared to externals in certain work settings, for example work flow, operating procedures, task accomplishment, operating procedures, working conditions, work assignments and relationships. It is thus noted that the LOC has relevance to a variety of positive relationships within the workplace. Furthermore, Maram and Miller (1998) indicate a strong relationship between WLOC and work behaviour such as leader member exchange and organisational commitment. Hence, personalities are an important aspect of organisational behaviour and continue to have strong implications for organisational growth and outcomes. Thus, there is evidence that WLOC positively influences work behaviour. This study assists in broadening the knowledge base on these important areas.

It is noted, in the 1980s researchers critiqued the unidimensional nature of the construct (Lefcourt, 1982; Levenson, 1981). Krampen (1985) notes that a unidimensional nature of the construct is too simplistic. Later, Furnham and Steele (1993) note critiques of the WLOC and indicate that internality is not always associated with positivity, as internals are likely to experience lower levels of self-esteem when faced with failure as

they more easily demonstrate accountability for their actions and may relate their failure to their actions. Thus, the WLOC construct is not without its critique and future research can offer clarity on these dilemmas outlined.

There are several practical implications for studying the impact of the WLOC in the organisational setting. For example, Harris, Harris and Eplion (2007) indicate through the identification of personality traits that are associated with desired individual and organisational outcomes, decision-makers can increase the effectiveness of selection devices when hiring employees. Harris *et al.* (2007) found 'an internal locus of control, need for power, and self-esteem are all associated with positive consequences'. Thus, an easy and efficient way to improve job outcomes may be to better select those candidates with desired characteristics in the recruitment process. In terms of the current study the outcomes have important implications for organisations' selection and recruitment model, in relation to the impact of the WLOC on positive psychological states. This study further demonstrated the usefulness of WLOC in explaining human behaviour, and not only focused on WLOC as a dispositional trait but also examined it as a predictor of positive psychological states. Hence, literature has indicated that the personality trait of WLOC is relatively stable and linked to positive work outcomes.

Locus of control is a person's perspective on an event if he can or can not control the events that happened to him (Rotter in Salomi, 2004). Locus of control is a person's perception of success or failure in performing a variety of activities in his life linked to external factors individuals which include the fate, fortune, power boss and work environment as well as connected also with the internal factors of individuals which include the ability to work and act work related to the success and failure of the individual work (Johan, 2002).

Someone with an internal locus of control, believe that everything that happened was the result of his own efforts. Someone who believes with external locus of control believes that everything that happened was beyond his ability (Rotter in Salomi, 2004). By using the concept of locus of control, work behavior can be explained when an employee felt the results of the work carried out as a result of internal locus of control and external locus of control. Internal locus of control will be visible through the ability to work and work-related measures of success and failure of employees at the time of the job (Salomi 2004). While employees with external locus of control feel that there are controls outside him which supports the results of the work performed. (Salomi, 2004). Locus of Control has a theoretical background in social learning (Rotter in the dissertation Browel, 1979 Salomi, 2004: 32). Rotter stated that the sustaining effect on humans is not just a simple process, but rather depends on the support itself and whether the individual receives antarperilaku relationship that requires support. However, it is not entirely the case because of his actions. This is usually due to luck, chance, fate or so as a result of something that was not foreseen. Individuals who interpret the incident thereto in the presence of external control. Conversely, if an individual feels that what happens depends on their own behavior and not be influenced by outside forces, he believes in the internal control. Locus of control according to Rotter (in Elizabeth, 1996) is defined as a matter of identifying the degree to which a person feels that the events in his life depends on the behavior or his personal character. Rotter in Ross and Taylor (1996) suggests humans are often described as "internal", where man himself believe that learning or exercise more produce or have better control in a variety of events and mempunnyai results which affect him. This is in contrast to the tendency of the "external" who believe that humans have very little control over what happens to him. Stone and Jackon (in

Elizabeth, 1996) also states that people who have an external locus of control will make changes to external sources. He sure took note and acted as though there are forces beyond their means (for example: fate, chance, others more powerful, social pressure, or instructions external), these are all factors that are important in determining the events that happened in his life.

Locus of control is one aspect of personality that describes the extent to which individuals believe they have the ability to exercise control over their environment. Rotter (1966) developed the internal-external locus of control that yields a single score on a scale from highly internal to highly external. Internals believe that events in their life result from their behaviors. Externals believe that they have very little control over the events in their life. Although several researchers have proposed that locus of control might be multidimensional, most studies of locus of control employ Rotter's single score scale (Chen & Wang, 2007).

The main effects of locus of control on job-related variables are broadly supported by many other studies (Daniel & Guppy, 1994; Judge *et al*., 2003). Important for this study is the relationship of locus of control to organizational commitment. Werbel *et al*. (1996) confirmed that job fit and locus of control were the most important antecedents of pre-entry organizational commitment. Luthans *et al*. (1987) demonstrated that locus of control is significantly associated with organizational commitment. Individuals with a higher internal locus of control are more likely to have a higher level of organizational commitment.

Hyatt and Prawitt (2001) examined how auditors' job performance is influenced by the interaction between individual auditors' locus of control and the employing firm's audit structure. Results indicate that internals perform at a higher level in unstructured

firms than in structured firms, while externals perform at a higher level in structured firms than in unstructured firms. This implies that locus of control may interact with characteristics of the work environment and affect job-related variables. A similar study of Lin *et al.* (2010) found that work characteristic change has a greater effect on the organizational commitment of internals than externals. In other words, the aforementioned results imply a moderating effect of locus of control on job-related variables.

Rahim (1996) argued that locus of control moderates the relationship between stress and strain. This hypothesis was partially supported by results from hierarchical regression analyses. However, the mediating effect of locus of control on the relationships between other variables is another possibility. Following this approach, Chen and Silverthrone (2008) posited that locus of control mediates the relationship between job stress and job performance, locus of control mediates the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance, and locus of control mediates the relationship between job satisfaction and job stress.

2.1.4 Leadership/Leadership Styles

Leadership has been an important topic in the social sciences for many decades. Recently, renewed interest in the concept of leadership has been aroused. The resurgence of interest in studying the topic of leadership appears to be accompanied by an acceptance of the distinction between transactional and transformational leadership (Den Hartog, Van Muijen & Koopman, 1997).

Leadership is perhaps one of the most important aspects of management (Weihrich, *et al.*, 2008). This is because leadership is a major factor which contributes immensely to the general wellbeing of organisations and nations. Organisations such as General Electric

and Chrysler had been turned around from the brink of bankruptcy to become two of the world's most profitable organisations through the effective leadership of Jack Welch and Lee Iacocca (Robbins & Coulter, 2007). Great nations like the United State of America, Britain, France and India are some of the most prominent nations in the world today on the wings of effective leadership (Weihrich *et al.*, 2008). This is because leaders in organisations and nations make things happen. Therefore, quality of leadership is considered to be of prime importance for organizational change that gives it competitive advantage (Parry & Sinha, 2005).

Several approaches have been put forward to explain leadership effectiveness. Two of the most prominent leadership approaches are Transformational and Transactional leadership theories also known as leadership styles. Since the late 1980s, transformational and charismatic leadership have been ascendant. Versions of transformational leadership have been proposed by several theorists, including Bass (1985, 1996). Although most authors agree that transactional and transformational leaderships are different in concept and in practice, many authors believe that transformational leadership significantly augments transactional leadership, resulting in higher levels of individual; group, and organizational performance (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Howell & Avolio, 1993). Others believe that Transactional leadership is a subset of transformational leadership (Weihrich *et al.*, 2008).

2.1.4.1 Transformational Leadership

The concept of transformational leadership was introduced by James Macgregor Burns in 1978 in his descriptive research on political leaders, but its usage has spread into organisational psychology and management with further modifications by B M Bass and J B Avalio (Jung & Sosik, 2002). A transformational leader is a person who stimulates and

inspires (transform) followers to achieve extraordinary outcomes (Robbins & Coulter, 2007). He/she pays attention to the concern and developmental needs of individual followers; they change followers' awareness of issues by helping them to look at old problems in a new way, and they are able to arouse, excite and inspire followers to put out extra effort to achieve group goals. Transformational leadership style is all about leadership that creates positive change in the followers whereby they take care of each other's interests and act in the interests of the group as a whole (Warrilow, 2012).

Transformational leadership enhances the motivation, morale, and performance of followers through a variety of mechanisms. These include connecting the follower's sense of identity and self to the project and the collective identity of the organization; being a role model for followers that inspires them and makes them interested; challenging followers to take greater ownership for their work, and understanding the strengths and weaknesses of followers, so the leader can align followers with tasks that enhance their performance.

Warrilow (2012) identified four components of transformational leadership style:

a) Charisma or idealised influence: the degree to which the leader behaves in admirable ways and displays convictions and takes stands that cause followers to identify with the leader who has a clear set of values and acts as a role model for the followers.

b) Inspirational motivation: the degree to which the leader articulates a vision that is appeals to and inspires the followers with optimism about future goals, and. offers meaning for the current tasks in hand.

c) Intellectual stimulation: the degree to which the leader challenges assumptions, stimulates and encourages creativity in the followers - by providing a framework for

followers to see how they connect (to the leader, the organisation, each other, and the goal) they can creatively overcome any obstacles in the way of the mission.

d) Personal and individual attention: the degree to which the leader attends to each individual follower's needs and acts as a mentor or coach and gives respect to and appreciation of the individual's contribution to the team. This fulfils and enhances each individual team members' need for self-fulfilment, and self-worth – and in so doing inspires followers to further achievement and growth.

Empirical evidence also shows that transformational leadership is strongly correlated with employee work outcomes such as lower turnover rates, higher level of productivity, employee satisfaction, creativity, goal attainment and follower well-being (Garci'a-Morales *et al*, 2008; PiccolO & Colquitt, 2006; Keller, 1992).

2.1.4.2 Transactional Leadership

Bass (1985) argues that leadership in research has generally been conceptualized as a transactional or cost-benefit exchange process. Transactional leadership theories are founded on the idea that leader-follower relations are based on a series of exchanges or implicit bargains between leaders and followers. Transactional leadership is characterized by behavior and attitudes that emphasize the quality of exchange between superiors and followers. The leader clarifies the performance criteria, what is expected from subordinates, and what they receive in return (Den Hartog *et al*., 1997).

According to Bass & Avolio (1994), "Transactional leadership emphasizes the transaction or exchange that takes place among leaders, colleagues and followers. This exchange is based on the leader discussing with others what is required and specifying the conditions and rewards these others will receive if they fulfill those requirements". Leaders who behave accordingly can compensate deficits of motivation, direction and

satisfaction of the workers or organization if demands and rewards are based on a mutual agreement. That is to say, the leader and followers discuss what is a requisite and what resources are necessary to reach given the aims.

The model of transactional leadership implies a process of social exchange where leaders and followers influence each other. In this sense, executives and subordinates are business partners in a deal in which the followers accept obedience, give support and recognition to the executives as a counterpart for their productive dispense of coordination, respect for the norms and necessities of the group, as well as their competition for the achievement of the followers´ tasks. In this "give and take", the executive gains the power to impose, if necessary, unpopular decisions, on the strength of his/her performance (Felfe, 2002). In general, transactional executives emphasize goal setting and give instructions that clarify structures, conditions and control. In this area, their strategy is, positive or negative contingent reinforcement depending on performance which executives achieve through the components of transactional leadership: contingent reward (CR) and management by exception (MBE-A or MBE-P).

Bass (1998) explains, "contingent reward has been found to be reasonably effective to achieve higher levels of development and performance. With this method, the leader assigns or gets agreement on what needs to be done and promises rewards or actually rewards others in exchange for satisfactorily carrying out the assignment".

Management-by-Exception (MBE) tends to be less effective than contingent reward. The corrective transaction may be active (MBE-A) or passive (MBE-P). In active MBE-A, the leader arranges to actively monitor deviances, mistakes, and errors in the followers' assignments and to take corrective action as necessary. MBE-P implies waiting passively for deviances, mistakes, and errors to occur and then taking corrective action.

Active MBE-P may be required and effective in some situations such as when safety is paramount in importance. Leaders sometimes must practice passive MBE-P when it is necessary to supervise a large number of subordinates who report directly to the leaders.

Transactional Leadership, also known as managerial leadership, focuses on the role of supervision, organisation, and group performance; transactional leadership is a style of leadership in which the leader promotes compliance of his followers through both rewards and punishments. Unlike Transformational leadership, leaders using the transactional approach are not looking to change the future, they are looking to merely keep things the same. These leaders pay attention to followers' work in order to find faults and deviations. This type of leadership is effective in crisis and emergency situations, as well as when projects need to be carried out in a specific fashion.

Within the context of Maslow's hierarchy of needs, transactional leadership works at the basic levels of need satisfaction, where transactional leaders focus on the lower levels of the hierarchy. Transactional leaders use an exchange model, with rewards being given for good work or positive outcomes. Conversely, people with this leadership style also can punish poor work or negative outcomes, until the problem is corrected. One way that transactional leadership focuses on lower level needs is by stressing specific task performance (Hargis, *et al*, 2001). Transactional leaders are effective in getting specific tasks completed by managing each portion individually.

Transactional leaders are concerned with processes rather than forward thinking ideas. These types of leaders focus on contingent reward (also known as contingent positive reinforcement) or contingent penalization (also known as contingent negative reinforcement). Contingent rewards (such as praise) are given when the set goals are accomplished on-time, ahead of time, or to keep subordinates working at a good pace at

different times throughout completion. Contingent punishments (such as suspensions) are given when performance quality or quantity falls below production standards or goals and tasks are not met at all. Often, contingent punishments are handed down on a management- by-exception basis, in which the exception is something going wrong. Within management-by-exception, there are active and passive routes. Active management-by-exception means that the leader continually looks at each subordinate's performance and makes changes to the subordinate's work to make corrections throughout the process. Passive management-by-exception leaders wait for issues to come up before fixing the problems. With transactional leadership being applied to the lower-level needs and being more managerial in style, it is a foundation for transformational leadership which applies to higher- level needs.

Transactional leaders use reward and punishments to gain compliance from their followers. They are extrinsic motivators that bring minimal compliance from followers. They accept goals, structure, and the culture of the existing organization. Transactional leaders tend to be directive and action-oriented.

Transactional leaders are willing to work within existing systems and negotiate to attain goals of the organization. They tend to think inside the box when solving problems Transactional leadership is primarily passive. The behaviours most associated with this type of leadership are establishing the criteria for rewarding followers and maintaining the status quo.

Transactional leadership takes place when leaders and followers are engaged in the exchange relationship to meet their own self-benefits (Burns, 1978). Leaders reward followers in exchange for work or service. Schermerhon *et al*., (2000) has proposed four dimensions of transactional leadership.

a.   Contingent rewards

b.   Active management by exception,

c.   Passive management by exception, and

d.   Laissez-faire

In contingent reward dimension of transactional leadership, the leader makes clear to the followers, by self-participation or direction, what the followers should do to be compensated for their services (Yukl, 2007). In active management by exception, the follower's performance is monitored and corrective actions are taken when the followers fail to meet standards (Bass & Riggio, 2006). In passive management by exception, the leader does not take any corrective action unless the problem arises (Bass & Riggio, 2006). In laissez-faire facet of leadership, the leader shuns taking any action (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

Several transactional theories have been tested extensively and some of them have received considerable empirical support such as path-goal theory from House and Mitchell (1974), and vertical dyad theory from Graen and Scandura (1987).

2.1.4.3 Laissez-Faire Leadership (LF)

This is the avoidance or absence of leadership and is most inactive, as well as most ineffective according to almost all research on the style. Laissez-faire represents a non-transaction. Necessary decisions are not made. Actions are delayed. Responsibilities of leadership are ignored. Authority remains unused (Bass, 1998).

The leadership is a process in which the manager of organization attempts to facilitate the responsibility fulfillment to reach the organizational aims by motivating and making an effective relationship and convince the staffs do their jobs willingly (Alvani, 2007). Beginning to study about the leadership comes along with personality theories and

internal features. The results of these studies showed that the internal features cannot ensure their success. Then it came to the behavioral theories of what behaviors the efficient leaders show off. Then, the researchers focused on the contingency theories in which recognizing the conditions and acting upon it are the keys of success (Moratazavi *et al.*, 2005). The relationship-oriented leader is characterized by fulfilling their duty, the accurate organizational patterns, communication channels and approaches of successful work, and the work — oriented leader is characterized by the open communication channels, emotional and psychological supports, active listening and facilitating behaviors (Rezaeeian, 2007).

Due to their focus on the output, followers may sometimes deviate from the rules or commit organizational crimes in the competitive business world. Transformational leadership is different from other leadership types in that it has a particular moral effect on the followers. That is, both the leader and the followers are carried to a different level of morality and values. The followers of a transformational leader are encouraged to reveal the morality in their actions and to be cautious about their path and deviant behaviors in order to make sure that they are ethical (Pradhan & Pradhan, 2014).

According to Avey *et al*. (2010), there is negative correlation between the control and flexible leadership and organizational deviation; that is, the more the control and flexible leadership is present, the less deviation is observed in the organization (Abdullah and Marican, 2014). It is suggested that the control and flexible leadership should be benefitted from in order to deal with the organizational and interpersonal deviance (Abdullah and Marican, 2014).

In summary, we can say that the concepts of leadership centered on the quality of the relationship of exchange between executives and subordinates can be taken to be

transactional. Here are included the objects of exchange, from concrete tasks and material rewards to the guarantee of having room for action and resources, and even non-material rewards like confidence and loyalty.

2.2 Theoretical Review

This section deals with the review of related theories. Specifically, the section reviewed the Multifactor Leadership Theory, McGregor's Theory X and Y, The Regulatory Focus Theory, Attribution Theory, and the Social Learning Theory.

2.2.1 The Multifactor Leadership Theory

One of the most accepted theories within situational leadership approach is multifactor leadership presented by Bass (1999). According to this theory, leadership consists of transformational, interactional and laissez-faire styles of leadership. Developing his studies on multifactor leadership in 1978, Bass (1999) has made some changes in his studies. In the beginning of his studies, Bass (1999) mentioned that transformational and interactional leadership are adverse and it is impossible for someone to perform both transformational and interactional leadership behaviors. However, backing down this idea in his final set of studies, Bass (1998) states that one may have both of these leadership behaviors and he explains this matter as situationism (Baloğlu *et al*., 2009).

Concept of transformational leadership has started to be examined by introducing its differences from interactional leadership. In 1973, Downtown stated that transformational leaders differed from the interactional leaders through their rebellious, revolutionary and reformist features. The concept of transformational leadership was firstly examined in literature by Burns (1978). He built his theory being affected by Zalenik's approach that oversees public needs and presents them in a new vision (Avolio

& Bass, 2004). Burns (1978) defined transactional leadership as connected more to past and traditions, and transformational leadership as focused more on innovation, changing and reforms (Owen *et al.*, 2007). However, these studies of Burns (1978) remained limited because the theory was not clear, and survey tool had not been developed yet. Studies in field of transformational leadership increased after Burns' (1978) studies (Eraslan, 2006). This emergent leadership paradigm gained importance subsequent to classification of transformational, interactional and laissez faire leadership types.

Transformational leadership is defined as pushing the limit, influence and counseling process in which followers discover their competence (Avolio & Bass, 2004). By continuously developing their capacity, transformational leaders endeavor to direct group for the aims to support their followers. For this, they struggle more than expected. These efforts of transformational leaders increase staff's motivation, self-competence, pleasure and devotion (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Transformational leaders think it is possible to achieve more when there is more performance than expected before. Because of this reason, they persuade the followers to use their standards of morale and ethic at a high level (Avolio & Bass, 2004). In this process, leaders listen to their staff, and try to figure out values and provisions they have (Tanrıverdi & Paşaoğlu, 2014).

