The Effects of Person–Organization Fit and Turnover Intention on Employees’ Creative Behavior: The Mediating Role of Psychological Ownership

Ahmet Cengiz Ucar1, Lutfihak Alpkan2, and Meral Elci1

Abstract
Some recent studies have examined the behavioral antecedents of employees’ creative behavior. However, the potential role of psychological ownership is rarely taken into consideration. This study specifically examines the mediating role of psychological ownership in the relationship between person–organization (P–O) fit and turnover intention on the one hand and employees’ creative behavior on the other via a survey in Turkish organizations. Findings based on the data from 969 employees in Istanbul and Western Anatolia indicate that P–O fit is positively related and turnover intention negatively related to both psychological ownership and creative behavior, and that psychological ownership plays a full mediating role in these relations. Psychological ownership has a central role in employees’ creative behavior; it should thus be augmented together with its antecedents if managers wish to foster creative behaviors among their employees.
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Introduction
Employees’ creative behaviors have recently gained more importance—both in business and in academia—than in the last century. Employees’ ability to come up with fresh ideas for changing or developing products, services, and processes can help to improve their organizations’ competitive performance (Amabile et al., 2005; de Jong & Den Hartog, 2007). Organizations therefore aim to encourage and recognize the creative behaviors and outcomes of their human capital to differentiate themselves in today’s digitally transforming, competitive arena where non-creative or routine employee activities can easily be replaced by automated or intelligent machinery, such as robotic process automation. Uncovering the factors for nurturing creative behaviors and the interrelations among these factors has hence become instrumental for practitioners and attractive for researchers. Accordingly, some recent studies (Dar & Rahman, 2020) have already begun to address the behavioral drivers of creativity, creative behavior, and creative performance.

Employees’ psychological ownership of their organization, among other possible antecedents, seems to play a critical role in the development of positive employee behaviors, including extra role (Park et al., 2013), constructive (Yildiz et al., 2015), innovative (Liu et al., 2019), and creative behaviors (Gray et al., 2020). However, other possible behavioral antecedents of creativity, such as positive employee perceptions, attitudes, and intentions, must also be studied deeply to understand the complex nature of their interrelations. The discovery of a mediator to bridge various antecedents to the consequences would reduce this complexity.

This study therefore proposes that employees’ psychological ownership—“the feeling of possessiveness and of being psychologically tied” to an organization (Pierce et al., 2001), as a central employee attitude or state of mind might link also other drivers (e.g., employee perceptions and intentions) to employees’ creative behaviors. According to Sarac et al. (2014), another important positive driver of creative and/or innovative behavior is the perception of person–organization (P–O) fit (i.e., employees’ interpretations about how well matched or compatible their own personal characteristics are with those of the work environment; Kristof-Brown
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et al., 2005). This positive sense of compatibility, together with psychological ownership, may nurture employees’ creativity at work. Beyond these possible positive interrelations, however, some negative intentions may creative behaviors. For instance, turnover intention, which is a critical tendency or willingness to leave both the present position and organization (Tett & Meyer, 2006), may also discourage creative thinking regarding current organizational matters. The positive or negative consequences of turnover intention have rarely been studied in recent literature (Hayes et al., 2012; Takase, 2010). Therefore, the possible negative effects of turnover intention on employees’ feeling of possessiveness toward the organization and their motivation to engage in creative solutions for the sake of the organization require more comprehensive consideration.

Despite recent empirical studies on the separate direct effects of some behavioral antecedents (e.g., employee perceptions, attitudes, and intentions) on employees’ creative behaviors, to the best of our knowledge, studies that uncover complex relations among these drivers have been limited. Therefore, our study examines, within an integrated theoretical model, the effects of P–O fit as a positive perception, turnover intention as a negative intention, and psychological ownership as a positive attitude on the creative behaviors of employees. Moreover, we test whether psychological ownership has a mediating role within these relations. In this regard, the paper is organized as follows: First, the conceptual framework and the development of hypotheses are presented. Then, the research methodology is explained, and the findings are presented. Finally, concluding remarks and limitations are discussed.

