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Abstract
In response to changing circumstances, how organizations actively promote organizational performance and member behavior, and enhance competitiveness have become important issues for enterprises. This research utilized the psychological ownership theory to study how organizational members’ organizational identity, organizational performance, and member behavior to fill the research gaps that organizational psychological ownership only explores at the individual level and extend previous research on its antecedents. Hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) analysis was conducted to test the cross-level hypotheses when organizational identity affects organizational psychological ownership. Participants were volunteers of the Republic of China army with a total of 160 group samples and 630 individual samples. The research resulted that organizational identity could affect organizational performance in team level and organizational psychological ownership in individual level. In the psychology process, organizational psychological ownership could mediate the relationship between work value and member behavior.
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Introduction
People, who have the potential to influence the effectiveness of organizations in the future, are the most valuable resource and the main source of competitive advantages for organizations. The management of an organization must promote a talent mindset within the entire organization (Chuai et al., 2008). Therefore, the most valuable resource of an enterprise is human resources and holds true in the case of military. Taiwan government has promoted the defense reform policy, the “Act of Military Service for Volunteer Enlisted Men” for 20 years. Different from the “conscription system,” in which people meet statutory service life and must be mandatory to join the army for a period, the “recruiting system” recruits talents to realize the military objective.

In recent years, the numbers of military volunteers, commissioned officers (COs), and noncommissioned officers (NCOs) in the army are unsatisfactory because the NCO recruitment rate is the worst (only 51.9%), and the CO recruitment rate is 66.1% (Ministry of National Defense, Republic of China, 2017). Currently, the Taiwanese armed forces are in an overall state of decline. Military personnel who have not completed their service years apply to hospitals for medical suspension and then leave the military. This situation has worsened currently, and such cases have become a focal point for the media. Consequently, people have a poor social perception of the military, and low morale exists within the military.

For addressing the aforementioned issues, strengthening the support relationships help soldiers to make sacrifice for the country is urgent issue when the values, goals, ideas, and personal perceptions of an organization are divergent (Elsbach & Bhattacharya, 2001). Relevant research indicated that improving the organizational management system would help improve employees’ work attitudes and reduce their turnover intentions (Lin et al., 2015) and gaining the trust of employees is the key for ensuring organizational change (Malik et al., 2019). However, some important issues in the
The process of organizational change are how to maintain the organization identity of members, promote organizational performance (OP), motivate them to develop a sense of ownership, and enhance the behavior and attitudes of members (Thomas & Christopher, 2014). It provided an insight to understand what organizational members choose to respond the dilemma in different level (Hitt et al., 2007). In the team level, Ha-Brookshire and Lu (2010) argued that organizational identity (OI), managers regarded it as organizational competitive advantages, was positively related to organizational performance because it brings the positive reputation, opportunity, and a high level of personnel commitment. Relatively in the individual level, managers would reduce member damage or violate established regulations by strengthening employee ownership during the process of organizational change (Bartkus, 1997; Brown, & Starkey, 2000). It is valuable to simultaneously examine the relationship between OI and OP in the team level and the relationship between OI and organizational psychological ownership (OPO) in the individual level.

Furthermore, individuals would exhibit positive support for the organization when they have an awareness of the organizational service as a part of his own sense of ownership. They can form a sense of ownership toward an organization even the organization does not provide a clear goal or they feel attached to the organization’s goals (Pierce et al., 2001). The formation of organization identity is considerably significant to motivate them for the work values (WV) of an organization which provide a benchmark to self-recognize or action priorities (Dose, 1997) about their behavior and attitudes. Psychological ownership which motivates individuals to be willing to take risks or makes personal sacrifices for the subject matter of ownership (Pierce et al., 2003) determines whether organizational members are willing to make sacrifices and contributions (Pratt & Dutton, 2000).

The study proposes a cross-level framework analysis, combined psychological ownership theory with organizational identity theory. With this integrated framework, theoretical derivation and verification are carried out to fill the research gap of psychological ownership at the individual level and organizational identity at the team level. The research framework is displayed in Figure 1.

**Figure 1.** Research framework.

**Literature Review and Hypothesis Development**

**Organizational Identity Theory, Psychological Ownership Theory, and Organizational Performance**

Organizational identity theory was developed from social identity theory, and OI refers to the identity defined by an individual for themselves and a type of organizational consciousness (Ashforth & Mael, 1989) when a person identifies with a group to have a sense of belonging toward the group (Mael & Ashforth, 1992). OI is generated in organization employees when their organization can satisfy the three personal self-definition rules, namely self-enhancement, self-continuity, and self-distinctiveness (Tajfel & Turner, 1985). OI causes employees to feel that they share attributes and values with other organization members, which causes the employees to exert considerable efforts to achieve work...
targets. Thus, OI helps members of a military organization to identify with the organization, which helps the employees to achieve their work goals. The perceived OI depends on an employee’s perceptions of identity cost and identity gap (Kovoor-Misra, 2009). OI comprises three constructs: similarity, membership, and loyalty. (1) Similarity refers to an individual’s perception that their characters are highly similar to those of the organization or their perception that they share goals, experiences, and achievements with other organization members. (2) Membership refers to the strong feeling toward the organization and pride experienced by a member toward their organization. (3) Loyalty refers to the levels of support, maintenance, and loyalty toward an organization by a member.

