A RESEARCH ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PSYCHOLOGICAL OWNERSHIP AND WORKAHOLISM

PSİKOLOJİK SAHİPLENME VE İŞKOLİKLİK ARASINDAKİ İLİŞKİYE YÖNELİK BİR ARAŞTIRMA

Arş. Gör. Deniz DİRİK[1]
İnan ERYILMAZ[2]

──────── ABSTRACT ────────

The purpose of this study is to determine the causal relationship between psychological ownership and employee workaholism behavior. The expected benefit from this study will be to demonstrate that workaholism as a cognitive-behavioral could be accounted for psychological ownership feelings targeted towards one's work. The cultural context of Turkish organizational setting assumed to contribute to the development of overt psychological ownership feelings towards job distinct correlations among workaholism and psychological ownership subscales are investigated with a view to exploring managerial implications of those relationships on a sample of teachers. To our knowledge, this study is the first attempt to analyze the aforementioned relationship in light of the theoretical discussions and recommendations. According to the results of our analyses, there are significant correlations between work perfectionism and territoriality, work addiction and accountability, as well as between unpleasantness and territoriality. Unpleasantness and work perfectionism are significantly predicted by territoriality psychological ownership.

Keywords: Workaholism, Psychological Ownership, Prevention-Promotion, Turkey, Teachers

Jel codes: M10, M54, L20

ÖZ

Bu çalışmanın amacı, çalışanların psikolojik sahiplenme tutumları ile işkoliklik davranışları arasındaki nedensel ilişkileri ortaya koymaktır. Çalışmanın, bilişsel-davranışsal bir yapı olarak işkolikliğin, kişinin işine yönelttiği psikolojik sahiplenme tutumu ile açıklanabileceğini ampirik olarak kanıtlaması gerekçesiyle literatüre katkıda bulunması beklenmektedir. Türkiye'deki örgütsel-kültürel bağlamın işe yönelik psikolojik sahiplenme tutumunun gelişmesine büyük ölçüde katkıda bulunacağı varsayımı altında, işkoliklik ve psikolojik saihplenme alt boyutları arasındaki farklılaşan ilişkiler, öğretmenlerden oluşan bir örneklem üzerinde ve yönetsel çıkarımlar perspektifinden araştırılmıştır. Çalışmanın bulgularına göre iş mükemmeliyetçiliği ve bölgecilik arasında, işe bağımlılık ve hesap verebilirlik arasında ve son olarak memnuniyetsizlik ile bölgecilik arasında anlamlı ilişkiler tespit edilmiştir. Bölgecilik temelli psikolojik sahiplenmenin, memnuniyetsizlik ve iş mükemmeliyetçiliği türü işkoliklik davranışlarının yordayıcısı olduğu bulgulanmıştır.

Anahtar kelimeler: İşkoliklik, Psikolojik Sahiplenme, Türkiye, Kaçınmacı-Yönelimci, Öğretmenler

Jel Kodları: M10, M54, L20

1   Manisa Celal Bayar University, deniz.ispirli@cbu.edu.tr
2   Manisa Celal Bayar University, inaneryilmaz@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

According to EuroStat 2013 Labor Force statistics, a full-time employed Turkish employee works an average of 52 hours per week, above the EU average of 41.5 hours/week. International Labor Organization (2005) records the weekly normal hour limit for Turkey at 52-hour per week. Overall, people in Turkey work 1855 hours a year, more than the OECD average of 1765 hours. More specifically, almost 43% of employees work for very long hours, which is much higher than the OECD average of 9%, with 47% of men working very long hours compared with 33% for women. Working for long hours and the subsequent effects on individuals' lives are no less threatening for Turkish people than the rest of the world. Given that workaholism has a cognitive element beyond the number of hours worked, the complex nature of workaholism is attempted to be measured by various indicators incorporated into measurement instruments. Psychological ownership of one's job as a manifestation of strong attachment and identification goes beyond formal ownership and implies various outcomes in terms of organizational behavior. Psychological ownership as an organizational attitude could be associated with employee workaholic behavior as well. In light of these considerations, this study attempts to determine workaholism levels of select Turkish employees with a view to revealing the source of workaholism in terms of psychological ownership. Moreover, it is assumed that the two forms of psychological ownership feelings- promotion or prevention- will be distinctly related to five different workaholism dimensions as measured by WAQ (Aziz, Ulrich, Wuensch & Swords, 2013; Gülova, İspirli & Eryılmaz, 2014).

2. PSYCHOLOGICAL OWNERSHİP[i]

Psychological ownership is defined as an overall feeling of possession and attachment targeted at various objects within the organization (Pierce, O'Driscoll & Coghlan, 2004; Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004; Vandewalle, Van Dyne & Kostova, 1995). In their seminal work on psychological ownership Pierce, Kostova and Dirks (2003) note that it is a state of mind implying non-formal and non-legal ownership and the target of ownership could be tangible or intangible in essence with a conceptual core based on a sense of possession.

The distinctiveness of psychological ownership from related constructs like commitment, satisfaction, and involvement is communicated through the basic question raised by each concept respectively (Sieger, Bernhard & Frey, 2011):

> Psychological ownership asks, ''How much do I feel this organization is mine'' (Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004); organizational commitment asks, ''Why should I maintain my membership in this organization'' (cp. Meyer & Allen, 1997; Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004); organizational identification asks, ''Who am I'' (Dutton et al., 1994); and job involvement asks, ''How important is the job and job performance to my self image?'' (Lawler & Hall, 1970).