A transformational leader enables his/her staff to overcome problems or difficulties that they encounter, and provide them with autonomy for raising their performance and competence (Bass *et al.*, 2003). As Currie and Loackett (2007) mention, transformational leadership is a kind of leadership that is aware of personal differences, and meets the needs of subordinates. Transformational leadership is generally observed in four dimensions. These are inspirational and intellectual motivation, idealized influence and customized importance (Avolio & Bass, 2004). Leader's determining vision and

mission of organization in company with members is called idealized influence. Inspirational motivation is defined as creating team spirit of an organization to reach its aims and increase performance. As for intellectual motivation, it means creating a supportive environment where individual differences are considered. In this way, opinion of subordinates is appreciated (Tourish & Pinnington, 2002).

Transactional leadership is built upon an agreement between the leader and his followers based on accomplishing tasks and rewarding when someone is successful (Avolio & Bass, 2004). Transactional leaders want to be sure that their followers' performance is good enough and they accomplish their tasks. In transactional leadership style, leaders clearly explain what they want from their followers and explain how they are going to be rewarded in return. For Bass (1998), transactional leaders perform these two kinds of behavior: conditional reward and exceptional management. While conditional reward behavior is based on a leader rewarding his followers in return for desired performance or behavior, exceptional management behavior dwells on a leader's approach to problems (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

Laissez-faire leaders act as if they need administrative activities least and leave their followers by themselves. Behaviors of laissez-faire leadership can make leaders forget that they have a problem to solve. This matter leads to dissatisfaction of followers. In this type of leadership, it is mentioned that laissez faire leaders are indifferent and they don't even expose leadership behavior (Baloğlu *et al*., 2009).

The multiple factor leadership theory has shown that leadership is an important factor in every organization as a determinant of employees' behaviour. Specifically, different styles of leadership account for different organisational outcomes. For instance, the theory indicates that transformational leadership style recognizes and helps the

subordinates or employees to meet their needs. Therefore, it can be said that the transformational leader is more subordinate friendly and gives motivation to the subordinates to perform appropriate workplace behaviours. It also implies that when the leader is not transformational and emphasizes strict accomplishment of task such as it is the case with transactional leadership, the followers are not motivated and may tend to engage in behaviours that are not ethical and which are destructive to the organization such as workplace deviant behaviours. In summary, this theory illustrates that transformational leadership styles encourages employees to engage in more constructive workplace behaviour while transactional or laissez faire leadership may lead the followers into workplace deviant behaviours.

2.2.2 McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y

Theory X and Y are theories of human motivation created and developed by Douglas McGregor at the MIT Sloan School of Management in the 1960s that have been used in human resource management, organizational behavior, organizational communication and organizational development. The theories describe two contrasting models of workforce motivation (McGregor, 1960).

Theory X

In this theory, management assumes that employees are inherently lazy and will avoid work if they can and that they inherently dislike work. As a result of this, management believes that workers need to be closely supervised and comprehensive systems of controls developed. A hierarchical structure is needed with narrow span of control at each and every level. According to this theory, employees will show little ambition without an enticing incentive program and will avoid responsibility whenever they can. According to McGregor, if the organizational goals are to be met, theory X

managers rely heavily on threat and coercion to gain their employees' compliance. Beliefs of this theory lead to mistrust, highly restrictive supervision, and a punitive atmosphere.

The Theory X manager tends to believe that everything must end in blaming someone. He or she thinks all prospective employees are only out for themselves. Usually these managers feel the sole purpose of the employee's interest in the job is money. They will blame the person first in most situations, without questioning whether it may be the system, policy, or lack of training that deserves the blame. A Theory X manager believes that his or her employees do not really want to work, that they would rather avoid responsibility and that it is the manager's job to structure the work and energize the employee.

Theory Y

In this theory, management assumes employees may be ambitious and *self-motivated* and exercise *self-control*. It is believed that employees enjoy their mental and physical work duties. According to them work is as natural as play. They possess the ability for creative problem solving, but their talents are underused in most organizations. Given the proper conditions, theory Y managers believe that employees will learn to seek out and accept responsibility and to exercise self-control and self-direction in accomplishing objectives to which they are committed. A Theory Y manager believes that, given the right conditions, most people will want to do well at work. They believe that the satisfaction of doing a good job is a strong motivation. Many people interpret Theory Y as a positive set of beliefs about workers.

A close reading of *The Human Side of Enterprise* reveals that McGregor simply argues for managers to be opened to a more positive view of workers and the possibilities that this creates. He thinks that Theory Y managers are more likely than Theory X

managers to develop the climate of trust with employees that is required for employee development (McGregor, 1960). It's employee development that is a crucial aspect of any organization. This would include managers communicating openly with subordinates, minimizing the difference between superior-subordinate relationships, creating a comfortable environment in which subordinates can develop and use their abilities. This climate would be sharing of decision making so that subordinates have say in decisions that influence them.

When managers apply Theory Y principles, workers receive independence and responsibility for work; they receive opportunities to recognize problems and their job will be to find solutions to them. This results in high-quality relationships (Sahin, 2012). In contrast, theory X managers highlight the close supervision of workers and the chain of command and motivate subordinates using extrinsic rewards. Therefore, workers that are overseen by theory X managers tend not to have the most beneficial relationship with their supervisor. They maintain a distance and impersonal and low-quality exchange relationships (Sahin, 2012).

McGregor's theory X and Y can be applied in explaining the source of strength for work behaviours. The theory provides two set of assumptions about the motivation of employees. Theory X opposes the view that individuals have inherent tendency to engage in their work activities. It believes that extrinsic motivation in form of money and punitive actions is the only way to get people to engage in their work. This view indicates that when employees are seen as inherently lazy and must be strictly supervised and monitored, it makes the employees detached from the leadership of the organization, and by extention, they become detached from the organization. Their sense of being part of the organization is lost and therefore, they perceive themselves as instruments meant for

achieving the organisational goals. Thus, they do not have feelings of possession for the organization and can engage in deviant behaviours which are detrimental to the organization.

On the other hand, theory Y believes that employees are self-motivated; they exercise self control in their work and have inherent passion for work. This part of the theory is in support of the belief that people do not depend on extrinsic motivation to exercise work engagement. Rather, they need sense of ownership (psychological ownership) that motivates them to engage in more productive and constructive behaviours in the organization.

2.2.3 Regulatory Focus theory

According to the Regulatory Focus Theory, individuals can adopt two distinct strategies or orientations when they pursue goals (Higgins, 1997, 1998, 1999a). They can pursue aspirations in the future, striving to maximize gains, called a promotion focus. Alternatively, they can strive to fulfill their immediate duties and obligations, attempting to minimize shortfalls, called a prevention focus. These two orientations significantly affect the behavior, emotions, cognitions, and preferences of individuals.

When individuals adopt a prevention--rather than promotion--focus, some drawbacks can ensue. Individuals can become more sensitive to distractions (Freitas, Liberman, & Higgins, 2002). They are also less inclined to change their behavior in response to criticism (Forster, Grant, Idson, & Higgins, 2001). In contrast, a promotion focus, which can be activated merely by reflecting upon future hopes and aspirations for example, can afford many benefits. A promotion focus tends to improve the capacity of individuals to negotiate effectively (Galinsky, Leonardelli, Okhuysen, & Mussweiler, 2005). They also solve problems more creatively (Friedman & Forster, 2001).

The concept of regulatory focus originated from self discrepancy theory (Higgins, 1987). According to this theory, throughout the lifespan, individuals learn the duties and obligations they must fulfill to prevent immediate adverse events, such as punishments (Higgins, 1987). Over time, these duties and obligations consolidate to form an abstracted set of principles, designated as an ought self guide (Higgins, 1987). When individuals feel they might not have fulfilled these duties and obligations, they anticipate an adverse event, experienced as agitation and anxiety (Strauman, 1989).

Furthermore, throughout their life, individuals also learn the achievements and aspirations they must realize to secure rewards, such as love and approval. These achievements and aspirations also coalesce to form an abstracted set of principles, referred to as the ideal self guide (Higgins, 1987). When individuals feel they might not be able to achieve these aspirations, they anticipate the withdrawal of these rewards--a gradual rather than abrupt sense of loss--manifested as dejection, disappointment, and depression (Strauman, 1989). Several studies have corroborated the key propositions that underpin self discrepancy theory (Higgins, 1999; Scott & O'Hara, 1993).

For example, Higgins, Shah, and Friedman (1997), accumulated evidence that vindicates self discrepancy theory. Participants were instructed to list traits they would like to exhibit, or feel they should exhibit--referred to as ideal and ought characteristics. In addition, participants specified the extent to which they exhibited each of these characteristics, called an actual self. Finally, the extent to which they experienced various emotions was assessed. Consistent with self discrepancy theory, participants who felt they had not fulfilled their ideals, called an actual-ideal discrepancy, reported an elevated incidence of dejection. In contrast, participants who felt they had not satisfied their oughts, referred to as an actual-ought discrepancy, reported an elevated incidence of agitation.

Regulatory foci: Whether individuals strive to fulfill their duties or aspirations, designated as regulatory focus, depends on both their disposition as well as the immediate context. For instance, some authority figures, such as parents or teachers, tend to apply punitive actions rather than withdrawal rewards to moderate the behavior of children. These children will evolve to become motivated to satisfy their ought self guide, called a prevention focus (Higgins, 1997, 1998). When authority figures withdrawal rewards instead, children will become driven to realize their ideal self guide, referred to as a promotion focus (Higgins, 1997, 1998). Nevertheless, reward structures and other properties of the context can impinge on the regulatory focus of individuals (Forster, Higgins, & Idson, 1998; Freitas, Liberman, & Higgins, 2002).

In short, individuals who adopt a promotion focus, as defined by Higgins (1997, 1998), experience needs that relate to nurturance, accomplishment, and progress. Hence, they form the goal to pursue ideals and aspiratiaons, striving to maximize future gains. In contrast, individuals who adopt a prevention focus experience needs that relate to safety, security, and protection. They form the goal to satisfy duties, obligations, and responsibilities, attempting to minimize imminent losses.

Regulatory fit: Regulatory focus shapes the preferences of individuals. As Freitas, and Higgins (2002) demonstrated, when individuals adopt a promotion focus, they prefer creative, exploratory activities in which they can achieve some form of gain--but shun tasks in which they need to identify and address shortfalls. When individuals adopt a prevention focus, however, they prefer to redress shortfalls than facilitate gains.

These observations can be ascribed to the principal of regulatory fit (Higgins, 2000, 2005, 2006). Specifically, individuals can adopt one of two means to fulfill promotion or prevention goals: eagerness or vigilance. Eagerness refers to the inclination

to enact behaviors that maximize hits, as defined by signal detection theory, rather than minimize false alarms (Crowe & Higgins, 1997). Vigilance refers to the inclination to minimize false alarms (Crowe & Higgins, 1997).

Whenever individuals adopt a promotion focus, they experience a sense of congruence, referred to regulatory fit, whenever they demonstrate eagerness (Cesario, Grant, & Hiuggins, 2004; Freitas & Higgins, 2002 Vaughn, Malik, Schwartz, Petrova, & Trudeau, 2006). In contrast, when individuals adopt a prevention focus, they experience this sense of fit whenever they demonstrate vigilance (Cesario, Grant, & Hiuggins, 2004; Freitas & Higgins, 2002 Vaughn, Malik, Schwartz, Petrova, & Trudeau, 2006). This affective experience promotes persistence and satisfaction (Higgins, Idson, Freitas, Spiegel, & Molden, 2003). Thus, individuals who experience a promotion focus will prefer tasks or contexts that entail or encourage an emphasis on maximizing gains, rather than minimizing losses. Individuals who experience a prevention focus will prefer tasks or contexts that entail or encourage the diminution of losses.

Mechanisms that underpin the benefits of regulatory fit: Several studies have examined the mechanisms that underpin the benefits of regulatory fit. For example, regulatory fit might facilitate the processing of information. Individuals tend to assume that information that is processed rapidly and fluently must be valuable (Lee & Aaker, 2004). Thus, when individuals experience a sense of regulatory fit, they assume the stimuli they are examining must be valuable, which can promote motivation.

To illustrate, in one study, conducted by Holler, Hoelzl, Kirchler, Leder, and Mannetti (2008), participants received messages that promulgated the importance of tax compliance. Participants who adopted a promotion focus were more likely to process the message rapidly--and more likely to support this message--if the benefits or gains

associated with compliance were emphasized. In contrast, participants who adopted a prevention focus were more likely to process the message rapidly if the losses or costs associated with breaches of the tax regulations were emphasized.

Mechanisms that underpin the drawbacks of regulatory fit: Usually, regulatory fit is regarded as a desirable and productive state. When individuals experience this sense of fit, they often feel more engaged in their tasks, for example. Nevertheless, regulatory fit can also elicit some undesirable consequences. That is, the converse of fit, called non-fit (Vaughn, O?Rourke, Schwartz, Malik, Petkova, & Trudeau, 2006), may be beneficial in some circumstances. For example, when individuals experience non-fit, they might deliberate over an issue more exhaustively and thus curb some misleading biases.

This possibility was corroborated by Vaughn, O'Rourke, Schwartz, Malik, Petkova and Trudeau (2006). In their study, a state of either fit or non-fit was evoked. In particular, the regulatory focus of individuals was first manipulated: They reflected upon their hopes and aspirations or their duties and obligations. Next, when reflecting upon how to fulfill these hopes and aspirations, participants received instructions to demonstrate either eagerness or vigilance. A promotion focus, coupled with vigilance, or a prevention focus, coupled with eagerness, presumably elicited a sense of non-fit. Finally, participants rated the degree to which a series of celebrities are attractive. Half of these participants were instructed to rate these individuals as accurately as possible.

Typically, after individuals rated a very attractive person, the next person seemed unattractive in comparison. Ratings were thus biased& that is, evaluations of individuals were dependent upon whether the previous person was attractive. If asked to rate accurately, however, individuals sometimes overrode this bias. That is, they recognized

the possibility of this bias and adjusted their ratings accordingly (Vaughn, O?Rourke, Schwartz, Malik, Petkova, & Trudeau, 2006).

A person with promotion-focus orientation is more likely to remember the occasions where the goal is pursued by using eagerness approaches and less likely to remember occasions where the goal is pursued by vigilance approaches. A person with prevention-focus orientation is more likely to remember events where the goal is pursued by means of vigilance than if it was pursued using eagerness approaches.

2.2.4 Attribution Theory

Attribution theory is intended to help a person understand the causes of human behavior, be it their own or someone else's. The basis of attribution theory is that people want to know the reasons for the actions that they and others take; they want to attribute causes to behaviors they see rather than assuming that these behaviors are random. This allows people to assume some feeling of control over their own behaviors and over situations. Psychologist Fritz Heider (1896–1988) first developed attribution theory in his 1958 book *The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations*. Heider proposed that what people perceived and believed about what they saw dictated how they would act, even if their beliefs about what they perceived were invalid.

Heider's proposed theory of attribution was further developed by psychologist Bernard Weiner and colleagues in the 1970s and 1980s, and this new theoretical framework has been used primarily in current attribution research. A final development to attribution theory was provided by psychologist Harold Kelley, who examined how consistency, distinctiveness, and consensus could be used by individuals to establish the validity of their perceptions.

Attributions are critical to management because perceived causes of behavior may influence managers' and employees' judgments and actions. For instance, managers must often observe employee performance and make related judgments. If a manager attributes an employee's poor performance to a lack of effort, then the outcome is likely to be negative for that employee; he or she may receive a poor performance appraisal rating or even be terminated from the job. Conversely, if a manager perceives that an employee's poor performance is due to a lack of skill, the manager may assign the employee to further training or provide more instruction or coaching. Making an inaccurate judgment about the causes of poor performance can have negative repercussions for the organization.

Attributions also may influence employee motivation. Employees who perceive the cause of their success to be outside of their control may be reluctant to attempt new tasks and may lose motivation to perform well in the workplace. Conversely, employees who attribute their success to themselves are more likely to have high motivation for work. Thus, understanding attributions that people make can have a strong effect on both employee performance and managerial effectiveness.

Attribution Process and the Causes of Behavior

Attribution is considered to be a three-stage process. First, the behavior of an individual must be observed. Second, the perceiver must determine that the behavior they have observed is deliberate. That is, the person being observed is believed to have behaved intentionally. Finally, the observer attributes the observed behavior to either internal or external causes. Internal causes are attributed to the person being observed, while external causes are attributed to outside factors. The two internal attributions one can make are that a person's ability or a person's effort determined the outcome. Task

difficulty and luck are the external causes of behavior. When perceiving behavior, an observer will make a judgment as to which of these factors is the cause of behavior. However, when making a determination between internal and external causes of behavior, the perceiver must examine the elements of consistency, distinctiveness, and consensus.

Consistency describes whether the person being observed behaves the same way when faced with the same set of circumstances. If the person being observed acts the same way in the same type of situation, consistency is high; if they act differently each time, then consistency is low. Distinctiveness is whether the observed person acts the same way in different types of situations. If the person being observed exhibits the same behavior in a variety of contexts, then distinctiveness is low; if they have different behavior depending on the context, then distinctiveness is high. Finally, consensus is the degree to which other people, if in the same situation, would behave similarly to the person being observed. If the observer sees others acting the same way that the person being perceived acts, then consensus is high. However, if others behave differently in the type of situation, then consensus is low. Consistency, distinctiveness, and consensus are evaluated when observing behavior, and then a judgment about an internal versus external cause of behavior is made. When consistency, distinctiveness, and consensus are all high, the perceiver concludes that there is an external cause of behavior. When consistency is high, distinctiveness is low, and consensus is low, the perceiver will attribute the cause of behavior to internal factors.

To better understand consistency, distinctiveness, and consensus, consider a workplace example. Nancy, a manager, has assigned a team of employees to develop a custom sales training program for a client. As the project progresses, Nancy continues to see problems in the work produced by Jim, one of the team members. In order to

determine why Jim's performance is not satisfactory, Nancy first considers consistency, or whether Jim has performed poorly on other similar team projects. A review of his past performance appraisals indicates that he has not had prior performance problems when creating custom sales training programs. This would lead Nancy to conclude that there was an external cause of the poor performance. Second, Nancy considers distinctiveness; she wants to know if Jim has performed poorly on different types of tasks. Again, in checking Jim's performance reviews, she finds that when he is on a team to accomplish a different type of task, such as developing a selection interview, he has excelled. This further points to an external cause of Jim's poor performance. Finally, Nancy assesses consensus, or the behavior of others in this similar task. In asking the team members about their experiences with the current project, she finds that many of them have had difficulty in developing this custom sales training program. Thus, all indicators point to Jim's poor performance being caused by an external factor, such as a difficult task or a demanding client. Based on this attribution, Nancy may explore ways in which to minimize the negative effects of the external factors on Jim's performance rather than attempting to influence his level of effort or ability.

The prior example illustrated how consistency, distinctiveness, and consensus might point toward an external cause. However, these three factors also may lead an observer to attribute behavior to an internal cause, such as the observed person's effort or ability. Nancy, the observer from the previous example, also has experienced difficulties with a secretary named Kelly. Another manager has complained to Nancy that Kelly has not completed work on time and turns in work full of errors. Nancy observes Kelly for several days and finds that, when given work by this particular manager, Kelly continues to perform poorly, which indicates an internal cause (i.e., high consistency). Second,

when performing work for other managers on other tasks, Kelly continues to do substandard work; this is distinctiveness, and it again points to an internal cause. Finally, Nancy observes that when other secretaries perform the work assigned by the manager who complained about Kelly, they are able to successfully perform their duties in a timely manner. This is consensus, and it also points to an internal cause. Based on these observations, Nancy can attribute Kelly's poor performance to an internal cause, or namely to Kelly's own lack of skill or effort.

Fundamental Attribution Error and Self-Serving Bias

People make attributions every day. However, these attributions are not always correct. One common problem in assigning cause is called the fundamental attribution error. This is the tendency of a person to overestimate the influence of personal factors and underestimate the influence of situational factors when assessing someone else's behavior. That is, when observing behavior, a person is more likely to assume that another person's behavior is primarily caused by them and not by the situation. In the workplace, this may mean that managers are more likely to assume that employees' poor performance is due to a lack of ability or effort rather than to task difficulty or luck. The fundamental attribution error, while prominent in North America, is not as common across the rest of the world. In other cultures, such as in India, the fundamental attribution error is the opposite; people assume that others are more influenced by situation than by personal factors. Thus, while one can assume this error to be present in American managers' perceptions, this may not be the case for managers from other cultures.