OI is a form of mental self-definition that links employees to the organization, where employee loyalty is the key to creating value for the organization (Guillon & Cezanne, 2014). Correlations exist among OI, character behavior, work, and satisfaction (Jones & Volpe, 2011). OI creates positive outcomes for work attitudes and behaviors, including motivation, job performance and satisfaction, individual decision-making, and employee interaction and retention (Scott et al., 1998). At the stage of organizational change, group behavior is a key factor affecting OP (Lewis, 1994). Therefore, the better for work performance and more reluctant to leave the organization (Efraty & Wolfe, 1988). The OI level of employees directly or indirectly affects their work performance (Van Dick et al., 2004). The higher the evaluation of the organization, the more harmonious are the members working in the organization. The higher the OI of the members, the higher is their willingness to make contributions for the organization (Tajfel, 1982).

OP covers a very wide range of topics. In addition to organizing product measurement and service value, OP includes factors such as management ability, employee factors, organizational factors, and environmental mastery (Campbell, 1977). The reason for different OP definitions is the difference in opinions on the nature of organizations (Goodman & Pennings, 1977). Through the evaluation of multiple indicators, we interpreted the results obtained for the Taiwanese military’s operations. The definition of OP varies because organizations use various managerial activities to achieve goals. Managerial activities aim to enhance three aspects: employee satisfaction, OP, and interpersonal relationship (Bourgeois & Brodwin, 1984; Dess & Robinson, 1984). Employee job satisfaction refers to the self-awareness of the satisfaction of the people and things involved in the work performed by members of an organization. Interpersonal relationships refer to the relationships with the organization or the relationships developed among organization members during interaction and learning. According to Bernanthos (2018), OI can improve performance and organizational development. Chang (2017) indicated that OI has a positive effect on perception (process, outcome, or customer-oriented perception), attitude (job satisfaction), and behavior (organizational citizenship, work performance, and innovative behaviors; Appendix 1). On the basis of the aforementioned discussion, we believe that OI has a positive effect on OP. Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed:

**Hypothesis 1 (H1):** OI is positively related to OP.

**Organizational Identity and Psychological Ownership**

When a person identifies with a group, their self-enhancement, self-distinctiveness, and self-continuity would be fulfilled. Pierce et al. (2001, 2003) stated that ownership aims to fuse the ownership target with the self. Research about psychological ownership theory, which is pivotal for explaining occupational motivations, behavior, and positive and negative properties on a personal level, has increased (Pierce & Jussila, 2011; Pierce et al., 2009) and they focus on employee behaviors and attitudes has also increased (Dawkins et al., 2017). Therefore, we propose that organization members might have ownership sense in the organizational context because this state exists in the working place and can be satisfied in the organization. The major characteristics of the aforementioned state have been highlighted by Pierce et al. (2001, 2003). First, psychological ownership has the conceptual core that people have a sense of possession for a certain object, as indicated by the phrase “It is mine!” The core can distinguish the mental ownership from constructs such as identity and commitment of the organization. Second, such ownership is affective and cognitive. Thus, a person exhibits thoughts, awareness, and beliefs regarding the possession target as well as the related emotion and meaning or affect. Because a connection is established between the owner and the target, ownership allows the owner to regard the target object as a social entity. OPO is a type of belonging attitude of employees toward their organization (Dirks et al., 1996) and results in the organization being regarded as the ownership target, which refers to organization mental ownership (Jafri, 2016).

OPO refers to the belief of individuals in serving units that the unit is theirs when individuals are willing to devote and sacrifice for the unit without reserve. The formation factors of psychological ownership include work characters, organizational culture, managerial attitude, corporate goals, vision, and reputation (Chiu et al., 2007). As displayed in Figure 1, the model of the psychological ownership theory includes self-identity, effectiveness and efficacy, exercise of control, owning a place, knowing intimately, investment in the self, and stimulation (Jussila et al., 2015). OI is defined as the employee-perceived sense regarding belonging to the organization (Mishra et al., 2012) and individuals perceived process of self-classification based on similarity to other organizational members (Tajfel & Turner, 1985). OI can be considered a form of identity with the society or the feeling of a person that they are part of the team (Dutton et al., 1994).
to connect between an individual and an organization (Wan-Huggins et al., 1998). We inferred that OI could be affected by stimulation, self-identity, exercise of control, owning a place, knowing intimately, and investment in the self. Based on the team-level OI is congregated by individual-level. The aforementioned argument indicates that OI has a positive effect on OPO. Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed:

$Hypothesis 2 (H_2)$: OI is positively related to OPO.

**Positive Effect of Organizational Psychological Ownership on Employee Behavior**

According to Jussila et al. (2015), psychological ownership is a significant predictor of behaviors, workplace motivations, and attitudes. Lawal and Balogun (2013) proposed a thought regarding OPO (e.g., the possessive feeling that an object is “mine” or “ours”), which has attracted increasing attention from practitioners and scholars as an important predictor of employee behaviors and attitude (Dirks et al., 1996). OPO (e.g., a sense of ownership for an object) has been proposed as an essential and predictive factor for the staff’s desire and behavior (Rezaei & Beheshtifar, 2017). A sense of psychological ownership is key part to linking an employee and organization (Kubzansky & Druskat, 1993). Positive behavioral and attitudinal effects may be generated through mentally experienced ownership (Pierce et al., 1991). The staff’s attitudes and work behaviors have a positive relationship with OPO (Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004). This study further explores the relations among WV, Work Engagement (WE), voice behavior (VB), and Workplace Well-Being (WWB).