Theoretical Background and Literature Review

Creative behavior refers to the disposition of learning, doing, and accomplishing new things that lead to creative achievements (Zhang et al., 2021). Such valuable employee efforts that exhibit original, creative, and innovative ideas and practices, etc. differentiate firms in the competition. Hence firms need to motivate their managers and employees to collect more data and information to analyze and interpret; then plan from their organizational milieu would reciprocate positively. In other words, if employees feel supported by the organization, then they will respond in a similar way (e.g., work hard, perform extra roles, etc.); this relationship of exchange is actually reciprocal (Mearns & Reader, 2008; Saks, 2006). Thus, in this study, to uncover the complex nature of the possible drivers of employees’ creative behavior, we assert that P–O fit would be an appropriate positive employee perception to foster this constructive behavior, while turnover intention may be a negative employee intention to inhibit it.

Concerning the attitude-behavior relationship, we draw on planned behavior theory, which posits that attitudes toward a behavior are among the motivational components of the general drivers behind the intention to engage in the behavior (Ajzen, 1991; Beckmann & Heckhausen, 2018; Rosenthal, 2018). Affective attitudes predict behavior, independent of intentions and instrumental attitudes (Van Wasssenova, 2018). Especially strong attitudes held with great conviction can persist over time to guide the behavior (Ajzen & Fishbein, 2005). Moreover, positive and negative attitudes may be separately related to positive and negative behaviors (Gonzalez et al., 2015). Accordingly, in this study, we propose psychological ownership as an affective positive attitude to produce creative behaviors among employees. We suggest that psychological ownership can trigger affect-driven positive behaviors (Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004), since creativity itself is inherently triggered by social and cognitive stimuli (Kim et al., 2012). We also extend the role of psychological ownership as a mediator that transmits the effects of P–O fit and turnover intention to creative behaviors.
Based on the general umbrella of above-mentioned theoretical lenses, this study seeks to answer the following research questions: (1) How do employees’ positive perceptions about their personal fit with their organization contribute to their creative behavior; (2) how does their negative intention to leave their organization relate to their creative behavior; and (3) what is the role of their psychological ownership as a positive attitude in these relations?

**Hypothesis Development**

**P–O fit and creative behavior.** The concept of P–O fit is defined as the perceived congruence between an organization’s values and an employee’s values (Chatman, 1989) or the compatibility between the characteristics of an individual and those of the work environment (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). The values, goals, and characteristics of employees and their organizations will mirror their integrity and identities (Siyal et al., 2020). This fit may produce mutual benefits when an employee meets the needs of the organization and when the organization meets the demands of an employee (Kristof, 1996) and tends to be positively associated with individual job satisfaction and work performance (Risman et al., 2016). This positive employee perception is therefore highly beneficial for an organization to attract, motivate, and retain compatible and high-performing personnel.

P–O fit has already been proposed as an important antecedent of positive behavioral outcomes, including extra-role, constructive, innovative, and creative employee behaviors (Afsar & Badir, 2016; Hoffman & Woehr, 2006; Hon & Leung, 2011; Kegans et al., 2012; Kim et al., 2013; Shalley & Gilson, 2004). Recent empirical findings are also in line with the assumption that the congruence between personal and organizational values would affect employees’ creativity positively (Ouakouak & Ouedraogo, 2017; Sarac et al., 2014). More recently, Suwanti et al. (2018) have found that employees possessing a positive perception of compatibility with their organization may try to reciprocate by engaging in creative thinking and positive work behaviors.

