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ABSTRACT

The study was a cross-sectional design to investigate psychological ownership and organisational trust as predictors of organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) among bank workers to increase the understanding of the ability of psychological ownership and organisational trust to predict citizenship behaviours in organizations. The following hypotheses were stated: that psychological ownership will not significantly predict organisational citizenship behaviour of Bank workers and that organisational trust will not significantly predict organisational citizenship behaviour of Bank workers. Two hundred and three (203) Bank workers from five Nigeria financial Banks located in Nsukka in Enugu state were sampled. Those Banks include: Access Bank, Diamond Bank, Eco Bank, UBA, and Fidelity Bank. All the participants were adults, with the age range of 19-47 years and mean age of 33. The participants volunteered to take part in the study. Three instruments (Organisational Citizenship Behaviour Scale (OCBS), Psychological Ownership Questionnaire (POQ), and Organizational Trust Index (OTI) were used in the study. Multiple regression analysis was used for data analysis and the results indicated that psychological ownership and organisational trust significantly predicted organisational citizenship behaviour of Bank workers ($\beta = 0.173, p< 0.05$; & $\beta = 0.372, p< 0.001$) respectively. Limitations of the study and recommendations for further research were also included in the study.
CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

One of the most important challenges facing organizations is management and motivation of workers. Employees have remained causal or contributory in success and failure of organisations. Employees that voluntarily work more than their duties contribute significantly to organization’s success (Organ, 1988). Since these persons go beyond their duties, by helping managers and other employees to achieve their aims, they therefore help the organisation to perform at maximal level. The willingness of individuals to contribute cooperative efforts to the organization is indispensable to effective attainment of organisational goals.

Employments into organizations are done to feel the need of the organisation. Personnel within the organization provide services that commensurate with their pay. This sometimes has effect on the productivity. However, according to Organ (1988), some personnel in the organisation go the extra mile by involving in extra role behaviours to ensure that the organization’s aspirations are met. This is because new challenges have made it necessary for organizational members to go beyond their required job roles (Morrison & Phelps, 1999). These new challenges include: the rapid advances in technology and increasing rate of globalisation. In sustaining the competition these new challenges have caused in today’s global markets, researchers have therefore called for the re-examination of the impact of extra-role behaviours in organisations (Organ, 1988).

Bateman and Organ (1983) defined extra-role behaviour as an innovative and spontaneous behaviour which goes above the job descriptions of employees. Extra-role behaviour includes such behaviour as informal act of cooperation, goodwill, helpfulness among other things (Bateman & Organ, 1983). These extra roles performed are based on individual discretion, and are not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward systems, but in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization (Organ, 1988). According to Organ (1988), extra-role behaviours are critical for organizational effectiveness because managers and supervisors cannot foresee all contingencies or fully anticipate the activities that they may desire or need employees to perform.
One critical form of extra-role behaviours that has recently attracted the attention of many researchers is organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) (Onyishi, 2006). The development of the concept of organizational citizenship behaviour could be directly linked to the work of Katz (1964) on the motivational basis of organizational behaviour. Katz (1964) identified three categories of employee behaviours that are essential for organizational effectiveness. According to Katz, individuals must first be induced to enter and remain with the organization; as employees, they must carry out specific role requirement in a dependable fashion; and they must engage in innovative and spontaneous activities that go beyond role prescriptions. These earlier assertions of Katz (1964) on the need for innovative and spontaneous behaviour from organisational members and the subsequent works of Bateman and Organ (1983), and Smith, Organ and Near (1983), points to the direction that for organisations to be effective, their employees must be willing to do more than the minimal formal and specified aspects of their job. The authors later termed such extra-role behaviours as “organizational citizenship behaviours”.

Organizational citizenship behaviour is defined as employee behaviour that goes beyond the call of duty, which is discretionary and not explicitly recognised by the employing organisation’s formal reward system, and on the aggregate contributes to organisational effectiveness (Smith, Organ & Near, 1983). Organ then proceeded to define what he meant by discretionary as the behaviour that is not an enforceable requirement of the role or the job description, that is, the clearly specifiable terms of the person’s employment contract with the organization. Discretionary behaviour being rather a matter of choice, its omission is not necessarily understood as punishable. Also such definition of organizational citizenship behaviour assumes that such behaviours are not directly or formally recognised by the organisation’s reward system. It is also important to note that OCB refers to only those behaviours that in aggregate, across time and across persons, contribute to organisational effectiveness. Therefore, not every single discrete instance of OCB would make a difference in organisational outcomes but when summated across the categories of relevant behaviour the effect would be positive (Organ, 1997).
Organizations seek to preserve their current customers and seek to increase their customer loyalty, regarding to ever-increasing cost of customer attraction. Customer loyalty is of great importance for organizations. Researches have been carried out on customer loyalty and its effective factors. One of most affective determinants is citizenship behaviour of organizations’ employee. Citizenship behaviour leaves critical effect on employee’s performance. OCB is also called “the good soldier syndrome” (Organ, 1988).

Several definitions have been offered for OCB, some of which are presented: as discretionary behaviour directed at individuals or at the organisation as a whole, which goes beyond existing role expectations and benefits or is intended to benefit the organisation (Organ, 1988). Therefore, OCB is referred to organizationally beneficial behaviours and gestures that can neither be enforced on the basis of formal employee’s role obligations nor elicited by a contractual guarantee of recompense (Somech & Ran, 2007).

OCB is voluntary behaviour of employee but not required as part of the job (Somech & Zahavy 2004). Employees choose OCB as activities to do or not to do, paying inattention to chastisement and official reasons (Organ 1990). OCB is a kind of job behaviour which is not considered as job qualifications. OCB serves organizations, supporting social and psychological contexts (Blakely, Andrews & Moorman 2005).

OCB refers to those activities not considered as organizational qualifications, but to do these activities are useful for organizations and support them. These behaviours might not be rewarded; therefore, employees are not rewarded for these prosocial behaviours. However these behaviours lead to rewarding later (Organ 1997). Employee might be rewarded for OCB. Awards are not always received and have non-linear relationship with behaviour (Bragger, et al. 2005). Therefore, each award will be postponed for later and there is no guarantee for winning award (Organ 1997).

Organizational citizenship behaviour provides a means of managing the interdependence among members of a work unit, which increases the collective outcomes achieved; reduces the need for an organization to devote scarce resources to simple maintenance functions which frees-up
resources for productivity; and improves the ability of others to perform their jobs by freeing up time for more efficient planning, scheduling and problem solving (Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Paine & Bachrach, 2000). The organizational citizenship behaviour represents voluntary action and mutual aid with no request for payment or formal reward in return. The behaviour is rather a matter of personal choice, such that its omission is not generally understood as punishable. The reward is not physical but psychological; through their age factors that promote organizational citizenship behaviour such as altruistic behaviour, believe in symbiotic relationship between the organisation and the employee.

These definitions have some indexes and aspects in common. Main indexes include voluntary behaviours not considered as official duties, lack of award and chastisement, prosocial and psychological reasons for these behaviours and these behaviours’ usefulness for organization (Lambert, Hogan, & Griffin, 2008).

Over time, a continuous exhibition of OCB could create an impression on supervisors and co-workers, which in turn could influence the recommendation of supervisors for a salary increase or promotion. However, it should be clearly stated that for behaviour to be termed OCB, there should be no contractually guaranteed returns on such behaviour (Onyishi, 2006).

Organizational citizenship behaviour is however, distinguishable from in-role behaviour. In-role behaviour is a technical performance required by the job, which is actually covered in the job description of the employees. In-role behaviours are not only expected but are also accepted and often rewarded by the employer. Extra-role behaviours are referred to as innovative and spontaneous behaviours that go above and beyond the job descriptions of employees. It includes such informal acts of cooperation, goodwill, helpfulness, among other things (Organ & Bateman 1991). According to Onyishi (2006), organizations that care for the well-being of their employees are likely to produce employees who have good organizational citizen.

OCB helps organizations evaluate and increase efficiency because employee’s experiences develop organization (Kemery, Bedeian & Zacur 1996; Organ 1988). These behaviours coordinate
with organizational efficiency in legal and fair organizations (Podsakoff, et. al. 2000; Podsakoff & Mackenzie, 1994). Podsakoff and Mackenzie (1994) say: “OCB oils organizational and social machineries”. Organizations whose employees demonstrate OCB enjoy higher managerial productivity; the efficient ‘on-boarding’ of new hires; improved strategic planning, business processes, the allocation of key organizational resources; and the frequency of communication between and across work groups (Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997). It is useful for organizations and includes constructive and positive behaviours.

Lievens and Ansell in their own idea, disclosed that those employees that demonstrate OCB are more likely to provide others with assistance in completing work tasks and demonstrate loyalty to work colleagues and the organization; foster connectedness with other individuals and work teams; and support organizational goals while also underwriting its psychological and social environment (Lievens & Ansell, 2004). Employees engaging in OCB help to foster an enjoyable and productive work environment (Spence, 2010).

Most conceptualization of OCB suggests that it has two major dimensions: altruism-social behaviours that are directed at specific individuals or groups within the organization; and conscientiousness (or generalized compliance) - pro-social behaviours directed at the organization (Randall, Cropanzano, Bormann & Birjulin, 1999; Rioux & Penner, 2001; Smith, Organ & Near, 1983). However, Organ (1988), further proposed three additional dimensions: courtesy (trying to prevent work-related interpersonal problems); sportsmanship (willingness to tolerate minor frustration in the job without complaints); and civic virtue (responsibly involving oneself in and being concerned about the group and the organisation). This proposition had received empirical support (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994; Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Moorman & Fetter, 1990).

Subsequent researchers have identified other forms of OCB distinct from that of Organ (1988). For instance, Van Dyne, Grahams and Dienesh (1994) identified three citizenship dimensions: loyalty OCB, participation OCB, and service delivery OCB. To this end, this research examines OCB as it affects banking institutions. Official hours of any organisation, for instance, are assumed to be hour at which customers are attended to. In banking institutions however, staff put in
extra time and energy to achieve the generalised objective of the institution. According to Rioux and Penner (2001); Smith and colleagues (1983), this act is referred to as generalised compliance – prosocial behaviours directed at the organisation. Besides, due to the sensitive nature of bank jobs and situations almost all bank workers do not go beyond the call of duty especially if the task does not involve every other member. Thus, the extent of OCB in banking sector may be limited to those general but official duties. Organizational citizenship behaviour is a helping behaviour not formally prescribed by the organization and for which there are no direct reward or punishments. This kind of behaviour may be due to the fact that the individual is taken the organisation as his own personal enterprise.

A growing body of research regarding OCB suggested that employees demonstrate greater role performance when they experience a strong connection to their organization, have a sense of ownership over to its continued success, and have found a sense of purpose and meaning in their daily work (Van Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch, 1994). The rate at which one protects his own valued item depicts how he or she loves and values the item. The organizations and those working in them live a symbiotic nature of life. They both need each other to survive. The survival of personnel greatly depends on how the organization is growing. This makes some members of staff in organization develop a sense of belongingness in an organization. This sense of belongingness could be termed as psychological ownership, which is defined as a state in which the individual feels as though the target of ownership or a piece of that target is theirs (Pierce, Kostova & Dirks 2001).

Psychological ownership is a cognitive and affective experience of connection between the self and various targets of possessions, such as ideas, relationship with others and physical entities (Pierce, Kostova & Dirks 2001). However, Avey, Avolio, Crossley and Luthan (2009), posited that psychological ownership has been associated with employee well-being and organizational citizenship behaviour, and other positive outcome. The experience of psychological ownership can also be associated with some negative attitudes such as refusal to share the target of ownership or resistance to change (Ceja & Tapies 2009).
Psychological ownership is the psychological experience in which an employee develops possessive feelings for the target. This influences human attitudes, motivation and behaviour and its links to self-identify, self-adjustment and well-being (Kasser & Ryan, 1993). The state of psychological ownership is complex and it comprises a cognitive and affective core. It is a condition, of which one is aware through intellectual perception. It reflects an individual’s awareness, thoughts and beliefs regarding the target of ownership. This cognitive state, however, is coupled with an emotional or affective sensation.