WV (Work Value) is generated from the concept of value and is part of the overall value system. WV comprises the factors of cognition, emotion, and behavior-forming persistent belief and represents the ideal goal people wish to achieve in their lives (Rokeach, 1973). The choice of value influences behavior and the evaluation of objects (Schwartz, 1992). WV enables people to judge things and distinguish what is right, good, and acceptable (Robbins, 2001). When employees and managers have the same WV, employee satisfaction and faith toward the organization increase (Meglino et al., 1989). In military organizations, people can realize self-transcendence through personal values (Clemmons & Fields, 2011). Referring to the study of Wolack et al. (1971), WV is defined as the willingness of a person to use faith for evaluating work, chasing work goals, and exhibiting work attitude and behavior. It can be expressed using six constructs: intrinsic values, social status of the job, organization member ethics, upward striving, attitude toward earnings, and conventional ethics. Intrinsic values refer to the values sensed by a person from work, such as new work methods, digging self-ability, gain stability, or a sense of accomplishment. Social status of the job refers to the social status and sense of value derived by an individual from external society, such as respect, affirmation, and recognition from other people. Organization member ethics refer to the personal perceived attitude generated from interactions related to ethical attitude, policy, or vision with coworkers (e.g., respect between colleagues, organization autonomy, or authority). Upward striving refers to feeling that personal work is valuable for future development (e.g., a person gains new knowledge, skills, and opportunities for further education or reuse). Attitude toward earnings refers to the value sense for gaining money and welfare from personal work (e.g., personal salary and reward and punishment system). Conventional ethics refer to individual behavioral perceptions regarding ethical norms and policies in the workplace (e.g., the organization’s responsibility for the care of current employees and relatives and the mutual care of peers).

WE originated from the study of Kahn (1990) regarding personal disengagement and engagement psychological condition at work. The role theory indicates that personal engagement affects a person’s physiology, cognition, and emotions and enables the person to achieve role performance. WE comprises the factors of energy, involvement, and professional efficacy. Schaufeli et al. (2002) used the positive perspective of psychology and considered WE as positive and ambitious. The state of mental possession for work-related vigor, dedication, and absorption is considered to be stable and unchangeable. In this study, WE is defined as the state of individuals when fully engaged in work with the characteristics of action, dedication, and concentration. WE has three constructs: absorption, vigor, and dedication (Schaufeli et al., 2002). Dedication refers to individuals having a positive emotion at work, experiencing passion and honor for their work, and being ready to face challenges at work. Vigor refers to individuals being willing to work hard for their work, not feeling tired easily, and having the courage to face difficulties. Absorption refers to individuals being fully committed to their work and not being easily influenced by the surrounding office environment.

Hirschman (1970) indicated that VB involves appealing to direct managers through personal or collective means. VB is reflected by active and strong intentions to appeal to those in power for changing any bad things rather than choosing a path of passive silence and escape. It is based on moral, political, economic, and psychological considerations and defined as the dialectic of the organization. People believed that whether voice behavior is active or passive destruction or construction according to the compulsory or open culture of the company (Gorden, 1988). The narrow definition of VB indicates that it is a challenging citizenship behavior that involves publicly expressing opinions and suggestions and challenging the status of the organization to improve the organization (LePine & Van Dyne, 1998). It also involves publicly stating that you have opinions regarding your work and other people’s behaviors, ideas, suggestions, and places.
When people have psychological ownership toward an organization, they are willing to take risks or make sacrifices for the organization. In military organizations, improving autonomous motivation would enable organization personnel to receive organizational support and achieve WE (Gillet et al., 2017). When people regard an organization as the target of ownership, OPO is generated. OPO is affected by psychological ownership, job characteristics, organizational culture, organizational climate, high-level managerial attitude, company goals, company vision, organizational reputation, effectiveness and efficacy, having a place, self-identity, stimulation, exercise of control, promotion of organization transformation, knowing intimately, investment in self, caring and protective behaviors toward the ownership target, and personal risk-taking. OPO has positive effects on members’ workplace motivation, behavior, and attitude. Chang (2017) indicated that psychological ownership is influenced by factors such as personal cognition, personal needs, and organizational environment and positively affects organizational characteristics, work outcomes and behavior, behavioral performance, and work attitude (Appendix 2). According to the aforementioned discussion, the following hypotheses are proposed:

Hypothesis 3 (H3): WV is positively related with OPO.
Hypothesis 4 (H4): WV is positively related with WE.
Hypothesis 5 (H5): OPO is positively related with VB.
Hypothesis 6 (H6): OPO is positively related with WWB.