Specifically, in line with social exchange theory and the above discussions, we also assert that employees who positively evaluate the compatibility of their characteristics and values with those of their organization may reciprocally try to develop creative ideas, designs, and solutions for the sake of the organization and make all the necessary physical and mental efforts. Accordingly, we hypothesize the following:

**Hypothesis 1 (H1):** P-O fit is positively related to creative behavior.

**Turnover intention and creative behavior.** Turnover intention refers to an employee’s determination to leave their present organization. It includes disengagement from the workplace, withdrawal from its social system, and the search for outside job vacancies; it is a cognition rather than an action, which may or may not result in actual turnover (Halawi, 2014; Hill et al., 1977; Mobley et al., 1978; Verbrugge & van Emmerik, 2020). Employees with this intention may feel that they are at the final stage before taking the initiative to leave (Gao et al., 2012), and accordingly, this may indicate that their positive feelings and attitudes—if any—toward the work environment have already diminished in intensity and impact. Halawi (2014) argues that an employee with the intention to leave may no longer be interested in positive behaviors and higher performance. This loss of emotional and professional attachment to the organization and the serious consideration of leaving may also decrease their extra-role behaviors (e.g., organizational citizenship) and increase negative ones (e.g., social loafing, absenteeism, deviant behaviors, etc.; Akgunduz & Eryilmaz, 2018; Burris et al., 2008; Christian & Ellis, 2014; Halawi, 2014; Mai et al., 2016; Xiong & Wen, 2020).

This negative social exchange relationship, which has been emphasized in recent literature, between the present organization and the employee who intends to quit may also be extended to other similar positive behaviors such as creative ones. According to Dea Nathisa and Noer (2018), the tendency to consider leaving an organization can inhibit employees’ performance, measured in terms of quality and quantity of work, attitude, cooperation, and also creativity. Even their leader’s turnover intention may exert negative effects on employees’ innovative performance (Jiang et al., 2019). Furthermore, feeling uncommitted to the present organization, losing social ties with the work environment, and even actually searching for possible employment opportunities in other organizations may decrease employees’ interest, concentration, and motivation to make the necessary efforts to develop creative ideas, designs, and solutions for the sake of the present organization. In line with the above discussions, we assert that employees who negatively evaluate their career in their present organization cannot effectively engage in creative behaviors. Accordingly, we hypothesize the following:

**Hypothesis 2 (H2):** Turnover intention is negatively related to creative behavior.

**P–O fit and psychological ownership.** Psychological ownership as a cognitive employee attitude or state of mind is a psychologically experienced phenomenon that occurs when employees develop possessive feelings about and psychological ties to the target organization (Dittmar, 1992; Pierce et al., 2001). This possessive feeling that an organization is “MINE” or “OURS” tends to be highly beneficial for the organization, which is the value-added nature of psychological ownership (Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004).

P–O fit seems to play a crucial role in the development of this beneficial and valuable sense of ownership of an organization whose values are perceived to fit with those of the employees. P–O fit in the form of value congruence between
people and organizations is an important organizational asset to achieve organizational goals (Eren et al., 2000); otherwise, the energy and loyalty of the employees may decrease (Ertosun et al., 2015). When employees’ goals, needs, and interests fit with those of the organization, employees’ perceived sense of belonging to, identification with, and possession toward their organization can also increase, which implies a positive relationship between P–O fit and psychological ownership. In this regard, Han et al. (2015) argue that P–O fit contributes to employees’ sense of belonging by making them feel as though they are insiders and their organization is a comfortable home. Similarly, Yildiz and Alpkan (2015) propose that P–O fit is related to psychological ownership, which then produces constructive employee behaviors. In addition, according to a recent empirical study by Rahmayanti and Kurniawan (2020), P–O fit is positively correlated with feelings of self-identity and a sense of belonging to an organization. We therefore hypothesize the following:

**Hypothesis 3 (H3):** P–O fit is positively related to psychological ownership.

**Turnover intention and psychological ownership.** Perceptual or attitudinal antecedents of employee turnover intention and its behavioral consequences have been extensively studied in past literature (Griffeth et al., 2000; Qiu et al., 2015; Wong & Cheng, 2020). A general understanding has been formed about the negative relation between employees’ positive attitudes, such as satisfaction, commitment, and engagement, and their turnover intention (McCarthy et al., 2020). However, to our knowledge, few studies have investigated the effects of turnover intention on employee attitudes. Among them is the study by Xiong and Wen (2020), who state that turnover intention decreases employees’ work engagement. Still, its attitudinal consequences require much more research. Aiming to identify specifically the effects of turnover cognitions on the development of attitudes of ownership toward an organization for which employees currently work, we purport that turnover intention must have a negative relationship with psychological ownership. Recent literature sometimes conversely or indirectly supports this proposition. For instance, Knapp et al. (2014) and Lu et al. (2017) found that psychological ownership was negatively related to turnover intention. Again, in a recent study, Verbruggen and van Emmerik (2020) emphasize that turnover cognitions initiate a psychological detachment process from the organization by also referring to Burris et al.’s (2008) study that labels this process as “quitting before leaving.” The opposite may also be valid, as Avey et al. (2009) mention that intentions to stay with an organization are positively related to psychological ownership. Therefore, developing a tendency to quit and looking for outside job opportunities seem to weaken an employee’s possessive feelings and psychological ties with their present organization. In line with the above discussions, we assert that employees who have already lost their intention to stay at their present organization can no longer effectively preserve their psychological ownership. Accordingly, we hypothesize the following:

**Hypothesis 4 (H4):** Turnover intention is negatively related to psychological ownership.

**Psychological ownership and creative behavior.** Psychological ownership has a stronger relationship with extra-role behavior than in-role behavior, according to Vandewalle et al. (1995), who conducted an earlier study on its consequences. The feeling of possession embedded within psychological ownership as an emotional attachment to an organization can trigger affect-driven positive behaviors and better performance (Kim & Beehr, 2017; Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004). Therefore, employees with higher levels of psychological ownership feel a responsibility to protect, promote, and enhance their organization, and in prior literature, this has been associated with positive attitudes and behaviors (e.g., job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behaviors, etc.) that are intended to help the organization succeed (Wiggins, 2018).

Among other positive behavioral outcomes, recent research has also explored the effects of psychological ownership on entrepreneurial and innovative behaviors. For instance, Sieger et al. (2013) and Mustafa et al. (2016) found that psychological ownership triggers entrepreneurial behaviors among employees. Similarly, according to Chung and Moon (2011), employees who experience feelings of ownership become much more innovative and implement unconventional work processes, which increase the organization’s overall effectiveness. Moreover, according to Liu et al. (2019), this attitude motivates employees to engage in and devote additional effort to innovative behavior to nurture, advance, and protect their organization, which has become a considerable part of themselves.

Psychological ownership can also be described as the investment of the self in the target organization, and “this investment can come from implanting one’s ideas, time, effort, and creative juices into the target of ownership” (Pierce & Peck, 2018, p. 9). Similarly, Sieger et al. (2013) assert that psychological owners feel empowered, and this feeling is linked to creativity and innovation. According to a recent study conducted by Yoon et al. (2020), individuals with higher levels of psychological ownership in the workplace can produce more creative outcomes. Therefore, we can deduce that having an affective positive attitude of psychologically owning an organization produces an intrinsic motivation in employees to put forth creative efforts.

**The mediating role of psychological ownership.** Attitudes can serve as an affective mechanism to translate perceptions, emotions, and traits, among other things, into behaviors. In other words, employees’ feelings or orientations may lead to some positive or negative behaviors through the agency of specific attitudes (Yildiz et al., 2015). For instance, according to Huang et al. (2019, p. 5), “job involvement plays a
mediating role between person–job fit and innovation behavior.” Similarly, a growing number of recent studies examine the mediating role of psychological ownership. For example, Yildiz et al. (2015) propose that psychological ownership mediates the positive relationship between P–O fit and constructive deviant workplace behaviors. In another study, Han et al. (2015) found that person–job fit was positively related to psychological ownership, resulting in increased contextual performance. Furthermore, according to Ibrahim (2016), psychological ownership partially mediates the effects of leadership and justice perceptions on organizational citizenship behaviors.