The feelings of ownership are said to be pleasure producing (Beggan, 1992; Furby 1978; Nuttin, 1987; Porteous, 1976) and accompanied by the sense of efficacy and competence (White, 1959). The affective component became apparent in the feeling that arises when others lay claim to objects for which one feels a sense of personal ownership or collective ownership shared by within a group. Psychological ownership for an organisation is a phenomenon in which an employee develops possessive feelings for the target. Building on Furby (1978) and Dittmar (1992), Pierce Kostova and Dirks (2001) linked feelings of possession with feeling of ownership and defined psychological ownership as the state in which individual feels that an object is experienced possessively. Pierce, Kostova and Dirks (2001, 2003) described psychological ownership as an attitude with both affective and cognitive elements.

Breckler and Weiggins (1989), Weiss and Cropanzano (1996) proposed Affective Event theory that differentiate the job from emotional experience at work. Affective Event theory proposes that different attitudes have different mixes or relative proportion of affective and cognitive elements. Applying this, Van Dyne and Pierce (2004) stated that psychological ownership is different from other job related attitudes and has unique explanatory power because its conceptual core is feeling of possession that trigger affect-driven behaviours.

Communication and organizational researchers have long been concerned with increasing organizational effectiveness; but today’s business environment brings constant change. Driven by the global economy, these changes involve increased competition, disruptive technologies, rapid
product development, and spontaneous connections among corporate players within and outside organizations (Christensen, 1997; Collins & Porras, 1994); organizational trust now holds a position on centre stage in that this trust affect productivity.

Several key factors have contributed to raising the profile of organizational trust, for example, sharing of business ideas, equipment, and manpower. Several writers have noted that the general subject of trust appears across disciplines (Bigley & Pearce, 1998; Fukuyama, 1995; Rousseau, Sitkin, & Camener, 1998; Tyler & Kramer, 1996); however, some see a lack of research that reflects an interdisciplinary integration of knowledge about trust in general, and about organizational trust in specific (Bhattacharya, Devinney, & Pillutlas, 1998).

To date, the most notable attempt at this interdisciplinary integration is done by Fukuyama (1995). This expansive and comprehensive synthesis places organizational trust at the centre of sustaining economic resilience in the global economy. Fukuyama (1995) argues that “spontaneous sociability,” based on the ability to form new associations and networks of trusting relationships to accomplish business transactions, will predict whether or not an organization will remain viable.

A general consensus among researchers concludes that trust is important in a range of organizational activities and processes such as team work, leadership, goal setting, performance appraisal, and in general, cooperative behaviours (Axelrod, 1984; Elangovan & Shapiro, 1998; Jones & George, 1998; Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995).

In recent years, definitions of how individuals experience trusts have moved from emphases on intentions and motivations to behavioural orientations. Hosmer (1995), for example, views individual trust as one party’s optimistic expectations of the behaviour of another when the party must make a decision about how to act under conditions of vulnerability and dependence. Mayer, Davis, and Schoorman (1995) describe trust as, “the willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other party will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control the other party”. Lewicki, McAllister, and Bies (1998) defined trust as confident positive expectations regarding another’s
conduct. Bhattacharya, Devinney, and Pillutla (1998) suggest that trust is an expectancy of positive outcomes that one can receive based on the expected action of another party in an interaction characterized by uncertainty. Whitener, Brodt, Korsgaard, and Werner (1998) merge several existing definitional approaches reflecting three basic facets of trust: (a) trust in another party reflects an expectation or belief that the other party will act benevolently; (b) a party cannot control or force another party to fulfil the expectation—that is, trust involves a willingness to be vulnerable and to assume risk; and (c) trust involves some level of dependency on the other party so that the outcomes of one party are influenced by the actions of another. According to Erickson (1963) trust is an element of life beginning with birth. The basic way of getting to know the people for a new born human being is to decide if they are reliable or not.

Mishra (1996), in building a model of trust for both individuals and organizations, defines trust as “one party’s willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the belief that the latter party is: (a) competent, (b) open, (c) concerned, and (d) reliable”. These four dimensions operate collectively to create the perception of trust. Fukuyama (1995), in focusing on organizational trust across cultures in international economic exchanges, defines trust as “the expectation that arises within a community of regular, honest, and cooperative behaviour, based on commonly shared norms on the part of other members of that community”. In defining trust in an organizational context, Cummings and Bromiley (1996) anchor their definition in the assertion that trust involves three components of belief (affective, cognitive, and intended behaviour) and three behavioural dimensions (whether an individual keeps commitments, negotiates honestly, and avoids taking excessive advantage).

Organizational trust is defined as the willingness of the employee to be vulnerable to the actions of the employer (s) based on the expectation that they would act in order to satisfy his needs irrespective of the ability to monitor or control (Mayer et al. 1995). It results in development of an emotional link between the employers and the employees, which enables effective interaction between them (Child, & Möllering, 2003; Wech, 2002), and facilitates development of organizational justice behaviour (Kickul, et al., 2005), increasing organizational citizenship
behaviours (Appelbaum et al., 2004), and causes job satisfaction, organizational commitment, clarification of roles and increase in performance (Laschinger & Finegan, 2005).

Taken as a whole, the foregoing definitions suggest that both organization-wide and individual conceptions of uncertainty, dependency, influence, and behaviour expectations undergird perceptions of trust. Individual trust refers to expectations about individual relationships and behaviours. Organizational trust refers to expectations individuals have about networks of organizational relationships and behaviours. As such, individuals in organizations simultaneously form perceptions of both individual and organizational trust. In this current work, organizational trust is viewed as positive expectations individuals have about the intent and behaviours of multiple organizational members based on organizational roles, relationships, experiences, and interdependencies. Trust in an organization can be experienced differentially by employees with different networks and experiences.

Trust is an assured reliance on the character, ability, strength or truth of someone or something. Therefore it can be approached in both forms of personal and impersonal. It is an indication of faithfulness and loyalty and viewed as prerequisite and basis for all valuable social relations. It protects the right and interest of other people aside from its importance throughout history. Trust has received relatively little research attention until recently (Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt, & Camerer 1998). The concept as being reviewed differently by different fields of scholar in shape of meso concept, integrating microlevel psychological processes and group dynamics with macrolevel institutional arrangements, and therefore a single widely accepted definition of trust has yet to emerge in the literature (Bagрайм & Hime, 2007). Trust as a concept has been approached from various theoretical frameworks (Cruz & Costa-silva, 2004; Rousseau et al., 1998) such as Transaction cost theory, where economists have a tendency to analyse trust as either calculative (Wiliamson, 1975) or institutional (North & Smallbone, 2000), social theory (Blau, 1964) where sociologists conceptualize trust in socially embedded properties of relationships among people or institutions (Granovecter, 1985; Zucker 1986).
Kramer and Carnevate (2001) argued that trust involves a set of beliefs and expectations that a partner’s actions will be beneficial to one’s long-term self-interest, especially in situations in which the partner must be counted on to provide unique benefits or valuable outcomes.

Kelly, Holmes, Kerr, Beis, Rusbult & Van-lange (2003) claim that trust can be assessed in certain interpersonal situations which Hosmer (1995) defined as confident expectations of a single individual to approach the dependent interactions of a dyad by defining trusting behaviour as consisting of actions that: increase one’s vulnerability; to another whose behaviour is not under one’s control; and, in a situation in which the penalty (disutility) one suffers if the other abuses that vulnerability is greater than the benefit (utility) one gains if the other does not abuse the vulnerability. Therefore, trust situations involve the configurations of high interdependences that blend rules for coordination and exchange that sustain interdependence and moderately corresponding interest.

However, Rousseau and colleagues (1998) attempted to clarify the confusion regarding the definition of trust by differentiating its two main components: intention to accept vulnerability, and positive expectation of the actions. However, McAllister (1995) put interpersonal trust as ‘the extent to which a person is confident in and willing to act on the basis of the words, actions and decisions of another’. And he identified two kinds of basis of trust to include cognitive judgments of another’s competence or reliability; and affective bonds among individuals. McKnight, Choudhury, and Kacmar (2002), see interpersonal trust as one party’s willingness to depend on the other party with feeling of relative security even though negative consequences are possible. This makes interpersonal trust to be putting oneself at the goodwill of the other.

Trust does occur within institution or system. This allow for bilateral cooperation and entrusting one institutional obligation on the other. McCauley and Kulhnert (1992) put trust as a multidimensional variable by explaining that an employee may trust his co-workers but distrust his supervisor or top management. They made the differences between vertical trust and lateral trust. Vertical trust is referred as trust relations among peers who share a similar work situation, whereas
lateral trust is regarded as trust relations between individuals and either their immediate superior, top management or the organization as a whole.

Further, McCauley & Kulhnert (1992) in explaining the reciprocal property of trust as highlighted by Fox (1974, 1985), stated that if structures, roles, and climate of the organization communicate a lack of trust in employees by top management, employees will respond with distrust and conversely, if top management communicates a high level of trust to its employees, employee will respond with high levels of trust in management. Therefore, the role of top management involves the creation and management of a system conducive of trust referred by Fox’s (1974, 1985) as institutionalized trust which does not refer to the degrees of trust or distrust that are embodied in personal attitudes between individuals. Interpersonal and system (institutional) trust do not stand alone, but act in concert with one another (Straiter, 2005). In essence, that trust lies in individual relationships is not in opposition to the experience of trust both inside interpersonal relationships and as an institutional phenomenon beyond interpersonal relationship, therefore, trust exists in impersonal and personal forms (Atkinson & Butcher, 2003).

Shamir and Lapidot (2003) argued that trust in organizations often combines both systemic and interpersonal considerations that affect each other; and full understanding of systemic trust is not possible without reference to the individuals who are members of the system, and a full understanding of personal trust is not possible without understanding the systemic context in which such personal trust develop (Grey & Garsten, 2001). Straiter (2005) cited in Hassan and Semercioz (2010), confirmed that Luhmann (1979) was among first who posited that trust occurs within the framework of interaction which is influenced by both personality and social system, and cannot be exclusively associated with either. He (Luhmann, 1979) further argued that personal trust and systems trust rest on different bases, personal trust involves emotional bond between individuals, and emotional pain that each other would experience in the event of betrayal serves as the protective base of trust, and in case of systems trust, this emotional content is largely absent. Systems trust is activated by the appearance that “everything seems to be in proper order” (Lewis & Weigert 1985).
Similarly, Zaheer, McEvely and Perrone (1998) also cited in Hassan and Semercioz (2010) recognized trust at both systemic and the interpersonal level and explained that trust translates from the individual level to organizational level and from the organizational level to the individual level.

Shamir and Lapidot (2003) argued that trust in formal leaders is likely to be affected by both systemic considerations because such leaders represents the organization or the system in the eyes of their subordinates, and interpersonal considerations arising from the interactions between leaders and subordinates and thus the bases of trust are likely to affect each other, systemic trust might affect trust in particular leaders and trust in particular leaders might influence system trust. McKnight and colleagues (1998) termed this impersonal form of trust as institution based trust which he defined as “the belief that proper impersonal structures are in place to enable one to anticipate a successful future endeavour”. Institution trust is enhanced by structures assurances in shape of safeguard as regulations that guarantee promotions and success, and an environment that allows benevolence, managerial integrity and favourable attributes of competency and ability and desire to treat equals equal.

**Statement of the Problem**

Reviewed literature shows that organizational citizenship behaviour promotes organizational effectiveness. This is because managers and supervisors cannot foresee all contingencies or fully anticipate the activities that they may desire or need employees to perform (Organ, 1988; Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Paine & Bachrack, 2000). For organizations to be effective, their employees must be willing to do more than the minimal formal and specified aspects of their job.