Psychological ownership is affected by personal motivation and reasons because its affects individual behavior, attitude, and motivation with mediating effects (Jussila et al., 2015). Chang (2017) presented a comprehensive research model that includes WV, WE, VB, and WWB. WV is personal cognition and has the characteristics of self-identity, motivation, effectiveness, and effectiveness. WV is influenced by the work environment, managerial and personal background, organizational image, and commitment. It also has significant positive effects on factors such as work attitude, work behavior and results, and organizational attractiveness (Appendix 3). WE is the representation of individual behavior, has a positive and active motivational connotation, and can improve work performance. It is affected by personal perception, organizational environment, and work attitude and positively affects personal perception, organizational climate, and behavioral performance (Appendix 4). VB is a manifestation of individual behavior that can improve or enhance the organizational work. It is influenced by factors such as personal cognition, leadership style, and personality traits and has significant positive effects on factors such as self-control, work attitude, and behavioral performance (Appendix 5). WWB refers to subjective individual feelings regarding work, colleagues, and supervisors, which are influenced by factors such as positive traits, emotional orientation, work resources, work life quality, transitional leadership, stereotype threats, emotional intelligence, and job control. The attitude toward work and behavior can be positively affected by WWB (Appendix 6). According to the aforementioned discussion, we propose the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 7 (H7): OPO mediates the relationships between WV and individual outcomes.
Hypothesis 7a: OPO mediates the relationships between WV and WE.
Hypothesis 7b: OPO mediates the relationships between WV and VB.
Hypothesis 7c: OPO mediates the relationships between WV and WWB.
Methodology and Measurement

Data Collection and Sample

To verify the proposed hypotheses in the context of the Taiwanese military, the questionnaire survey method was adopted. Questionnaires were sent by post to potential participants. The army at the theater level of the Ministry of National Defense of the Republic of China is the research object. The Taiwanese army is currently undergoing institutional transformation. The research participants were volunteer NCOs and COs working in the theater of operations (TO) of the Army Command of the Republic of China. This study used convenience sampling, and the NCO respondents were the NCOs of the “squads” included in the company under the Army Command. Because the squad is the smallest unit of military combat, the leader of the squad must lead the tasks assigned by their military officer. Therefore, we regarded the squad leaders as the team-level sample and the team members as the individual-level sample. Different responses were used for the various constructs in this research to avoid common method variance (CMV). For instance, we concealed interview information, carefully sorted questionnaire items, and described the items in a simple manner. In this study, positively and negatively worded tests were conducted, and respondents with different TO and job attributes were recruited. After the questionnaire was completed, we tested the CMV by using Harman’s one-factor test. A total of 160 questionnaires were randomly sent to squad leaders to obtain the team-level sample, and 630 questionnaires were randomly sent to squad members to obtain the individual-level sample. The effective response rates for the team- and individual-level samples were 95% (152 samples) and 90.476% (570 samples), respectively.

Measurements

The adopted questionnaire measured seven constructs: OI, OP, OPO, WV, WE, VB, and WWB. The conducted survey was a “tick-the-box” survey. According to Bollen (1989), the 7-point scale of the adopted questionnaire is more accurate than the 5-point scale that can accurately measure the experiences of the respondents. A 7-point scale was used to measure all variables, except demographic variables (7 = strongly agree and 1 = strongly disagree).

OI. This study used Wu’s (2016) adaptation of the OI scale developed by Patchen (1970). The modified OI scale of Wu comprises 14 questions. An example item is of the aforementioned scale is “I have sufficient confidence to complete the job and continue to work with the unit.” The Cronbach’s alpha value for the adopted OI scale was .936.

OP. This study used Niu’s (2004) modification of the OP scales of Wang (2004) and Hou (2003). The modified scale comprises 12 questions. An example item of the aforementioned scale is “I have sufficient confidence to complete the job and continue to work with the unit.” The Cronbach’s alpha value for the adopted OP scale was .941.

OPO. In this study, OPO was assessed using the psychological ownership scale proposed by Van Dyne and Pierce (2004), which comprises seven questions. An example item of the aforementioned scale is “I feel that this unit is like me.” The Cronbach’s alpha value for the adopted OPO scale was .924.

WV. This study used Wang’s (2015) modification of the WV scale developed by Wollack et al. (1971). The modified scale of Wang comprises 19 questions. An example item of the aforementioned scale is “I am at work; I have the opportunity to try new ways of working.” The Cronbach’s alpha for the adopted WV scale was .97.

WE. This study used Lu’s (2015) modification of the WE scale developed by Schaufeli et al. (2002). An example of the modified scale of Lu is “I am full of energy and vitality while working.” The Cronbach’s alpha value for the adopted WE scale was .962.

VB. This study adopted Burris’ (2012) modification of the VB scales developed by Tsai (2013) and LePine and Van Dyne (1998). The modified scale of Burris comprises six questions. An example item of the aforementioned scale is “I would strongly recommend that the leading officer or cadre handle the problem of this unit.” The Cronbach’s alpha value for the adopted VB scale was .896.

WWB. In this study, WWB was assessed using the questionnaire developed by Hyett and Parker (2015), which comprises 16 questions. An example item of the aforementioned questionnaire is “The work I am responsible for has been completed successfully.” The Cronbach’s alpha value for the adopted WWB questionnaire was .956.