It is now generally acknowledged in the relevant literature that there are three routes to psychological ownership which explain what factors affect the development of psychological ownership feelings, namely controlling the target, intimately knowing the target, and investing the self into the target (Pierce et al., 2003). The objects over which individual control is established tend to be more deeply experienced in terms of ownership (Fraser & Kemp, 2012; Pierce, Kostova & Dirks, 2001; Csikszenthmihalyi & Rochberg-Halton, 1981) and *the more intimate knowledge an individual has over the object, the deeper the relation between the self and the object, and the further the fusion between the self and the target"* (Heino & Jussila, 2010). Moreover, the targets with the strongest

potential to be the objects of psychological ownership (the so-called psychologically proximal vs. distal targets) are those that fall within the controllable area of the individual, those that are most intimately known and recognized and those into which the individual self is most invested (Pierce et al., 2003). In addition to three direct routes to the emergence of psychological ownership, there are some other indirect routes such as job design, organization structure, organizational processes, technology, participative decision making, and leadership.

2.1. Dimensions of Psychological Ownership

Researchers identified various dimensions of psychological ownership that are basically categorized under two independent forms borrowed from the regulatory focus theory (Higgins, 1997), which are promotion and prevention. The hedonic principle that points to the human motivation as generally acknowledged within psychology literature for approaching pleasure and avoiding pain lays the groundwork for Higgins' study on regulatory focus (Brockner & Higgins, 2001; Crowe & Higgins, 1997). Regulatory focus theory states that desired-end-states could be attained by both approach and avoidance strategies and there are different ways of approaching different types of desired-ends, that is equifinality (Shah, Higgins & Friedman, 1998). The difference between two distinct self-regulation foci of promotion versus prevention stems from the varying individual needs sought to be satisfied and goals pursued, as well as the psychological situation characterizing an individual at a specific time and place. These two distinct regulatory orientations result in varying consequences in terms of behavioral outcomes and emotions. Needs related to growth and development are more prominent for promotive individuals; safety and security stand out for those with prevention focus. Aspiring to an ideal self-identity is more likely for a promotion-focused individual; complying with a normative image of identity is more likely for a prevention-focused individual. People with promotion self-regulation focus are more sensitive to presence and absence of positive outcomes and they are more likely to adopt approach strategy for achieving desired-ends whereas those with prevention self-regulation focus are more sensitive to presence/absence of negative outcomes and more likely to adopt avoidance strategies. Promotion focused individuals are expected to persevere in the face of hardships whereas prevention focused individuals are expected to give up more easily. Individuals operating within the promotion motive are inclined to be more concerned with accomplishments and achievements whereas those operating within the prevention motive are more concerned about obligations and musts and tend to be more conservative and risk-averse. As for the motivational source behind their goal-attainment strategies, promotion-focused individuals try to reach their aspired goals whereas prevention-focused individuals seek to fulfill their obligations and evade punishments or losses (Higgins, 1997).

In terms of psychological ownership theory, promotion and prevention foci have been proposed to be related with different employee reactions. Individuals with promotive psychological ownership feelings consider the improvements to the organization as self-fulfilling and regard change and creativity as upholding values for both their self-identities and the organization and thus, they are more likely to share information with their colleagues whereas those with preventative psychological ownership tend to avoid information sharing due to conservative reservations about change and the desire for having things as they are (Peng, 2013; Jeswani & Dave, 2012; Avey, Avolio, Crossley & Luthans, 2009). Griffith (as cited in Ward, 2013) notes that an overall prevention orientation and protectiveness might render a company susceptible to entropy as it becomes unable to adapt to the changing environment in the course of time.

Promotion orientated dimensions of psychological ownership are comprised of self-efficacy, self-identity, accountability and a sense of belongingness. Prevention orientation is made up of the territoriality dimension.

Self-efficacy: The sense of efficacy as a dimension of psychological ownership is about the personal intention to do a task and owning the responsibility to achieve success (Avey et al., 2009). The research suggests that exercising more control and authority, and investing more time and labor for a target and the capacity to produce effects in one's environment are accompanied by the development of a greater bulk of ownership feelings (Fraser & Kemp, 2012; Pierce et al., 2001; Furby, 1980). In whatever type of the concept, whether physical or psychological and primary or secondary, control positively relates to psychological ownership and this latter could be explained by feelings and exercise of control over a target.

Accountability: Accountability is the sense of responsibility and obligation to be accountable in terms of the ownership target and to hold the others accountable on behalf of the owned object (Avey et al., 2009). Accountability is a dimension of psychological ownership due to which individuals with high psychological ownership feelings expect others to be able to account for their impacts on the ownership target.

Sense of Belongingness: Sense of belongingness is about feeling "at home" with the target of ownership as Bauman (as cited in Özler, Yılmaz & Özler, 2008) noted that humankind has always been in need of inhabiting a peaceful and risk-free, familiar and secure, controllable and defendable place. Individuals and groups are governed by an instinctual tendency to assert possession over physical space (Porteous, 1976). Both at micro-personal and macro-communal levels, there is a need for exercising control within a specified territory by which identity is established, security is guaranteed and stimulation is ensured. By personalizing and defending one's surroundings, the requirements for identity, security and stimulation are satisfied and the best place to realize these territorial satisfactions is the home.

Self-identity: A sense of self develops as a result of interactions between one's actions in personal influence sphere and the outcomes of these actions regarding a target object (Furby, 1980). This sense of the self is inevitably linked with what we might call ours, i.e. our possessions that is, the self is defined through possessions and ownership. Employees use ownership to define and distinguish themselves and perpetuate the continuity of their self-identities though time. Self-identity is thus about identifying with the target of ownership. Identifying with one's organization by way of psychologically owning the parts of it like a work team create a sense of meaningfulness and connectedness for individuals (Avey et al., 2009; Buchem, 2012).