Psychological ownership is the psychological experience in which an employee develops possessive feelings for the target. This influences human attitudes, motivation and behaviour and its links to self-identify, self-adjustment and well-being (Kasser & Ryan, 1993). The state of psychological ownership is complex and it comprises a cognitive and affective core. It is a condition, of which one is aware through intellectual perception. It reflects an individual’s awareness, thoughts
and beliefs regarding the target of ownership. This cognitive state, however, is coupled with an emotional or affective sensation.

A general consensus among researchers is that trust is important in a range of organizational activities and processes such as team work, leadership, goal setting, performance appraisal, and in general, cooperative behaviours (Axelrod, 1984; Elangovan & Shapiro, 1998; Jones & George, 1998; Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995). Mishra (1996), in a model of trust for both individuals and organizations, notes that one party’s willingness to be vulnerable to another party is based on the belief that the latter party is: (a) competent, (b) open, (c) concerned, and (d) reliable”. These four dimensions operate collectively to create the perception of trust.

Psychological ownership and Organisational trust are positive psychological variables that have little literature owing to their recent arrival as psychological constructs. Owing to this, the study is set to provide answers to the following questions.

i) Would psychological ownership predict organizational citizenship behaviour among bank workers?

ii) Would organisational trust predict organizational citizenship behaviour among bank workers?

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the study is to investigate whether psychological ownership is related to organizational citizenship behaviour among bank workers; and whether organizational trust is related to organizational citizenship behaviour among bank workers. Specifically, the study tends to find out:

i) the relationship between psychological ownership and organizational citizenship behaviour among bank workers, and
ii) the relationship between organizational trust and organizational citizenship behaviour among bank workers.

**Operational Definition of Terms**

**Psychological ownership** is a cognitive and affective experience of connection between the self and various targets of possessions, such as ideas, relationship with others and physical entities (Pierce et al 2001). In this study, psychological ownership would be measured by Psychological Ownership Questionnaire (POQ) developed by Avey, Avolio, Crossley and Luthans (2009).

**Organizational trust** is the willingness of the employee to be vulnerable to the actions of the employer(s) based on the expectation that they would act in order to satisfy his needs irrespective of the ability to monitor or control. In this study, organisational trust would be measured by Organizational Trust Index (OTI) developed by Shockley-Zalabak, Ellis and Cessaria (1999) and was revalidated in Nigeria by Ugwu (2011).

**Organisational Citizenship Behaviour** refers to employee behaviour that goes beyond the call of duty that is discretionary and not explicitly recognized by the employing organization’s formal reward system, and that contribute to organizational effectiveness. In this study, organisational citizenship behaviour would be measured by Organisational Citizenship Behaviour Scale (OCBS) developed by Onyishi (2007).
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

The review of relevant literature is from two perspectives: theoretical and empirical reviews.

THEORETICAL REVIEW

Although researchers over the years have carried out studies on organizational citizenship behaviour; the progress made on the development of organisational citizenship behaviour theory is quite slow (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994). However, the nature of organisational citizenship behaviour has been vigorously debated by many theorists, but for the interest of this study, the researcher shall review the following theories: The Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964); the Motivational Theory (McClelland, 1961, 1965); and the Equity Theory (Adams, 1963).

The Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964).

The social exchange theory evolved from Thorndike’s (1932, 1935) work on the development of reinforcement theory and Mill’s (1923) marginal utility theory (Smale, 1990). Modern-day influences have been derived from the work of sociologists such as Homans (1961), Blau (1964) and Emerson (1972); but the social exchange theory has been mostly credited to Blau (1964) which has its origin in the norm of reciprocity earlier proposed by Gouldner (1960). As proposed by Homans (1961), social exchange theory is based on the premise that human behaviour or social interaction is an exchange of activity, tangible and intangible particularly of rewards and costs. The purpose of this exchange is to maximize benefits and minimize costs. According to social exchange theory, people weigh the potential benefits and risks of social relationships. When the social risks outweigh the social rewards, people will likely terminate or abandon that relationship. It treats the exchange of benefits notably giving others something more valuable to them than is costly to the giver, and vice versa, as the underlying basis or open secret of human behaviour and so a phenomenon permeating all social life (Homans, 1961). According to Blau (1964), social exchange relationships are based on trust. That is, when an individual gives to another, they do so trusting that the other party will
reciprocate. Therefore, unlike economic exchange, social exchange is not an explicit, contractually based arrangement. Eventually, such relationships evolve over time into trusting, reciprocating, loyal, and mutual relationships (Trivers, 2009). Blau (1964) stated that:

“social exchange ...involves favours that create diffuse future obligations, not precisely specified ones, and the nature of the return cannot be bargained about but must be left to the discretion of the one who makes it...Since there is no way to assure an appropriate return for a favour, social exchange requires trusting others to discharge their obligations” (pp. 93-94).

However, under this theory, parties must abide by certain rules of exchange such as reciprocity, negotiation, rationality, altruism, group gain, status consistency, and competition (Trivers, 2009).

Social exchange theory includes unspecified obligations; this means that when one person does another a favour, there is an expectation of some future return. As regards work organisations, social exchange has long been used to describe the motivational basis behind employee’s behaviours and the foundation of positive employee’s attitude (Levison, 1965). Not only is the organisation permeated by exchange but also the non–economic realm – the social relations situated between extremes of intimacy, self-interest or cost-benefit calculation and disinterested, expressive behaviour (Blau, 1964). Social exchange is a social interaction characterised by reciprocal stimuli. This means they would not continue in the long-run if reciprocity were violated. The concept of exchange ratio or balance-imbalance, leading to the concepts of power, dependence, and cohesion, is implied in the attribute of reciprocal reinforcements (Emerson, 1969). In consequence, exchange theory examines the processes establishing and sustaining reciprocity in social relations, or mutual gratifications between individuals or groups and organisations.

The basic assumption of exchange theory is that individuals establish and continue social relations on the basis of their expectations that such relations will be mutually advantageous. The initial impetus for social interaction is provided by the exchange of benefits, intrinsic and extrinsic, independently of normative obligations (Blau, 1994).

Blau (1964) suggested that the basis of any exchange relationship could be described in terms of either social or economic policies. As Blau (1964) put it, social exchange, just like economic exchange, generates an expectation of some future return for contributions, but unlike economic
exchange, the exact nature of such return is unspecific. In this view, economic exchange features precise specifications of transactions and prevalence of extrinsic rewards, especially material gains. By contrast, social exchange is characterised by unspecified personal obligations and trust as well as intrinsic in conjunction with extrinsic-rewards, thus occupying the middle ground between pure calculation of advantage are conditioned by bonds based on personal trust, unlike economic transactions that rely on impersonal markets and legal regulations. Moreover, unlike economic exchange, this bond created by reciprocal benefits of extrinsic character is the principal output rather than side-effect of social exchange (Blau, 1994). Hence, exchange theory is said to centre on “enduring long-term social relations”, as distinguished from “one-shot transactions” in the market realm (Cook, 2000).

All exchanges are done on some main points. For a resource theory (1980, 1974) introduces six kinds of exchange resources: love, situation, information, money, goods and services (Ahmadi, Forouzandeh & Kahreh, 2010). Shore, Tetrick, Lynch, and Barksdale (2006) identified four main factors distinguishing between social exchanges and economic exchanges: level of trust, amount of investment, time (short term versus long term), and emphasis on exchanges (social-emotional versus pure economic and financial). In social exchanges there is a high level of trust, there is high investment on employee, there is concentration on long term relations and emphasis on social-emotional relations (Shore, Tetrick, Lynch, & Barksdale, 2006).

Social exchanges which are based on communication and subjective exchanges between employers and employees are identified by profit of social-emotional exchanges, mutual commitment and trust, long-term concentration and endless commitment. Employees identify their exchange relations after perception of organisational support of the employee. When employee think their organisations pay enough attention to their needs, their social exchanges with their organisations turn more valuable (Ahmadi, Forouzandeh & Kahreh, 2010).

Social exchange theory explains that when the employee uses social exchange approach, they show more commitment and better performance in comparison with the time when they just wait for
economic rewards for their practices (Ahmadi, Forouzandeh & Kahreh, 2010). If employees perceive increase in their employer’s commitment to themselves, they will be probably more committed to their organisations (Cho & Johansson, 2008). Alderfer’s equity theory derives from social exchange theory says the way of one’s perception of intra-organisational exchanges specifies his attitudes towards organisation and the employee (Ahmadi, Forouzandeh & Kahreh, 2010).

This theory has one of the best platforms to explain organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) of employee (Organ, 1990). The basic concept of social exchange theory is reinforcement of compensation. This means that when one of the parties (employer) gives especial profit to another party (employee), employee feels that he or she should compensate. In this social exchange models, the employee use resources and do their best in their relations for the rewards (Thompson, 2003). Social exchange relations increase the employee’s dependence on their organisations. Perceived organisational support increases organisational identity, thereby growing feelings for retrieving behaviours according to organisations’ interests. This kind of perception leaves effect on quality of employee’s behaviour towards organisations and their commitment to organisations (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994). If employees regard social organisational exchanges fair, they will be more committed to organisations and pay less attentions to economic regards, but if they regard these exchanges unfair, they will strive for compensation and will divert their attentions to economic issues. Then, salary, promotion and financial regards are compared with other organisations and turn to be motives for employee’s loyalty. The employees’ concern for their organisations decrease and they continuously compare their organisation with other ones; they might leave their organisations for better financial benefits.

The two major ways or forms by which the social exchange has been conceptualised in organisational literature are perceived organisational support and distinctive justice. Perceived organisational support means employee’s believes as to degree of importance their organisations give to their employee’s participation, role and welfare (Eisenberger, Stinglehamber, Vandernberghe, Sucharki & Rhoades, 2002; Ahmadi, Forouzandeh & Kahreh, 2010). When there is high
organisational support, the employees show more dutifulness to compensate for this support (Hadmann & Morgeson, 1999) by exhibiting OCBs. In social exchange, it is believed that when employer or employee does another (employer or employee) a favour, there is an expectation of future return. It is thus assumed that high levels of perceived organisational support create feelings of obligation. In this case, employees will not only feel that they are supposed to be committed to the organisations or firms (employers), but they will also feel an obligation to return the organisations’ commitment by involving in behaviours that will up-grade the organisational goals.

Another form of social exchange named distributive justice is used to evaluate the degree of justice in the received rewards (Ahmadi, Forouzandeh & Kahreh, 2010). The researchers showed that when the employee receive specific regards, nationally compatible with their knowledge, skills and abilities; they more likely regard the outputs such as salary, premium and job qualifications fair. If the employees feel the outputs such as salary and premium do not reflect their skills, knowledge and values, they pay less attention to distributive justice in organisations (Ahmadi, Forouzandeh & Kahreh, 2010). This is implicated in citizenship behaviour where the behaviour though not attracting any formal rewards to the actors but is needed for the overall functioning of the organisation (Organ, 1988). Applying the concepts of social exchange, theorists have reasoned that OCB occur as an employee’s response to the felt obligation to the organisation. As the employee senses strong support from the organisation, the employee will tend to show positive job attitudes as behavioural reciprocation to the organisation. Therefore, OCB from the social exchange theory are means for an employee to reciprocate fair treatment from the organisation.

**Motivational-Based Theory (McCleland, 1961, 1965)**

The need for achievement is most frequently associated with the work of David McClelland (McClelland, 1961). One of the most prominent to the explanation of motivation in organisational settings is from the work of McClelland (1961, 1965). David McClelland developed a concept of motivational theory which was based on the human need for achievement. He says that people with a
high need for achievement have a compelling desire for success and an equally intense fear of failure.

However, McClelland (1961, 1965) developed the concept of the motivational theory from one of the 20 needs underlying behaviour proposed by Murray (1938, quoted by Arnold, Silvester, Patterson, Robertson, Cooper & Burnes, 2005). Murray (1938) says that need for achievement concerns the desire ‘to overcome obstacles, to exercise power, to strive to do something difficult as well and as quickly as possible’. McClelland proposed three basic needs in humans. These include: need for achievement, need for affiliation and need for power.