As described previously, when a person perceives their own success or failure versus perceiving the success or failure of others, they assign one or more causes: effort, ability, task difficulty, or luck. Effort and ability are internal causes, and task difficulty

and luck are external causes. Some researchers argue that it is human nature to have a self-serving bias, which is the tendency to credit one's own successes to internal factors and one's own failure to external factors. Thus, a common assessment of a person's own success might be: "I got a raise because I'm very skilled at my job" (ability), or "I was promoted because of all of the hours I've put into the job" (effort). Common assessments of a person's own failure might be: "I didn't finish the project on time because the deadline was unreasonable for the amount of work required" (task difficulty), or "I didn't make the sale because someone else happened to speak to the client first" (luck). Coupled with the fundamental attribution error, the self-serving bias indicates that people tend to make different attributions about their own successes and failures than the successes and failures of others.

While some researchers argue that the self-serving bias is widespread across most humans in most cultures, others argue that this is not so. Results from a meta-analysis (a method that statistically combines results of multiple empirical research studies) published in 2004 by Mezulis, Abramson, Hyde, and Hankin aimed to address this issue. In examining more than 500 published research studies, some of the results of this meta-analysis indicated that, in general, there were no differences between men and women in their self-serving biases; men and women were just as likely to make self-serving attributions. Additionally, these researchers found that the United States and other Western nations (Canada, the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, and Western Europe) had a strong self-serving bias, which was more pronounced than in most other cultures on other continents. However, despite these strength-related differences, the researchers found that there was a positive self-serving bias in all cultures studied. Within the United States, there were no meaningful differences in self-serving bias among

different racial and ethnic groups; no one race was more likely than the others to be more susceptible to this self-serving bias. The general conclusion of Mezulis and her colleagues was that there is a universal self-serving attributional bias that exists across gender, race, and even nation.

Attribution theory was developed to explain how people understand the causes of human behavior, be it their own or someone else's. Managers often act based on their attributions and may act inappropriately if attributions are not valid. Managers who are aware of the attributional process, the types of internal and external attributions, and the presence of the fundamental attribution error and the self-serving bias can better understand their own and others' behavior.

2.2.5 Social Learning Theory

In developing social learning theory, Rotter (Rotter, 1954) departed from instinct-based psychoanalysis and drive-based behaviorism. He believed that a psychological theory should have a psychological motivational principle. Rotter chose the *empirical law of effect* as his motivating factor. The law of effect states that people are motivated to seek out positive stimulation, or reinforcement, and to avoid unpleasant stimulation. Rotter combined behaviorism and the study of personality, without relying on physiological instincts or drives as a motive force.

The main idea in Julian Rotter's social learning theory is that personality represents an interaction of the individual with his or her environment. One cannot speak of a personality, internal to the individual, that is independent of the environment. Neither can one focus on behavior as being an automatic response to an objective set of environmental stimuli. Rather, to understand behavior, one must take both the individual (i.e., his or her life history of learning and experiences) and the environment (i.e., those

stimuli that the person is aware of and responding to) into account. Rotter describes personality as a relatively stable set of potentials for responding to situations in a particular way.

Rotter sees personality, and therefore behavior, as always changeable. Change the way the person thinks, or change the environment the person is responding to, and behavior will change. He does not believe there is a critical period after which personality is set. But, the more life experience one has building up certain sets of beliefs, the more effort and intervention required for change to occur. Rotter conceives of people in an optimistic way. He sees them as being drawn forward by their goals, seeking to maximize their reinforcement, rather than just avoiding punishment.

Rotter has four main components to his social learning theory model predicting behavior. These are behavior potential, expectancy, reinforcement value, and the psychological situation.

Behavior Potential: Behavior potential is the likelihood of engaging in a particular behavior in a specific situation. In other words, what is the probability that the person will exhibit a particular behavior in a situation? In any given situation, there are multiple behaviors one can engage in. For each possible behavior, there is a behavior potential. The individual will exhibit whichever behavior has the highest potential.

Expectancy: Expectancy is the subjective probability that a given behavior will lead to a particular outcome, or reinforcer. How likely is it that the behavior will lead to the outcome? Having high or strong expectancies means the individual is confident the behavior will result in the outcome. Having low expectancies means the individual believes it is unlikely that his or her behavior will result in reinforcement. If the outcomes are equally desirable, we will engage in the behavior that has the greatest likelihood of

paying off (i.e., has the highest expectancy). To have a high expectancy, people must believe both (a) that they have the capacity to enact the behavior effectively and (b) that that behavior will result in reinforcement.

Expectancies are formed based on past experience. The more often a behavior has led to reinforcement in the past, the stronger the person's expectancy that the behavior will achieve that outcome now. In addition, people do not need to have direct experience with reinforcement of a particular behavior. Rotter wrote that our observations of the outcomes of others' behaviors affect our own expectancies. If we see someone else being punished for a particular behavior, we don't have to experience punishment personally to form an expectancy that this behavior is likely to be punished.

It is important to note that expectancy is a subjective probability, because one common source of pathology is irrational expectancies. There may be no relationship whatsoever between the person's subjective assessment of how likely a reinforcement will be and the actual, objective probability of the reinforcer's occurring. People can either over- or underestimate this likelihood, and both distortions can potentially be problematic.

Reinforcement Value: Reinforcement is another name for the outcomes of our behavior. Reinforcement value refers to the desirability of these outcomes. Things we want to happen, that we are attracted to, have a high reinforcement value. Things we don't want to happen, that we wish to avoid, have a low reinforcement value. If the likelihood of achieving reinforcement is the same (i.e., expectancies are equal), we will exhibit the behavior with the greatest reinforcement value, the one directed toward the outcome we prefer most. As the name social learning theory suggests, the social environment is of primary importance in shaping our behavior. Social outcomes, such as approval, love or

rejection, are powerful influences on our behavior. For people, the most important reinforcers are often social reinforcers.

As with expectancy, reinforcement value is subjective, meaning that the same event or experience can vastly differ in desirability, depending on the individual's life experience. Punishment from a parent would be negatively reinforcing to most children and something to be avoided. However, children who get little positive attention from parents can seek out parental punishment because it has a higher reinforcement value than neglect.

The value of any given reinforcer is determined in part by other, future reinforcers it might lead to. For example, doing well on an exam in a particular class would have a heightened reinforcement value, if you believe that doing well in that class will lead to being able to work in your professor's lab. Therefore, even an apparently trivial event can have a very strong reinforcement value, either positive or negative, if the individual sees it as leading to other strongly valued reinforcers.

The least amount of reinforcement that still has a positive value is known as the minimal goal. If people achieve an outcome that equals or exceeds their minimal goal, they will feel that they have succeeded. When the level of reinforcement falls below an individual's minimal goal, that reinforcement feels like failure. People differ in their minimal goals. Thus, the same outcome may represent success to one person (with a lower minimal goal) while it feels like failure to another person (with a higher minimal goal).

Predictive Formula: Behavior Potential (BP), Expectancy (E) and Reinforcement Value (RV) can be combined into a predictive formula for behavior:

BP = f(E & RV)

This formula can be read as follows: behavior potential is a function of expectancy and reinforcement value. Or, in other words, the likelihood of a person's exhibiting a particular behavior is a function of the probability that that behavior will lead to a given outcome and the desirability of that outcome. If expectancy and reinforcement value are both high, then behavior potential will be high. If either expectancy or reinforcement value is low, then behavior potential will be lower.

Psychological Situation: The psychological situation represents Rotter's idea that each individual's experience of the environment is unique. Although the psychological situation does not figure directly into Rotter's formula for predicting behavior, Rotter believes it is always important to keep in mind that different people interpret the same situation differently. Different people will have different expectancies and reinforcement values in the same situation. Thus, it is people's subjective interpretation of the environment, rather than an objective array of stimuli, that is meaningful to them and that determines how they behave.

Generality versus Specificity: An important dimension of personality theories is the generality versus specificity of their constructs. General constructs are broad and abstract, while specific constructs are narrow and concrete. Both types of constructs have their advantages. A theory with general constructs allows one to make many predictions, across situations, from knowing only a small amount of information. The disadvantages of general constructs, though, are that they are harder to measure and the predictions made from them have a lower level of accuracy. Specific constructs, on the other hand, are easier to measure, and they can be used to make more accurate predictions. However, these predictions are limited to being situation-specific.

For example, knowing that someone is a generally hostile person allows us to make predictions that this individual will be hostile toward a range of people. Across situations, this person is likely to be more hostile to others than is someone low in hostility. However, our ability predict how hostile this person would be to Jane, for example, is limited, because there may be other factors that determine whether this individual will treat Jane in a hostile way during a particular encounter (e.g., person likes Jane, or situational factors inhibit an expression of hostility). On the other hand, if we know that this person hates Jane, we can predict with a high level of accuracy that this person will be hostile toward Jane. But, we will not be able to predict whether this person will treat other people in a hostile way.

A strength of Rotter's social learning theory is that it explicitly blends specific and general constructs, offering the benefits of each. In social learning theory, all general constructs have a specific counterpart. For every situationally specific expectancy there is a cross-situational generalized expectancy. Social learning theory blends generality and specificity to enable psychologists to measure variables and to make a large number of accurate predictions from these variables.

For many people, their only exposure to the ideas of is his concept of generalized expectancies for control of reinforcement, more commonly known as locus of control. Locus of control refers to people's very general, cross-situational beliefs about what determines whether or not they get reinforced in life. People can be classified along a continuum from very internal to very external.

People with a strong internal locus of control believe that the responsibility for whether or not they get reinforced ultimately lies with themselves. Internals believe that success or failure is due to their own efforts. In contrast, externals believe that the

reinforcers in life are controlled by luck, chance, or powerful others. Therefore, they see little impact of their own efforts on the amount of reinforcement they receive.

Rotter has written extensively on problems with people's interpretations of the locus of control concept. First, he has warned people that locus of control is not a typology. It represents a continuum, not an either/or proposition. Second, because locus of control is a generalized expectancy it will predict people's behavior across situations. However, there may be some specific situations in which people who, for example, are generally external behave like internals. That is because their learning history has shown them that they have control over the reinforcement they receive in certain situations, although overall they perceive little control over what happens to them. Again, one can see the importance of conceiving of personality as the interaction of the person and the environment.

Locus of control is embedded within the Rotter's (1954) social learning theory of personality which postulates that behaviour is a function of expectancy and reinforcement value in a specific situation. In other words, a particular behavior is more likely to occur if it is associated with high reinforcement value and expectancy. Reinforcement value is the degree of preference for a particular reinforcement if various alternative reinforcements are available. Expectancy is the probability that the particular reinforcement will occur as a result of an individual's behavior (Rotter, Chance, & Phares, 1972). The potential for a particular behavior to occur therefore is a function of the expected occurrence of reinforcement following the behaviour (Rotter, 1954).

2.3   Empirical Review

This section reviewed previous empirical studies that are concerned with the relationship between psychological ownership between and workplace deviant behaviour,

locus of control and workplace deviant behaviour, as well as leadership styles and workplace deviant behaviour.

2.3.1 Psychological Ownership and Workplace Deviant Behaviour

Peng (2013) examined why and when employees hide knowledge. He built and tested a theoretical model linking knowledge-based psychological ownership with knowledge hiding via territoriality. Data were collected from knowledge workers in China via a three-wave web-based survey. The final sample was 190 cases. Hierarchical regression models and a bootstrapping approach were used to test the hypotheses. The results show that knowledge-based psychological ownership positively affects knowledge hiding. Territoriality fully mediates the link between knowledge-based psychological ownership and knowledge hiding. Moreover, organization-based psychological ownership moderates the positive link between territoriality and knowledge hiding. Specifically, territoriality will mediate the indirect effect of knowledge-based psychological ownership on knowledge hiding when organization-based psychological ownership is low, but not when it is high.

Chung and Moon (2011) proposed psychological ownership to be significantly related to constructive deviant behavior because it is considered to be functional behavior that is intended to improve the organization's well-being. Furthermore, they investigated the moderating effects of collectivistic orientation on psychological ownership and constructive deviant behavior. The study sampled 465 Korean employees and has found psychological ownership to be significantly related to innovative constructive deviant behavior and interpersonal constructive deviant behavior. For the moderating effects, collectivistic orientation moderated the relationships between psychological ownership

and organizational constructive deviant behavior and interpersonal constructive deviant behavior.

Sieger, Zellweger and Aquino (2013) investigated whether feelings of ownership among senior managers in the absence of formal ownership can align agents' interests with those of principals, thus turning agents into psychological principals. Using a moderated mediation model, they found that psychological ownership is positively related to company performance through the mediating effect of individual-level entrepreneurial behaviour. They also found that the effect of psychological ownership on individual-level entrepreneurial behaviour and, ultimately, company performance is weaker for high levels of monitoring compared to low levels. These findings offer important contributions to agency, psychological ownership, and entrepreneurship literatures.

Lo, Cheng, Wong, Rochelle and Kwok (2011) designed a study to explore the psychological and social correlates of deviant behaviour in a sample of Hong Kong school students. Findings revealed that their deviant behaviour was significantly and positively correlated with rebelliousness and susceptibility to negative peer influence. While weak direct relationships were found between self-efficacy, self-esteem and deviant behaviour in general, we found "bullying/vandalism", "verbally/physically attacking parents", "lack of motivation to study", and "verbally/physically attacking teachers" had significant effects with "self-esteem and/or self-efficacy". The present study concludes that changing the delinquents' deviant identity is essential; the identity-rebuilding process would strengthen their self-image and prevent them from going astray.

Wilson, Perry, Witt, and Griffeth (2015) in their study focused on factors that can cause autonomy to create production deviance instead of acting as a motivational job characteristic. Conservation of Resources Theory was utilized to predict that autonomy,

emotional exhaustion, and employment opportunity would interact as antecedents to production deviance. Results support the proposed hypotheses. Specifically, employees who were emotionally exhausted used their autonomy to engage in production deviance in efforts to preserve and protect remaining energy resources. This process was particularly strong when employees felt they can acquire 'better' opportunities than their current job. Hence, high levels of autonomy, emotional exhaustion, and employment opportunity result in the highest levels of production deviance

Chung and Kim (2013) examined the mediating effects of organizational justice on the relationship between psychological ownership and constructive deviant behavior. Psychological ownership is theorized to promote organizational interests, shared feelings of responsibility, and employee commitment and integration; therefore, suggesting that it will be associated with pro-organizational attitudes and behaviors. Further, according to social exchange theory and equity theory, when individuals perceive fair treatment and justice from their organizations, they are more likely to reciprocate their attitudes and behaviors toward their organization. Hence, organizational justice will be significantly related to constructive deviant behavior as constructive deviant behavior is voluntary behavior that is intended to be beneficial toward the organization as it can improve organizational effectiveness and prevent organizational wrongdoing. The study sampled 250 employees in the manufacturing sector in Korea. Structural equation modeling results found: (a) psychological ownership to be related to procedural justice and interactional justice and (b) procedural justice to fully mediate the relationships between psychological ownership with innovative constructive deviant behavior and organizational constructive deviant behavior.

Türkan and Serkan (2016) conducted a study with the aim of identifying Bolu central district secondary school teachers' views on organizational deviance, psychological ownership and social innovation and to determine whether these views were related. The universe of the study conducted with relational screening model was composed of 360 teachers employed in Bolu central district secondary schools. Psychological Ownership, Organizational Deviance and Social Innovation Scales were used as data collection tools. Means, standard deviation and Spearman's Rho correlation analysis were used in data analysis. According to research results it was found that teachers displayed organizational deviance behaviors towards themselves or their coworkers albeit in low levels and agreed to the items related to psychological ownership and social innovation. Negative, low level and significant relationships were detected between teachers'views on organizational deviance towards self and coworkers, psychological ownership and social innovation. Also, a positive, medium level significant relationship was found between psychological ownership and social innovation.

Jekwu, Audu, Tochukwu and Jekwu (2016) investigated the role of emotional intelligence and self-efficacy on ethical work behavior of artisan in Maiduguri, capital of Borno State Northeast Nigeria. The study adopted behavioural theory of obedience as its main theoretical framework. Ex post facto survey design was adopted for the study. Two hundred and eight-two (282) participants were selected accidentally for the study. Results revealed that artisans who reported with high emotional intelligence were significantly different in the level of ethical work behaviour compared to those who reported low level of emotional intelligence. Emotional intelligence does not significantly predict ethical work behavior of artisan and self-efficacy significantly predict ethical work behavior of artisans. However, it shows that emotional intelligence and self-efficacy jointly predict

ethical work behavior of artisan. There was no any significant main and interaction effect of emotional intelligence and self-efficacy on ethical work behaviour among artisans in Maiduguri. Female artisans significantly reported higher scores on ethical work behaviour scale than male artisans. The study however recommended that management of the organization should send their employees (artisans) on sponsored training programme of the organisation which focused on enhancing their ethical work behavior.

2.3.2 Locus of Control and Workplace deviant behaviour

Storms and Spector (2007) examined the influence of organizational frustration and locus of control on emotional and behavioural reactions to frustrating conditions. Data were collected by questionnaire from 160 employees from all levels of a community mental health facility. As hypothesized, organizational frustration was found to be positively related to interpersonal aggression, sabotage and withdrawal. Subgroup moderator analysis supported the hypothesized moderating relationship of locus of control on the perceived frustration behavioural reactions relationship. These results suggest that persons with an external locus of control are more likely to respond to frustration with counterproductive behaviour than persons with an internal locus of control.

Abdul-Rahim, and Nasurdin (2008) investigated the moderating role of locus of control (LOC) in the relationship between trust in organization (TiO) and workplace deviant behavior (WDB). Three forms of deviant behavior are identified: interpersonal deviance, production deviance, and property deviance. The regression analyses carried out on a sample of 355 employees show mixed results. Trust in organization (TiO) demonstrates a negative relationship with production deviance and property deviance. In contrast, trust in organization (TiO) is positively related to interpersonal deviance.

Furthermore, locus of control (LOC) is found to moderate the relationship between trust in organization (TiO) and deviant behaviors.

Olabimitan, and Alausa (2014) examined the extent to which work locus of control and perceived organizational justice predict workplace deviant behaviour. Participants were 300 nurses (Male = 123; female = 177) randomly selected from public hospitals in 3 local government areas in Lagos. Their ages ranged between 21-58 years (Mage= 36.5; SD= 9.32). They responded to measures of work locus of control, perceived procedural and distributive justice, and workplace deviance behaviour. Results of the multiple regression showed that work locus of control significantly predicted workplace deviant behaviour in such a way that employees who were susceptible to external locus of control tended to exhibit workplace deviant behaviour than those who displayed internal locus of control. Workplace deviant behaviour reduced with employees' perception of organizational justice. Male nurses manifested higher deviant behaviour than their female counterparts.

Owolabi (2013) investigated the extent to which work locus of control and perceived environmental support influence employees" work attitude and organizationally beneficial behaviour. A total of 181 employees (105 females; 76 males), selected from private and public sector organizations, participated in the study. Results indicated that employees who held internal locus of control had better work attitude than those who held external locus of control. Though perceived environmental support did not influence employees" work attitude, results revealed that when employees perceived supportive work environment they tended to engage in organizationally beneficial behaviour, compared with when the work environment was perceived as less supportive.