Results

The SmartPLS (V3.2.6), HLM 6.02, and SPSS 22.0 software programs were used for statistical analysis. Due to the small size of the research sample, the method proposed by Chin and Newsted (1999), Ringle et al., (2012), and Urbach and Ahlemann (2010) was adopted. The partial least squares (PLS) structural equation modeling (SEM) method was used to analyze the research data. For cross-level analysis, the hierarchical linearity model was adopted for determining the intraclass correlation (ICC) (1) and ICC (2) of the null model and for hypothesis verification.

The standard deviations, means, square roots of the average variances extracted (AVEs), and positive correlations of
the Variance Accounted For (VAF) value of H7 was higher than 20%. Thus, hypothesis 7 was supported.

### Table 1. Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations of the Constructs.

| Constructs | Mean (M) | Std. Dev. (SD) | A | B | C | D | E |
|------------|----------|----------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Individual-level** |           |                |   |   |   |   |   |
| A. OPO     | 4.52     | 1.01           | .833 | | | | |
| B. WVV     | 4.26     | 1.14           | .727*** | .759 | | | |
| C. WE      | 4.51     | 1.17           | .694*** | .746*** | .837 | | |
| D. VB      | 4.45     | .975           | .577*** | .669*** | .632*** | .837 | |
| E. WWB     | 4.57     | .956           | .694*** | .628*** | .604*** | .534*** | .73 |
| **Team-level** |         |                |   |   |   |   |   |
| A. OI      | 4.24     | 1.04           | .828 | | | | |
| B. OP      | 4.42     | 1.04           | .241*** | .92 | | | |

**Note.** For Team-level = 152, diagonal elements are the square roots of AVE. For Individual-level, N = 570. OPO = organizational psychological ownership; WV = work value; WE = work engagement; VB = voice behavior; WWB = workplace well-being; OI = organizational identity; OP = organizational performance (OP). ***p < .001.

### Table 2.

| Constructs | Mean (M) | Std. Dev. (SD) | Correlation |
|------------|----------|----------------|-------------|
| OPO        | 4.52     | 1.01           | .833        |
| WVV        | 4.26     | 1.14           | .727***     |
| WE         | 4.51     | 1.17           | .694***     |
| VB         | 4.45     | .975           | .577***     |
| WWB        | 4.57     | .956           | .694***     |

The proposed hypotheses were tested with the PLS-SEM model by using the SmartPLS (V3.2.6) data analysis software program. The path coefficient (β) values generated by the PLS algorithm function and the bootstrap method were used to verify the significance of the model coefficients. The cross-level hypotheses were verified using the HLM (6.02) statistical analysis software program. All the proposed hypotheses were supported (Table 3). The p and r values of H1, H2, H3, H4, H5, and H6 were <.05 and >1.96, respectively; the Variance Accounted For (VAF) value of H1 was higher than 20%. Thus, H1 had a significant effect.

Table 4 lists the HLM results. To ensure that the team-level variables were appropriate, we first performed a null model test for calculating the ICC (1) and ICC (2) values of the variables. ICC (1) can be used to estimate the variance in individual responses, which indicates the extent to which a method represents a population or group. James (1982) recommended that the ICC (1) criterion should be greater than 0.12. The ICC (2) factor can be used for evaluating a group’s internal consistency in a sample (Castro, 2002). Glick (1985) have recommended that the ICC (2) criterion should be greater than 0.6. The research results indicated that ICC (1) was 0.29826 and ICC (2) was 0.61447; thus, ICC (1) and ICC (2) exceeded the corresponding standard values, and the r wg value was verified again. George and Bettenhausen (1990) recommended a standard r wg value of 0.7, which represents good consistency within a group. Table 4 indicates that the r wg value in this study was > 0.7; thus, the r wg value in this study exceeded the standard. We believe that aggregating the self-OI of all personnel into a team-level variable is appropriate for conducting hypothesis verification. The results indicate that the t value of hypothesis 2 was 14.576; thus, hypothesis 2 reached a significant standard and was strongly supported.

According to Table 5, the VAF value was between 20% and 80%. According to the verification intermediary method proposed by Hair et al. (2014), the VAF value ranges from 20% to 80%. Therefore, hypothesis 7 was supported. Consequently, OPO mediates the relationships between WV and individual outcomes (such as VB, WE, and WWB).

Three findings can be obtained from the aforementioned results.

First, a high OI among organization members at the team level positively affects OP. Therefore, when an organization has a high degree of OI, the OP would improve. Second, at the individual level, WV strengthens the OPO of organization members. It contributes to personal cognition, behavior, and attitude when organization members have a strong sense of ownership. Therefore, the generation of psychological ownership has positive effects on the work of organization members, their VB, and their happiness of the workplace. WV can positively affect professionalism, work, and well-being at the workplace through OPO. In summary, when an organization creates WV that is recognized by the organization members, the members’ sense of ownership toward the organization as well as their WWB, WE, and VB would increase. A high
Table 2. The Constructs’ CR, the Loadings (λ) of the Items, Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficients, and AVEs.