McClelland’s theory as a motivation model is applied to the concept of OCB as a means of understanding why people exhibit citizenship behaviour in work organisations (Onyishi, 2006). In the achievement motive model, OCB are shown as a means for task accomplishment. When achievement is the motive, OCB emerge because such behaviours are viewed as necessary for success in the task. Need for achievement is seen as an acquired, rather than an in-born need (Onyishi, 2006). McClelland suggested that certain cues or stimuli in the environment acquire motivational properties by virtue of having been associated with success and failure in the past. If a person succeed in the past in a particular situation, then the person would be more likely to engage in achieving behaviours in the future in a similar situation. Individuals with a high need for achievement generally try to do a good job at whatever they attempt.

According to McClelland (1961), people vary substantially in the relative importance they attach to various needs and further, that there is no necessary hierarchy (that is, that people do not inevitably emphasise self-actualization after lesser needs are met) (Okpara, 2005). Typically, people with high need for achievement seek tasks that are fairly difficult, but not impossible. They like to take sole responsibility for them, and want frequent feedback on how well they are doing (Arnold, Silvester, Patterson, Robertson, Cooper & Burnes, 2005). McCleland (1961) posits that persons high in need achievement react well to challenges while those who are low in this dimension are concerned principally with playing safe and avoiding failure. Presumably, those high in need
affiliation prefer direction to autonomy (Okpara, 2005). The need for achievement arises from an individual’s desire to accomplish a goal or task more effectively than in the past. As Ugwu and Onyeneje (2002) put it, the main objective behind need achievement theory is to understand characteristics of higher need achievers, the outcome associated with high need achievement, and methods of increasing the need for achievement.

Achievement is generally not the only need operating in the organisation. As McClelland (1961) posited, many employees have stronger need for affiliation than they do for achievement. For these classes of employees, the social relations of working are more important than fulfilling job duties. People with a high need for affiliation prefer to work in groups, and they are as concerned with process by which work is accomplished as they are with final product. People with strong need for affiliation choose to spend time with close friends or significant others; write letters, make calls to friends or family; are sensitive to others’ reactions; prefer collaborative activities; prefer occupations in which they work closely with others such as teachers and counsellors (McClelland, 1985). The affiliation-oriented exhibit OCB because they place value on people and relations. These workers can be generally said to be “people-oriented”, always seeking to serve others. Unlike the achievement motive, which is portrayed by a focus on task accomplishment, the affiliation motive is best portrayed as a commitment to serving people. The affiliation-oriented people help others because they need the help, or communicate information because of its benefit to the receiver. OCB such as helping others, communicating and cooperating with fellow workers and participating in meetings emerge from the desire to belong to and remain with the group. Thus, as long as the individual sees the group as valuing their contributions to the group, the OCB will continue.

McClelland (1985) later in his theory introduced the notion of a need for power as an additional influence on motivation. McClelland and Burnham (1976) concluded that a high level of need for power, which refers to a need to influence others, is a critical factor for success. As they posited, people with strong need for power often assert themselves by taking leadership positions, gambling, drinking alcohol, and committing aggressive acts; have high blood pressure; prefer
occupations in which they can help or have impact on others, ministers and managers; and like to collect prestige positions (McClelland & Burnham, 1976). People high in power motive are continuously searching for opportunities to influence others. According to Niehoff (2004), there are much organisational behaviours that support the organisation on one hand, yet are very self-serving on the other. The power-oriented people therefore see OCB as a means to acquire power and status with authority figures in the organisation. Acts of OCB are driven by a commitment to self and one’s own career agenda.

People with a high need for achievement tend to set moderately difficult goals, make moderately risky decisions, want immediate feedback becomes preoccupied with their task and assume personal responsibility. In contrast, people with low achievement motivation tend to be motivated primarily by a desire to avoid failure. As a result, they seek out easy task in order to avoid failure; they seek out very difficult task when they are convinced that failure has no negative implications because almost anyone would fail at them. People with low achievement motivation tend to stay away from tasks of intermediate difficulty because they have high fear of failure and feel they might fail where others have been successful (Moorhead & Griffin, 1995). Need for achievement formed the basis of McClelland’s (1961) theory of work motivation, McClelland argued that a nation’s economic prosperity depends partly on the level of need for achievement in its population. As for personal success, Parker and Chusmir (1991) found that people with high need for achievement tend to feel more successful regarding status or wealth, professional fulfilment and contribution to society than those with lower need for achievement.

Another obvious need that has been regularly studied in organisational settings is need for affiliation. People high in affiliation desire the approval of others; and often conform to the wishes of those around them, particularly if they value friendship of those people (Ugwu & Onyeneje, 2002). According to the authors, the need for affiliation is the need for human companionship. People with a strong need for affiliation most often work in jobs with a lot of interpersonal contact, such as sales and teaching positions. Another need that has implications for work motivation according to
McClelland is need for power. This is the third classification in David McClelland’s theory of motivation. The need for power is the desire to control the resources in one’s environment (McClelland & Burnham, 1976). People high in need for power always strive to control their environments and the people around them. Workers high in need for power may attempt to persuade others to take their suggestions, and abide by their wishes (Ugwu & Onyeneje, 2002).

Moorhead and Griffin (1995) named three conditions that make people with such needs successful. First, they must seek power for the betterment of the organisation rather than for their own interests. Secondly, they must have a fairly low need for affiliation since their quest for power may alienate other members of the workforce. Finally, they need much self-control so that they can curb their desire for power when it threatens to interfere with effective organisational or interpersonal relationships.

Behaviours such as helping others, communicating changes that affect others, retraining from complaining, and participation in unit meetings are all considered to be critical to the overall accomplishment of task, project, objective or mission. The achievement-oriented citizen views those things that make up OCB as part of his or her work role and quite critical to success (Onyishi, 2006).

Similar to the literature on achievement motivation, the achievement-oriented citizen will persist in exhibiting OCB as long as there are sufficient challenges for doing so. OCB are often referred to as “little things” that someone must do, but no one is assigned to do (Organ, 1997). As such, most people generally ignore them. The achievement-oriented citizens see the performance of OCB as a unique contribution to the work unit, helping the unit operate more efficiently. Since OCB contribute to organisational effectiveness (Organ, 1988), the achievement-oriented citizens see a decrease in OCB as most likely to lead to reduction in efficiency or task success. The achievement-oriented workers, therefore, will exhibit any OCB as if it is needed for task success. In terms of the need for feedback, the achievement-oriented citizen is motivated to improve future performance and strive towards success. Feedback must be helpful and fair. The employee expects respect and fair
treatment from supervisors and others. When feedback is withheld, inaccurate, or un-fair, the achievement-oriented citizens will likely lose interest in OCB (Onyishi, 2006).

The achievement-oriented citizen is determined to succeed and will do what it takes to accomplish the task. As long as the higher achiever is receiving fair treatment from the organisation, OCB will continue to be exhibited. If the employee perceives that OCB loose its impact and contribution to success, the motivation to exhibit OCB will drop. Since OCB are viewed as critical to task success, one is likely to find high correlations between job performance and OCB, according to some authors (Mackenzie, Podsakoff & Felter, 1991; Werner, 1994).

It is therefore most probable that power-oriented citizens provided help to others or communicates across departments or provides input into organisational processes in order to be visible to those in power roles. As long as the target authority figure recognises the occurrence of the OCB, the power seeker is motivated to continue. In other words, OCB are exhibited not only because they contribute to organisational effectiveness, but also that they promote the individual’s rating in the organisation. Power-oriented people are willing to sacrifice to the organisation as far as such sacrifices also enable them to achieve their personal objectives.

The Equity Theory (Adams, 1963).

Adams (1963) equity theory is one of the motivational theories which explain behaviours of motivation in the work setting. Generally, equity theory is a model of motivation that explains how people strive for fairness and justice in social exchanges or give-and-take relationships (Kreitner & Kinick, 2001). Adams based his equity theory on cognitive dissonance theory, developed by social psychologists Leon Festinger (Festinger, 1957). According to Festinger’s theory, people are motivated to maintain consistency between their cognitive beliefs and their behaviours. Perceived inconsistencies create cognitive dissonance or psychological discomfort, which, in turn, motivates corrective action. Adams also did not take his equity theory far from this. He maintained that employees try to obtain fair treatment from their employers. Organ and Bateman (1991) traced the idea concerning the importance of fairness in the human condition to as far back as Aristotle, who
offered the criterion of distributive justice that a person’s share of community wealth should be proportional to merit. Adams pioneered application of the equity principle to the workplace. Central to understanding Adams’ equity theory of motivation is an awareness of key components of the individual or employee-organisation exchange relationship. This relationship is pivotal in the formation of employee’s perception of equity and inequity (Kreitner & Kinicki, 2001).

Adams (1963) said that equity would be assumed to exist if person’s and referent other’s inputs and outcomes are analogous, inequity when they are discrepant in any way. The degree of magnitude of felt inequality is said to vary as a function of the degree of discrepancy between the two ratios (Pritchard, 1969). According to Adams (1963), inequity is said to exist for a person whenever his perceived job inputs and/or outcomes stand psychologically in an obverse relation to what he perceives are the inputs and/or outcomes of the other person. Inequality can exist because one’s own ratio of outcome to input is either lesser or greater than those of the comparison person. Whichever way, the result is discomfort or disequilibrium, and the discomfort motivates the person to do something to restore equity. The suggestion of equity theory is that when a person is over compensated in relation to others, he or she may reduce inequity by increasing inputs so as to justify the over compensation. So also that when he or she is under compensated he or she will reduce input in order to restore equity. Although there is fully strong empirical support for the underpayment conditions (Adams & Rosenbaum, 1962), studies of over payment yield results that are both less consistent and open to alternative explanation (Carrell & Dittrich, 1978). Generally, researchers have questioned the entire portion of overpayment in organisations. According to Muchinsky (1993), rather than feeling of inequity in an overpayment conditions, workers are more likely to adjust their perception of input or output based on the assumption that the organisation would not pay them more than they are actually worth. Muchinsky (1993) also noted that people seem to have a very high threshold for underpayment. This means that, it takes a large increment for people to feel overpaid but a small decrement makes people to feel grossly underpaid.
Adams (1963) considered the use of the “inequity” as being more precise than “equity” in his explanation of a worker’s perceived relationship of his work and resultant reward or pay on the one hand, and the work and consequent pay or reward of others on the other hand. The theory defines equity as the belief that we are being treated fairly in relation to others and inequity as the belief that we are being treated unfairly in relation to others. These “others” include a co-worker, a classmate, a group of workers and an organisation.

The theory perceptions are formed when the individual first evaluates how he or she is being treated by the organisation; the individual evaluates how a “comparison other” is being treated; and thirdly, the individual compares the respective situations after evaluating the treatment of self and other. As a result of this comparison, the employee experiences either equity or inequity. According to Adams, employee often compares his pay and other job outcomes to those of other employees with similar jobs or with similar qualifications in his or her organisations. Therefore, according to Kreinter and Kinicki (2001), three things are formed from this theory: inputs, outcomes, and comparison other. Inputs are those acquired and inherent attributes of the worker. According to Kreitner and Kinicki (2001), they include education qualification, work experience, skills, effort, expended training, and creativity; others include seniority, loyalty to organisation, age, personality traits and personal appearance.

However, Ugwu and Onyeneje (2002) posit that any of the aforementioned attributes is an input only if its possessor recognises its relevance as such, despite the perceptions of the other party. The problems of inequity are said to normally arise, however, if only the possessor of an attribute recognises the attribute as such, without a reciprocal recognition by the non-possessor who is a party to the exchange of services for wages. Therefore, Adams (1963) believed that an employee’s perception of whether his or her pay was just and fair or not was contingent on the worker’s perceived services to his employer.