Blanchard and Henle (2008) investigated correlates of different forms of cyberloafing with particular focus on the role of norms and external locus of control. They defined cyberloafing as the personal use of email and the Internet while at work. The purpose of this study is to identify the different forms of cyberloafing and their antecedents. They proposed that cyber-loafing has two primary forms: minor cyberloafing (sending and receiving personal email at work) and serious cyberloafing (online gambling, surfing adult oriented web sites). Additionally, they hypothesize that employees' perceptions of coworker and supervisor norms supporting cyberloafing are related to minor cyberloafing but not serious cyberloafing. They also hypothesize that external locus of control (i.e., a belief that chance and powerful others determines one's outcomes), as an antecedent of other counterproductive work behaviors, will be related to both minor and serious cyberloafing. Two hundred and twenty two employed graduate business students were surveyed. Two forms of cyberloafing were identified: one composed of minor cyberloafing behaviors and one composed of the more serious cyberloafing behaviors. As predicted, employees' perceptions of their coworkers' and supervisor's norms were positively related to minor cyberloafing, but not related to serious cyberloafing. Also as predicted, belief in chance was positively related to both minor and serious cyberloafing. A belief in powerful others was not related to minor or serious cyberloafing.

Waheeda and Hafidz (2012) looked at individual factors as antecedents of CWB, focusing on personality, locus of control, and values. Data were collected from 267 students studying psychology by means of a questionnaire measuring CWB, the Big-Five factor personality, work locus of control, and values. Only agreeableness and conscientiousness (out of the five personality factor) was found to be negatively

correlated to CWB. Work locus of control showed a positive correlation with CWB. Hedonism and power was found to be positively related to CWB, whereas benevolence and conformity was found to be negatively related to CWB. The findings on personality and locus of control as antecedents of CWB are consistent with past research, meaning that employers can use this finding in their selection process. The findings on values have given a new insight to an area that can be researched further in the process of understanding why individuals engage in CWB.

2.3.3 Leadership styles and workplace deviant behaviour

Puni, Agyemang and Asamoah (2016) examined the relationship between leadership style, employee turnover intentions, and counterproductive work behaviours using a cross sectional survey design by purposively sampling eight (8) branches of one of Ghana's premier banks and conveniently selecting 170 respondents. Data were solicited by means of questionnaire adapted from Simon and Oates (2009) measured on five (5) point Likert- scale and analysed using inter-correlation matrix to establish the relationship between the study variables. The result showed a significant positive association between autocratic leadership style, employee turnover intentions, and counterproductive work behaviour but exposed significant negative connection between democratic leadership styles, employee turnover intentions, and counterproductive work behaviours. Laissez faire leadership style indicated significant negative relationship with turnover intentions but significant positive correlation with CWB implying that subordinates under laissez faire leaders will show less turnover intentions but more CWBs due to the apathetic attitude showed by the leader. Employees under autocratic leaders are more prone toCWBs and intentions to quit job mainly as a result of the leaders over emphasis on production than people. Workers under democratic leadership style are

less likely to involve in turnover intentions and CWBs due to the collective decision-making approach of the leader.

Uddin, Rahman and Howlader (2014) explored the relationships among transformational leadership, deviant workplace behavior, and job performance. Data were collected with the help of a self administered questionnaire from 175 working executives in Bangladesh using convenience sampling technique. Data that have been collected were analyzed using descriptive statistics, bivariate correlation, and regression analysis. Results indicated a negative correlation between transformational leadership and deviant workplace behavior while a positive correlation was found between transformational leadership and job performance. It also reported that there is a negative correlation between deviant workplace behavior and job performance.

Abdullah and Marican (2014) conducted a study to identify the prevalence of deviant behavior and leadership behavior and to study the association between the two, as literatures indicate that the organizational leadership influences deviant behavior. In this study, two forms of leadership were emphasized which include control and flexibility leadership. Meanwhile two perspectives of deviant behavior are used to classify deviant behaviors, which are organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance. These perspectives are useful as it identifies deviant behavior of different severity and target. Result indicated that, control and flexible leaderships are prevalence. The study also indicated that organizational and interpersonal deviance is present. While correlation analysis reveals that control and flexibility leadership influences organizational and interpersonal deviance negatively. In sum, the study supports the deviance literatures and showed that, leadership causes improvement in organizational environment which can deter deviant behavior.

Saidon, Galbreath and Whiteley (2013) analyzed the relationship between moral disengagement and workplace deviance by integrating the moderating effect of transformational leadership style. Data were randomly collected from 669 employees in large electrical and electronic manufacturing companies in Malaysia. Applying a two-staged structural equation modeling software (Analysis of Moment Structures or AMOS), results indicate that moral disengagement is associated with workplace deviance. Furthermore, transformational leadership style is found to moderate the relationship between moral disengagement and interpersonal deviance. Also, interpersonal deviance was found to be associated with organizational deviance.

Hamid, Juhdi, Ismail, and Abdullah (2015) examined the relationship between abusive supervision as perceived by subordinates with workplace deviance by investigating how abusive supervision is moderated by spiritual intelligence and influence target-directed deviant acts (interpersonal and organizational deviance). Primary data were gathered from 136 completed questionnaires returned by employees of several manufacturing organizations in Selangor. The results showed that individuals with low spiritual intelligence strongly moderated the relationship between abusive supervision and workplace deviance compared to individuals with high spiritual intelligence.

In a similar study, Elçi, Şener, and Alpkan (2013) investigated the effect of both ethical leadership and ethical climate on the occurrence of antisocial behaviors of employees. Using a sample of 468 employees in 30 firms operating in various industries in İstanbul, Kocaeli, Ankara and Antalya from Turkey, we find support for the hypothesized model. The findings of the research indicate a negative effect of presence of ethical leadership on the antisocial behaviors of employees. Besides, ethical climate both

has a negative effect on antisocial behaviors of employees and also it mediates the relationship between ethical leadership and the antisocial behaviors of employees.

Erkutlu and Chafra (2013) examined the relationships between authentic leadership and organizational deviance and to test the moderating effects of trust and psychological contract violation on that relationship. Data were collected from ten state universities in Turkey. The sample included 848 lecturers and their department chairs chosen randomly. Moderated hierarchical regression was used to examine the moderating roles of trust and psychological contract violation on the authentic leadership and organizational deviance relationship. The results show that authentic leadership is negatively and significantly correlated with organizational deviance. In addition, the results of the hierarchical multiple regression analyses support the moderating effects of employee trust and psychological contract violation with regard to the relationship between authentic leadership and organizational deviance.

Bruursema (2004) investigated relations among job stressors, leadership style, emotional reactions to work, counterproductive work behavior (CWB), and autonomy. Participants representing a wide variety of jobs were surveyed. Results indicate that transactional leadership style is related to negative emotions and occurrence of CWB. Relationships between variables were mediated by emotions.

Young-Hyung and Hye-Kyoung (2016) investigated the effect of ethical leadership on employees` behaviors (deviant behavior and personal initiative) and to explore the moderating roles of self-efficacy and trust in leader in the relationship between ethical leadership and employees` behaviors. This study developed four hypotheses and tested them using regression and hierarchical regression analyses. The results showed that the negative relationship between ethical leadership and deviant

behavior and the positive relationship between ethical leadership and personal initiative were statistically supported. And this study found that self-efficacy and trust in leader played moderating roles in the relationship between ethical leadership and employees` behaviors.

Yan-Hong, Ying-Ying, Yong-Xing, and Yuan (2014) explored the influences of leadership and work stress on employee behavior, and the moderating effects of transactional and transformational leadership on the relationship between work stress and employee negative behavior. Using convenience sampling method, the authors investigated employees from 20 firms in different places and industries, and 347 valid questionnaires were collected. SPSS 18.0 statistical analysis software was used for reliability and validity analysis, descriptive statistics, correlation analysis and hierarchical regression analysis to test the hypothesis. The empirical results show that there is a positive correlation between work stress and employee negative behavior. Transformational leadership has negative impacts on work stress and employee negative behavior, whereas transactional leadership has positive influences. Moreover, transactional leadership strengthens the influence of work stress on employee negative behavior, whereas transformational leadership has no moderating effect.

Aksu (2016) conducted a research aimed at determining the level of teachers' organizational deviant behaviors to show the relationship between deviant behavior level and principal's leadership styles. Research's data were collected from 557 secondary school teachers working in Izmir province by using scales named as "Organizational Deviance Scale for Schools" and "Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire". According to the findings, teachers have displayed organizational deviant behaviors at low level and principals have absorbed transformational and interactional leadership. According to

correlation analysis, there has been a negative relationship between organizational deviant behaviors and transformational and interactional leadership styles, and a positive relationship between organizational deviant behaviors and laissez-faire leadership. Findings have explained the effect of principals' leadership styles on deviant behavior.

Jurjew and Belschak (2012) drew upon empirical evidence provided by researchers to investigate leadership and Machiavellianism. Two types of behaviors, namely proactive behavior, CWB and three personal motives were included in this study. A total of 104 returned questionnaires were used in multiple regression analyses. Transformational Leadership and Machiavellianism were proposed to have a moderating role on motives, proactivity and CWB. Significant interaction relationships between transformational leaders, Machiavellians, proactivity and CWB were reported. Subjects scoring high on Machiavellianism had a stronger relationship with proactive behavior, pro-organizational motives, and vice versa a weaker relationship with CWB and impression management in a high-transformational leadership setting. Impression management was negatively related to proactivity, and positively to CWB. Inter alia, pro-organizational motives were significantly positive related with proactivity and negatively with CWB.

Mekpor and Dartey-Baah (2017) conducted a study to determine the extent to which leadership styles predict the voluntary work behaviors of employees. The quantitative approach was adopted to collect data from 234 respondents. Both purposive and simple random sampling techniques were used for the selection of the respondents. The findings of the study revealed that though both the transformational and transactional leadership styles positively predicted the organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) of

employees, transformational leadership is more significant. Also, transformational leadership was found to have a significant negative relationship with the counterproductive workplace behavior (CWB) of employees, whereas transactional leadership had an insignificant relationship with CWB.

Brown and Treviño (2006) conducted a field study to investigate the relationship between socialized charismatic leadership and deviance in work groups. Because socialized charismatic leaders are thought to play an ethical leadership role, the authors hypothesized that the socialized charismatic leadership style would be associated with reduced deviance in the leader's work group. This prediction was supported for both the interpersonal and the organizational dimensions of deviance. Next, the authors examined the mediating role of values congruence. The results were partially supportive of the values congruence mediating hypothesis. Implications for future research and for management are discussed.

Huang, Lu and Wang (2014) using survey data collected from 252 employees in different organizations in China, empirically examined the relationship between transformational leadership and employee's pro-social rule breaking and the mediating role of job autonomy. Results indicate that transformational leadership is positively related to pro-social rule breaking, job autonomy fully mediates the relationships between transformational leadership and employee's pro-social rule breaking. Theoretical and practical implications are discussed. A set of future research directions are offered.

2.4 Summary of Literature Review

The literature review was carried out in three major sections. In the first section, the basic concepts under investigation were extensively discussed. These include the concepts of workplace deviant behaviour, psychological ownership, locus of control and

leadership styles. Workplace deviant behaviours were conceptualised in different ways by different authors. However, this study adopted the conceptualization that categorizes it into two: organisational deviance and interpersonal deviance. Psychological ownership was also found to have two broad categories (promotion-oriented and Prevention oriented ownership) with the promotion-oriented dimension having six forms while prevention-oriented has one. Locus of control has two categories which are internal and external while the multi-factor leadership styles which include transactional, transformational leadership and laissez faire were adopted.

Five psychological theories were reviewed in relation to the topic of this research. These include the multifactor leadership theory, theory X and Y, the Regulatory Focus Theory, Attribution theory, and social learning theory. These theories were discussed and linked to the variables of the study appropriately.

Finally, related empirical studies were reviewed. They centered on the relationship between psychological ownership, locus of control and leadership styles with workplace deviant behaviours. On the whole, the reviewed has indicated that the variables are related among them. Specifically, psychological ownership, especially the promotion-oriented dimensions have shown to relate with workplace deviant behaviour negatively while the prevention-oriented dimension characterized by territoriality was observed to have posite relationship with workplace deviant behaviour. Similarly, employees with internal locus of control were found to be more responsible and therefore avoid any act that could drag the organisational and their personality as individuals to disrepute while externals have tendencies of engaging in workplace deviant behaviours. In a similar way, studies reviewed have indicated that transformational leadership style is found to be more subordinate friendly and therefore, motivates the employees to engage in positive

behaviours to promotes the organization while transactional leadership may encourage workplace deviant behaviour.

2.5   Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were tested in this study:

i.   Psychological ownership will significantly influence workplace deviant behaviour among staff of Benue State Internal Review Service.

ii.   Locus of control will significantly influence workplace deviant behaviour among staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service.

iii.   Leadership styles will significantly influence workplace deviant behaviour among staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service.

iv.   Psychological ownership, locus of control, and leadership styles will jointly influence workplace deviant behaviour among staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service.

CHAPTER THREE

METHOD

This chapter presents a step by step explanation of the method followed in conducting this research. Specifically, the chapter dealt with the design, setting, participants and sampling. Other areas covered include the instruments for data collection, procedure of administration of the instruments as well as data analysis.

3.1 Design

The study adopted the cross sectional survey design. This is the type of survey design that is used to collect data to make inferences about a population of interest at a point in time. This design is suitable for this study in the sense that it allowed the researcher the opportunity to collect data from a cross-section of employees from Benue State Internal Revenue Service which is used to make inferences about their workplace deviant behaviour as it is influenced by psychological ownership, locus of control and leadership styles.

3.2 Setting

This study was carried out in the offices of Benue State Internal Revenue Service across Benue State. Benue State as it is today was carved out of the defunct Benue-Plateau State. It lies within the lower river Benue through in the middle belt region of Nigeria. Its geographic coordinates are longitude 7° 47' and 10° 0' East. Latitude 6° 25' and 8° 8' North; and shares boundaries with five other states namely: Nasarawa State to the north, Taraba State to the east, Cross-River State to the south, Enugu State to the south-west and Kogi State to the west. The state also shares a common boundary with the Republic of Cameroon on the south-east. Benue occupies a landmass of 34,059 square kilometres.

The state is populated by several ethnic groups including Tiv, Idoma, Igede, Etulo, Abakpa, Jukun, Hausa, Igbo, Akweya and Nyifon. The Tiv are the dominant ethnic group, occupying 14 local government areas with the Etulo and Jukun , while the Idoma, Igede, Igbo, Akweya and Nyifon occupy the remaining nine local government areas. Most of the people are farmers while the inhabitants of the river areas engage in fishing as their primary or important secondary occupation.

The state has different government ministries, departments and agencies (MDAs). One of such government departments is the Benue State Internal Revenue Service (BIRS). Among several other responsibilities, the State Internal Revenue Service is responsible for the assessment and collection of Pay As You Earn and other personal Income Tax and as well, responsible for ensuring the effectiveness and optimum collection of all taxes and penalties due to government.

The management team of the board is made up of an executive chairman, four directors (one each for Tax Assessment, Administration and Finance, Collection and Accounting, Planning, Research and Strategy), Board Secretary, Accountant and a Legal Officer. According to the data obtained from the corporate headquarters of the BIRS, the board has a total of 638 employees who man the 46 offices that are spread across the 23 local governments in the state (See Appendix C). The employees of this board constituted the population for this study.

3.3   Participants

The participants in this study were 239 employees of Benue State Internal Revenue Service (BIRS) across the 23 Local Government Areas of Benue State. They were within the age range of 20 – 50 years with mean age of 32 years, (SD=5.86) comprising of 144(60.3%) males, 85(35.6%) females, and 10(4.2%) who did not indicate

107

their sex. Their demographic data further showed that 106(44.4%) were single, 112(46.9%) were married, 3(1.3%) were widowed, while 18(7.5%) did not indicate their marital status. A total of 210(87.9%) were Christians while 29(12.1%) did not indicate their religion. They were 80(33.5%) junior staff, 137(57.3%) senior staff, and 22(9.2%) who did not indicate their cadre. According to departments, 40(16.7%) were in tax assessment, 38(15.9%) were in open and secret registry, 49(20.5%) were in legal unit, 110(46%) were in other different departments, while 2(0.8%) did not indicate their department.

3.4 Sampling

This section dealt with sample estimation and the sampling technique used in this study.

3.4.1 Sample Size Determination

The sample size for this study was estimated using the formula invented by Krejcie and Morgan's (1970). The formula is stated below:

$$S = \frac{X^2 NP(1-P)}{d^2(N-1) + X^2 P(1-P)}$$

Where:

S = Required sample size

X = Z value (i.e. 1.96 for 95% confidence level)

N = Population size

P = Population proportion (expressed as a decimal; assumed to be 0.5 i.e. 50%)

d = Degree of accuracy (5%) expressed as a proportion (.05); i.e. the margin of error

Data obtained from the office of the Benue State Internal Revenue Service showed that the board has a total of 638 employees who man the 46 offices that are spread across

the 23 local government areas in the state. Applying the above formula on the population of 638 employees, the sample size was estimated as follows:

$$S = \frac{1.96^2 638 X 0.5(1 - 0.5)}{0.05^2(638 - 1) + 1.96^2 X 0.5(1 - 0.5)}$$

$$S = \frac{3.84 X 638 X 0.25}{0.0025 \ X 637 + 3.84 X 0.25}$$

$$S = \frac{612.48}{1.59 + 0.96}$$

$$S = \frac{612.48}{2.55} = 240.2$$

$S \cong 240$

Therefore, the ideal sample size for this study is 240 employees of the Benue State Internal Revenue Service (BIRS).

3.4.2   Sampling Technique

The simple random sampling technique used in selecting the participants for this study. This involved allowing every member of the population equal chance of being selected for the study. In order to execute this technique, the balloting system was adopted. The researcher prepared pieces of paper some of which were labeled 'yes' while the others were blank. These were carefully sealed to protect the labels from being detected by the participants. In each of the offices of BIRS that the researcher visited, the staff wwere asked to pick from the ballots. Those that picked the 'yes' label were asked to participate while those that picked the blank ballot were exempted from the study.

3.5   Instruments

The instrument for data collection in this study was a structured questionnaire that contains five sections, A – E. Section A deals with the demographic data of the respondents such as their sex, age, marital status, religion and ethnicity among others. Section B is the Workplace Deviance Questionnaire by Bennet and Robinson (2000), Section C is the Psychological Ownership Questionnaire by Avey and Avolio (2007); Section D is the Work Locus of Control Scale (WLCS) designed by Spector (1988); while Section E is the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) by Avolio and Bass (1997) (See Appendix B).

3.5.1   Workplace Deviance Questionnaire

In this study, deviant workplace behaviour were measured using the Workplace Deviance Questionnaire developed by Bennett and Robinson (2000). The 19-item questionnaire has been widely employed in previous studies (Judge, Scott, & Ilies, 2006; Omar, Halim, Zainah, Nasir, & Khairudin, 2010), and have demonstrated good reliabilities ranging from .74 to .94 (Darrat, Amyx, & Bennett, 2010). The questionnaire has two subscales namely: organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance. Out of the 19 items, 12 items measure organisational deviance and the remaining 7 items measure interpersonal deviance. Participants are requested to indicate, while in the job, how often they had participated in each behavior on a 7-point rating scale ranging from 1 – 7 (1=never, 2=once, 3=a few times, 4=several times, 5=monthly, 6=weekly, 7=daily). High scores on this scale indicates high involvement in deviant behaviours while low scores signify low or no involvement in such behaviours.

3.5.2 Psychological Ownership Questionnaire

The Psychological Ownership Questionnaire (POQ) by Avey and Avolio (2007) was used in this study to collect data from the participants on their feeling of ownership in their organization. There are two 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. The authors reported a good internal consistency and validity of the instrument. Chen, Hui and Xi (2012) also found the reliability of the instrument to be above 0.80 and acceptable content and criterion validity.

The questionnaire presents statements on how employees may think about themselves at the moment. Respondents are required to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement with each of the statements by ticking any of the options ranging from 1=Strongly Disagree to 6=Strongly Agree.

3.5.3 Work Locus of Control Scale

Work locus of control was measured using Work Locus of Control Scale (WLCS) designed by Spector (1988). It is a 16-item scale which is used to assess control beliefs in the workplace. The Work Locus of Control Scale (WLCS) is a format which is rated on a 6-point response choice:1- Disagree very much, 2-Disagree moderately, 3- Disagree slightly, 4- Agree slightly, 5- Agree moderately, 6-Agree very much, its total score is the sum of all items, and ranges from 16 to 96. The scale is scored so that externals receive

high scores while internals receive low scores. It is a domain specific locus of control scale that correlates at about .50 to .55 with general locus of control.