| Constructs    | Items          | λ     | CR   | Cronbach’s alpha | AVE  | √AVE  |
|---------------|----------------|-------|------|------------------|------|-------|
| Individual-level | OPO-1          | .839  | .925 | .94              | .693 | .833  |
|               | OPO-2          | .846**|      |                  |      |       |
|               | OPO-3          | .881***|     |                  |      |       |
|               | OPO-4          | .853***|     |                  |      |       |
|               | OPO-5          | .864***|     |                  |      |       |
|               | OPO-6          | .825***|     |                  |      |       |
|               | OPO-7          | .705***|     |                  |      |       |
|               | WV01-1         | .845  | .959 | .963             | .576 | .759  |
|               | WV01-2         | .891***|     |                  |      |       |
|               | WV01-3         | .856**|     |                  |      |       |
|               | WV01-4         | .829***|    |                  |      |       |
|               | WV02-1         | .851  |      |                  |      |       |
|               | WV02-2         | .900***|    |                  |      |       |
|               | WV02-3         | .898***|   |                  |      |       |
|               | WV03-1         | .851  |      |                  |      |       |
|               | WV03-2         | .826***|   |                  |      |       |
|               | WV03-3         | .860***|   |                  |      |       |
|               | WV04-1         | .884  |      |                  |      |       |
|               | WV04-2         | .922***|   |                  |      |       |
|               | WV04-3         | .880***|   |                  |      |       |
|               | WV05-1         | .874  |      |                  |      |       |
|               | WV05-2         | .925***|   |                  |      |       |
|               | WV05-3         | .906***|   |                  |      |       |
|               | WV06-1         | .899  |      |                  |      |       |
|               | WV06-2         | .906***|   |                  |      |       |
|               | WV06-3         | .897***|   |                  |      |       |
|               | WE01-1         | .927  | .946 | .955             | .7   | .837  |
|               | WE01-2         | .940***|    |                  |      |       |
|               | WE01-3         | .916***|   |                  |      |       |
|               | WE02-1         | .913  |      |                  |      |       |
|               | WE02-2         | .892***|   |                  |      |       |
|               | WE02-3         | .918***|   |                  |      |       |
|               | WE03-1         | .884  |      |                  |      |       |
|               | WE03-2         | .903***|   |                  |      |       |
|               | WE03-3         | .904***|   |                  |      |       |
|               | VB01-1         | .885  | .915 | .934             | .701 | .837  |
|               | VB01-2         | .936***|   |                  |      |       |
|               | VB01-3         | .882***|   |                  |      |       |
|               | VB02-1         | .907  |      |                  |      |       |
|               | VB02-2         | .938***|   |                  |      |       |
|               | VB02-3         | .916***|   |                  |      |       |
|               | WWB01-1        | .749  | .937 | .945             | .533 | .73   |
|               | WWB01-2        | .887***|   |                  |      |       |
|               | WWB01-3        | .933***|   |                  |      |       |
|               | WWB01-4        | .904***|   |                  |      |       |
|               | WWB02-1        | .911  |      |                  |      |       |
|               | WWB02-2        | .933***|   |                  |      |       |
|               | WWB02-3        | .905***|   |                  |      |       |
|               | WWB02-4        | .890***|   |                  |      |       |
|               | WWB03-1        | .858  |      |                  |      |       |
|               | WWB03-2        | .923***|   |                  |      |       |

(continued)
### Table 3. The Results of the Research Framework.

| Hypothesis | Path               | Path coefficient | t value  | VAF    | Results          |
|------------|--------------------|------------------|----------|--------|------------------|
| H1         | OI → OP            | .241*            | 2.158*   |        | H1 is supported  |
| H2         | OI → OPO           | .727***          | 14.576***|        | H2 is supported  |
| H3         | WV → OPO           | .269**           | 2.583**  |        | H3 is supported  |
| H4         | OPO → WE           | .191*            | 2.048*   |        | H4 is supported  |
| H5         | OPO → WWB          | .502***          | 7.56***  | 26.195%| H5 is supported  |
| H6         | WV → OPO → WE     |                 |          |        |                 |
| H7         | WV → OPO → VB      |                 |          |        |                 |
| H8         | WV → OPO → WWB     |                 |          |        |                 |

**Note.** VAF > 80% completely mediating, 80% partial mediating, > VAF > 20%, 20% > VAF not significantly.  
OPO = organizational psychological ownership; WV = work value; WE = work engagement; VB = voice behavior; WWB = workplace well-being;  
OI = organizational identity; OP = organizational performance. 

---

### Table 2. (continued)

| Constructs | Items          | λ   | CR  | Cronbach’s alpha | AVE | √AVE |
|------------|----------------|-----|-----|------------------|-----|------|
| WWB03-3    | .935***        |     |     |                  |     |      |
| WWB03-4    | .920***        |     |     |                  |     |      |
| WWB04-1    | .839           |     |     |                  |     |      |
| WWB04-2    | .915***        |     |     |                  |     |      |
| WWB04-3    | .841***        |     |     |                  |     |      |
| WWB04-4    | .858***        |     |     |                  |     |      |

**Note.** OPO = organizational psychological ownership; WV = work value; WE = work engagement; VB = voice behavior; WWB = workplace well-being;  
OI = organizational identity; OP = organizational performance. 