In this study, we assert that the already mentioned mediating role of psychological ownership between positive perceptions (e.g., person–job fit, etc.) and positive behaviors (e.g., constructive and innovative, etc.) may also be examined to link P-O fit to creative employee behaviors. According to Afsar and Badir (2016), the perceived congruence between an employee’s values and those of the organization (i.e., P–O fit) can lead to such psychological mechanisms that will affect the employee’s engagement in the necessary efforts to create and implement new and innovative ideas.

In line with the social exchange and planned behavior theories and the above discussions, we purport that employees who perceive their own characteristics, values, and goals, among other things, as being compatible with those of their organization may reciprocally develop ownership attitudes toward it, and these attitudes would consequently lead to creative efforts and behaviors for the benefit of this organization. We also extend this mediation to the relationship between turnover intention on the one hand and psychological ownership and creative behavior on the other, since we have already hypothesized that the former is negatively related to the latter two elements. The rationale behind this mediating role of psychological ownership may be based on the possible relation between withdrawal evaluations and the psychological detachment of employees who intend to quit; this would automatically demotivate them to put forth creative efforts. Accordingly, we hypothesize the following:

**Hypothesis 5 (H5): Psychological ownership mediates the relationship between P–O fit and creative behavior.**

**Hypothesis 6 (H6): Psychological ownership mediates the relationship between turnover intention and creative behavior.**

The theoretical model of hypothesized relations is depicted in Figure 1.

**Method**

**Measures**

In general, survey items were adapted from well-established and validated measures in the related literature. Furthermore, they were measured on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5).

**Creative behavior.** We adopted the first five items of the creative behavior scale from studies by George and Zhou (2001) and Tierney et al. (1999). The remaining three items were adapted from other relevant studies. Some examples of the eight-item instrument are as follows: “I demonstrate originality in my work”, “I have suggested new uses for the existing methods or types of equipment”, and “I exhibit creativity on the job when opportunity is given”.

**P–O fit.** The first three items of the P–O fit scale were taken from Cable and DeRue (2002), while the fourth item “This organization has the same values as I do about concern for others” was from Netemeyer et al. (1997), and the last item “My values match those of current employees in an organization” was chosen from Cable and Judge (1996).

**Turnover intention.** The six-item turnover intention scale has been used by researchers for decades. The first item, “As soon as I find a better job, I will leave this organization” was developed by Walsh et al. (1985). The remaining items, including “I do not think I will spend my entire career with this organization”, “I intend to leave this organization within a short period”, and “I have decided to quit this organization” were created by Ganesan and Weitz (1996).

**Psychological ownership.** Van Dyne and Pierce (2004) constructed a six-item scale assessing organization-based psychological ownership. Examples are as follows: “Most people working for this organization feel like they own the company”, “This is our company”, and “I feel a very high level of personal ownership for this organization”.

**Data Collection**

The scales are well established and have been widely used in the literature; however, to test the general reliability and validity of these scales in a Turkish business context, we conducted an in-person pilot study with 177 participants. The pilot study results revealed that factor loadings (≥.50), total variance explained [64.33%], and internal consistencies [Cronbach’s alpha ≥ .87] were satisfactory to continue with the same questionnaire items.

Convenience sampling was utilized to collect data for the survey study from a general population of blue- and white-collar employees in Western Anatolia and Istanbul, Turkey. This cross-sectional survey was administered to participants in person and online, and 1,146 responses were gathered. After perusing the surveys, we eliminated 167 of them because the participants did not fill in most items. However, to use partially missing surveys, we first reviewed them entirely and found that the ratio of missing responses per item was 2% overall. We used the mean imputation
technique for missing items up to a missing items ratio of 5% (Scheffer, 2002). Additionally, scales with missing items versus mean imputed items did not differ significantly in terms of the means and standard deviations. Of the 979 surveys, 812 (83%) were conducted in person, and 167 (17%) were conducted online. To understand whether these two samples (in person vs. online) differ from each other, they were tested via an independent t-test. The t test demonstrated that there were no significant differences between the samples in all constructs.