The internal consistency (coefficient alpha) of the scale generally ranges from .80 to .85 in the English language version. Test-retest reliability for a year was reported as .57 by Bond and Bunce (2003) and .60 by Moyle (1995). The scale has been shown to relate to several work variables, including job performance and job satisfaction. It relates also to counterproductive behaviour and organizational commitment.

3.5.4 Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire

Leadership styles in this study were measured using the multi-factor leadership questionnaire (MLQ) which was developed by Avolio and Bass (1997). The MLQ contains 45 items tapping nine conceptually distinct leadership factors and three leadership outcomes. Transformational leadership scale consists of 20 items grouped in 5 subscales: Idealized influence (attributes), items 10,18,21,25; Idealized influence (behaviours), items 6,14,23,34; Inspirational motivation, items 9,13,26,36; Intellectual stimulation, items 2,8,30,32; and Individual consideration, items 15,19,29,31. Transactional leadership scale consists of 12 items, categorized in 3 subscales (Contingent Reward, Passive Management-by-exception, and Active Management-by-exception); Laissez-faire leadership is one scale with items 5,7,28,33 . The questionnaire is the best measure of transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles and it was chosen because of its extensive use in leadership research as it has been used in nearly 200 research programmes, doctoral dissertations, and master's theses around the globe in the mid 90s (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1995).

Respondents are required to think of their leader and judge how frequently each of the statement fits the leader he/she is describing. The responses ranged from 0= not at all,

1= once in a while, 2 = sometimes, 3 = fairly often to 4= frequently, if not always. High scores on each of the dimensions indicate that the leader is high on the particular leadership style while low scores indicate that he/she is low on the leadership style in question. MLQ is considered the best validated measure of transformational and transactional leadership (Ozaralli, 2003). Bass and Avolio (1995) have carefully examined the reliability and validity of the MLQ 5X based on the data from several examinations. They reported satisfying reliability of .74 - .94. Recently, Amazue, Nwatu, Ome, and Uzuegbu (2016) reported a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .91 for the MLQ on the population of Nigerian university employees.

3.6   Pilot Study

In order to ascertain the reliability of the instruments, pilot study was conducted on a sample of 47 staff of Federal Inland Revenue Service (FIRS) in Makurdi metropolis. This population was chosen because it shares similar characteristics with employees of Benue State Internal Revenue Service (BIRS) since both are concerned with revenue collection. The participants were comprised of 35(74.5%) males and 12(25.5%) females who were within the age range of 30 – 62 years, with mean age of 44.2 years, (SD=8.6). Based on their marital status, 11(23.4%) were single, 33(70.2%) were married, while 3(6.4%) were widowed. On their religion, 4(85.1%) were Christians while 7(14.9%) were Muslims; 14(29.8%) were in the junior cadre while 33(70.2%) were in the senior cadre.

To test for the reliability of the instruments, the Cronbach's alpha was used. Data collected from the participants was subjected to statistical analysis and the following results were obtained.

When the Organisational and Interpersonal Deviance Scale were examined, the 19 items on the scale yielded a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .87 which is well above the

required .70 minimum benchmark. Although two of the items (item 7 & 9) had corrected item total correlation below the minimum requirement of .30, they were retained in the scale because, removing them could not yield any reasonable increase in the Cronbach's alpha coefficient (See Appendix D). On the two major subscales, the results showed that Organisational Deviance subscale had Cronbach's apha coefficient of .79 while Interpersonal Deviance subscales had .77. Therefore, the Organisational and Interpersonal Deviance Scale was proven to be suitable for use on the population of Benue State Internal Revenue Service employees.

The next instrument examined was the Psychological Ownership Questionnaire. When tested, the 16 items scale yielded a Cronbach's coefficient of .86 with all its items having corrected items total correlation above the minimum requirement of .30. Based on this result, the instrument was also found reliable and suitable for use on the population of BIRS employees.

The Work Locus of Control Scale was also examined to ascertain its reliability. The 16 items instrument yielded a high Cronbach' alpha coefficient of .82 which above the minimum standard of .70. Although items 14 and 16 on the instrument did not load up to the required minimum of .30 corrected item total correlation, the two items were retained based on the fact that deleting does not lead to any significant increase in the total Cronbach's alpha. Based on the result, the instrument was confirmed reliable for use in this study.

The last instrument examined in the pilot study was the Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire. The 45 item instrument, when tested, yielded a Cronbach's coefficient as high as .93 which is very well above the minimum requirement of .70. Two of the items (10 & 32) were found to have corrected items total correlation below .30 which is the

minimum requirement. However, they were still retained because removing them would not increase the total Cronabach's alpha for the scale. This instrument was therefore found to be highly reliable for use in this present study.

3.7   Procedure

The researcher first and foremost obtained a letter of introduction from the Department of Psychology, Benue State University, Makurdi. This letter of introduction alongside with a request seeking to collect data from the employees of Benue State Internal Revenue Service was submitted to the Chairman of the Board, Benue State Internal Revenue Service (See Appendices F & G). An approval was obtained from the management of Benue State Internal Revenue Service allowing the researcher to collect data from the staff of the board. (See Appendix H). The researcher then, with the aid of some research assistants, visited the offices of Benue State Internal Revenue Service (BIRS) across the 23 local government areas in the state. In each of the offices, the researcher introduced himself and the essence of the research and then sought the consent of the staff to participate. When their consent was obtained, the questionnaire was randomly shared to them using balloting system as explained in the sampling technique. When completed, the researcher retrieved the questionnaire, thank the participants and left.

3.8   Data Analysis

The analysis of data in this study involved the use of both descriptive and inferential statistics. The descriptive statistics were first of all used to summarize the biodata of the respondents such as their age, sex, marital status and work cadre. These include frequencies, percentages, mean and standard deviation. On the other hand, inferential statistics were used to test the hypotheses for the study. Specifically, standard

multiple linear regression was used to test the influence of psychological ownership and its dimensions on workplace deviant behaviours; simple linear regression was used to examine the influence of locus of control on workplace deviant behaviours; and finally; and, standard multiple linear regression was used to test the influence of leadership styles and its dimensions (interactional, transaction and laissez faire leadership styles) on workplace deviant behaviours. The analysis was performed with the aid of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

In this chapter, the findings of the study are presented. The chapter begins with the presentation of the inter-correlations among the study variables, followed by the results of the tests of hypotheses beginning from hypothesis one to four as stated in chapter two.

Table 4.1: Inter-correlation among Study Variables

S/N	Variable	N	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	Age	226	31.89	5.86	-											
2	Overall Psy. Ownership	238	59.76	9.06	.03	-										
3	Prev. Ownership	238	11.42	4.25	-.02	.61**	-									
4	Promo. Ownership	238	48.37	7.30	.05	.89**	.17**	-								
5	Work LOC	238	61.23	17.22	.28**	.55**	.24**	.55**	-							
6	Overall Leadership Style	217	73.73	24.00	.12	.39**	.17*	.37**	.48**	-						
7	Transformational Leadership style	219	41.54	16.51	.08	.32**	.03	.37**	.41**	.95**	-					
8	Laissez-Faire leadership style	233	5.14	3.23	.01	.35**	.42**	.18**	.25**	.60**	.38**	-				
9	Transactional Leadership Style	228	26.74	7.59	.12*	.44**	.33**	.34**	.53**	.85**	.65**	.62**	-			
10	Workplace Deviance	238	25.59	7.78	-.05	-.10	-.10	-.07	-.13*	-.03	.07	.02	-.27**	-		
11	Org. Deviance	238	16.62	5.19	-.08	.12	-.01	.15*	-.00	.04	.14*	.03	-.11	.85**	-	
12	Interpersonal Deviance	238	8.97	4.31	.00	-.32**	-.17**	-.30**	-.24**	-.15	-.08	-.00	-.36**	.78**	.34**	-

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Table 4.1 shows the relationship among the variables in the study. The table shows that there is no significant relationship between age of employees and overall psychological ownership($r_{(224)}$=.03; p> 0.05), preventive ownership ($r_{(224)}$=-.02; p> 0.05), promotive ownership ($r_{(224)}$=.05; p> 0.05), overall leadership style ($r_{(203)}$=.12; p> 0.05), transformational leadership style ($r_{(205)}$=.08; p> 0.05) and laissez-Faire leadership style ($r_{(219)}$=.01; p> 0.05). Also, age has no significant relationship with workplace Deviance ($r_{(224)}$=-.05; p> 0.05), organisational deviance ($r_{(224)}$=-.08; p> 0.05) and interpersonal deviance ($r_{(224)}$=.00; p> 0.05). On the contrary, age has a significant positive relationship with work locus of control ($r_{(224)}$=.28; p< 0.01) and transactional leadership style ($r_{(214)}$=.12; p< 0.05). The significant positive relationship between the variables means that as employees grow in age so is their work locus of control and transactional leadership style.

Results show that overall psychological ownership has significant positive relationship with preventive ownership ($r_{(236)}$=.61; p< 0.01), promotive ownership ($r_{(236)}$=.89; p< 0.01), work locus of control ($r_{(236)}$=.55; p< 0.01), overall leadership style ($r_{(215)}$=.39; p< 0.01), transformational leadership style ($r_{(217)}$=.32; p< 0.01), laissez-faire leadership style ($r_{(231)}$=.35; p< 0.01) and transactional leadership Style ($r_{(226)}$=.44; p< 0.01). The results indicate that increase in psychological ownership brings increase in preventive ownership, promotive ownership, work locus of control, overall leadership style, transformational leadership style, laissez-faire leadership style and transactional leadership Style. On the contrary, overall psychological ownership has significant negative relationship with interpersonal deviance ($r_{(236)}$=-.32; p< 0.01) meaning that increase in overall psychological empowerment leads to a decrease in interpersonal deviance among employees.

Table 4.1 also shows that preventive organisational ownership significantly and positively correlates with promotive psychological ownership ($r_{(236)}$=.17; p< 0.01), work locus of control ($r_{(236)}$=.24; p< 0.01), overall leadership style ($r_{(215)}$=.17; p< 0.05), laissez-faire leadership style ($r_{(231)}$=.42; p< 0.01) and transactional leadership style ($r_{(226)}$=.33; p< 0.01). These relationships mean that increase in preventive organisational ownership will bring significant increase in promotive psychological ownership, work locus of control, overall leadership style, laissez-faire leadership style and transactional leadership style. On the other hand, there is no significant relationship between preventive organisational ownership and overall workplace deviance ($r_{(236)}$=-.10; p> 0.05) and organisational deviance ($r_{(236)}$=-.01; p> 0.05). A significant negative correlation was found between preventive organisational ownership and interpersonal deviance ($r_{(236)}$=-.17; p< 0.01) showing that an increase in preventive organisational ownership leads to decrease in interpersonal deviance.

Promotive psychological ownership has significant positive relationship with work locus of control ($r_{(236)}$=.55; p< 0.01), overall leadership style ($r_{(215)}$=-.37; p< 0.05), transformational ($r_{(217)}$=.37; p< 0.01), laissez-faire leadership style ($r_{(231)}$=.12; p< 0.01), transactional leadership style ($r_{(226)}$=.34; p< 0.01) and organisational deviance ($r_{(236)}$=.15; p< 0.05). The result shows that increase in promotive psychological ownership will bring about significant increase in work locus of control, overall leadership style, transformational, laissez-faire leadership style, transactional leadership style and organisational deviance. A significant negative relationship was noticed between promotive psychological ownership and interpersonal deviance ($r_{(236)}$=0.34; p< 0.01) meaning that increase in promotive psychological ownership leads to decrease in interpersonal deviance.

Work locus of control correlated positively and significantly with overall leadership style ($r_{(215)}$)=0.48; P< 0.01), transformational leadership style ($r_{(217)}$)=0.41; P< 0.01), laissez-faire leadership style ($r_{(231)}$)=.23; P< 0.01) and transactional leadership style ($r_{(226)}$)=.53; P< 0.01). There is a significant negative correlation between work locus of control and overall workplace deviance ($r_{(236)}$)=-13; p< 0.05) and interpersonal deviance ($r_{(236)}$)=-.24; P< 0.01).

Overall leadership style has a significant positive correlation with transformational leadership style ($r_{(215)}$)=0.95; p< 0.01), laissez-faire leadership style ($r_{(215)}$)=.60; P< 0.01) and transactional leadership style ($r_{(215)}$)=.85; P< 0.01). On the other hand, there is a significant negative correlation between overall leadership style and interpersonal deviance ($r_{(215)}$)=-.15; p< 0.05).The significant positive correlation between overall leadership style and transformational, laissez-faire and transactional leadership styles means that when overall leadership style is on the increase, there is also an increase in the various forms of leadership styles. Overall leadership style did not significantly correlate with overall workplace deviance ($r_{(215)}$)=-.03; p> 0.05), and organisational deviance ($r_{(215)}$)=.04; p> 0.05).

Furthermore, transformational leadership style correlated significantly and positively with laissez-faire leadership style ($r_{(217)}$)=.38; p< 0.01), transactional leadership style ($r_{(215)}$)=.85; p< 0.01) and organisational deviance ($r_{(217)}$)=.14; p< 0.05). This explains that the Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire used in the study has internal consistency. On the other hand, transformational leadership style did not correlate significantly correlated with overall workplace deviance ($r_{(217)}$)=.07; p> 0.05). and interpersonal deviance ($r_{(217)}$)=-.08; p>0.05).

Laissez-faire leadership style had significant positive correlation with transactional leadership style ($r_{(226)}$=.618; p< 0.01) showing internal consistency. On the other hand, laissez-faire leadership style did not correlate significantly with overall workplace deviance ($r_{(231)}$=.02; p> 0.05), organisational deviance ($r_{(231)}$=.03; p> 0.05) and interpersonal deviance ($r_{(231)}$=-.00; p>0.05).

Transactional leadership style correlated significantly but negatively with organisational deviance ($r_{(226)}$=-.27; p< 0.01) and interpersonal deviance ($r_{(226)}$=-.36; p<0.01). The results mean that increase in transactional leadership style leads to decrease in overall workplace deviance and interpersonal deviance. On the contrary however, transactional leadership style did not correlate significantly with organisational deviance ($r_{(226)}$=-.11; p> 0.01).

Correlational analysis was also performed among the workplace deviance variables. Overall workplace deviance had significant positive correlation with organisational deviance ($r_{(236)}$=.85; p< 0.01) and interpersonal deviance ($r_{(236)}$=.78; p< 0.01). This shows internal consistency of the Workplace Deviance Scale. Finally there was a significant positive relationship between organisational deviance and interpersonal deviance ($r_{(236)}$=.34; p< 0.01).

4.2   Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis 1: This hypothesis states that psychological ownership will significantly influence workplace deviant behaviour among staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service. This hypothesis was tested using standard multiple regression as shown in table 4.2.1.

Table 4.2.1: Standard Multiple Regression Showing the Influence of Psychological Ownership on Workplace Deviant Behaviour among Staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service.

Variable	R	R^2	F	P	βeta	t	P
Constant					-	8.651	<.001
Preventive Psy. Ownership					-.088	-1.337	>0.05
	.109	.012	1.404	>.05			
Promotive Psy. Ownership					-.050	-.762	>.05

The result presented in table 4.2.1 shows that psychological ownership did not significantly influenced workplace deviant behaviour among staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service ($F_{(2,235)}$=1.404; p>0.05) with R=.109 and R^2=.012. Going by this result it is clear that the hypothesis which states that psychological ownership (preventive and promotive psychological ownership) will significantly influence workplace deviant behaviour among staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service is rejected.

The independent influence of the dimensions of psychological ownership on workplace deviant behaviour among staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service were also assessed as shown in Table 4.2. The results show that preventive psychological ownership has no significant influence on workplace deviant behaviour among staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service (β=-.088, t=-1.337, P>0.05). Similarly, promotive psychological ownership has no significant influence on workplace deviant behaviour among staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service (β=-.050, t=-.762, P>0.05). These results are not in line with

earlier postulations that psychological ownership will significantly influence workplace deviant behaviour among staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service.

Hypothesis 2: This hypothesis stated that work locus of control will significantly influence workplace deviant behaviour among staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service. This hypothesis was tested using Simple Linear Regression as shown in table 4.2.2.

Table 4.2.2: Simple Linear Regression Showingthe Influence of Work Locus of Control on Workplace Deviant Behaviour among Staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service.

Variable	R	R^2	F	βeta	t	P
Constant				-	15.779	<.001
Work Locus of Control	.132	.017	4.203	-.132	-2.050	<0.05

Table 4.2.2 shows that work locus of control significantly influenced workplace deviant behaviour among Staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service ($F_{(1,236)}$=4.203; $p<0.05$) with R=.132 and R^2=.017. Work locus of control explains a marginal 1.7% of the variance in workplace deviance behaviour. The result confirms the earlier postulation that work locus of control will significantly influence workplace deviant behaviour among Staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service.

Hypothesis 3: This hypothesis states that leadership styles will significantly influence workplace deviant behaviour among staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service. This hypothesis was tested using Standard Multiple Regression as shown in table 4.2.3.

Table 4.2.3: Standard MultipleRegression Showingthe Influence of Leadership Styles on Workplace Deviant Behaviour among Staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service.

Variable	R	R^2	F	P	βeta	t	P
Constant					-	17.738	<.001
Transformational Leadership Style					.398	4.787	<.01
	.405	.164	13.913	<.001			
Laissez-faire Leadership Style					.233	2.801	<.01
Transactional Leadership Style					-.639	-6.282	<.01

The results of the test of hypothesis three is presented in Table 4.2.3. The result indicates that all the leadership styles have significant joint influence on workplace deviant behaviour among staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service ($F_{(3,213)}$=13.913; p<0.01) with R=.405 and R^2=.164. The result means that leadership styles accounted for 16.4% of the variance in workplace deviant behaviour. And the remaining 83.6% is accounted for by other factors as will be explained in chapter five.

On the individual basis, transformational leadership style has significant positive influence on workplace deviant behaviour among staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service (β=.398, t=4.787, P<0.01). Transformational leadership style accounted for 39.8% positive change in workplace deviant behaviour. This means that when a manager adopts a transformational leadership style there will be an increase in workplace deviant behaviour.

Laissez-faire leadership style also has significant positive influence on workplace deviant behaviour among staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Revenue (β= .233, t=2.801, P<0.01). Laissez-faire leadership style accounted for 23.3% of the positive change in

workplace deviant behaviour. This means that when a manager adopts a laissez-faire leadership style there will be an increase in workplace deviant behaviour.

Similarly, transactional leadership style significantly but negatively influenced workplace deviant behaviour among staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service (β= -.639, t=-6.282, P<0.01). Looking at the beta value, transactional leadership style accounted for 63.9% negative change in workplace deviant behaviour. This means that when a manager adopts a transactional leadership style there will be a decrease in workplace deviant behaviour. All the results presented in table 4.2.3 are in line with hypothesis three.

Hypothesis 4: This hypothesis stated that psychological ownership, work locus of control and leadership styles will significantly influence workplace deviant behaviour among staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service. This hypothesis was tested using Standard Multiple Regression as shown in table 4.2.4.

Table 4.2.4: Standard Multiple Regression Showing the Joint Influence of Psychological Ownership, Locus of Control and Leadership Styles on Workplace Deviant Behaviour among Staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service.

Variable	R	R²	F	P	βeta	t	P
Constant					-	7.617	<.001
Psychological Ownership					-.009	-.113	>.05
	.083	.007	.489	>.05			
Work Locus of Control					-.084	-.984	>.05
Leadership Styles					.016	.199	>.05

Table 4.2.4 shows that psychological ownership, work locus of control and leadership styles have no significant joint influence on workplace deviant behaviour among staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service ($F_{(3,213)}$=.489; p>0.05) with R=.083 and R²=.007.With the result it is clear that the hypothesis which states that psychological ownership, work locus

of control and leadership styles will significantly influence workplace deviant behaviour among staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service is rejected.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter deals with the discussion of findings that emerged from this study. Specifically, the chapter covered discussion of findings, conclusion, recommendations and limitations of the study.