On the outcome side of the exchange, the organisation reciprocates by providing such things as pay, fringe benefits, bonuses, recognition, challenging assignments, job security, career
advancement or promotions, status symbols, pleasant or safe working environment, opportunity for personal growth and development, supportive supervision, and participation in important decisions. These outcomes vary widely, depending on one’s organisation and rank (Kreitner & Kinicki, 2001). Ugwu and Onyeneje (2002) were of the view that outcome is potentially an outcome if the employer, or both employer and employee, recognise the outcome. The same outcome becomes an outcome if the employer, or both the employer and the employee, recognise the outcomes as relevant to the exchange of his or her input. Walster, Bersheild and Walster (1973), were also of the view that outcomes can be negative or positive. They called the former “costs,” while the latter is “rewards”. A worker’s total outcomes in a relationship are believed to be equal to the difference between the rewards he or she obtains from such relationship and the costs he or she incurs.

According to Adams (1963), inputs and outcomes are imperfectly inter-correlated; the central theme of job inequity is the employee’s constant comparisons between his or her inputs and outcomes on one hand and those of “others” on the other hand. People tend to compare themselves to other individuals with whom they have close interpersonal ties – such as friends – and/or to similar others – such as people performing the same job or individuals of the same gender or educational level – rather than dissimilar others (Shah, 1998). As Adams (1963) views it, inequity is said to exist for a worker whenever he or she perceives the correlations as unfair to him or her. If the value of the ratio equals the value of the “other” ratio, the situation is perceived as equitable and no existence of psychological tension, but if the values are not proportional, that is, the values of the worker’s ration are larger or smaller than the values of the “other” ratio, psychological tension will arise and the individual will be motivated to reduce the tension (Adams, 1963).

According to Onyishi (2006), equity theory places a rather heavy emphasis on the choice of a comparison or referent others for the purpose of evaluating outcomes. Inasmuch as the theory placed much emphasis on the choice of referent others, it did not elaborate on the mode of choice of others by the individual. For Greenberg (1986), there is always some confusion about the nature of referent. Potential sources of referents that might be used when an individual evaluates his or her outcomes
have been identified (Goodman & Friedman, 1971). The authors maintained that individuals may use more than one referent and that their self-satisfaction with pay was affected by a combination of comparisons with the appropriate referents. A major area of concern that arises in research on equity theory has been the possible role of individual differences in equity calculation and tension reduction. Personal orientation such as belief in just world has been found to influence individual’s equity calculations (Hagedoorn, Bullink & Van de Vlient, 2002; Huseman, Hatfield & Miles, 1987; King & Miles, 1994; Lerner, 1977, all in Onyishi, 2006).

If employees perceive unfair compensation, then they may be less likely to perform OCB. This is because such behaviours are discretionary, which is outside an employee’s formal role requirements. According to Onyishi (2006), failure to perform OCB is less likely than failure to perform duty in the job description to result in official sanctions or in the sacrifice of incremental rewards provided by the formal reward system. As a response to perceive inequity, an employee may withhold voluntary behaviours to adjust his or her input portion of the equity calculation. If employees perceive unfair compensation, then they may be less likely to perform OCB.

**EMPIRICAL REVIEW**

**Psychological Ownership and Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB)**

People develop possessive feelings (mine and ours) towards tangible and intangible objects. Just like the case with attitudes, psychological ownership has cognitive, emotional and behavioural elements and can exist on individual level or group (organisational) level (Pierce, Kostova & Dirks, 2001).

However, the antecedents of psychological ownership have not been extensively addressed in the empirical literature (Chi & Han, 2008). By looking at past research, it can be believed that the feeling of ownership is an important part of the human condition; people develop feelings of ownership towards different objects – both tangible and intangible – throughout their lifetimes. These feelings of ownership give shape to a person’s self-identity. Moreover, feelings of ownership have important behavioural, emotional and psychological consequences (Ceja & Tapies, 2011).
Empirically, psychological ownership differs from possession in terms of concept and motives (Ceja & Tapies, 2011). A feeling of possession is omnipresent and may involve tangible or intangible objects; it is based on both legal and non-legal ownership. Pierce, Kostova and Dirks (2001) suggest that, in terms of motive, psychological ownership occurs to satisfy three basic human needs: (1) home, that is, a sense of belonging; (2) effectiveness and efficiency; and (3) self-identification.

Even in the absence of any legal, economic or physical attachment, people experience this feeling in all parts of their lives (Dittmar, 1992; Furby, 1980). There are some opinions that support the idea that psychological ownership relates the individual to the society and the environment in terms of sociology and psychology. Perhaps the most obvious effect of psychological ownership is that employees will come to see themselves as owners of the organisation. Pierce and Rodgers (2004) proposed a model of the psychology of employee ownership that described ownership existing as separate objective (formal) and psychological states.

Psychological ownership can be organisation-based or job-based (Mayhew, Ashkanasy, Bramble, & Gardiner, 2007). Organisation-based psychological ownership is an individual’s feelings of possession and relatedness to the organisation as a whole, whereas job-based psychological ownership is an individual’s feelings of possession over their job exclusively. Both are attitudinal states, rather than enduring personality traits, and therefore context specific being influenced by the current state of the organisation and job (Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004).

In this study, the researcher focuses on the organisation as the target of psychological ownership. Recent studies have demonstrated that psychological ownership for the organisation is positively related to organisational commitment and organisational citizenship behaviour (O’Driscoll, Pierce & Coghlan, 2006; Van dyne & Pierce, 2004; Vandlewalle, Van Dyne, & Kostova, 1995).

Dyne and Pierce (2004) in their favourable results reported that there was a positive relationship between psychological ownership for the organisation and organisational citizenship behaviour. The researchers’ aims among other things were to find out how psychological ownership
for the organisation can result in OCBs, organisational commitment and job satisfaction. In a sample of 822 workers which included clerical, offices, supervisory, professional, and management jobs from different areas of the United States of America, they found that psychological ownership added 7-8% to explained variance in OCB beyond demographics. In addition, psychological ownership for the organisation continued to increase explained variance in supervisor- and peer-rated OCB (3-4%), over and above the effects of commitment and satisfaction. They summarized by saying that in their findings, psychological ownership for the organisation provides incremental explanatory power in understanding organisational citizenship beyond age, education, gender, tenure, commitment, and satisfaction. They also reported that the correlation between psychological ownership for the organisation and commitment was significant. After accounting for the demographic controls, psychological ownership increased explained variance in commitment by 15% and 16% for job satisfaction.

In one of the recent studies by Avey and colleagues (2009), for the variables of psychological ownership for the organisation, OCB, organisational commitment and job satisfaction also, a similar results were found. A sample which comprised 316 working adults in the United States of America from wide cross section organisations who volunteered to participate in the research were used. The researchers examined if psychological ownership could lead to OCB, organisational commitment and job satisfaction. Of those participants, 37 per cent identified themselves as entry level, 42.7 per cent were mid-level including supervisors, and 18.7 per cent of participants were at a higher position. The mean age for the sample was 32.1 years with 7.1 years tenure at the existing organization. There were 46.5 per cent females, 49.7 per cent males and 3.8 per cent of the participants did not list gender.

The findings of the study revealed that psychological ownership was positively related to ratings of individual OCBs as well as organization-targeted OCBs, with the latter finding supporting that the organization would potentially be a more important target of psychological ownership. Affective commitment toward the organization was also positively related to psychological ownership. As anticipated by the researcher, workplace deviance was negatively related to
psychological ownership and intentions to stay with the organization were positively related to psychological ownership. Finally, they found that job satisfaction was positively related to psychological ownership.

The major contributions of Avey and colleagues’ (2009) study to the current research were their findings that the extent to which one feels like an owner over a target will be reflected in whether the individual personally identifies with the target, feels a sense of belongingness toward the target, considers it a right to hold oneself and others accountable for their influence on the target. In addition, both types of organizational citizenship behaviours (individual and organizational) were related to promotive psychological ownership.

Scholars such as Pierce and Jussila (2010) have found that the psychological sense of ownership is an integral part of the employee’s relationship with the organisation. In the organisation context, the concept of psychological ownership captures the nature of the bond between the employee and the organisation. The attachment and identification contained in the sense of psychological ownership represents the foundation of the unique culture of organisations and therefore their inimitable competitive advantage (Ceja & Tapies, 2011).

Pierce and Rodgers (2004) proposed a process of how psychological ownership may positively affect employee attitudes and behaviours and provide motivation for the employee to contribute to the wellbeing of the organisation through OCB. By extending the opportunity of organisational ownership to employees, sharing organisational information, and permitting employee involvement in decision making, the employer communicates a message to the employee that he or she is valued and important to the organisation and this can promote OCB in the organisation. As employees internalise the belief that they are competent, important, and valuable to the organisation they will be motivated to work hard to maintain that self-image.

Similarly, as employees come to increasingly experience a sense of ownership over the organisation, the organisation becomes a part of the employee owner’s extended sense of self. The self-regulatory mechanisms of self-efficacy and self-enhancement provide the performance motivation to maintain or enhance that self-image which includes the organisation (Pierce &
Rodgers, 2004). Summed up as, “It is when the owned object is a part of the self and the self is motivated to maintain or enhance the sense of self that employee owners are motivated to improve organisational citizenship behaviour and ensure the vitality of the organisation” (Pierce & Rodgers, 2004, p. 606).

Based on the past research, it is believed that psychological ownership is positively related to organisational citizenship behaviour, that is, behaviour that contributes to the organisations’ well-being, is voluntary and is intended to be positive in nature, for which there is no promised or implied reward (Organ, 1988). Behaviour is, in part, a function of one’s self identity, as individuals create and maintain their sense of self by initiating stable patterns of behaviour that infuse roles with personal meaning (Burke & Reitzes, 1991). Therefore, when individuals feel ownership for a social entity such as family, group, organisation, and nation, they are likely to engage in citizenship behaviours towards that entity. This link has been suggested also by empirical research reporting a positive and significant correlation between psychological ownership and citizenship behaviour in a cooperative living arrangement (Pierce, Kostova, & Dirks, 2003).

The willingness to assume personal risk or make personal sacrifice on behalf of a social entity is another important association of psychological ownership with OCB. While such behaviours are part of role requirements in rescue teams, military, police, and fire fighting organisations, they are important and also occur in other situations where they are not obligatory (Pierce, Kostova, & Dirks 2003). For example, members who are willing to step forward “blow the whistle” such as report unethical behaviour, illegal acts, or malfeasance, are taking personal risk and making a sacrifice for the well-being of their organisations (Pierce, Kostova, & Dirks, 2003). Drawing from the above report, we propose that such behaviours will be prompted by feelings of ownership for the target (organisation). It is, after all, the situation where the target has been brought into the citadel of the self, and its impairment result in a diminution of the self. Therefore, when individual becomes cognizance of events that are detrimental to the health and well-being of their organisations, they will assume the risk to “blow the whistle”, which is also a part of OCB.
Closely related to experience responsibility are the feelings of stewardship where individuals feel responsible as the caretakers of a property, even though they are not the legal owners. As proposed by Davis, Schoorman, and Donaldson (1997) in their stewardship theory, in certain situations when individuals feel like stewards they are motivated to act in the best interest of the principals rather than in their personal interests. The researcher suggests that psychological ownership is likely to create such situation which is also part of OCB.

Extra-role behaviour encompasses discretionary behaviour, external to formal employment conditions, and rewards (Van Dyne, Cummings, & McLean, 1995). Although there has been an inconsistent use of the terminology to describe such behaviours, organisational citizenship behaviour (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983) and extra-role behaviour (Van Dyne, Cummings, & McLean, 1995) are the most accepted labels. Furthermore, LePine, Erez, and Johnson (2002) found that the varying terminology of these discretionary behaviours does not produce differences in predictive relationships. Therefore, literature on organisational citizenship behaviour will also be applied to develop support for the hypotheses concerning extra-role behaviours.

There has been support for psychological ownership to produce increments in extra-role behaviours. Pierce, Rubenfeld, and Morgan (1991) theorized that psychological ownership would be associated with extra-role behaviours. Vandewalle, Van Dyne, and Kostova (1995) found a significant positive relationship between extra-role behaviours and psychological ownership, and this relationship was stronger than the relationship between in-role behaviours and psychological ownership.