To determine outliers, the interquartile range (IQR) measure is useful because it uses percentiles, which do not depend on a specific distribution and are robust to the presence of outliers compared to other methods. First, we calculated averages of the scales; then, we used the boxplot technique and found 10 outliers (seven cases in creative behavior and three cases in psychological ownership). Finally, 969 complete surveys were used for this research (completion rate is 84.6%).

Of the participants who completed the survey, 552 (57.0%) were men, and 365 (37.7%) were women. The remaining participants did not indicate their gender. Moreover, 76.0% had a bachelor’s or master’s degree, and 13.2% graduated from high school. The others did not indicate their education level. Ages ranged from 18 to 55 years, with an average age of 32. Furthermore, the average tenure in their current organization was 10 years. Participants were working in various types of industries, including manufacturing (365), services (295), and other industries (283), with 26 no-responses. To eliminate social desirability or acquiescence bias, we ensured the privacy of the participants and emphasized to them that there were no right or wrong answers (Spector, 2006). Participants completed the creative behavior scale first, followed by the psychological ownership, P–O fit, and turnover intention scales. Lastly, they completed their personal information.

Measurement Model

The measurement model was assessed in four steps: individual item reliability, construct reliability, convergent validity, and discriminant validity (Henseler et al., 2016). We started by assessing the individual item reliability of the measurement model. Field (2013) states that if the measurement model has four or more loadings greater than 0.60, regardless of the sample size, then it is considered to be reliable. All standardized loadings exceeded the threshold ≥0.60, apart from one item related to psychological ownership (PO1) and one item regarding turnover intention (TI2), both of which were removed (Table 1). The reliability of individual items is overall acceptable.

The measures of construct reliability and convergent validity represent measures of internal consistency. First, construct reliability proves whether the items genuinely measure the constructs (Pittino et al., 2017). For constructs to be reliable, the construct reliabilities (CRs) of all constructs should be >.70 (Sarstedt et al., 2014). Second, to assess convergent validity, the constructs’ average variance extracted (AVE) should be calculated, and AVE values should be >.50 for the construct to be convergently valid. Finally, to assess discriminant validity, we used the Fornell–Larcker criterion, which dictates that the square root of the AVE should be greater than the correlation among the other constructs in the model (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). Moreover, diagonal values must be greater than the off-diagonal values in the corresponding rows and columns (Table 2). These conditions were also satisfied for each construct in terms of construct reliability, convergent validity, and discriminant validity.

In addition to strong reliabilities, to confirm the measurement model, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted with modifications recommended by the structural equation modeling (SEM) software. The final measurement model fit the data well (χ²=641.077, df=215, χ²/df=2.982, TLI=.967, GFI=.942, RMSEA=.045, and its P(CLOSE)=.973). Although there is no agreement on an acceptable range of χ²/df, Wheaton et al. (1977) recommend that it should be 5 or lower, whereas Tabachnik and Fidell (2007) suggest a value of 2 or less. Furthermore, the RMSEA should be smaller than .06 (Hu & Bentler, 1999) or .07 (Steiger, 2007). Hu and Bentler (1999) also suggest that GFI and TLI fit indices above .95 indicate adequate fit. Given these indices, we found strong support for the proposed measurement model. To further validate our measurement model, we also sought to prevent common method bias. Self-reported biasness may cause common method variance, which could result in inflated relationships between variables (Conway & Lance, 2010). First, we used the Harman single factor test, in which all items are loaded into one common factor. A total variance of less than 50% for a single factor (in this study, 33.3%) indicated that common method bias does not affect the data (Harman, 1960). In addition, we compared the good fit indices of our measurement model with this common latent factor model, and it turned out that the fit to the data was insufficient. This comparison showed that our measurement model is more compatible with the data compared to the common latent factor model (Podsakoff et al., 2012). As a result, common method bias is unlikely to have influenced our study results. The first step of analyses demonstrated that the measurement model results are satisfactory.