---

***p < .001.
Table 4. Analysis of Cross Level Effect Organizational Identity.

| Organizational psychological ownership (OPO) | Aggregation of all participants’ sample (Team level data) |
|--------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|
|                                            | $r_{wg}$                                             |
| ICC(1) > 0.12                             | 0.2982                                              |
| ICC(2) > 0.6                              | 0.6687                                              |
| Average > 0.6                             | 0.7940                                              |
| Mean > 0.6                                | 0.8274                                              |

| Controls | Standardization coefficient | t value |
|----------|-----------------------------|---------|
| Level    |                             |         |
| Intercept| .521542                     | .061    |
| Gender   | .158193                     | 2.410   |
| Unit attribute | .048997 | .064   |
| Marital status | .151809 | .365   |
| Rank     | .118034                     | −.030   |
| Years of work experience | .111178 | −.231 |
| Education| 0.044616                    |         |
| Predictive variable | Level |             |
| Organizational identity | .066582 | 14.576*** |

Note. Standardized estimating of 3,000 bootstrap sample. ICC(1) = intra class correlation(1); ICC(2) = intra class correlation(2); $r_{wg}$ = within-group inter-rater reliability. ***$t$ > 3.29, $\alpha$ < .001.

Table 5. Analysis of Mediating Effect Organizational Psychological Ownership.

| Path | Direct effect | Indirect effect |
|------|---------------|-----------------|
|      | Path coefficient | t value | Path coefficient | t value | VAF  |
| 1. WV $\rightarrow$ OPO | .727 | 19.075*** |                     |         |      |
| 2. OPO $\rightarrow$ WE | .269 | 2.583*** | .191 | 2.048* | 20.729% (partial mediation) |
| 3. WV $\rightarrow$ WE | .551 | 5.469*** | .502 | 7.56*** | 50.12% (partial mediation) |
| 2. OPO $\rightarrow$ VB | .531 | 5.704*** |                     |         |      |
| 3. WV $\rightarrow$ VB | .531 | 5.704*** |                     |         |      |
| 2. OPO $\rightarrow$ WWB | .502 | 7.56*** |                     |         |      |
| 3. WV $\rightarrow$ WWB | .263 | 3.517*** |                     |         |      |

Note. Standardized estimating of 3,000 bootstrap sample. About 80% partial mediating > VAF > 20%, 80% completely mediating < VAF, VAF < 20% not significantly. OPO = organizational psychological ownership; WV = work value; WE = work engagement; VB = voice behavior; WWB = workplace well-being; OI = organizational identity; OP = organizational performance; VAF = variance accounted for. *$t$ > 1.96, $\alpha$ < .05. ***$t$ > 3.29, $\alpha$ < .001.

The degree of OPO has positive effects on WWB, WE, and VB. Third, at the cross level, the aggregation of the OI of individual employees into team-level OI has a positive and significant effect on the psychological ownership at the individual level. Therefore, consistency in OI is essential for all organization members and contributes to OPO at the individual level.

Discussion and Conclusions

This study explained that volunteers served in the Republic of China army have the experience which OI was positively related to psychological ownership. According to Yammarino et al. (2008), although numerous studies have been conducted on positive leadership, no study has examined the relative mediating mechanisms at multiple levels and integrated the construct with positive behavior toward an organization. This study explored the multilevel relationship mechanism, especially OPO of organization members is influenced by team-level OI (Dawkins et al., 2017; Jones & Volpe, 2011; Pierce & Jussila, 2011) and provided initially empirical evidence to support these assumptions in different level.
The positively significant relationship between OI and OP at the team level suggested that high-level IO of organization members perceive harmony in the organization and directly or indirectly promote their positive outcomes for work attitudes and behavior. Min et al. (2020) suggested that institutional forces might constrain organization members to accept the vision within an organization which guides and shares a common purpose among them. It showed that organization members have feelings about adaptability, honor, and loyalty to an organization which could promote them creating value for the organization to perform positive work outcomes.

The cross-level effect between OI and OPO has a positively significant relationship. It showed that organizational members might own self-efficacy, accountability, sense of belongingness, and self-identity when they feel to belong one part of the team (Avey et al., 2009). For example, Dai et al. (2020) resulted that OPO was positively related to high-level work engagement and low-level job burnout because employees generate an affective and cognitive connection to the group membership. It fills the research gap between OI and OPO how team environment might affect the recognition of organization members. In the workplace, managers should understand and build the organizational environment to format a consensus for organizational identity.

The positively significant relationship between OPO and its antecedent and consequences at individual level suggested that OPO would play an important role in organization. This study concluded that the cognition of organizational members would influence their attitude and behavior through the feeling of possession toward their organization. Like Mayhew et al. (2007) results, psychological ownership is a significant mediator between autonomy and work behaviors and attitudes when investigating employees in organizations. It showed that the internal factor could motivate employees to benefit the organization. Our results also support the behavior mechanism in a similar way and offer insights into the relationship between OPO and its antecedent and consequences to stimulate managers in what the organizational environment should build.

This study explored the relationship between the OI and OP of organization members during the transformation of the military service system in Taiwan. It provides a significant theoretical foundation for examining the relationship between OPO and OI. The research results have some essential implications for the application of OI and psychological ownership theories to organization members. First, few studies have examined psychological ownership by using cross-level models because psychological ownership initially explored the inner state of the individual. We want to explore the relationships among organization members’ behaviors and expand the field of psychological ownership research. Second, we determined the importance among team leaders and team members to an organization which leaders would create value at the team level to promote members’ psychological state and behavior outcomes at the individual level. It means that the external factor could affect individual cognition and enhance the individual psychological ownership of organization members to strengthen their positive behavior and attitude, especially we examine the effect of OI. Finally, the research results verified the psychological ownership model of Jussila et al. (2015). Organization managers can enhance the positive behaviors and attitudes of employees by enhancing the OPO of the employees.