Based on Van Dyne, Cummings, and McLean’s (1995) typology of extra-role behaviour, two specific dimensions of extra-role behaviour will be examined, rather than a single global measure. Because the researcher were interested in the positive consequences of psychological ownership, he chose to investigate the two types of promotive behaviour—helping and voice behaviour. Helping extra-role behaviour refers to promotive behaviour that is cooperative and facilitates working relationships, while voice extra-role behaviour includes constructive expression aimed at continuous organisational improvement (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). It can be expected that when employees
feel ownership in their organisation, they are motivated to maintain harmonious relationships, and feel entitled to offer suggestions for change, in order to facilitate overall performance in their organisation through OCB.

Positive work behaviours include Organisational Citizenship Behaviours (OCBs) which are discretionary work behaviours are not a part of formal job expectations (LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002). For example, helping co-workers, or volunteering for special tasks (Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004). Psychological ownership influences levels of OCB (Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004; Vandewalle, Van Dyne, & Kostova, 1995; Wagner et al., 2003). Vandewalle, Van Dyne, & Kostova, (1995) found that the relationship between psychological ownership and extra role behaviour was mediated by commitment and Van Dyne and Pierce (2004) found that psychological ownership increased the explained variance in OCB above that explained by commitment, satisfaction, and demographic factors. This is an important finding that adds validity to the claim that psychological ownership is a construct that can help predict employee attitudes and work behaviours beyond that possible with organisational citizenship behaviour, commitment and satisfaction (Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004).

It has been proposed that aspects of these claims can be explained by the process described above, where a positive change in employee attitudes and behaviours occurs through the development of psychological ownership, related positive organisational attitudes, and resulting pro-organisation behaviours such as OCBs (Chi & Han, 2008; Mayhew et al., 2007; Pierce, Rubenfeld, & Morgan, 1991; Pierce, Kostova, & Dirks, 2001; Pierce, Kostova, & Dirks, 2003; Pierce & Rodgers, 2004; Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004; Wagner et al., 2003).

Organisational Trust and organisational Citizenship Behaviour

The conceptualization of organisational citizenship behaviour was hinged on the assumption that the behaviour though discretionary in nature and not fully recognised by the employing organisations’ reward system, positively contributes to overall functioning of the organisation (Organ, 1988). It is therefore not surprising that researchers have begun to empirically examine the relationship between OCB and organisational trust. Organisational trust enables cooperative behaviour, reduces conflict, and decreases transaction costs at work (Rousseau et al., 1998). It has
been demonstrated to be an important predictor of certain organizational outcomes such as organizational commitment (Cook & Wall, 1980) and organizational citizenship behaviour (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994, Van Dyne et al., 2000).

Studies have continued to provide data showing that organisational trust positively relate to OCB. In one of such studies, Yui-Tim Wong, Hang-Yue Ngo, and Chi-Sum Wong (2004) in their work titled: “Perceived Organisational Justice, Trust, and OCB: A study of Chinese Workers in Joint Ventures and State-owned Enterprises”, carried out an investigation to find out the relationships of perceived organisational justice, organisational trust, and organisational citizenship behaviours (OCB) among Chinese workers in joint ventures (JVs) and state-owned enterprises (SOEs). In the study, they selected factory workers, including production-line workers, clerks, technicians, foremen, and production supervisors. The respondents of the JV sample and the SOE sample comprised 295 and 253 employees and their immediate supervisors respectively.

The immediate supervisors of the participants were asked to evaluate their subordinates’ level of OCB. They measured the employee’s trust in their organization by an eight-item scale that combined the two-item scales on trust in organization that Ashford, Lee, and Bobko (1989) developed and the six-item scale on trust in management that Cook and Wall (1980) developed. The coefficient alpha of the sample in JV is 0.79. The coefficient alpha of the sample in SOE is 0.89. For OCB scale, they modified and used the Farh, Earley, and Lin (1997) scale with twenty-two items. The coefficient alpha of the sample in JV is 0.82. The coefficient alpha of the sample in SOE is 0.92.

The results showed that both trust in organization and trust in supervisor have a positive and significant correlation with OCB. In one of their hypotheses, they stated that the employees’ trust in organisation will have a positive effect on their OCB. And the researchers’ results showed that organisational trust positively related to OCB for the SOE sample and JV sample.

As confirmed by their findings, trust in supervisor has a strong and positive effect on OCB in JV. Moreover, on the contrary, the effect of trust in supervisor on OCB is insignificant in SOE (β = 0.076, ns).
In a more recent study, Trivers (2009) investigated the servant leadership’s effects on organisational trust and organisational citizenship behaviours. The research was conducted in North-western US organizations. The sampling was done with three survey instruments measuring servant leadership; trust in leadership and organizational citizenship behaviour. 134 surveys represented the sample.

Trivers (2009) tested two hypotheses to determine correlative relationships between the predictor variable of servant leadership and criterion variables of organisational trust and OCB. A third hypothesis was tested by the researcher to determine a correlative relationship between the predictor variable of organisational trust and criterion variable of OCB. Positive significant correlations were found supporting the first three hypotheses. The correlation between servant leadership and organizational citizenship behaviour was .47 and significant; the correlation between servant leadership and organizational trust was .77 and significant; the correlation between organisational trust and organizational citizenship behaviour was .54 and significant.

A fourth hypothesis was also tested by Trivers to know if organizational trust mediates the association between servant leadership and organizational citizenship behaviour. This hypothesis was upheld as organizational trust was shown to completely mediate the relationship between servant leadership and OCB.

According to the study, city employees reported higher trust scores than both Health Care and National Security and Federal Transportation Administration employees reported higher organizational trust scores than Health Care employees. There were no significant trust differences among the demographics of gender, age, education, sector, size of the work group and supervisor’s title.

The study also revealed that 20 to 29 year old employees reported higher OCB scores than employees over 60 years old. Employees having some college reported lower OCB scores than those having Bachelor’s or Post-graduate degree. Federal National Security employees reported lower OCB scores than Environmental Services employees, Management Services employees, City
employees and Federal Transportation Administration employees. There were no significant OCB differences among the demographics of gender, sector, size of the work group and supervisor’s title.

The researcher’s finding of an $r = .77$ correlation between servant leadership and organizational trust is similar to Reinke’s (2004) correlations of .69 to .81 between trust in the leader and the individual constructs of servant leadership. This correlation is similar to Danhauser and Boshoff’s (2006) correlation of .86 between servant leadership and trust in the organization & manager. This result is also similar to Joseph and Winston’s (2005) correlation between servant leadership and trust in the leader. Similarly, the correlation between servant leadership and OCB is consistent with Ehrhart’s (2004) findings. Ehrhart found positive significant relationships between servant leadership and unit-level OCB subscales of helping/altruism and conscientiousness.

The correlation of trust in the leader and organizational citizenship behaviour is similar to the Asgari, Silong, Ahmad, and Samah (2008) correlation. However, this correlation is not consistent with the Dirks and Ferrin (2002) meta-analytical correlations of .11 to .22 between trust in the leader and the five Organ (1988) constructs of OCB. Given the similarity of the other correlative comparisons with previous work and the fact that the allowing error terms to correlate did not significantly change the SEM results, these disparities are possibly due to differences in the operationalization of the constructs, especially trust. Dirks and Ferrin noted that the operational definition of trust has a strong effect on the relationship between trust and its antecedents and outcomes; a view previously hypothesized by Hosmer (1995). Additionally, this may be due to differences in the sample populations among the various studies.

The positive and significant correlations among servant leadership, organizational trust and organizational citizenship behaviours are consistent with social exchange theory where positive supportive exchanges between leader and individuals lead initially to reciprocating altruistic and trusting relationships between and among leaders and employees. When individuals act in discretionary ways that benefit others (such as organizational citizenship behaviours), an implied commitment for future reciprocation is created. This commitment requires trusting relationships. Such reciprocation is the basis for future organizational citizenship behaviours.
As such, reciprocal service becomes a collective concept promoting positive outcomes, both individually and organizational and a positive cycle that is long-term and sustainable (Patterson, 2003). The idea of an organizational trust-to-feedback is also consistent with the concepts of reciprocity and social exchange. Trust indeed is a critical component to establishing and—more importantly—maintaining social relationships in that reciprocal exchanges consistently produce stronger feelings of trust, affective regard, commitment, and fairness between exchange partners (Molm, Takahashi & Peterson 2000). When employees perceive they are being treated fairly (a basis for trust), they have been shown to engage voluntarily in citizenship behaviour (Farh, Podsakoff, & Organ, 1990; Organ, 1988) in a form of social exchange (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994).

The linkage between trust in organization and OCB has also been examined by some scholars (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman & Fetter, 1990). According to Konovsky and Pugh (1994), organisational trust is a manifestation of social exchange, and social exchange accounts for OCB by encouraging employees to behave in ways that are not strictly mandated by their employers (Rousseau & Parks, 1993). It follows that employees with higher trust in their organization are likely to display more OCB, regardless of the types of organization.

One possible antecedent to Greenleaf’s (1977) trust proposals is organizational citizenship behaviour. Greenleaf’s proposition that nothing happens without trust suggests the possibility of the relationship between organisational trust and organizational citizenship behaviour. According to some researchers’ investigation, building of trust between leaders and followers (Cherry, 2000; Dirks & Skarlicki, 2004; Kollok, 1994; Konovsky & Pugh, 1994) leads to increased frequency of organizational citizenship behaviours (Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2005). Farling, Stone, and Winston, (1999) suggested that the climate of trust that helps establish a cooperative organizational climate also results in increased levels of service both from leader-to-follower and follower-to-leader.

Appelbaum, Bartolomucci, Beaumier, Corrigan, Dore, Girard, and Serroni, (2004) in their own study, studied the impact of culture, leadership and trust in the institution of organizational citizenship behaviour and concluded that trust has a major role in the institution of the mentioned
behaviour. Dolan, Tzafrir and Baruch (2005) investigated the relationship among organizational trust, organizational citizenship behaviour and organizational justice and discovered the existence of a positive relationship between organizational justice and organizational trust and asserted that organizational trust has a strong impact on the institution of organizational citizenship behaviour.

Conn (2004), Kickul, Gundry, and Posig (2005) and Hubbell and Assad (2005) studied the relationship between organizational trust and organizational justice which can lead to OCB and found out a reciprocal relationship between the two factors.

Perry and Mankin (2007), Zalabak, Ellis, Winograd (2000), Gillis (2003) and Driscoll (1978) assert that organizational trust environment is an important factor for providing job satisfaction and inversely lead to OCB. İşbaşı (2000) investigated the role of organizational trust held by the employees towards their managers and their perspectives about organizational justice on the creation of organizational citizenship behaviour in a tourism organization and discovered a positive relationship between organizational trust and organizational citizenship behaviour.

Kamer (2001) investigated the effects of organizational trust and organizational commitment on organizational citizenship behaviour and observed a positive relationship between organizational trust and organizational commitment yet they assert that there is not a clear relationship between organizational trust and organizational citizenship behaviour. Deluga (1994) was able to find out that supervisor’s trust building behaviour was closely associated with employees’ OCB. As a consequence of social exchange, employees’ trust in supervisor is likely to affect their OCB. Based on the fact that empirical supports have been existed between OCB and organisational trust, interest on OCB is likely to be retained, at least for the near future.

SUMMARY OF LITERATURE REVIEW

Social exchange theory is based on the premise that human behaviour or social interaction is an exchange of activities – tangible or intangible – particularly of reward and costs. People weigh the potential benefits and risks of social relationships. When the risks involved outweigh the social reward, people will likely terminate or abandon that relationship. This means that in exchange theory, if benefit given to others is more valuable to them than the cost to the giver and vice versa as
underlying bases or open secret of human behaviour. In other words, when individual give to another, he or she does so in trust believing that the other person will reciprocate the gesture. This give and take attitude reinforces compensation; therefore, if employees regard social organisational exchange to be fair and favourable, there will be increase chances of citizenship behaviour.