5.1   Discussion of the Findings

The findings of this study are discussed in line with the hypotheses tested. The first hypothesis which stated that psychological ownership will significantly influence workplace deviant behaviour among staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service was tested and rejected. The findings showed that psychological ownership did not significantly influence workplace deviant behaviour among staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service. The non significant result occurred for both preventive and promotive dimensions of psychological ownership.

The finding means that whether or not employees of Benue State Internal Revenue Service have sense of ownership of the organization, it does not influence their involvement in workplace deviant behaviours. For instance, employees who are protective of their ideas, workspace, property, and projects, which signify preventive psychological ownership, and those who are comfortable in their organization, feel at home in the organization and consider the success of the organization is theirs, which signify promotive psychological ownership, may all get involved in deviant behaviours such as doing things that are detrimental to the orgnisation like forging receipts, or things that hurt co-workers like

embarrassing a co-worker or playing mean pranks on other co-workers. On the other hand, such employees with sense of protective and promotive psychological ownership may not be involved in those deviant acts.

The finding implies that the sense of ownership does not always make an employee favourably disposed to their organization. This finding is contrary to majority of the previous findings on the relationship between psychological ownership and deviant workplace behaviour. It disagrees with Peng (2013) who found that psychological ownership positively affects knowledge hiding, a form of deviant workplace behaviour. It also disagrees with Chung and Moon (2011), Sieger, Zellweger and Aquino (2013), Türkan and Serkan (2016), Jekwu, Audu, Tochukwu and Jekwu (2016), Lo, Cheng, Wong, Rochelle and Kwok (2011), and, Wilson, Perry, Witt, and Griffeth (2015) who variously found psychological ownership to be related with deviant workplace behaviour in one way or the other.

As much as this finding seems contrary to conventional wisdom, it has important implications to the management of organizations. The finding implies that the management of organizations especially BIRS should not only focus on giving the employees sense of ownership such as allowing them freedom to decide how they perform their work, but rather, the employees should be monitored and made accountable in their work roles.

The second hypothesis which stated that work locus of control will significantly influence workplace deviant behaviour among staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service was tested and confirmed. It was found that locus of control had significant negative influence on workplace deviant behaviour among Staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service. Based on how locus of control was measured in this study with high scores

indicating external locus of control and lower scores indicating internal locus of control, the negative influence means that people who have external locus of control are less likely to engage in workplace deviant behaviours while those who have internal locus of control are more likely to engage in workplace deviant behaviours.

This finding implies that employees of BIRS who attribute their success in the workplace to luck and external forces such as significant persons (external locus of control) are less likely to perform acts that are directly detrimental to the organization such as stealing, sabotage, and absenteeism, or acts that affect the coworker such as verbal and physical aggression. On the contrary, it means that employees of BIRS who believe that their success depends on their personal effort and ability (internal locus of control) are more likely to engage in deviant acts such as work sabotage, absenteeism, theft, and aggressive behaviour. It is not clear why this is the case, however, the researcher suspects that when employees have high tendency to attribute their success to external forces, they tend to employ more carefulness in performing their job activities than when they believe in their own ability to make things happen. For instance, an employee of BIRS who believes that his/her elevation in the organization can be influenced by external forces, he/she will always behave in positive ways that may attract anticipated favour from the external forces. Thus, he/she will always try to avoid acts that will put them in bad light or damage their records when caught or suspected.

This finding is contrary to most empirical finding in research literature on locus of control and deviant workplace behaviiour. It disagrees with Storms and Spector (2007) who reported that persons with an external locus of control are more likely to engage in

counterproductive behaviour than persons with an internal locus of control. It further contradicts the findings of Abdul-Rahim, and Nasurdin (2008), Olabimitan, and Alausa (2014), and, Owolabi (2013) who in their various findings reported employees with external locus of control are more linked with deviant workplace behaviour than employees with internal locus of control. Also, the finding disagrees with Blanchard and Henle (2008) who found that belief in chance (external locus of control) was positively related to both minor and serious cyberloafing, which are forms of deviant workplace behaviour.

The third hypothesis which stated that leadership styles will significantly influence workplace deviant behaviour among staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service was tested and confirmed. The findings indicated that all the leadership styles have significant joint influence on workplace deviant behaviour among staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service. This means that the style of leadership adopted by supervisors or managers of BIRS determine to a significant extent the involvement or non involvement of the employees in deviant behaviour.

On the individual basis, transformational leadership style has significant positive influence on workplace deviant behaviour among staff of Benue State Internal Revenue. This means that when a manager adopts a transformational leadership style, there will be an increase in workplace deviant behaviour. What this finding means is that when a manager or supervisor goes beyond self-interest for the good of the employees, emphasizes having collective sense of mission, and purpose, articulates compelling vision for the future, and suggests new ways of accomplishing a task, it rather increases the chances of the employees to engage in deviant behaviours that are targeted at the organization or the coworker. This

finding seems to be contrary to expectation as transformational leadership style is often associated with positive employee outcome.

This finding is in line with Huang, Lu and Wang (2014) also found transformational leadership to be positively related to pro-social rule breaking. The finding however disagrees with majority of the findings such as Puni, Agyemang and Asamoah (2016) who found that there is a negative connection between democratic (transformational leadership) leadership style and counterproductive work behaviours. It also disagrees with Uddin, Rahman and Howlader (2014), Yan-Hong, Ying-Ying, Yong-Xing, and Yuan (2014), Aksu (2016), and, Mekpor and Dartey-Baah (2017) who in their various studies found significant negative relationship between transformational leadership style and deviant workplace behaviour. The large number of studies that are opposed to this present finding imply the need for more to be done on the role of transformational leadership style and deviant workplace behaviours.

The finding further indicated that laissez-faire leadership style also has significant positive influence on workplace deviant behaviour among staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service. This means that that when a manager or supervisor adopts a laissez-faire leadership style, there will be an increase in workplace deviant behaviour. More specifically, the result indicates that employees with a manager or supervisor who is absent when needed, avoids making decisions and getting involved when important issues arise, or delays responding to urgent questions, are more likely to engage in deviant behaviours that are both targeted at the organization and the coworker such as absenteeism, sabotage, theft and aggressive behaviour. This is because such employees have no proper direction and checks on how their work is done. Thus, they are bound to engage in any kind of unwholesome act

without being checked. This is in line with Puni, Agyemang and Asamoah (2016) who found that laissez faire leadership style has significant positive correlation with workplace deviance. It also tallies with Aksu (2016) who also found a positive relationship between organizational deviant behaviors and laissez-faire leadership.

Finally, the finding indicates that transactional leadership style significantly but negatively influenced workplace deviant behaviour among staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service. This means that when a manager adopts a transactional leadership style, there will be a decrease in workplace deviant behaviour. Specifically, the finding means that employees with a manager or supervisor who clearly defines desired goals and rewards, doesn't interfere until problems become serious, who deals with mistakes, complaint and failures, are less likely to engage in deviant workplace behaviours. This could be possible because such managers are specific on who is responsible for achieving particular goals and when such a goal is not achieved, the person is held responsible. When individual believe that they will be held accountable for anything, they tend to be more careful in their dealings. This finding however disagrees with majority of the findings including Puni, Agyemang and Asamoah (2016), Yan-Hong, Ying-Ying, Yong-Xing, and Yuan (2014), Mekpor and Dartey-Baah (2017), and, Bruursema (2004) who in their various studies reported significant positive association between transactional leadership style and deviant workplace behaviour.

The fourth hypothesis which stated that psychological ownership, work locus of control and leadership styles will significantly and jointly influence workplace deviant behaviour among staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service was tested and not confirmed. It was found that psychological ownership, work locus of control and leadership

133

styles have no significant joint influence on workplace deviant behaviour among staff of Benue State Internal Revenue Service. This finding means that locus of control and leadership styles which have significant influence on deviant workplace behaviour in this study have independent capacity for influencing deviant behaviour without dependent on each other. Likewise psychological ownership which in this study has no significant influence on deviant behaviour does not become significant even when it interplays with locus of control and leadership styles. Although studies combining psychological ownership, locus of control and leadership styles as predictor variables of deviant workplace behaviour that could be used in supporting this finding have been elusive in the literature, the finding has clearly demonstrated the strength of the variables in predicting deviant behaviour without relying on another.

5.2 Conclusion

Based on the findings of this study, it can be concluded that psychological ownership does not play any significant role in determining deviant workplace behaviour while locus of control and leadership styles are significant determinants of deviant workplace behaviour. Specifically, external locus of control and transactional leadership style are factors that are related to lower deviant workplace behaviour while internal locus of control, transformational leadership style, and laissez-faire are factors related to higher deviant workplace behaviour.

5.3 Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations were made:

i. Since psychological ownership seems not to play significant role in deviant workplace behaviour, the management of Benue State Internal Revenue Service should, instead of giving permanent employment especially to the field staff, give employment on contract basis. This may engender more productive behaviours because the employees believe they can be laid off any moment they are found wanting in the performance of their duty. As a way of protecting their contract, they will be more honest in their job and to the organisation.

ii. The supervisors should endeavour to identify employees with internal locus of control and always watch their work activities closely. This is because, this study revealed that people with internal locus of control have higher tendency to engage in deviant workplace behaviour.

iii. The management of Benue State Internal Revenue Service should always apply transactional leadership style on the employees. They should clearly define goals, responsibilities and rewards. They should reward success and punishment failure appropriately.

iv. Meanwhile, researchers should make further investigation on the role of psychological ownership in deviant workplace behaviour especially among employees of Benue State Internal Revenue Service.

5.4   Limitations of the Study

Some of the major limitations of this study include the following:

i. Data collection in this study is based on self-report. Since this study is concerned with deviant behaviours which is considered as negative organizational behaviour,

it is suspected that the employees would not be honest in providing responses on their involvement in those behaviours. This could be due to fear of being penalized if exposed. However, as a means of palliating the effect of this on the result of the study, the researcher first of all assured the respondents of their confidentiality and allowed them to complete an informed consent form.

ii. Another major limitation of this study is that majority of the respondents were drawn from the state capital while the local governments were not properly covered. This was so because employees of Benue State Internal Revenue Service posted to the local government areas were either out for field work or are absent from office. Thus, only insignificant number of staff could be accessed as at the time of the research. To minimize sampling bias in this case, the researcher adopted random selection of the participants.

REFERENCES

Abdul, R., Abdul, R. & Nasurdin, A. M. (2008). Trust in Organization and Workplace Deviant Behaviour: The Moderating Effect of Locus of Control. *Gadjah Mada International Journal of Business, 10*(2), 211-242.

Abdullah A, Marican HS (2014). Can control and flexible leaderships influence deviant behavior? *Int. J. Technical Res. Appl.,* 10(6), 11-18.

Abdul-Rahim, A., & Nasurdin, A. M. (2008). Trust in Organizational and Workplace Deviant Behavior The Moderating Effect of Locus of Control. *Gadjah Mada International Journal of Business,* 10(2)211-235.

Adas, A. (1999). *Educational psychology* (1st edn.). Amman, Jordan: Al Fikr House.Alvani, 2007

Aksu, A. (2016). Organizational deviance and multi-factor leadership. *Educational Research and Reviews, 11*(8), 589-597.

Alias, M., Rasdi, R.M., Ismail, M. & Samah, B.U. (2013). Predictors of workplace deviant behaviour: HRD agenda for Malaysian support personne. *European Journal of Training and Development,* 37(2), 161-182 ·

Anderson, C. R. (1977). Locus of control, coping behaviours, and performance in a stress setting; A longitudinal study. Journal of Applied Psychology, 62, 4, 446-45

Appelbaum, S. H., Iaconi, G. D., & Matousek, A. (2007). Positive and negative deviant workplace behaviors: causes, impacts, and solutions. *Corporate Governance: Internal Journal of Business and Society, 7*(5), 586-598.

Aquino, K., Tripp, T. M., & Bies, R. J. (2001). How employees respond to personal offense: The effects of blame attribution, victim status, and offender status on revenge and reconciliation in the workplace. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86, 52–59.

Ashby, J. S., Kottman, T. & Draper, K. (2002). Social lnterest and Locus of Control: Relationship and implications. *The Journal of Individual Psychology, 58*, (1), 52-61.

Avey JB, Avolio BJ, Crossley CD, and Luthans F. (2009). Psychological ownership: Theoretical extensions, measurement and relation to work outcomes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* 30(2), 173-191.

Avey, J. B., Palanski, M. E., & Walumbwa, F. O. (2010). When Leadership Goes Unnoticed: The Moderating Role of Follower Self-Esteem on the Relationship Between Ethical Leadership and Follower Behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *98*(4), 573–582.

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2004). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire: Third edition manual and sampler set.* Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.

Babalola, S.S. (2009). Women entrepreneurial innovative behaviour: The role of psychological capital. *International Journal of Business Management*, 4(11), 184–192.

Baron, R. A., & Neuman, J. H. (1996). Workplace violence and workplace aggression: Evidence on their relative frequency and potential causes. *Aggressive Behavior,* 22, 161-173.

Basım, H. N., Erkenekli, M. & Sesen, H. (2010). The Relationship of Locus of Control in Individual Behavior with the Perception of Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity. *TODAĐE's Review of Public Administration, 4*(1), 169-189.

Bass, B. M. (1999). Two Decades of Research and Development in Transformational Leadership. *European, Journal of Work and Organisational Psychology, 8*, 9-32.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectivenessthrough transformational leadership*: Sage.

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership*, 2. Aufi., Mahwah.

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership*. Psychology Press.

Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., Jung, D. I., & Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal Applied Psychology*, 88(2), 207.

Beggan, J.K. (1992). On the social nature of nonsocial perception: The mere ownership effect. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 62(2), 229-237.

Bennett, R. & Robinson, S. (2003). *The Past, Present, and Future of Workplace Deviance Research*. In Jerald Greenberg (Ed) Organizational Behavior: The State of the Science (2nd ed.), 247-281. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*(3), 349.

Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 85, 349–360.

Bernardi, R. A. (2001). A Theoretical Model for the Relationship among Stress, Locus of Control and Longevity. *Business Forum, 26*, 27-33.

Berry, C. M., Ones, D. S., & Sackett, P. R. (2007) Interpersonal Deviance, Organizational Deviance, and their Common Correlates: A Review and Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 410-424

Bilgin, S.L. (2007). An investigation on the relaionship between work locus of control and union commitment. Retrieved June 14, 2017, from http://econpapers.repec.org/RePEc:and:journl:v:7:y:2007:i:1:p:39-52

Blanchard, A. L. & Henle, C. A. (2008). Correlates of different forms of cyberloafing: The role of norms and external locus of control. *Computers in Human Behavior, 24*(2008) 1067–1084

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.

Boemer, S, Eisenbesiss, S. A. & Griesser, D (2007). Follower behaviour and organizational performance: The impact of transformational leaders. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 13(3), 15-26

Bosman, J., Buitendach, J.H., & Rothman, S. (2005). Work locus of control and dispositional optimism as antecedents to job insecurity. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, *31*(4), 17–31.

Brady, P. (2010). Organizational Deviance and the" Grammar" of Secondary Schooling. *EAF J.* 21(2), 76.

Brown, G., Lawrence, T. B. & Robinson, S. L. (2005). Territoriality in organizations. *Academy of Management Review, 30,* 577-594.

Brown, M. E. & Treviño, L. K. (2006). Socialized charismatic leadership, values congruence, and deviance in work groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(4), 954-962.

Brownell, P. (October 1982b). A field study examination of budgetary participation and locus of control, *The Accounting Review*, 766-777

Bruursema, K. (2004). Leadership style and the link with counterproductive work behavior (cwb): An investigation using the job-stress/cwb model (2004). Graduate Theses and Dissertations. Retrieved from:http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd/970

Bruursema, K. (2004). Leadership Style and the Link with Counterproductive Work Behaviour (CWB): An Investigation using the Job-Stress/CWM Model. Unpublished Thesis Presented to the University of South Florida.

Buchko, A. A. (1992). Effects of employee ownership on employee attitudes; A test of three theoretical perspectives. *Work and Occupations*, 19, 59-78.

Bučiūnienė, I., & Škudienė, V. (2008). Impact of Leadership Styles on Employees' Organizational Commitment in Lithuanian Manufacturing Companies. *South East European Journal of Economics and Business*, *3*, 57–66.

Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York. Harper & Row.

Carrim, N. (2006). The relationship amongst locus of control, self-determination and job satisfaction in call centers. Retrieved August 09, 2011, from upetd.up.ac.za/thesis/available/etd-02132012-105055/.../dissertation.pdf\

Carrim, N., Basson, J., & Coetzee, M. (2006). The relationship between job satisfaction and locus of control in the South African call centre environment. *South African Journal of Labour Relations, 2*, 66–81.

Cesario, J., & Higgins, E. (2008, May) Making Message Recipients "Feel Right": How Nonverbal Cues Can Increase Persuasion. *Psychological Science, 19*(5), 23-31.

Cesario, J., Grant, H., & Higgins, E. T. (2004). Regulatory fit and persuasion: Transfer from feeling right. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 86*, 388-404.

Cesario, J., Higgins, E., & Scholer, A. (2008, January). Regulatory fit and persuasion: Basic principles and remaining questions. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 2*(1), 444–463.

Chen, J.C., & Silverthorne, C. (2008). The impact of locus of control on job stress, job performance and job satisfaction in Taiwan. *Leadership & Organisation Development Journal, 29*(7), 572–582.

Choi, J. & Choi, Y. (2008). *Dimensions of Leadership in Public Relations. Exploring an Organizational- Wide Perspective*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, TBA, MOntreal, Quebec, Canada.

Chullen, C. L., Dunford, B. B., Angermeier, I., Boss, R.W. & Boss, A.D. (in press) Minimizing Deviant Behavior In Healthcare Organizations: The Affects Of Supportive Leadership And Job Design. *Journal of Healthcare Management*.

Chung, Y. W. & Kim, S. H. (2013). The Mediating Effect of Organizational Justice on the Relationship between Psychological Ownership and Constructive Deviant Behavior. Retrieved from: http://citeweb.info/20131752836

Chung, Y. W. & Moon, H.K. (2011). The Moderating Effects of Collectivistic Orientation on Psychological Ownership and Constructive Deviant Behavior. *International Journal of Business & Management*, 6(12), 65-73.

Chung, Y. W., & Moon, H. K. (2011). The moderating effects of collectivistic orientation on psychological ownership and constructive deviant behavior. *International Journal of Business and Management, 6*(12), 65-77.

Coffin, B. (2003). Breaking the silence on white collar crime. *Risk Management, 50*(9), 8-15.

Cooper, D.J. (2003). *Leadership for Follower Commitment. Butterworth- Heinemann.* Oxford, UK.P.35-36.

Crowe, E., & Higgins, E. T. (1997). Regulatory focus and strategic inclinations: Promotion and prevention in decision-making. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes

Currie, G., & Lockett, A. (2007). A critique of transformational leadership: Moral, professional and contingent dimensions of leadership within public services organizations. *Human Relations, 60*(2), 341–370.

Darrat, M., Amyx, D. & Bennett, R. (2010). An investigation into the effects of work family conflict and job satisfaction on salesperson deviance. *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management. 30*(3), 239-252.

Dittmar, H. (1992). The social psychology of material possessions: To have is to be. New Fox, S., & Spector, P.E. (1999). A model of work frustration-aggression. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour, 20,* 915-913.

Dunlop, P. D., & Lee, K. (2004). Workplace deviance, organizational citizenship behavior, and business unit performance: The bad apples do spoil the whole barrel. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour, 25*(1), 67-80.

Edwards, M. S. & Greenberg, J. (2010). What is insidious work behavior? In: Greenberg J (Edn). *Insidious work behaviour*, New York: Routledge, pp: 3-28.

Erkutlu, H. & Chafra, J. (2013). Effects of trust and psychological contract violation on authentic leadership and organizational deviance, *Management Research Review, 36*(9), 828 – 848.