Territoriality: Territoriality as a research topic has been introduced into organization studies and intertwined with the highly related concept of psychological ownership by Brown, Lawrence and Robinson (2005). Territoriality implies possessive feelings over physical spaces, ideas, roles, and relationships within the organizational context (Brown et al., 2005; Brown & Robinson, 2011). These researchers define territoriality as *"an individual's behavioral expression of his or her feelings of ownership toward a physical or social object"* (p.578). As different from psychological ownership which is a psychological state implying possessiveness for and attachment to some objects, territoriality is a social behavioral concept and refers to actions and behaviors often resulting from a feeling of psychological ownership.

Territoriality in the traditional sense has positive implications for organizational well-being in that it boosts employee commitment and hinders conflict whereas on the negative side it has the potential to lead to inter- and intra-individual problems. Territoriality feelings are greatly challenged by external threats and those external threats lead to emergence of three territorial strategies in the form of "*increasing the defence of existing territorial claims; narrowing the field by shifting or shrinking territorial boundaries to a more defensible position; and renouncing one's territorial claims*" (Brower, 1980). The risk of losing one's territory may lead to deviant behaviors such as politicking and lack of transparency, cooperation, and sharing due to defensive territoriality (Heino & Jussila, 2010). Claiming psychological ownership over an object as one's own property is an *"assertion of territoriality through ownership"* and it is an attempt on the part of the individual to extract from the target the given qualities ascribed to it by the society (Pierce et al., 2003). The objects over which an individual develops psychological ownership are located within the safe and secure self-control territory and in that realm protection and withdrawal are most likely to occur, as a consequence of which the individual rejects sharing and interaction with third parties and reacts to infringement more fiercely (Brown & Robinson, 2011). As Ward (2013) puts it; *"A prevention focus... is driven by territoriality, a desire to be in control, and an antipathy to sharing"* (p. 11).

3. WORKAHOLISM

Despite the incontestable disagreement and divergent arguments on its conceptualization (*i.e.* an addiction, a syndrome, a behavioral pattern, a set of attitudes regarding work, the number of hours spent at work or working) (Aziz & Zickar, 2006; McMillan & O'Driscoll, 2006; Schaufeli, Taris & Bakker, 2006; Spence & Robbins, 1992), and contextualization (i.e. organizational setting, psychology research, psychosocial environment, labor statistics) as well as measurement (Schaufeli et al., 2006; Robinson, 1999; Spence & Robbins, 1992), workaholism has been defined as an "*unforced addiction to incessant work activity*" (Golden, 2009), *"a deleterious compulsion to work"* (Oates, 1971), *"working to the exclusion of other life activities"* (Clark, Lelchook & Taylor, 2010; Ng, Sorenson & Feldman, 2007; Scott, Moore & Miceli, 1997; Porter, 1996), *"being consumed with thoughts and feelings about working"* (Clark et al., 2010; Ng et al., 2007; Scott et al., 1997; Porter, 1996; Spence & Robbins, 1992), and *"going above one's assigned roles/duties at work because of internal, rather than external (e.g., financial situation) factors"* (Clark et al., 2010; Schaufeli, Taris & Van Rhenen, 2008; Mudrack, 2004). In line with these definitions, workaholism is purported to occur in circumstances where the amount of time devoted to work-oriented activities exceeds the requisite level in a perpetual pattern despite the lack of any exigency or an extrinsic force to that end (Snir, Harpaz & Burke, 2006; Machlowitz, 1980). The voluntariness of the drive towards work allegedly stems from two incompatible sources, which are either being pulled to work via the pleasure produced per se, or being pushed to work due to an underlying obsession (Taris, Schaufeli & Shimazu, 2010). In the extant literature on workaholism, one rare shared argument is that the phenomenon is defined by two core characteristics, which are working excessively and working compulsively (Buelens & Poelmans, 2004; Schaufeli et al., 2006). Working excessively appears in almost all conceptualizations with a view to for example work involvement or a tendency to work anytime at any place (McMillan & O'Driscoll, 2006; Spence & Robbins, 1992). Although working for long hours might be rooted in a variety of other reasons rather than necessarily being addicted to work (Van den Broeck, Schreurs, De Witte, Vansteenkiste, Germeys & Schaufeli, 2011; Schaufeli et al., 2006) and thus a workaholic, it is embedded in the very definition itself that workaholics work for long

hours. Sources of motivation to work for individuals could be in the form of both extrinsic and intrinsic rewards such as economic benefits or career advancement (Golden, 2009; Ellingsen & Johannesson, 2007; Wolfe, 1997). That is why workaholism is defined by yet another characteristic, which is an inner compulsion to work. Working compulsively denotes an unbridled commitment to work and a personal indisposition to dispense with work-related activities (Robinson, 1999; Spence & Robbins, 1992). As the authors put it unanimously, whereas the first characteristic of working excessively is behavioral, this latter characteristic of working compulsively is highly cognitive in nature (Schaufeli, Bakker, Van der Heijden & Prins, 2009). These two features of workaholism have been associated with diverse individual well-being and work outcomes. Working excessively might well be positively correlated with well-being indicators along with some negative correlates whereas working compulsively is mostly associated with ill-being such as exhaustion and burnout (Schaufeli, Kubota & Kawakami, 2012; Shimazu, Demerouti, Bakker, Shimada & Kawakami, 2011; Van den Broeck et al., 2011).