Results

Descriptive statistics for creative behavior, psychological ownership, P–O fit, and turnover intention, as well as their correlations, are presented in Table 3. Creative behavior correlated with P–O fit (r=.227, p<.01), psychological ownership (r=.331, p<.01), and turnover intention (r=-.163, p<.01). Furthermore, P–O fit and turnover intention correlated strongly with psychological ownership (r=.598, p<.01, and r=-.446, p<.01, respectively).
To confirm that the distributions of the constructs are normal, the recommendation is to use kurtosis and skewness measures. The acceptable range or skewness and kurtosis for normality is below +1.5 and above −1.5 for kurtosis and +1.0 to −1.0 for skewness (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). The kurtosis and skewness of the constructs are displayed in Table 3. The values were satisfactory, and we can thus conclude that the distribution of all constructs are normal.

To find the linearity among all constructs, we employed the curve estimation method for all relationships among the constructs. We found that all relationships were sufficiently linear to be tested using SEM.

Additionally, the Durbin–Watson test is the first choice to clarify whether the residuals are independent or dependent. This test specifically determines whether the residuals are autocorrelated. The value of the Durbin-Watson test in our analysis was 1.872, which shows that there was no autocorrelation in residuals, and we can thus conclude that the residuals are independent (Durbin & Watson, 1971). Then, to assess whether the residuals of the predicted value are homoscedastic, we conducted a Breusch–Pagan test (Breusch & Pagan, 1979). The result of the test revealed that heteroscedasticity is not an issue.

Finally, to test the hypotheses, the full structural equation model using maximum likelihood estimation was run to

---

### Table 1. Standardized Loadings of the Measurement Model.

| Items  | Creative behavior (CB) | Psychological ownership (PO) | Person-organization Fit (POF) | Turnover intention (TI) |
|--------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| CB1    | 0.648                  |                             |                               |                        |
| CB2    | 0.708                  |                             |                               |                        |
| CB3    | 0.743                  |                             |                               |                        |
| CB4    | 0.685                  |                             |                               |                        |
| CB5    | 0.718                  |                             |                               |                        |
| CB6    | 0.597                  |                             |                               |                        |
| CB7    | 0.607                  |                             |                               |                        |
| CB8    | 0.688                  |                             |                               |                        |
| PO2    |                        | 0.828                       |                               |                        |
| PO3    |                        | 0.792                       |                               |                        |
| PO4    |                        | 0.932                       |                               |                        |
| PO5    |                        | 0.719                       |                               |                        |
| PO6    |                        | 0.619                       |                               |                        |
| POF1   |                        |                             | 0.850                         |                        |
| POF2   |                        |                             | 0.908                         |                        |
| POF3   |                        |                             | 0.914                         |                        |
| POF4   |                        |                             | 0.768                         |                        |
| POF5   |                        |                             | 0.639                         |                        |
| TI1    |                        |                             |                               | 0.752                  |
| TI3    |                        |                             |                               | 0.882                  |
| TI4    |                        |                             |                               | 0.945                  |
| TI5    |                        |                             |                               | 0.876                  |
| TI6    |                        |                             |                               | 0.780                  |

Note. CB = creative behavior; PO = psychological ownership; POF = person-organization Fit; TI = turnover intention.

### Table 2. Construct Reliability (CR), Convergent Validity, and Discriminant Validity.

| Variable | CR     | AVE | CB     | PO     | POF    | TI     |
|----------|--------|-----|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| CB       | .794   | .790| .889   |        |        |        |
| PO       | .832   | .616| .331   | .785   |        |        |
| POF      | .876   | .676| .227   | .598   | .822   |        |
| TI       | .904   | .722| -.163  | -.446  | -.323  | .850   |

Note. CB = creative behavior; PO = psychological ownership; POF = person-organization Fit; TI = turnover intention; CR = construct reliability; AVE = average variance extracted.