Ermann, M. D., & Lundman, R. J. (1978). Deviant Acts by Complex Organizations: Deviance and Social Control at the Organizational Level of Analysis1. *Sociol. Q.* 19(1), 55-67.

Fagbohungbe, B. O., Akinbode, G. A., & Ayodeji, F. (2012). Organisational Determinants of Workplace Deviant Behaviours: An Empirical Analysis in Nigeria. *International Journal of Business and Management, 7*(5), 207-221.

Forster, J., Grant, H., Idson, C., & Higgins, E. T. (2001). Success/failure feedback, expectancies, and approach/avoidance motivation: How regulatory focus moderates classic relations. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 37, 253-260.

Forster, J., Higgins, E. T., & Idson, L. C. (1998). Approach and avoidance strength during goal attainment: Regulatory focus and the "goal looms larger" effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 1115-1131.

Freitas, A. L., & Higgins, E. T. (2002). Enjoying goal-directed action: The role of regularity fit. *Psychological Science,* 13, 1-6.

Friedman, R. S., & Forster, J. (2001). The effects of promotion and prevention cues on creativity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81*, 1001-1013.

Frucot, V., & Shearon, W. T. (1991). Budgetary participation, locus of control, and Mexican managerial performance and job satisfaction. *The Accounting Review, 66* (January), 80-98.

Furby, L. (1976). The socialization of possession and ownership among children in three cultural groups: Israeli kibbutz, Israeli city, and American. In S. Modgil and C. Modgil (Eds.), *Piagetian Research: Compilation and Coammentary*, (8, pp. 95-127). Windsor: NFER Publishing.

Furby, L. (1978). Possession in humans: an exploratory study of its meaning and motivation. *Social Behaviour and Personality,* 6, 49–65.

Furnham, A., & Steele, H. (1993). Measuring of locus of control: A critique of general childrens health – and work related locus of control questionnaire. *British Journal of Psychology, 84*(4), 443–489.

Galejs, I., & Hegland, S. (1982). Professor-Child Interactions and Children's Locus of Control Tendencies, *American Educational Research Journal*, 19, 293-302.

Galinsky, A. D., Leonardelli, G. J., Okhuysen, G. A., & Mussweiler, T. (2005). Regulatory Focus at the Bargaining Table: Promoting Distributive and Integrative Success. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 3*1(8), 1087-1098.

Giacalone R. A., & Greenberg J. (1997). *Antisocial Behaviour in Organisations*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Green, D. (2014). Insider Threats and Employee Deviance: Developing an Updated Typology of Deviant Workplace Behaviors. *Issues in Information Systems Information Systems, 15*(II), 185-189.

Griffin,R.W., O'Leary, A.M., & Collins, J. (1998). Dysfunctional Work Behaviors in Organizations. In. Cooper, C.L., & Rousseau, D. M. (Eds.), *Trends in Organizational Behaviors* (pp. 65-82). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Gruys, M. L., & Sackett, P. R. (2003). Investigating the dimensionality of counter productive work behavior. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment,* 11(1):30-42.

Gruys, M. L., & Sackett, P. R. (2003). Investigating the dimensionality counterproductive work behaviour. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 11* (1), 30-42.

Gulveren, H. (2008). Investigation of Relations Between Internal-External Locus of Control Trait Anger, Anger Expression Styles and Intelligence in 12 Grade High School Students. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Maltepe University, Social Sciences Institute, Istanbul.

Hamid, R.A., Juhdi, N.H., Ismail, D. & Abdullah, N.A. (2015). Abusive supervision and workplace deviance as moderated by spiritual intelligence: An empirical study of Selangor employees. *Malaysian Journal of Society and Space, 12*(2), 191-202.

Hargis, M. B., Wyatt, J.D., & Piotrowski, C. (2001). Developing Leaders: Examining the Role of Transactional and Transformational Leadership across Contexts Business. *Organization Development Journal 29*(3), 51–66.

Harris, K.J., Harris, R.B., & Eplion, D.M. (2007). Personality, leader-member exchanges, and work outcomes. Retrieved May 12, 2017, from http://ibam.com/pubs/jbam/articles/vol8/no2/JBAM_8_2_1.pdf

Heider, F. (1958). *The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations.* New York: Wiley.

Hellriegel, D., & Slocum, J. W. Jr. (1974). Organizational climate: Measures, research and contingencies. *Academy of Management Journal, 17*(2), 255-280.

Henle, C. A. (2005). Predicting WD from the interaction between organizational justice and personality. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, *17*, 247-63.

Higgins, E. (1997, December). Beyond pleasure and pain. *American Psychologist*, 52(12), 1281

Higgins, E. (2000, November). Making a good decision: Value from fit. *American Psychologist*, 55(11), 1217–1230.

Higgins, E. (2005). Value From Regulatory Fit. *American Psychological Society, 14* (2005): 209–13.

Higgins, E. T. (1997). Beyond pleasure and pain. *American Psychologist*, 52, 1280-1300.

Higgins, E. T. (1999b). When do self-discrepancies have specific relations to emotions? The second-generation question of Tangney, Niedenthal, Covert, and Barlow (1998). *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 1313-1317.

Higgins, E., Friedman, R., Harlow, R., Idson, L., Ayduk, O., & Taylor, A. (2001). Achievement orientations from subjective histories of success: Promotion pride versus prevention pride. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 31*(1), 3–23.

Higgins, E., Idson, L., Freitas, A., Spiegel, S., & Molden, D. (2003, June). Transfer of value from fit. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*(6), 1140–1153.

Hoegl, M., Parboteeah, K. P., & Munson, C.L. (2003). Team-level antecedents of individuals' knowledge networks. *Decision Science, 34*(4), 741-770.

Hoffi-Hofstetter, H., & Mannheim, B. (1999). Managers' coping resources, perceived organizational patterns, and responses during organizational recovery from decline. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 20*. 5, 665-85.

Hollinger, R., & Clark, J. (1982). Employee deviance: A response to the perceived quality of the work experience. *Work and Occupations*, *9*, 97-114.

Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated-business unit performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 891-902.

Huang, Y., Lu, X. & Wang, X. (2014). The Effects of Transformational Leadership on Employee's Pro-social Rule Breaking. *Canadian Social Science*, 10(1), 128-134.

Hyatt, A.T., & Prawitt, F.D. (2001). Does Congruencebetween Audit Structure and Auditors' Locus of Control Affect Job Performance. *The Accounting Review, 76*, 263-274.

James, W. (1890). The principles of psychology. New York: Holt.

Janz, B. D., Wehterbe, J.C., Colquitt, J.A., & Neo, R.A (1997). Knowledge worker team effectiveness: the role of autonomy interdependence, team development, and contextual support variables. *Personnel psychology, 50*(4), 877-904.

Jekwu, O. L., Audu, A. & Tochukwu, O. & Jekwu, M.O.L. (2016). Psychological Ownership (Self-Efficacy) And Workplace deviant behaviour Emotional Intelligence And Self-Efficacy As Determinants Of Ethical Work Behaviour Of Artisan In Maiduguri, Borno State Nigeria. *International Journal of Social Science and Management, 3*(3), 188-192.

Johan, R. (2002). Kepuasan Kerja Karyawan dalam Institusi Pendidikan, *dalam Jurnal Pendidikan Penabur,* No.01 / Th.I / Maret 2002

Jung, D.D., & Sosik, J.J. (2002). Transformational Leadership in Work Groups: The Role of Empowerment, Cohesiveness, and Collective-Efficacy on Perceived Group Performance. *Small Group Research. 33,* 313 –336

Jurjew, R. & Belschak, F. D. (2012). Transformational Leadership and Employee's Work Behaviors: Is Charismatic Leadership Suitable for Machiavellian Employees? Master Thesis Retrieved from: http://dare.uva.nl/cgi/arno/show.cgi?fid=462880

Kamptner, N. L. (1991). Personnel possessions and their meanings: A live-span perspective. In F. W. Rudmin (Ed.), To Have Possessions: A Handbook on Ownership and Property. *Special issues Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 6*(6), 209-228.

Keller, R.T (1992) Transformational leadership and the Development of Research and Development Project Groups. *Journal of Management,* 489 –501.

Kinicki, J.A., & Vecchio, P.R. (1994). Influences on the Quality of Supervisor-Subordinate Relations: The Role of Time-Pressure, Organizational Commitment, and Locus of Control. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 15, 75-82.

Krejcie, R. V. & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30,* 607 – 610.

Larsen, R., & Buss, D. (2009). *Personality psychology: domains of knowledge about human nature*. (4th ed., p. 388).

Lefcourt, H.M. (1982). *Locus of control: Current trends in theory and research*. (2nd edn.). Hillsade, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum and Associates Publishers.

Lefcourt, H.M. (1984). *Research with the locus of control construct*. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Lerner, J. S., & Tetlock, P. E. (1999). Accounting for the effects of accountability. *Psychological Bulletin, 125*(2), 255-275.

Levenson, H. (1981). Differentiating among internality, powerful others, and chance. In H.M. Lefcourt (Ed.), *Research with the locus of control construct* (Vol. 1, pp. 15–63). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Lian, L K, & Tui, L G (2012) Leadership Styles and Organizational Citizenship Behavior the Mediating Effect of Subordinates' Competence and Downward Influence Tactics. *Journal of Applied Business and Economics*, 13(2), 59-96.

Lo, T.W., Cheng, C.H.K, Wong, D.S.W., Rochelle, T.L. & Kwok, S.I. (2011). Self-Esteem, Self-Efficacy and Deviant Behaviour of Young People in Hong Kong.

Lowe, K.B., Kroeck, K., & Sivasubramaniarn, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *Leadership Quarterly*, 7 (3), 385- 426.

Lu, L., Kao, S., Cooper, C.J., & Spector, P.E. (2000). Managerial stress, locus of control, and job strain in Taiwan and UK: A comparative study. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 7(3), 209–226.

Mangione, J.W., & Quinn, R.P. (1974). Job satisfaction, counterproductive behaviour and drug use at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 60,*114-16.

Maram, A., & Miller, K. (1998). An empirical assessment of the construct work locus of control. *Journal of Industrial Psychology, 24*(3), 48–51.

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98*, 224-253.

Mayhew, M. G., Ashkanasy, N. M., Bramble, T. & Gardner, J. (2007). A study of the antecedents and consequences of psychological ownership in organisational settings, *The Journal Social Psychology, 147*(5), 477-500.

McClelland, D. (1951). *Personality*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

McCracken, G. (1986). Culture and consumption: A theoretical account of the structure and movement of the cultural meaning of consumer goods. *Journal of Consumer Research, 13,* 71-84.

McGregor, D. M. (960). *The Human Side of Enterprise*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

McIntyre, N., Srivastava, A. & Fuller, J.A. (2009). The relationship of locus of control and motives with psychological ownership in organizations. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 21*(3), 383-401.

Mearns, J. (2009). Social learning theory. In H. Reis & S. Sprecher (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of human relationships* (vol. 3) (pp. 1537-1540). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mekpor, B. & Dartey-Baah, K. (2017). Leadership styles and employees' voluntary work behaviors in the Ghanaian banking sector. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 38*(1), 74-88.

MOW (The Meaning of Working National Research Team). (1987). *The meaning of working*. London: Academic Press.Myers & Myers, 1986

Muafi (2011). Causes and consequences deviant workplace behavior, Int. J. Innovation, Manage. *Technol*. 2(2):123-6.

Mulki, J.P., Jaramillo, F., & Locander, W.B. (2006). Emotional exhaustion and organizational deviance: Can the right job and a leader's style make a difference. *Journal of Business Research*, 59, 1222–1230

Ng, T. W. H., Sorenson, K. L. & Eby, L. T. (2006). Locus of Control at Work: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 27*, 1057-1087.

O'Brein, K.E. (2004). Self-determination theory and locus of control as antecedents of voluntary workplace behaviours. Retrieved September 12, 2017, from http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd/1182

O'Neill, T. A., & Hastings, S. E. (2011). Explaining workplace deviance behavior with more than just the "Big Five". *Personality and Individual Differences*, 50(2), 268-273.

O'Reilly, C. E. (2002). *The wrong kind of ownership. Across the Board,* Sept/Oct, 19–20.

Ogbonna G. N. & Ebimobowei, A. (2012). Impact of Tax Reforms and Economic Growth of Nigeria: A Time Series Analysis. *Current Research Journal of Social Sciences. 4*(1), 62 – 68.

Olabimitan, B. & Alausa, W.M. (2014). Psychological factors predicting workplace deviance behaviour among nurses in the public health sector in Lagos. *Nigerian Journal of Applied Behavioural Sciences, 2,* 137-152.

Olckers, C., & Du Plessis, Y. (2012). Psychological ownership: A managerial construct for talent retention and organisational effctiveness. *African Journal of Business Management, 6*(7), 2585–2596.

O'Leary-Kelly, A. M., Griffin, R. W. & Glew, D. J. (1996). Organisation-Motivated Aggression: A research framework. *Academy of Management Review, 21*, 225 – 253.

O'Leary-Kelly, A. M., Griffin, R. W., & Glew, D. J. (1996). Organization-motivated aggression: A research framework. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(1), 225-253.

Oliver, J. E., Jose, P. E., & Brough, P. (2006). Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the Work Locus of Control Scale. *Educational and Psychol Measurement, 66*, 835-851.

Omar, F., Halim, F.W. Zainah, H. Nasir, R. Khairudin. R. (2011). Stress and job satisfaction as antecedents of workplace deviant behaviour. *World Applied Sciences Journal (Special Issue of Social and Psychological Sciences for Human Development)*. 12, 46-51.

O'Neill, T. A., Lewis, R. J., & Carswell, J. J. (2011). Employee personality, justice perceptions, and the prediction of workplace deviance. *Personality Individual Diff. 51*(5), 595-600.

Owen H, Hodgson V, Gazzard N (2007). Liderlik el kitabı. İstanbul: Çeviren: Münevver Çelik, Owolabi, A. B. (2013). Influence Of Work Locus Of Control And Perceived Environmental Support On Employees' Work Attitude And Organizationally Beneficial Behaviour. *Nigerian Journal of Applied Behavioural Sciences, 1*(2013), 11-20.

Owolabi, A. B. (2013). Influence of Work Locus of Control and Perceived Environmental Support on Employees' Work Attitude and Organizationally Beneficial Behaviour. *Nigerian Journal of Applied Behavioural Sciences, 1*(2013), 11-20.

Pareek, U. (1989). Motivational analysis of organizations-climate (MAO-C), In J. W. Pfeiffer (Ed.), *The 1989 annual (161-171)*. San Diego, CA: University Associates.

Parks GS, Jones SE, Hughey MW (2013). Belief, truth, and positive organizational deviance. *Howard LJ*, 56:399.

Parry, K. W., & Sinha, P. N. (2005). Researching the trainability of transformational organizational leadership. *Human Resource Development International, 8*(2), 165-183.

Peng, H. (2013). Why and when do people hide knowledge? *Journal Of Knowledge Management,* 17(3), 398-415.

Peterson, D. K. (2002). Deviant workplace behavior and the organization's ethical climate. *Journal of Business and Psycholology, 17*(1):47-61.

Peterson, D. K. (2002). Deviant Workplace Behavior and The Organization's Ethical Climate. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 17(1), 47-61.

Piccolo, R. F, & Colquitt, J.A. (2006) Transformational Leadership and Job Behavior: The Mediating Role of Core Job Characteristics. *Academy of Management Journal*. 327 – 340.

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(1), 84-107.

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.

Pierce, J. L., Rubenfeld, S. A., & Morgan, S. (1991). Employee ownership: A conceptual model of process and effects. *Academy of Management Review*, 16, 121–144.

Pierce, J. L., Rubenfeld, S. A., & Morgan, S. (1991). Employee ownership: a conceptual model of process and effects. *Academy of Management Review, 16,* 121–144

Pierce, J. L., Van Dyne, L., & Cummings, L. L. (1992). *Psychological ownership: A conceptual and operational examination. Southern Management Association Proceedings,* New Orleans, LA., 203-211.

Pradhan S, Pradhan RK (2014). Transformational leadership and deviant workplace behaviors: the moderating role of organizational justice. *Proceedings of the First Asia-Pacific Conference on Global Business, Economics, Finance and Social Sciences* (1-11). Singapore.

Pradhan, S, Pradhan, K. R. (2014). Transformational leadership and deviant workplace behaviors: The moderating role of organizational justice. *Proceedings of the first Asia Pacific Conference on Global Business, economics, finance and social sciences* (AP14SINGAPORE Conference) Singapore.

Prelinger, E. (1959). Extension and structure of the self. *The Journal of Psychology, 47,* 13-23.

Puni, A., Agyemang, C. B. & Asamoah, E. S. (2016). Leadership Styles, Employee Turnover Intentions and Counterproductive Work Behaviours. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Development, 5*(1), 1-7.

Rezaeian, A. (2007). *Principles of Organizational Behavior Management*, Tehran: change leader role, Drucker, P. F., translators: Rahimian, H.,and Babaei, M.R. Tadbir Magazine, Vol. 15, No. 154.

Rioux, P., Roberge, M. E., Brunet, L., Savoie, A., & Courcy, F. (2005). Classification des comportement antisociaux au travail: établissement d'ne nouvelle classification. *Interactions, 9*(1), 63-88.

Robbins, D. L., & Galperin, B. L. (2010). Constructive deviance: striving toward organizational change in healthcare. *Journal of Management and Marketing Research*, 5, 1-11.

Robbins, P. S. (2003). *Organizatioanal Behavior*. 9th Edition. New Jersey: Precentice Hall International Inc.

Robbins, S. P. & Coulter, M. (2007). *Management* (9th ed.).London: Prentice-Hall.

Robinson, S. L. & Bennett, R. J. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of applied Pschology, 85*(3), 349-60.

Robinson, S. L. & Greenberg, J. (1998). Employees behaving badly: Dimensions, determinants and dilimmas in the study of workplace deviance. In D. M. Rousseau and C. Cooper (Eds), *Trends in Organisational Behaviour, 5*, 1-30.

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.

Robinson, S. L., & O'Leary-Kelly, A. (1998). Monkey see, monkey do: The influence of work groups on the antisocial behavior of employees. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41, 658–672.

Robinson, S., & Bennett, R. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multi-dimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal, 38,* 555-572.

Rochberg-Halton, E. (1980). Cultural signs and urban adaptation: The meaning of cherished household possessions. Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago. Dissertation Abstracts International, 40(8-A), 4754-4755.

Rotter, J. B. (1942). Level of aspiration as a method of studying personality. II. Development and evaluation of a controlled method. *Journal of Experimental Psychology, 31,* 410-422.

Rotter, J. B. (1954). *Social learning and clinical psychology.* New York: Prentice-Hall.

Rotter, J. B. (1960). Some implications of a social learning theory for the prediction of goal directed behavior from testing procedures. *Psychological Review, 67,* 301-316.

Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs, 80.* (Whole No. 609).

Rudmin, F.W., & Berry, J.W. (1987). Semantics of ownership: A free-recall study of property. *Psychological Record, 37*(2), 257–268.

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.

Sackett, P.R. & DeVore, C.J. (2001). Counterproductive behaviors at work. In N. Anderson, D.S. Ones, H. Sinangil and C. Viswesvaran (eds.) *Handbook of Industrial, Work, and Organizational Psychology*, vol. 1. London: Sage.

Sahin, F. (2012). The Mediating Effect of Leader-Member Exchange on the Relationship between Theory X and Y Management Styles and Affective Commitment: A Multilevel Analysis. *Journal of Management and Organization, 18,* 159-174.

Saidon, I.M., Galbreath, J. & Whiteley, A. (2013). Moderating Role of Transformational Leadership on the Relationship between Moral Disengagement and Workplace Deviance. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences, 7*(8), 706-719.

Salazar, J., Hubbard, S., & Salazar, L. (2002). The influence of locus of control on hotel managers job satisfaction. *The Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality and Tourism, 1*(2), 15–26.