Although the term workaholism presupposed a negative interconnectivity between excessive and prolonged periods of work and the individual's well-being (Bakker, Demerouti & Burke, 2009; Aziz & Zickar, 2006; Killinger, 1991; Schaef & Fassel, 1988) at the initial stage of its coinage and definition, subsequent researchers associated workaholism with positive aspects such as enjoyment and additional benefits (Fujimoto, 2014; Schaufeli et al., 2004)[3]. The basic reasoning for this negative association is the mutual exclusivity of work and non-work roles, which means that the time and energy spent for work cannot be possibly allocated to other spheres of life such as family or leisure (Schaufeli et al., 2009).

Working excessively has become an honored practice all over the world and is well-appreciated by employees and the society rather than reckoned with only negative consequences (Porter, 1996). Workaholism positively correlates with work hours at least to some extent (McMillan & O'Driscoll, 2006). There are structural, economic, social and behavioral factors suggested to be influential in explaining contemporary longer work hours, rather than just attributing them to workaholism as an individual disposition. In his measurement of workaholism, Mosier (1983) categorize individuals who work at least 50 hours per week as "workaholics" (Brady, Vodanovich & Rotunda, 2008). However, Peiperl & Jones (2001) caution against the inadequacy and misleadingness of conceptualizing workaholism by focusing solely on the number of hours spent at work, as high effort expenditure at work might well be accounted for by different causes (Van Beek, Taris & Schaufeli, 2011) and the addictive nature of workaholism is herein neglected (Schaufeli et al., 2009). Yet, others (i.e. Brett & Stroh, 2003) regard similar ill-being indicators such as damage to psychological and physical health, poor productivity, and distressed family and social relationships as risks associated with extreme work hours. Porter (1996) noted that the most common behavior attached to any discussion of workaholism is long hours worked. The long working hours or excessive working dimensions of any measurement instrument of workaholism justify the construct to be at least partially defined in terms of the hours worked.

Although they did not refer to extreme work hours (over 35 hours/week based on The US Department of Labor standard for full time work as of 1997) and the associated individual outcomes as workaholism and consequences, Breth & Stroh (2003) tested four hypotheses to explain the motivations for extreme work hours on a sample of US managers with

---

[3]   This initial negativity of the concept is reflected by the coinage of two new words in Japan; karoshi (death due to overwork) and karo-jisato (suicide due to work overload) (Kanai, 2006, as cited in Van den Broeck et.al, 2011).

families, i.e. *work–leisure trade-off, social contagion, family stress, and rewards of work*, which are reminiscent of workaholism typologies and dimensions. Of these, the rewards of work hypothesis, which implies involvement in work and is a psychological incentive in the form of achievement and self-esteem, provided the best explanation for male managers' hours, whereas for female managers, a more complicated combination of work-leisure trade-off, social contagion and family stress was found to be influential.

4. CULTURAL CONTEXT AND RELEVANCE

Psychological ownership within the organizational context is mostly studied from an individual perspective (Pierce & Jussila, 2010). As opposed to and in a way to provide an extension to this approach, Pierce and Jussila (2010) offer a collective psychological ownership construct which carries the subject of the ownership from an "I" and "me" to a "we" and "us" by conveying the concept to a *group-level psychological state* which refers to a socially constructed shared mental model (Druskat & Pescosolido, 2002) among the members of an organization; *"A shared mental model of psychological ownership would involve the collective belief that all members were part owners, and that team actions and outcomes were under the team's authority and responsibility, i.e. this is 'our' team"* (p.291).

The genesis of the collective sense of ownership, underlying motives, the targets of collective psychological ownership and the conditions under which it develops are among the questions raised by researchers (Pierce & Jussila, 2010).The concept of collective psychological ownership is differentiated from similar notions such as group identity and group-identification via the question asked in either case, namely "who are we?" for group identity versus "what do we feel is ours?" for collective psychological ownership as well as by diverging paths of motivation, theoretical basis, target objects, and due rights and responsibilities.

As the pioneering researchers of social identity approach within the organizational context, Ashforth and Mael (1989) note that self-defining and self-referencing oneself as an organizational member underlies the perceived success and failure feelings associated with the work outcomes within the organization. As the socially and organizationally-identified individual's behavior is dominated more by organizational membership than by individual identity, that person is more susceptible to engage in extra-role behavior, lower absenteeism and higher work performance to the benefit of the organization and experience higher job and organizational satisfaction, higher motivation and organizational loyalty and physical-emotional well-being to the benefit of the individual self and organizational identification negatively relates to individuals' intent to leave the organization (Jones & Volpe, 2010; Riketta, 2005; Riketta & Van Dick, 2005; Adler & Adler, 1988; O'Reily & Chatman, 1986).

Van Dyne and Pierce (2004) suggested that future research into the dynamics of psychological ownership should be carried out in a different cultural setting than USA where ownership is defined by different legal and social understandings and conceptualizations. This study in the non-European and non-American context of Turkey, categorized as a collectivist country, is a response to this call where the effects and consequences of psychological ownership are expected to be largely dissimilar to those to be displayed in an individual-oriented setting. The cultural-collectivistic organizational setting is assumed to considerably contribute to the emergence of workaholism and

workaholics tendencies as well as development of group level collective psychological ownership.