Achievement motivation theory in organisational setting posits that employees high in need achievement react well to challenges, while those who are low in this dimension are concerned principally with playing safe and avoiding failure. The achievement – oriented citizens are determined to succeed and will do what it takes to accomplish tasks. As long as the higher achiever is receiving fair treatment from the organisation, he or she will continue to exhibit organisational citizenship behaviour and vice versa. Power – oriented citizens provide help others or communicate across sections or even provide inputs into organisational processes in order to be visible to those in power role. As far as the authority recognises the power seeker, he or she is continually motivated to provide services which deepen the organisational citizenship behaviour.

The equity theorist believes that inequity can exist because one’s own ratio of outcome to input is either lesser or greater than those of comparison other.

**HYPOTHESES**

The following hypotheses were tested:

i) Psychological ownership will not predict organizational citizenship behaviour among bank workers.

ii) Organisational trust will not predict organizational citizenship behaviour among bank workers.
CHAPTER THREE
METHOD

Participants

A total of 203 Bank workers from five Nigerian Banks participated in the study. The banks used include: Diamond Bank, Access Bank, Eco Bank, UBA, and Fidelity Bank. The Banks are located in Nsukka in Enugu State, Nigeria. All the participants were adults, with age range of 19-47 years and mean age of 33. Seventy eight (78) women and one hundred and twenty eight (128) men participated in the study. One hundred and thirty eight (138) of the participants were single and sixty five (65) were married. The participants volunteered to take part in the study.

Instruments

Questionnaires were used for data collection. The Questionnaires has two sections: the first section covered statements that elicited demographic data such as age, employment status, gender and academic qualifications. The second section focused on measures of other variables of interest. Three separate scales were used to measure the variables in the study and these include: Organisational Citizenship Behaviour Scale, Psychological Ownership Questionnaire, and Organisational Trust Index.

Organisational Citizenship Behaviour Scale (OCBS) developed by Onyishi (2007) was used to measure organisational citizenship behaviour. It is a 21-item scale. Onyishi tested and validated the scale. The scale has a reliability coefficient (Cronbach alpha) of .83 and a test-retest reliability coefficient of .76.

The quality of every test is measured on its ability to test and its power for generalisation (Anastasi & Urbina, 1997); thus, a pilot test was conducted to make it useable among bank workers in Nigeria and to assess the internal consistency of the OCB inventory. One hundred and fifteen (115) participants were drawn from the staff of micro finance banks in Nsukka, Enugu state. Their ages ranged from 20-60 years. Analysis of the raw scores showed a Cronbach alpha of .74 for the
scale. This indicates that the inventory is reliable and can be used for the research; therefore, all the items in the OCBS were retained for the study.

The OCBS is a self-report Likert format response scale ranging from “never”, to “very often”. It is scored as follows: Never = 1 point, rarely = 2 points, Sometimes = 3 points, Often = 4 points and Very often = 5 points. A sample item for the OCBS is ‘‘I help my colleagues who are absent by doing some of their jobs”. Onyishi (2007) conducted factor analysis on the study and it was revealed that organisational citizenship behaviour has two separate dimensions: one dimension is directed to specific individual in the workplace and the other is directed to the organisation.

Psychological ownership was measured with Psychological Ownership Questionnaire (POQ). It is a 16-item scale developed by Avey and colleagues (2009). There are three items for each of the four components for the promotion-oriented ownership scales and four items for the feelings of territoriality. Internal reliabilities for the components were: self-efficacy (a=.90), accountability (a=.81), sense of belongingness (a=.92) and self-identity (a=.73) (Avey, Avolio, Crossley, & Luthans, 2009). For the content and face validity, the 16 selected items were sent to an organisation behaviour research group consisting of faculty and doctoral students. These reviewers agreed that each of the items selected were either the best choices or among the best choices in terms of capturing the construct as well as having high face validity (Avey, Avolio, Crossley, & Luthans 2009).

The 16-items scale that was developed by Avey and colleagues (2009) as a short version of scale was used in the present study. To make responses easier, a 5-point Likert response format (1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Undecided, 4 = Agree, and 5 = Strongly Agree) was adopted instead of the 6-point format (1= Strongly Disagree to 6= Strongly Agree) originally used by the authors. The 16 items were subjected to pilot test to make it suitable in Nigeria. One hundred and fifteen (115) respondents participated in the study. The participants were drawn from the staff of micro finance banks in Nsukka, Enugu state. Their ages ranged from 20-60 years. Analysis of the raw scores showed a Cronbach alpha of .77 for Psychological Ownership Questionnaire (POQ). This
means that the inventory is reliable and can be used to measure what it is designed to measure and as well can stand the test of time. All the items in the POQ were retained for the study.

The Organizational Trust Index (OTI) was used to measure Organisational Trust. The Organizational Trust Index (OTI) has 29 items which was initially developed by Shockley-Zalabak, Ellis and Cessaria (1999) and was revalidated in Nigeria by Ugwu (2011). It is a 29-item scale that addresses four dimensions of trust built from Mishra’s (1996) model for organisational trust. They included the concepts of competence, openness, concern, and reliability, but Shockley-Zalabak, Ellis and Cessaria, (1999) added the fifth dimension – identification-- as the last of the five faces of organisational trust. The authors of OTI tested and validated the scale by conducting confirmatory factor analysis. Rigorous statistical testing demonstrated that the instrument is both reliable and valid for use in international arena (Shockley-Zalabak, Ellis and Cessaria, 1999). Cronbach alpha for the 29-item OTI was .95, indicating that the instrument is stable over time and internally and externally consistent. Alpha reliabilities for the five subscales, each of which measure one dimension of trust ranges from .85 to .90. According to the developers, the five dimensions of organizational trust did not differ by geographic culture or type of industry.

Even though Shockley-Zalabak, Ellis and Cessaria (1999) stated that the OTI did not differ by geographic culture or type of industry, they were obviously making reference to the Western community. The 29-item instrument was therefore subjected to validity and reliability tests to make it useable in Nigeria by Ugwu (2011). For the face validity, the instrument was presented to six judges in the fields of management and psychology; and there was a 100% agreement among all the six judges that the 29 items have face validity to measure organisational trust in Nigerian work organisations.

The 29-item OTI were further subjected to content validation study and also to item analysis to determine the item-total correlations by the author. The result produced item-total correlations that ranged from .30 to .66. The OTI had a reliability coefficient, Cronbach $\alpha$ of .89 and a test-retest reliability of .82 after three weeks interval. The result of the item analysis indicated that all the items
of the OTI measured up to the benchmark of .30 for an item to be successful for inclusion; therefore all the items in the OTI were retained for the study. The 29 items were also subjected to exploratory factor analysis using Varimax rotation with Kaiser Normalization method to ascertain whether the proposed five-dimensional structure of organisational trust index: competence, openness, concern, reliability and identification would hold. The result of the factor analysis of the current study equally supported the five-dimensional approach of organisational trust (Ugwu, 2011).

The OTI was designed in a 5-point Likert-type response former ranging from “very little” to “very great”. It is scored as follows: Very little – 1 point, little = 2 points, some = 3 points, great = 4 points, and very great = 5 points. Sample items include: “I am highly satisfied with the overall quality of the products and/or services of the organisation”, (competence). “I receive adequate information regarding how well I am doing in my job”, (openness). “My immediate supervisor speaks positively about subordinates in front of others”, (concern). “My immediate supervisor follows through with what he/she say”, (reliability). “I feel connected with my organisation”, (identification).

To update the reliability of the inventory, especially among Nigeria bank workers, the present researcher conducted a pilot test on OTI. One hundred and fifteen (115) participants were used for the test. The participants were drawn from the staff of micro finance banks in Nsukka, Enugu state. Their ages ranged from 20-60 years. Analysis of the raw scores showed a Cronbach alpha of .94 for OTI. This indicates that the inventory is reliable and can be used for the research; therefore, all the items in the OTI were retained for the study.

Procedure

The researcher introduced himself to the bank management and sought the consent of the authority to conduct the study. A letter of identification was collected by the researcher from the Department of Psychology, University of Nigeria, Nsukka. The letter helped the researcher by facilitating the cooperation bank workers. The researcher informed them that the research was a part of M.Sc. program which the researcher cannot complete without conducting research. The researcher
also informed the participants that their names were not going to be taken, but their efforts would be appreciated eventually. Two hundred and three questionnaires were administered to 203 participants and all were collected through snowball sampling technique after adequate rapport had been established. The questionnaires comprised all the items from the three inventories.

**Design and Statistic**

The study employed a cross-sectional design. Multiple regression analysis was used for data analysis, using the SPSS computer program.
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Results

Table 1 shows the result of correlation analysis on relationship among psychological ownership, organizational trust and organizational citizenship behaviour.

Table 1: Correlation among the study variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCB</th>
<th>Psy. Owner</th>
<th>Organ. trust</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Employment status</th>
<th>Length of service</th>
<th>Years in current job</th>
<th>Educational qualification</th>
<th>Marital status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.180**</td>
<td>.410***</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>-.149*</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>-.049*</td>
<td>-.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological ownership</td>
<td>.180**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.295***</td>
<td>-.173*</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>-.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational trust</td>
<td>.410***</td>
<td>.295***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.190**</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>-.096</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>-.140*</td>
<td>-.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>-.173*</td>
<td>-.190**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>-.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.149*</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.265***</td>
<td>.469***</td>
<td>.211***</td>
<td>.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>-.096</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>-.265***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.285***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>length of service</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.469***</td>
<td>-.285***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.634***</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in current job</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>-.140*</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.211***</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>.634***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational qualification</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>-.133</td>
<td>-.064</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>.304***</td>
<td>.453***</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.264***</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.05  
**p<0.01  
***p<0.001

The result of the correlational analysis as presented in Table 1 shows that organizational citizenship behaviour was positively related to psychological ownership: $r = 180$, $p < 0.01$, and organizational trust: $r = 410$, $p < 0.001$. While age showed a negative correlation with OCB: $r = -.149$, $p < 0.01$, gender, employment status, length of service, years in current job, educational qualification, and marital status did not significantly correlate with OCB. Psychological ownership correlates positively with organizational trust: $r = .295$, $p < 0.01$ and negatively with gender: $r = -.173$, $p < 0.01$, but did not correlate with other demographic variables. Also, organizational trust negatively correlates with gender: $r = -.190$, $p < 0.001$ and years in current job: $r = -.140$, $p < 0.001$ respectively; but did not relate to other demographic variables.

The demographic variables such as gender only relates with marital status: $r = .304$, $p < 0.05$; age negatively relate with employment status: $r = -.265$, $p < 0.001$, length of service: $r = -.469$, $p < 0.$
001, years in current job: \( r = .211, p < 0.001 \), and marital status: \( r = .453, p < 0.001 \). Employment status negatively correlates with length of service: \( r = -.285, p < 0.001 \); length of service also correlate with years in current job: \( r = .634, p < 0.001 \), and marital status: \( r = .264, p < 0.001 \) respectively.

Multiple linear regressions analysis was further conducted to examine the predictive ability of psychological ownership and organizational trust on organizational citizenship behaviour and the result is presented in Table 2 below:

Table 2
Regression analysis on relationship among psychological ownership, organizational trust and organizational citizenship behaviour.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
<td>-.124</td>
<td>1.191</td>
<td>-1.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>-.133</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>-1.457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employment status</td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>1.411</td>
<td>-1.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>length of service</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>-.979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>years in current job</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.458</td>
<td>.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educational qualification</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>-.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marital status</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>1.399</td>
<td>-.173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>1.187</td>
<td>-1.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.148</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>-1.641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>1.393</td>
<td>-.980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of service</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>.506</td>
<td>-1.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in current job</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>.669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational qualification</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>-.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>1.383</td>
<td>-.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological ownership</td>
<td>.173*</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>2.456</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>1.123</td>
<td>-.603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.112</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>-1.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>1.317</td>
<td>-.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of service</td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td>-.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in current job</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.424</td>
<td>.998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational qualification</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>1.295</td>
<td>-.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological ownership</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>1.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational trust</td>
<td>.372***</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>5.327</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*p<0.05
***p<0.001

According to the Table, psychological ownership significantly predicted organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) among Bank workers (\( \beta = 0.173, p < 0.05 \)). Also organisational trust significantly predicted organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) among Bank workers (\( \beta = 0.372, p < 0.001 \)). The higher the employees experience their organisation possessively the more likely they were
disposed to exhibit citizenship behaviour and also the higher they experience trust in their organisation the more they demonstrate citizenship behaviour. Organisational trust has stronger prediction on OCB than psychological ownership. Based on these findings, the two hypotheses which stated that psychological ownership and organisational trust will not significantly predict organisational citizenship behaviour were not confirmed.
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

The primary objective of the study was to increase the understanding of the ability of psychological ownership and organisational trust to predict citizenship behaviours in organizations. The result demonstrated that perceived psychological ownership significantly predicted organisational citizenship behaviour among bank workers ($\beta = 0.173$), over and above the demographic characteristics. This finding implies that psychological ownership increases the ability to predict and understand employee behaviour at work.