**Research Limitations**

First, the research participants only comprised volunteer officers and soldiers from “squad” units of the Taiwanese military, and other military personnel were not recruited. The research sample represents a well-disciplined military organization, whose culture is different from that of a strong and highly regulated corporate organization. Second, the cross-section analysis method could only provide the correlations rather than causal relationships. For example, the OI, OP, OPO, WV, WE, and VB of military personnel vary with time. This study mainly involved quantitative research based on cross-level analysis. Only a narrow comparison was performed of the relationships among the constructs. Because few studies have explored the aforementioned relationships, the main empirical research can also be regarded as a temptation-oriented research, which may lead to increased future research on the aforementioned factors and their relationships.

**Future Direction**

First, the object of this research was military personnel, whose organization is highly disciplined and strict. Future research can explore the corporate management culture of strong and highly regulated organizations, such as corporate organizations with a mechanistic structure. The reliability and validity of the model adopted in this study can be verified by applying it to Guo Taiming’s organization for examining important factors that may influence OP and team efficacy, such as leadership behavior, leadership development (Cuadra-Peralta et al., 2017), and transformational leadership (Babić et al., 2014; Liu et al., 2011). Second, a longitudinal research design can be adopted to examine the changes in the relationship between OP and OI over time. The emotional or experiential effects can be examined to verify the stability of the research model. Third, corporate social responsibility (CSR) has become a significant policy for enterprises. Many related studies have indicated that CSR can enhance OI (Kim et al., 2018) and OP (Choi & Yu, 2014). Therefore, we recommend that future studies should investigate the influential factors of CSR and the relevance of this study as well as expand the research model. Fourth, future research should explore the destructive reverse behavior. This study only examined positive behavior. In the future, destructive behaviors of organizations, such as workplace deviation behavior and anti-orthogonal behavior, can be investigated to understand the relationship between organization members’ attitudes and behaviors.
Appendix 1. Organizational identity comprehensive research model.

Source: Refers to Chang (2017).
Appendix 2. Psychological Ownership Comprehensive research model.

Source. Chang (2017).
Mediator Variables
1. Principals’ Work Pressure; 2. Presidential Leadership Styles; 3. Work Attitude

Antecedents Variables
1. Principals’ Background Variables; 2. Internal Marketing; 3. Leader Member Exchange; 4. Organizational Commitment; 5. Generation; 6. Job Characteristics; 7. Job Satisfaction; 8. Background Variables; 9. Military’s Images; 10. Marketing Strategy; 11. Leadership Properties Demographic Variables; 12. Work Pressure.

Work Value

Consequences Variables
1. Teaching Effectiveness; 2. Service-Oriented Organizational Citizenship Behavior; 3. Career Satisfaction; 4. Work Attitude; 5. Job Performance; 6. Employee Morale; 7. Job Involvement; 8. Burnout; 9. Organizational Attractiveness; 10. Organizational Citizenship Behavior; 11. Professional Identity; 12. Well-Being; 13. Turnover Intention; 14. Job Satisfaction.

Moderators Variable
Paternalistic Leadership

Appendix 3. Work Value Comprehensive research model.
Source: Chang (2017).
Appendix 4. Work Engagement Comprehensive research model.
Source. Refers to Chang (2017).
Mediator Variables
1. Interpersonal Trust 2. Voice Self-Efficacy 3. Psychological Empowerment 4. Leader-Members Exchange 5. Turnover Intention 6. Affective Organizational Commitment 7. Group Voice Climate 8. Trust 9. Self-Perceived Status 10. Group Voice Behavior 11. Leadership Styles 12. Psychological Safety Perception 13. Perceived Issue Threat 14. Trust Management

Antecedents Variables
1. Political Skill 2. General Self-Efficacy 3. Empowering Leadership 4. Perception of Unit Problems 5. Individual Factors: Personality Traits (Extrovert, Conscientiousness, Prudence); Job Satisfaction; Interpersonal Trust; Self-Efficacy; Organization Career Development; Positive / Negative Mood 6. Situational Factors- Organization Situational (Organizational culture); Leadership level (Leadership Trait and Style, Leader-Member Exchange) 7. Supervisory Responsiveness 8. Individual Voice, Self-Efficacy 9. Employee's Work Moods 10. Perceived Organizational Support 11. Team-Member Exchange 12. Change-Oriented Leadership 13. Altruistic Concern for Prosaically Motives (Good Soldiers) 14. Felt Accountability for Impression Management Motives (Good Actors) 15. Employee-Oriented Human Resource Management

Consequences Variables
1. Organization and Group level (Organizational Decision-Making, Organization learning, Colleagues and team harmony) 2. Employee individual level (Self-Control, Work Attitude, Work Performance, Organizational Culture, Public Image, Reward, Performance Evaluation) 3. Job Performance 4. Employees Career Success

Moderators Variables
1. Participative Leadership 2. Employee Personality Traits 3. Supervisor Attributed Motives

Appendix 5. Voice Behavior Comprehensive research model.
Source. Refers to Chang (2017).
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