5. RESEARCH AND DATA

The research population is comprised of high school teachers working in Kırkağaç District of Manisa Province. We adopted this approach departing from the fact that most studies on workaholism have been conducted on a sample of white collar workers. Each individual in the sample population was targeted via convenience sampling method. A total of 126 teachers were contacted by way of a questionnaire that consists of demographic questions and two other scales to measure workaholism and psychological ownership levels. The data analyses were conducted on 104 complete questionnaire forms via IBM SPSS 22.0 statistical analysis software. The questionnaire consists of three main sections. The first section includes demographic variables of gender, age, education and experience. The second section includes the 16-item psychological ownership questionnaire, which consisted originally of 5 dimensions with internal reliabilities for the components as follows: self-efficacy α = ,90, accountability α = ,81, sense of belongingness α = 0,92, self-identity α = 0,73, and territoriality α = 0,84 (Avey et al., 2009). The first Turkish study using the adapted items of the scale revealed 4 factors with identity and belonging dimensions merging to form one single factor (İspirli, 2014, cronbach's alpha: 0,88). The current study adopts the factorial structure of the latter four-dimensional psychological ownership scale. The factor structure of the scale was determined by confirmatory factor analysis. KMO measure of sampling adequacy for psychological ownership scale is 0,84 and four subscales explain the 71,60 % of the total variance.

The third section of the questionnaire form includes 29-item workaholism scale developed by Aziz et al. (2013, α = ,93) and adapted into Turkish by Gülova et al. (2013; α = ,81). WAQ consists of 5 distinct subscales as follows; work life conflict 28, 24, 29, 26, 25, 23, 14, 27, 6, 12; work perfectionism, 19, 20, 22, 21, 18; work addiction 8, 11, 13, 7, 9; unpleasantness 17, 15, 16, 1; and withdrawal symptoms 3, 2, 4, 5. The factorial structure of the scale was determined by confirmatory factor analysis. KMO measure of sampling adequacy for psychological ownership scale is 0,69 and five subscales explain the 60,07 % of the total variance.

Respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with a given statement on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1: totally agree to 5: totally disagree.

5.1. Hypotheses and Findings

As is evident in Table 1, 32, 6% of the respondents are women and 67, 4% are men. 25, 6% of the respondents are aged between 24-39, 37,2% are between 30-35, 23,3% are between 36-41, and 14% are 42 years old and above. Almost all are university graduates (94, 2%). As for experience, the frequencies are as follows; 23, 3% have 1-5 years of experience, 34, 9% have 6-10, 24, 4% have 11-25, 11, 6% have 16-20, and finally, 5, 8% have 21 and more years of experience.

Table 1: Demographic Findings

		N	%
Gender	Woman	28	32,6
	Man	58	67,4
Age	24-29	22	25,6
	30-35	32	37,2
	36-41	20	23,3
	42 +	12	14
Education	College	1	1,2
	University	81	94,2
	Master's Degree	4	4,7
Experience	1-5	20	23,3
	6-10	30	34,9
	11-15	21	24,4
	16-20	10	11,6
	21+	5	5,8

To determine the relationships among workaholism and psychological ownership, two main hypotheses were constructed and the correlation analysis was conducted to test the.

H1: There is a positive causal relationship between workaholism and psychological ownership.

H1a: There is a positive relationship between work-life conflict and psychological ownership dimensions.

H1b: There is a positive relationship between work perfectionism and psychological ownership dimensions.

H1c: There is a positive relationship between work addiction and psychological ownership dimensions.

H1d: There is a positive relationship between unpleasantness and psychological ownership dimensions.

H1e: There is a positive relationship between withdrawal symptoms and psychological ownership dimensions.

H2: The psychological ownership levels of the respondents affect their degree of workaholism. Specifically, the higher the level of PO is, the more workaholic the respondent is.

The relationships among workaholism and psychological ownership subscales and the appertaining Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients are seen in Table 2.

Table 2: The Relationships among Workaholism and Psychological Ownership
Subscales and Cronbach's Alpha Coefficients

	Mean	Ss.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1.**Work-Life Conflict**	2,48	0,69	(,832)								
2.**Work Perfectionism**	3,05	0,74	,508**	(,781)							
3. Work Addiction	3,40	1,00	,277**	,245**	(,709)						
4. Unpleasantness	2,65	0,90	,414**	,679**	,227**	(,735)					
5.**Withdrawal Symptoms**	3,47	0,86	,209	-,080	,049	-,202	(,778)				
6.Identity **and Belongingness**	4,03	0,81	,007	,142	,181	,019	,066	(,882)			
7. Territoriality	2,75	1,03	,087	,395**	,048	,373**	-,127	,230**	(,733)		
8. Self-efficacy	4,21	0,90	,100	,033	,098	-,098	,165	,607**	-,001	(,916)	
9. Accountability	4,14	0,82	,151	,161	,247**	-,003	,110	,475**	,095	,662**	(,815)

*p<0,05, **p<0,01

Correlation analysis revealed significant relationships only between work perfectionism and territoriality, work addiction and accountability, and finally unpleasantness and territoriality (p<0,01). According to these correlations H1b, H1c and H1d are confirmed, which suggests that H1 is partly accepted.

To test the causal relationships and effect, regression analysis was conducted with psychological ownership as independent and workaholism as dependent variables, only in terms of the dimensions that were found to be correlated in correlation analysis.

Table 3: Regression Analysis: Work Perfectionism

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	Beta	t	p	F	Model (p)	R	R2
Work perfectionism	Constant		4,091	,000	4,362	,003	,421	,177
	Identity-belonging	,038	,282	,779				
	Territoriality	,370	3,495	**,001**				
	Self efficacy	-,110	-,715	,476				
	Accountability	,181	1,328	,188				

p<,05

The regression analysis featuring work perfectionism as dependent variable and psychological ownership subscales as independent variables was found to be significant (p<,05). According to the regression model in Table 3, workaholic tendencies in terms of work perfectionism increase along with territoriality psychological ownership feelings.