Dyne and Pierce (2004) result corresponds with the findings of the present result. In the same vein, Avey and colleagues (2009) found that psychological ownership for the organization significantly correlates with OCB, among other variables. Though, the present study could not go as far as establishing a clear landmark between the two levels of OCBs (individual OCBs and organization target OCBs) as they relate with psychological ownership, Avey and colleagues (2009) did establish a significant relationship between different levels of OCB and psychological ownership.

In organizational settings, Pierce and Jussila (2010) have found that the concept of psychological ownership captures the nature of the bond between the employee and the organization. The implication of this is that the attachment and identification contained in the sense of psychological ownership represents the foundation of the unique culture of organizations and therefore, their inimitable competitive advantage (Ceja & Tapies, 2011).

This implication, according to Pierce and Rodgers (2004), is that such employee attitudes and behaviours positively may provide motivation for the employee to contribute to the well-being of the organization through OCB. These results however, refuted hypothesis 1 which stated that psychological ownership will not significantly predict organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) among bank workers.
The present study further examined the ability of organizational trust to predict OCB. The result revealed that organizational trust significantly predicted OCB (β = 0.372). This is in line with the findings of Konovsky and Pugh, (1994), and Van Dyne et al., (2000), that organisational trust has been demonstrated to be an important predictor of certain organizational outcomes such as organisational citizenship behaviour. Yui-Tim Wong, Hang-Yue Ngo, and Chi-Sum Wong (2004) also in their work found that organisational trust have a positive and significant correlation with OCB. This confirms the work of some researchers, that when employees perceive they are being treated fairly (a basis for trust), they will show to engage voluntarily in citizenship behaviour (Farh et al., 1990; Organ, 1988) in a form of social exchange (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994).

Thus, organizational trust is a strong predictor of OCB. Organizational trust is a strong and positive predictor of OCB which suggests that organizational trust may be able to create conditions to enhance OCB. This prediction provides strong support that future research on organisational trust is likely to unveil important links in positive organisational behaviour research. In conclusion, organisational trust may be an important contextual factor that contributes to employee citizenship behaviour.

**IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY**

Quinn (1996) has lamented that employees may unfortunately be understood as prostitutes; trading their time for money, with no will, energy or passion for their work. This is in contrast to O'Reilly’s (2002) observation that “when managers talk about ownership, what they typically want to instil 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 organization”. Results here provide beginning support that having employees who feel like owners is beneficial in terms of their work such as OCB among other things.

Results also suggest that OCB may be positively affected through organizational trust. Human resource practitioners have typically been limited to employee stock plans, stock options, or compensation schemes (Wagner, Parker, & Christiansen, 2003) to promote feelings of trust.
However, these techniques appear to have contributed relatively little to the understanding of organizational trust or to developing organizational trust in employees. A broader understanding and perspective of organizational trust may yield fruitful research in examining the issue of fostering and maintaining employee citizenship behaviours.

For the future, development processes and implications of psychological ownership need to be given focused attention. Just as the positive resource of psychological capital development has been recently demonstrated (Luthans, Avey, Avolio, Norman, & Combs, 2006; Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007), positive form of psychological ownership may also be developed in carefully designed and executed training interventions.

Moreover, based on the relationship that organizational trust have on OCB, the recent work on the development of organizational trust, would seem to have significant practical implications for OCB encouragement and exhibition, and, in turn, performance impact in organizations.

**STRENGTHS, LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The primary strength of this study is that it represents the first empirical study testing psychological ownership for the organisation, organisational trust, and organisational citizenship behaviour among bank workers in Nigeria. Through empirical evidence, this study adds a theoretical contribution to the organisational behaviour literature regarding psychological ownership, organisational trust, and organisational citizenship behaviour. The results suggest that psychological ownership and organisational trust can have a positive influence on employees' trust and organizational citizenship behaviours.

The methods of data collection and analyses provided both strengths and potential limitations for interpreting the study results. Analytical techniques to revalidate the psychometric properties of the psychological ownership, organizational trust and organizational citizenship behaviour measures were generally strengths of this study. For example, the multiple regressions used for the data analysis demonstrate correlation among the variables.
Despite the strengths, there are several limitations that need to be recognized. The most evident limitation is the ability to draw correlative conclusions from sample data about a larger group. This study is limited by its moderate sample size in one part of Nigeria. Therefore, one cannot generalize to the entire population of other similar business operations. The results and conclusions are limited to the specific types of organization in the South East of the country. The study is also limited by a potential bias towards the private sector; more data in the public sector would have made the results more generalizable.

Moreover, this study explicitly focused more on the positive side of psychological ownership, and has only one dependent variable. Therefore, it should be noted that prior research has indicated there may be a “dark side” to psychological ownership. For example, research has acknowledged the negative side to a degree with the concept of preventative ownership, where individuals become so territorial and even aggressive about targets of ownership that organizational change becomes very difficult to implement (Brown, Lawrence, & Robinson, 2005; Pierce et al., 2003). Further research should examine the role of such preventative ownership. This could consider the potentially more destructive forms of ownership and how they impact important processes such as organizational change, which may have only been captured in part by the scale in this study.

Although our objective was to examine the predictive nature of psychological ownership for the organization and organizational trust on OCB among bank workers, the study is bounded by cultural and geographical factors. Future research should examine psychological ownership and organizational trust in different settings where different legal arrangements and social programs may influence employee conceptualizations of ownership (Rousseau & Shperling, 2003). The present researcher also recommend research in settings where cultural values such as collectivism and role obligations may reduce the effects of psychological ownership and organizational trust on employee behaviour.

In addition, since the present study only focused on the understanding of the link among psychological ownership for the organization, organizational trust and OCBs among bank workers,
the model is incomplete and under-specified. Future research should consider a wider range of concepts that are theoretically relevant to the variables involved. Replication of this research to a larger sample is suggested to substantiate or refute these results. It would also be valuable to replicate the research in other locals to test its’ finding’s generalizability to other countries and cultures. Similarly, future research should further refine the distinctiveness of psychological ownership compared to a broader range of constructs. For example, it would be useful to compare the incremental validity of psychological ownership and organizational trust with that of proactive personality (Crant, 2000) and psychological empowerment (Spreitzer, 1995).

More still, the cross-sectional design used in this study prohibits causal inferences. The present researcher encourages other researchers to extend this work by using experimental and/or quasi-experimental designs that assess causality. Finally, the researcher considered OCB as the only outcome variable in this study, studies may investigate other employee outcomes, such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and job performance.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

This study investigated psychological ownership and organisational trust as predictors of organisational citizenship behaviour among Bank workers. It was discovered that psychological ownership and organisational trust predicted organisational citizenship behaviour among Bank workers; therefore, the two hypotheses were not confirmed.

The study adopted a cross-sectional survey design and three instruments were used to unravel this knowledge. Two hundred and three (203) bank workers were sampled from five Nigeria commercial banks through snowball sampling method. Those Banks include: Access Bank, Eco Bank, Diamond Bank, U B A and Fidelity Bank all in Nsukka. Multiple linear regression analysis was used to analyse the data.

In conclusion, the results showed that employees exhibit citizenship behaviours when they feel that they are the owners of the organisation, and also when they have so much trust for the
organisation. In other words, the higher the feelings of ownership, the more likely they will demonstrate citizenship behaviour and the higher the degree of trust for their organisation the more they exhibit OCB. These results are intended to provide a platform and stimulation for further discussion and empirical research on the positive resource of psychological ownership and organizational trust and how they can potentially relate to all facets of individual, group, and organizational effectiveness and ultimately competitive advantage.
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APPENDIX

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDY

Department of Psychology,
University of Nigeria,
Nsukka.
05/07/2012.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am a Master of Science student of the above department and the questionnaire below is part of my M Sc thesis.

Please read carefully through the questions that are contained in each of the sections and respond to them as they apply to you. The purpose of this exercise is purely academic and every response will be treated with utmost confidentiality.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

Onogwu Nichodemus C.

PART ONE

PERSONAL INFORMATION

1. Gender: Male ( ) Female ( )
2. Age .............................................
3. Post/occupational level ......................
4. Employment status: Permanent ( ) Temporal/Casual ( )
5. How long have you been in the company? ......................
6. How long have you been on the current job? ......................
7. Your Department ........................................
8. Highest educational qualification..............................
9. Marital Status ............................................
PART TWO

SECTION A

INSTRUCTION

OCBS

Think of those things you do in the company and rate on a five-point scale (i.e. never, rarely, sometimes, often or very often), how each of the statements below apply to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 I help my colleagues who are absent by doing some of their jobs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 I offer emotional support to my co-workers in times of problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 I encourage others to speak up at meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 I make myself available to my co-workers to discuss their personal or professional problems they are facing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 I try to motivate my colleagues to do their best.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 I encourage my co-workers to learn new skills and techniques.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 I help orient new people even though it is not required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 I volunteer to do things although they are not part of my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 I help others who have heavy workloads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 I share personal properties with others if necessary to help them with their work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 I keep my workplace clean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 I find fault with what my company does.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 I talk about quitting my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 I pay a lot of attention to announcements, messages or printed materials that provide information about our company.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 I do not agree with sudden change in company/management policies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 I find myself complaining about trivial matters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 I attend and participate in meetings regarding the company.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 I initiate actions on how to improve the operations of the company.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 I inform people before using any equipment or materials under their care.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 I attend functions that might not be required, which I feel might help the company’s image.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 I attend voluntary meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SECTION B**  
**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.

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

OTI

**Instruction:** Following are statements about your organisation. Please tick (✓) in the box that best indicates the extent to which the statement describes the current reality of your organisation. **This is the way it is.**

How much the statement describes my organisation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Great</th>
<th>Very Great</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I can tell my immediate supervisor when things are going wrong.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>My immediate supervisor follows through with what he/she says.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I am highly satisfied with the organization’s overall efficiency of operation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>My immediate supervisor listens to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I feel connected to my peers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Top management is sincerer in their efforts to communicate with employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>My immediate supervisor behaves in a consistent manner from day to day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I am highly satisfied with the overall quality of the products and/or services of the organisation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I feel connected to my organisation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>My immediate supervisor keeps confidences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I received adequate information regarding how well I am doing in my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I am highly satisfied with the capacity of the organisation to achieve its objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I receive adequate information regarding how I am being evaluated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Top management listens to employees’ concerns.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Top management keeps their commitments to employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I am highly satisfied with the capacity of the organization’s employee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I receive adequate information regarding how my job-related problems are handled.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>My immediate supervisor is concerned about my personal well-being.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I feel connected to my immediate supervisor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Top management is concerned about employees’ well-being.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>My immediate supervisor keeps his/her commitment to team members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>My values are similar to the values of my peers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td>My immediate supervisor is sincere in his/her efforts to communicate with team members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td>My immediate supervisor speaks positively about subordinates in front of others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td>I am free to disagree with my immediate supervisor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td>I have a say in decisions that affect my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td>I receive adequate information regarding how organizational decisions are made that affect my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td>I receive adequate information regarding the long-term strategies of my organisation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td>My values are similar to the values of my immediate supervisor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>