Sardogan E. M., Kaygusuz, C. & Karahan, T. F. (2006). A Human Relations Skills Training Program, University Students' Locus of Control Levels, *Mersin Uni-versity Journal of the Faculty of Education, 2* (2), 184-194.

Schein, E. (1992). *Organisational culture and leadership*. (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schermerhorn, J., Hunt, J., & Osborn, R., (2000). *Organizational Behaviour* (7th ed.), New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Scott, L. O., & Hara, M. W. (1993). Self-discrepancies in clinically anxious and depressed university students. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 102, 282-287.

Shadur, m.A., Kienzle, R.,& Rodwell,J.J.(1999,December). The relationships between organizational climate and employees perceptions of involvement. *Group and Organizational Management*, 479-503

Sieger, P., Zellweger, T. & Aquino, K. (2013). Turning Agents into Psychological Principals: Aligning Interests of Non-Owners through Psychological Ownership. *Journal of Management Studies*, 1-28.

Silvester, J., Mohamed, A. R., Anderson-Gough, F. M., & Anderson, N. R. (2002). Locus of Control, Attributions and lmpression Management in The Selection Interview. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 75* (1), 59-67.

Skarlicki, D. P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82,* 416-425.

Snare, F. (1972). The Concept of Property. *American Philosophical Quarterly, 9*(2), 200-206.

Solmuş, T. (2004). Đş Yaşamı, Denetim Odağı ve Beş Faktörlük Kişilik Modeli, Türk Psikoloji Bülteni, Cilt 10, s. 196-205.

Spector, P. E. (1988). Development of The Work Locus of Control Scale. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 61*, 335-340.

Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2005). The stressor-emotion model of counterproductive work behavior. In S. Fox, & P. E.Spector (Eds.), *Counterproductive work behavior: Investigations of actors and targets* (pp. 151–174). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2010). Theorizing about the deviant citizen: An attributional explanation of the interplay of organizational citizenship and counterproductive work behavior. *Human Resource Management Review*, 20(2), 132-143.

Spector, P.E. (1982). Behaviour in organisations as a function of employee's locus of control. *Psychological Bulletin*, 91(3), 482–487.

Spector, P.E. (1988). Development of the work locus of control scale. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 61, 219–230.

Spector, P.E., Fox, S., Penney, L.M., Bruursema, K., Goh, A., Kessler, S., (2006). The dimensionality of counterproductivity: are all counterproductive behaviors created equal? *Journal of Vocational Behavior 68*, 446–460

Spiegel, S., Grant-Pillow, H., & Higgins, E. (2004, January). How regulatory fit enhances motivational strength during goal pursuit. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 34*(1), 39–54.

Spreitzer, G.M. & Sonenshein, S. (2004). Toward the construct definition of positive deviance, *American Behavioral Scientist, 47*(6), 828-47.

Srivastava, S. (2009). Locus of Control as a Moderator for Relationship between Organisational Role Stress and Managerial Effectiveness. *Vision: The Journal of Business Perspective, 13*(4), 49-61.

Steven, H., A., Giulio, D. I., & Albert, M., (2007). Positive and negativedeviant workplace behaviors: causes, impacts, and solutions, *Corporate Governance*, 7(5), 586–598.

Storms, P. L. & Spector, P. E. (2007). Relationships of organizational frustration with reported behavioural reactions: The moderating effect of locus of control. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology, 60*(3), 227–234

Strauman, T. J. (1989). Self-discrepancies in clinical depression and social phobia: Cognitive structures that underlie emotional disorders? *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 98, 14-22.

Strauser, D. R., Ketz, K., & Keim, J. (2002). The Relationship Between Self Efficacy, Locus of Control and Work Personality, *Journal of Rehabilitation, 68*, 20-26.

Strickland, B. R. (1989). Internal-External control expectancies: From contingency to creativity, *American Psychologist, 44*, 1-12.

Taylor, S. E., Peplau, A. L. & Sears, D. O. (2006). *Social Psychology* (l2th ed.)*, Prentice Hall, New Jersey.

Thomas W. H. N., Kelly, l. S., and Lillian T. E., (2006) Locus of Control At Work: A Meta-Analysis, *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 27*, 107–118.

Thomas, W.H.N., Sorensen, K.L., & Eby, L.T. (2006). Locus of control at work: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour, 27*, 1057–1087

Tourish D, Pinnington A (2002). Transformational leadership, corporate cultism and the spirituality paradigm: An unholy trinity in the workplace? *Human Relations,* 55(2), 147-172.

Türkan, A. & Serkan, E. (2016). Teachers' Views on Organizational Deviance, Psychological Ownership and Social Innovation. *Universal Journal of Educational Research 4*(12A), 133-139.

Uddin, A., Rahman, S. & Howlader, M.H.R. (2014). Exploring the relationships among transformational leadership, deviant workplace behavior, and job performance: An Empirical Study. *ABAC Journal, 34*(1), 1-12.

Vadera, A. K., Pratt, M. G., & Mishra, P. (2013). Constructive deviance in organizations integrating and moving forward. *Journal of Management*, XX(XXXX), 1-56.

152

Van der Sluis, J., Van Praag, C.M., & Van Witteloostuijn, A. (2004), *The returns to education: A comparative study between entrepreneurs and employees*, Retrieved November 29, 2016, from http://ftp.iza.org/dp4628.pdf

Van Dyne, L., & Pierce, J. L. (2004). Psychological ownership and feelings of possession: three field studies predicting employee attitudes and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 25*(4), 439-459.

Van Dyne, L., & Pierce, J. L. (2004). Psychological ownership and feelings of possession: Three field studies predicting employee attitudes and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 25*, 439-459.

Vandewalle, D., Vandyne, L. & Kostova, T. (1995). Psychological Ownership: An Empirical Examination of Its Consequences, *Group and Organization Studies*, 20, 2, 210-226.

Vardi, Y. & Wiener, Y. (1996). Misbehavior in organizations: a motivational framework. *Organization Science, 7* (2), 151-165.

Vaughn, L. A., O'Rourke, T., Schwartz, S., Malik, J., Petkova, Z., & Trudeau, L. (2006). When two wrongs can make a right: Regulatory non fit, bias, and correction of judgments. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 42*, 654–661.

Vaughn, L., Ann, S. J. H., Zhivka, P., & Lindsay, T. (2009). This story is right on: The impact of regulatory fit on narrative engagement and persuasion." 4 Oct. 2008. *Wiley InterScience. Journals. University of Oklahoma Library,* Norman.

Wagner, S.H., Parker, C.P., & Christianson, N.D. (2003). Employees that think and act like owners: Effects of ownership beliefs and behaviors on organizational effectveness. *Personnel Psychology, 56,* 847–871

Waheeda, H. & Hafidz, M. (2012). Individual Differences as Antecedents of Counterproductive Work Behaviour. *Asian Social Science, 8*(13), 220-226.

Weihrich, H., Cannice, V. M. & Koontz, H. (2008). *Management*. New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing Company Limited. 12lh Edition.

Werbel, J., Landau, J., & DeCarlo, T. (1996). The relationship of pre-entry variables to early employment organizational commitment. *J. Person. Sell. Sales Manage., 16,* 25-36.

White, R. (1959). Motivation reconsidered: the concept of competence. Psychological Yukl, G. A. (1998). *Leadership in organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Wilson, R.A., Perry, S.J., Witt, L.A., & Griffeth, R.W. (2015). The exhausted short-timer: Leveraging autonomy to engage in production deviance. *Human Relations, 68*(11), 1693-1711.

Wood, J.A., & Winston, B.E. (2007). Development of three scales to measure leader accountability. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 28*(2), 167–185.

Yan-Hong, Y., Ying-Ying, F., Yong-Xing, G. & Yuan, L. (2014). Leadership, work stress and employee behavior, *Chinese Management Studies*, 8(1), 109 – 126.

Yildiz, B. & Yildiz, H. (2015). The Effect of Servant Leadership on Psychological Ownership: The Moderator Role of Perceived Organizational Support. *Journal of Global Strategic Management, 9*(2), 65-77

Young-Hyung; K. & Hye-Kyoung, K. (2016). The moderating roles of employees` self-efficacy and trust in leader on the relationship between ethical leadership and employees` behaviors. *Journal of Digital Convergence, 14*(3), 71-81.

Yukl, O. (1994). *Leadership in organizations* (3rd ed), Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Zhang, S., Chen, G., & Chen, G. Q. (2008). Interpersonal and collective group identities: Differential contribution to business security. Research Paper sponsored by CIBER. Retrieved on March, 8, 2010.

APPENDICES

Appendix A:

Informed Consent Form

Investigator:

My name is **James Aondoakula Igbaakaa** and I am a postgraduate student in the Department of Psychology, Benue State University, Makurdi. I am carrying out a study on "**Influence of psychological ownership, locus of control and leadership styles on workplace deviant behaviour among employees of BIRS**". I seek your consent to fill the questionnaire to enable me gather the necessary data to complete the study. This will take approximately 20 mins of your time. All information will be kept confidential. Your name will not appear anywhere and no one except me will know about your specific answers.

_____

Name of investigator

_____   _____

Signature of investigator   Date

Participant

All of my questions and concerns about this study have been addressed. I choose, voluntarily, to participate in this research project. I certify that I am at least 18 years of age

_____

Name of participant

_____   _____

Signature of participant   Date

Appendix B:

Research Questionnaire

SECTION A: BIODATA

Age:_____

Sex: Male [ ]   Female [ ]

Marital status: Single [ ] Married [ ] Separated [ ] Divorced [ ] Widowed [ ]

Religion: Christianity [ ]   Islam [ ]   Others

Cadre: Junior [ ]   Senior [ ]

Department:_____

Section B: Organizational and Interpersonal Deviance Scale

INSTRUCTIONS: Please indicate, using the following scale, how often you have engaged in each of the following behaviors in the past five months.

KEY: 1=never, 2=once, 3=a few times, 4=several times, 5=monthly, 6=weekly, 7=daily

In the past five months, how often have you……?

S/N	Organisational Deviance Items	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	Taken property from work without permission							
2	Spent too much time fantasizing or daydreaming instead of working							
3	Falsified a receipt to get reimbursed for more money than they spent on business expenses							
4	Taken an additional or longer break than is acceptable at your workplace							
5	Come in late to work without permission							
6	Littered the work environment							
7	Neglected to follow your boss' instruments							
8	Intentionally worked slower than you could have worked							
9	Discussed confidential company information with an unauthorized person							
10	Used an illegal drug or consumed alcohol on the job							
11	Put little effort into your work							
12	Dragged out your work in order to get overtime							
	Interpersonal Deviance							
13	Made fun of a co-worker at work							
14	Said something hurtful to a co-worker at work							
15	Made ethnic, religious, or racial remarks at work							
16	Cursed at a worker at work							
17	Played a mean prank on a co-worker at work							
18	Acted rudely toward a coworker at work							
19	Publicly embarrassed a coworker at work							

Section C: Psychological Ownership Questionnaire (POQ)

Instructions: Below are statements that describe how you may think about yourself right now. Use the following scales to indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement.

KEY: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Undecided, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree

S/N	Item	1	2	3	4	5
1	I feel I need to protect my ideas from being used by others in my organization					
2	I feel that people I work with in my organization should not invade my workspace					
3	I feel I need to protect my property from being used by others in this organization					
4	I feel I have to tell people in my organization to 'back off' from projects that are mine					
5	I am confident in my ability to contribute to my organization's success					
6	I am confident I can make a positive difference in this organization					
7	I am confident setting high performance goals in my organization					
8	I would challenge anyone in my organization if I thought something was done wrong					
9	I would not hesitate to tell my organization if I saw something that was done wrong					
10	I would challenge the direction of my organization to assure it's correct					
11	I feel I belong in this organization					
12	This place is home for me					
13	I am totally comfortable being in this organization					
14	I feel this organization's success is my success					
15	I feel being a member in this organization helps define who I am					
16	I feel the need to defend my organization when it is criticized					

Section D: Work Locus of Control Scale

Instruction: The following statements concern your beliefs about jobs in general. They do not refer only to your present job. On a scale of 1 – 6, indicate your degree of agreement or disagreement with each of the statement. The numbers stand for:
KEY: 1=Disagree very much, 2=Disagree moderately, 3=Disagree slightly, 4=Agree slightly, 5=Agree moderately, 6=Agree very much

S/N	Item	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	A job is what you make of it.						
2	On most jobs, people can pretty much accomplish whatever they set out to accomplish						
3	If you know what you want out of a job, you can find a job that gives it to you						
4	If employees are unhappy with a decision made by their boss, they should do something about it						
5	Getting the job you want is mostly a matter of luck						
6	Making money is primarily a matter of good fortune						
7	Most people are capable of doing their jobs well if they make the effort						
8	In order to get a really good job, you need to have family members or friends in high places						
9	Promotions are usually a matter of good fortune						
10	When it comes to landing a really good job, who you know is more important than what you know						
11	Promotions are given to employees who perform well on the job						
12	To make a lot of money you have to know the right people						
13	It takes a lot of luck to be an outstanding employee on most jobs						
14	People who perform their jobs well generally get rewarded						
15	Most employees have more influence on their supervisors than they think they do						
16	The main difference between people who make a lot of money and people who make a little money is luck						

Section E: Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

Instructions: This questionnaire provides a description of different leadership styles.

Twenty- one descriptive statements are listed below. Think of your boss or leader in the

office and judge how frequently each statement fits the leader you are describing.

KEY: 0 = Not at all

1 = Once in a while

2 = Sometimes

3 = Fairly often

4 = Frequently, if not always

S/N	Item	0	1	2	3	4
1	Provides me with assistance in exchange for my efforts					
2	Re-examines critical assumptions to questions whether they are appropriate					
3	Fails to interfere until problems become serious					
4	Focuses attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions and deviations from standards					
5	Avoids getting involved when important issues arise					
6	Talks about his/her most important values and beliefs					
7	Is absent when needed					
8	Seeks differing perspectives when solving problems					
9	Talks optimistically about the future					
10	Instills pride in me for being associated with him/her					
11	Discuss in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets					
12	Waits for things to go wrong before taking action					
13	Talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished					
14	Specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose					
15	Spends time teaching and coaching					
16	Makes clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved					
17	Shows that he/she is a firm believer in "if it ain't broke, don't fix it"					
18	Goes beyond self-interest for the good of the group					
19	Treats me as an individual rather than just as a member of a group					
20	Demonstrates that problems must become chronic before he/she takes action					
21	Acts in ways that build my respect					

22	Concentrates his/her full attention dealing with mistakes, complaints and failures					
23	Considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions					
24	Keeps track of all mistakes					
25	Display a sense of power and confidence					
26	Articulates a compelling vision of the future					
27	Directs my attention towards failures to meet standards					
28	Avoids making decisions					
29	Considers me as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others					
30	Gets me to look at problems from many different angles					
31	Helps me to develop my strengths					
32	Suggests new ways of looking at how to complete assignments					
33	Delays responding to urgent questions					
34	Emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission					
35	Expresses satisfaction when I meet expectations					
36	Expresses confidence that goals will be achieved					
37	Is effective in meeting my job-related needs					
38	Uses methods of leadership that are satisfying					
39	Gets me to do more than I expected to do					
40	Is effective in representing me to higher authority					
41	Works with me in a satisfactory way					
42	Heightens my desire to succeed					
43	Is effective in meeting organisational requirements					
44	Increases my willingness to try harder					
45	Leads a group that is effective					

Appendix C:

BIRS Offices Across the 23 LGAs of Benue State

S/N	Stations	Address
1	Corporate Head Office	Plot 121b Gboko Road, Makurdi
2	Head Office Annex	Budget Office Floor, Benue State Secretariat, Makurdi
3	Zonal Tax office, Wadata, makurdi	#73 Benue Crescent wadata, Makurdi
4	Zonal Tax office Gboko	Sub-treasury premises, Beside Federal Prisons, Gboko Central, Gboko
5	Zonal Tax office Otukpo	Makurdi road by Sub-treasury premises, Otukpo
6	Zonal Tax office , Katsina-Ala	Opposite NKST Central church, Police Station Road, Katsina-Ala
7	Area Tax office, Ado	Ado Local Govt. Secretariat premises, Igumale
8	Area Tax office, Agatu	Opposite Agatu local Govt. secretariat, Obagaji
9	Area Tax office, Apa	Otukpa House, Agatu Road, Ogbokpo
10	Area Tax office, Buruku	Ugba Road, Buruku Market Square, Buruku
11	Area Tax office, Central Ward,Makurdi	Old finance central Ward Makurdi
12	Area Tax office, Wailomayo	High Level Roundabout by High level Motor park, Makurdi
13	Area Tax office, Wadata	No. 73, Benue Crescent, Wadata Makurdi
14	Area Tax office, North Bank	Old Lafia Road, V 10 testing ground , North Bank, Makurdi
15	Area Tax office, Modern Market	No.16 Sylvester Utulu Street off modern Market Road makurdi
16	Area Tax office, Terwase Agbadu	No. 6, Joe Shashie street, Terwase Agbadu Road, Makurdi

17	MLA New Taxi Park Wurukum	New Taxi Park, New bridge roundabout, wurukum, Market.
18	Area Tax office, Gboko	Subtreasury premises Beside Federal Prisons, Gboko Central, Gboko
19	Area Tax office, Adekaa	No. 15, captain Downes Road, Adekaa, Gboko
20	Area Tax office, Mkar	Gboko NKST Hospital Road, Mkar
21	MLA BCC Yandev-Tse-kucha	Dangote Cement factory, Gboko Road, Tse-Kucha
22	Area Tax office, Gbajimba-Guma	Opposite Gbajimba market, Gbajimba, Guma LGA
23	Area Tax office, Gwer –Aliade	The subtreasury , Aliade-makurdi Road, Aliade
24	Area Tax office, Gwer West – Naka	Beside Naka market, Adoka Road, Naka, Gwer West LGA
25	Area Tax office, Katsina-Ala	The Sub treasury, police station Road, Katsina-Ala
26	Area Tax office, Konshisha-Tse Agberagba	Old NRC Secretariat, Tse-Agberagba Ogoja Road, Konshisha
27	Area Tax office, kwande-Adikpo	The subtreasury, Adikpo- Ikyogen road.
28	Area Tax office, Logo-Ugba	Ugba Roundabout, Zaki-Biam Road, Ugba
29	Area Tax office, Obi	Otukpo road Obarike/to Obi LGA
30	Area Tax office, Ogbadibo	Opposite Obolo park Enugu road, Otukpa
31	Area Tax office, Ohimini	Ohimini Local Govt. secretariat premises, Idekpa
32	Area Tax office, Oju	Subtreasury premises, by LGA secretariat Oju
33	Area Tax office, Okpoga	Okpokwu LGA road, by sub-treasury Okpoga
34	Area Tax office, Otukpo	Makurdi road by Sub-treasury Opposite ministry of works & transport Otukpo
35	Area Tax office, Tarka	Zongu, along Gboko road, Wannune Tarka LGA

36	Area Tax office, Ukum-Zaki-Biam	NURTW secretariat, K/Ala Road Zaki-Biam
37	Area Tax office, Ushongu Town	Along Katsina-Ala-Adikpo road Ushongu Town
38	Area Tax office, Lessel	Km 3 Gboko road, Lessel Ushongo LGA
39	Area Tax office, Vandeikya	The sub-treasury Koti-yough road Vandeikya
40	Area Tax office, Adoka	Udabi-Adoka town, Adoka, Otukpo LGA
41	Area Tax office, Onyagede	Beside Methodist Church, Onyagede Ohimini LGA
42	MLA corporate Headquarters	Opposite BSU Gboko Road makurdi
43	Centre Cashier Corporate Headquarters	Opposite BSU Gboko Road makurdi
44	MLA Central Ward	Kashim Ibrahim road, old Finance, sub-treasury, mkd
45	Area Tax office, Ugbokolo	Opposite Unity Bank, Ugbokolo
46	Area Tax office, Sigwa House	Along new Otukpo road, opposite 1st Bank Makkurdi

Source: Retrieved from: http://www.birs.gov.ng/tax-offices