Table 4: Regression Analysis: Work Addiction

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	Beta	t	p	F	Model (p)	R	R2
Work addiction	Constant		3,060	,003	1,877	,122	,291	,085
	Identity-belonging	,164	1,165	,247				
	Territoriality	-,019	-,167	,868				
	Self efficacy	,-205	-1,269	,208				
	Accountability	,308	2,142	**,035**				

p<,05

The regression analysis featuring work addiction as dependent and psychological ownership subscales as independent variables was found to be non-significant (p<,05). According to the regression model in Table 4, workaholic tendencies in terms of work addiction do not display a linear trend along with psychological ownership feelings.

Table 5: Regression Analysis: Unpleasantness

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	Beta	t	p	F	Model (p)	R	R2
Unpleasantness	Constant		3,700	,000	3,586	,010	,388	,150
	Identity-belonging	-,017	-,128	,899				
	Territoriality	,372	3,462	**,001**				
	Self efficacy	-,121	-,779	,439				
	Accountability	,051	,367	,714				

p<,05

The regression analysis featuring unpleasantness as dependent variable and psychological ownership subscales as independent variables was found to be significant (p<,05). According to the regression model in Table 5, workaholic tendencies in terms of unpleasantness increase along with territoriality psychological ownership feelings.

According to the three regression models above, H2 is partly confirmed. No hypothesis regarding the demographic variables were constructed.

6. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study attempted to explore the hypothesized relationships among psychological ownership and workaholism factors. Specifically, the first hypothesis assuming a positive-causal relationship between workaholism and psychological ownership was partly confirmed, suggesting that we cannot explain much of the workaholic tendencies in terms of psychological ownership feelings. To that end, some other variables need to be considered to account for the variance explained of workaholism.

A potential cause of the relationships between accountability PO and unpleasantness workaholism and between territoriality PO and work perfectionism could be the cultural context of Turkish organizational setting, which is characterized by collectivistic attitudes. As individuals' sense of responsibility toward their peers and organization increase, so do their workaholism levels. In a similar vein, the high power distance atmosphere which features close monitoring might endanger a sense of responsibility, albeit coercively. This sense of responsibility could account well for workaholic unpleasantness feelings.

An overall implication of our study is that psychological ownership could explain workaholism only to a limited extent, with the cultural-organizational setting as a potential confounding factor. Considering the complexity and sophistication that encircles organizational life, some other factors like personality and context could be further researched to highlight the dark points. All in all, this study is the first of its kind to fill a gap in the literature on psychological ownership and workaholism relationship.

7. LIMITATIONS

This research has a number of limitations that could have caused confounding at the various stages of the research process. There are also delimitations that were purposively established for narrowing the scope of the study to better focus on the issue of interest.

First of all, as all survey-based research non-response bias, social desirability bias and courtesy bias might have intervened in sample responses. The 5-point Likert scale might have directed the participants towards a central-tendency whereby people find it more convenient to give a mid-point reply rather than tending towards extremes. Sample representativeness is the next issue to be considered, given that we tested our hypotheses on a very small sample of teachers. In this frame, the sampling method was designed as non-probability (judgmental) sampling. Without the use of probability sampling, the generalizability of the research findings is relatively low and indeed, only limited to the sample on which the research was conducted. Considering the needs and different dynamics of social sciences research as opposed to the mainstream positivist sciences, the use of non-probability sampling could be justified by a few points. The first is, where it is not possible to construct a sampling frame, you will need to use non- probability sampling techniques. Non- probability sampling techniques also provide you with the opportunity to select your sample purposively and to reach difficult-to-identify members of the population (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009). Second, being modest with the research results and verifying the logicality of the assumptions and the corresponding findings will make sense in terms of them being materially true (Saunders et al., 2009).

Overall, the limitations of this study lie in the sample and the method, and accordingly in its generalizability. Yet, our study could offer a pilot study for future researchers.

REFERENCES

ADLER, P. A. & ADLER, P. (1988). "Intense loyalty in organizations: A case study of college athletics", Administrative Science Quarterly, 33: 401–417.

ASHFORTH, B.E. & MAEL, F. (1989). "Social Identity Theory and the Organization", Academy of Management Journal, 14: 20-39.

AVEY, J.B., AVOLIO, B.J., CROSSLEY, C.D. & LUTHANS, F. (2009). "Psychological Ownership: Theoretical Extensions, Measurement and Relation to Work Outcomes", Journal of Organizational Behavior, 30: 173-191.

AZIZ, S. & ZICKAR, M. J. (2006). "A Cluster Analysis Investigation of Workaholism as a Syndrome", Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 11: 52–62.

AZIZ, S., ULRICH, B., WUENSCH, K.L. & SWORDS, B. (2013). "The Workaholism Analysis Questionnaire: Emphasizing Work-Life Imbalance and Addiction in the Measurement of Workaholism", Institute of Behavioral and Applied Management. East Carolina University, Greenville, NC, 27858-4353.

BAKKER, A.B., DEMEROUTI, E. & BURKE, R. (2009). "Workaholism and Relationship Quality: A Spillover-Crossover Perspective", Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 14:23-33.

BRADY, B.R., VODANOVICH, S.J. & ROTUNDA, R. (2008). "The Impact of Workaholism on Work-Family Conflict, Job Satisfaction, and Perception of Leisure Activities", The Psychologist-Manager Journal, 11:241–263.

BRETT, J.M. & STROH, L.K. (2003). "Working 61 Plus Hours a Week: Why Do Managers Do It?", Journal of Applied Psychology, 88(1):67–78.

BROCKNER J. & HIGGINS, E.T. (2001). "Regulatory Focus Theory: Implications for the Study of Emotions at Work", Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 86(1): 35-66.

BROWN, G. & ROBINSON, S.L. (2011). "Reactions to territorial infringement", Organization Science, 22(1): 210-224.

BROWN, G., LAWRENCE, T.B. & ROBINSON, S.L. (2005). "Territoriality in Organizations", Academy of Management Review, 30(3): 577–594.

BUCHEM, I. (2012). "Psychological Ownership and Personal Learning Environments: Do sense of ownership and control really matter?", Paper presented at the PLE Conference, July 2012, Aveiro, Portugal.

BUELENS, M. & POELMANS, S.A.Y. (2004). "Enriching the Spence and Robbins' Typology of Workaholism", Journal of Organizational Change Management, 17(5): 440-458.

CLARK, M.A., LELCHOOK, A.M. & TAYLOR, M.L. (2010). "Beyond the Big Five: How Narcissism, Perfectionism, and Dispositional Affect Relate to Workaholism", Personality and Individual Differences, 48: 786–791.

CROWE, E. & HIGGINS, E.T. (1997). "Regulatory Focus and Strategic Inclinations: Promotion and Prevention in Decision-making", Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 69(2): 117-132.

CSIKSZENTHMIHALYI, M. & ROCHBERG-HALTON, E. (1981). "The meaning of things: Domestic symbols and the self", pp.1-20, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

DRUSKAT, V. U. & PESCOSOLIDO, A.T. (2002). "The Content of Effective Teamwork Mental Models in Self-managing Teams: Ownership, Learning and Heedful Interrelating", Human Relations, 55(3): 283–314.

ELLINGSEN, T. & JOHANNESSON, M. (2007). "Paying Respect", Journal of Economic Perspectives, 21(4): 135–149.

EUROSTAT 2011 LABOR FORCE SURVEY (2011), http://www.theguardian.com/news/datablog/2011/dec/08/europe-working-hours#data

FRASER, K. & KEMP, S. (2012). "Effects of Employee Governance and Operational Control on Psychological Ownership and Perceived Justice", New Zealand Journal of Psychology, 41(3): 13-20.

FUJIMOTO, T. (2014). "Workaholism and Mental and Physical Health", Japan Labor Review, 11(1):50-67.

FURBY, L. (1980). "The Origins and Early Development of Possessive Behavior", Political Psychology, 2(1): 30-42.

GOLDEN, L. (2009). "Brief History of Long Work Time and the Contemporary Sources of Overwork", Journal of Business Ethics, 84:217–227.

GÜLOVA, A., İSPİRLİ, D. & ERYILMAZ, İ. (2014). "İşkoliklik ve Tükenmişlik Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesine Yönelik Beyaz Yakalılar Üzerine Bir Araştirma", Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 19: 25-39.

HEINO, N. & JUSSILA, I. (2010). "Psychological Ownership: A Key Mediator in Family Involvement – Effects –Relationship", Paper presented at the 10th Annual IFERA World Family Business Research Conference, July 6-9, 2010, Lancaster, UK.

HIGGINS, E.T. (1997). "Beyond Pleasure and Pain", American Psychologist, 52(12): 1280- 1300.

İSPİRLİ, D. (2014). Knowledge as an Object of Psychological Ownership and Knowledge Hiding via Territoriality Among Knowledge Workers, Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Manisa Celal Bayar University Institute of Social Sciences, Manisa, Turkey.

JESWANI, S. & DAVE, S. (2012). "Conceptual Framework on Psychological Ownership as Predictor of Turnover Intentions", International Journal of Research in Social Sciences and Humanities (1).

JONES, C. & VOLPE, E.H. (2010). "Organizational Identification: Extending Our Understanding of Social Identities Through Social Networks", Journal of Organizational Behavior.

KILLINGER, B. (1991). Workaholics: The Respectable Addicts, New York: Simon & Schuster.

MACHLOWITZ, M. (1980). Workaholics: Living with Them, Working with Them, Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

MCMILLAN, L. H. & O'DRISCOLL, M. P. (2006). "Understanding Workaholism: The Case for Behavioral Tendencies", In R.J. Burke (Ed.), Research Companion to Working Time and Work Addiction, Edward Elgar.

MCMILLAN, L. H. W. & O'DRISCOLL, M. P. (2004). "Workaholism and Health: Implications for Organizations", Journal of Organizational Change Management, 17:509-519.

MUDRACK, P. E. (2004). "Job Involvement, Obsessive-Compulsive Personality Traits, and Workaholic Behavioral Tendencies", Journal of Organizational Change Management, 17: 490–508.

NG, T.W.H., SORENSEN, K. L. & FELDMAN, D. C. (2007). "Dimensions, Antecedents, and Consequences of Workaholism: A Conceptual Integration and Extension", Journal of Organizational Behavior, 28(1):111–136.

O'REILLY, C. A. & CHATMAN, J. (1986). "Organizational Commitment and Psychological Attachment: The Effects of Compliance, Identification, and Internalization on Prosocial Behaviour", Journal of Applied Psychology, 71(3): 492-499.

ÖZLER, H., YILMAZ, A. & ÖZLER, D. (2008). "Psychological Ownership: An Empirical Study on Its Antecedents and Impacts Upon Organizational Behaviors", Problems and Perspectives in Management, 6 (3): 38-47.

PEIPERL, M. & JONES, B. (2001). "Workaholics and Overworkers: Productivity or Pathology?", Group and Organization Management, 26: 369–393.

PENG, H. (2013). "Why and When Do People Hide Knowledge?", Journal of Knowledge Management, 17(3): 398-415.

PIERCE, J.L. & Jussila, I. (2011). Psychological Ownership and The Organizational Context: Theory, Research, Evidence, and Application. New Horizons in Management Series. UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.

PIERCE J. L., KOSTOVA, T. & DIRKS, K. (2001). "Toward A Theory of Psychological Ownership in Organizations", The Academy of Management Review, 26(2): 298-310.

PIERCE, J. L. & JUSSILA, I. (2010). "Collective Psychological Ownership Within the Work and Organizational Context: Construct Introduction and Elaboration", Journal of Organizational Behavior, 31: 810–834.

PIERCE, J. L., KOSTOVA, T. & DIRKS, K. (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.

PORTEOUS, J. (1976). "Home: The Territorial Core", Geographical Review, 66: 383-390.

PORTER, G. (1996). "Organizational Impact of Workaholism: Suggestions for Researching the Negative Outcomes of Excessive Work", Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 1: 70–84.

RIKETTA, M. (2005). "Organizational Identification: A Meta-analysis", Journal of Vocational Behavior, 66: 358–384.

RIKETTA, M. & VAN DICK, R. (2005). "Foci of Attachment in Organizations: A Meta-analytic Comparison of the Strength and Correlates of Workgroup versus Organizational Identification and Commitment", Journal of Vocational Behavior, 67:490–510.

ROBINSON, B. E. (1999). "The Work Addiction Risk Test: Development of a Tentative Measure of Workaholism", Perceptual and Motor Skills, 88: 199–210.

SAUNDERS, M., LEWIS, P. & THORNHILL, A. (2009). Research Methods for Business Students, 5th edition, Prentice Hall.

SCHAEF, K. S. & FASSEL, D. (1998). The Addictive Organization, San Francisco: Harper & Row Publishers.

SCHAUFELI W.B., TARIS, T. W. & VAN RHENEN, W. (2008). "Workaholism, Burnout, and Work Engagement: Three of a Kind or Three Different Kinds of Employee Well-being?", Applied Psychology, 57(2):173–203.

SCHAUFELI, W.B., BAKKER, A.B., VAN DER HEIJDEN, F.M.M.A. & PRINS, J.T. (2009). "Workaholism, Burnout and Well-Being among Junior Doctors: The Mediating Role of Role Conflict", Work & Stress, 23(2): 155-172.

SCHAUFELI, W.B., TARIS, T.W. & BAKKER, A.B. (2006). "Dr Jekyll or Mr Hyde? On the Differences between Work Engagement and Workaholism", In R.J. Burke (Ed.), Research Companion to Working Time and Work Addiction, Edward Elgar.

SCOTT, K. S., MOORE, K. S. & MICELI, M. P. (1997). "An Exploration of the Meaning and Consequences of Workaholism", Human Relations, 50: 287–314.

SHAH, J., HIGGINS, E.T. & FRIEDMAN, R.S. (1998). "Performance Incentives and Means: How Regulatory Focus Influences Goal Attainment", Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74(2):285-293.

SHIMAZU, A., DEMEROUTI, E., BAKKER, A.B., SHIMADA, K. & KAWAKAMI, N. (2011). "Workaholism and Well-being among Japanese Dual-earner couples: A Spillover-Crossover Perspective", Social Science & Medicine, 73:399-409.

SHIMAZU, A., SCHAUFELI, W.B., KUBOTA, K. & KAWAKAMI, N. (2012). "Do Workaholism and Work Engagement Predict Employee Well-being and Performance in Opposite Directions?", Industrial Health, 50:316–321.

SIEGER, P., BERNHARD, F. & FREY, U. (2011), "Affective Commitment and Job Satisfaction among Non-Family Employees: Investigating the Roles of Justice Perceptions and Psychological Ownership", Journal of Family Business Strategy, 2:78-89.

SNIR, R., HARPAZ, I., & BURKE, R.J. (2006). "Workaholism in Organizations New Research Directions", Career Development International, 11(5): 369–373.

SPENCE, J.T. & ROBBINS, A.S. (1992). "Workaholism: Definition, Measurement, and Preliminary Results", Journal of Personality Assessment, 58(1): 160-178.

TARIS, T.W., SCHAUFELI, W.B. & SHIMAZU, A. (2010). "The Push and Pull of Work: About the Difference Between Workaholism and Work Engagement", In A.B. Bakker & M.P. Leiter (Eds.), Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research (pp. 39-53), New York: Psychology Press.

VAN BEEK, I., TARIS, T.W. & SCHAUFELI, W.B. (2011). "Workaholic and Work Engaged Employees: Dead Ringers or Worlds Apart?", Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 16 (4): 468–482.

VAN DEN BROECK, A., SCHREURS, B., DE WITTE, H., VANSTEENKISTE, M., GERMEYS, F. & SCHAUFELI, W. (2011). "Understanding Workaholics' Motivations: A Self-Determination Perspective", Applied Psychology: An International Review, 60(4): 600–621.

VAN DYNE, L. & PIERCE, J.L. (2004). "Psychological Ownership and Feelings of Possession: Three Field Studies Predicting Employee Attitudes and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour", Journal of Organizational Behavior, 25: 439-459.

VANDEWELLE, D., VAN DYNE, L. & KOSTOVA, T. (1995). "Psychological Ownership: An Empirical Examination of Its Consequences", Group & Organization Management, 20 (2): 210-226.

WARD, B. (2013). "Prevention- and Promotion-Focused Psychological Ownership in Small Employee Owned Firms" (Doctoral Dissertation), Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database (UMI No. 3557894).

WOLFE, A. (1997). "The Moral Meaning of Work", Journal of Socio-Economics, 26(6): 559–570.

---

[i] The literature review on the construct psychological ownership has largely been derived from the first author's unpublished MA thesis titled "Knowledge as an Object of Psychological Ownership and Knowledge Hiding via Territoriality Among Knowledge Workers".