Diagonal elements (bold) are the square root of the variance shared between constructs and their measures (AVE). Off diagonal elements are the correlations among constructs.
confirm the relations between constructs. SEM is preferred because random or measurement errors in independent and dependent variables can be modeled and estimated explicitly; systematic and method errors can be demonstrated easily; constructs are purified of types of bias; and errors in inference will be prevented. Moreover, SEM includes more comprehensive tests of mediation; construct validity can be carried out in depth according to classical methods; and SEM has the ability to correct systematic bias in hypothesis tests (Bagozzi & Yi, 2012).

We tested the associations between P–O fit and creative behavior (H1), turnover intention and creative behavior (H2), P–O fit and psychological ownership (H3), and turnover intention and psychological ownership (H4), as well as the mediating role of psychological ownership within the associations of both P–O fit and turnover intention on creative behavior (H5 and H6). The first model had a good fit to the data ($\chi^2/df = 3.005$, TLI = .967, GFI = .943, RMSEA = .046, and its $p_{CLOSE} = .966$) and supported all four direct hypotheses (H1, H2, H3, and H4). H1 proposed that P–O fit would be positively related to creative behavior ($\beta = .207$, $p < .01$). H2 predicted that turnover intention would be negatively related to creative behavior ($\beta = -.282$, $p < .01$). H3 proposed that P–O fit would be positively related to psychological ownership ($\beta = .505$, $p < .01$). H4 predicted that turnover intention would be negatively related to psychological ownership ($\beta = -.318$, $p < .01$). The $\chi^2$, degree of freedom, and $p$ value of our model were 643.168, 214, and 0.001, respectively (Figure 2).

With regard to the last two hypotheses on the mediating role of psychological ownership, multiple necessary conditions had to be met (Baron & Kenny, 1986). First, the independent variables (i.e., P–O fit and turnover intention) had to be associated with both the mediator (i.e., psychological ownership) and the dependent variable (i.e., creative behavior). Second, the mediator (i.e., psychological ownership) had to be related to the dependent variable (i.e., creative behavior). Finally, if the proposed mediator variable entered into the model, then the relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable would become nonsignificant for full mediation or weak for partial mediation.

Our findings revealed that all these necessary conditions were met. The full mediation model had a better fit to the data than the first model ($\chi^2/df = 2.847$, TLI = .970, GFI = .946, RMSEA = .044, and its $p_{CLOSE} = .995$). Psychological ownership was positively related to creative behavior ($\beta = .296$, $p < .01$), and the relationships between other constructs (P–O fit and turnover intention) were nonsignificant ($\beta = .050$, $p > .05$, and $\beta = -.011$, $p > .05$, respectively; Figure 3). The $\chi^2$ was 606.460, the degree of freedom was 213, and the $p$ value of our model was .001. According to these conditions, we found support for full mediation, as we predicted in H5 and H6.

Lastly, the standardized direct, indirect effects and results of the final model are presented in Table 4.

**Discussion**

**Theoretical Implications**

This empirical study on blue- and white-collar employees in Turkey, with the research goals of (a) examining the effects of P–O fit on turnover intention on employees’ psychological ownership and creative behavior and (b) testing the mediating role of psychological ownership within these complex relations, produced support for all the related hypotheses. P–O fit was found to be positively associated with both psychological ownership and creative employee behaviors, in line with Blau’s (1964) social exchange theory, according to which employees reciprocate positive inputs from their organization with positive attitudes and behaviors. Earlier studies have also provided not exactly the same, but similar findings (Chatman, 1989; Goodman & Svyantek, 1999; Hoffman & Woehr, 2006; Vilela et al., 2008). In addition, the turnover intention was negatively associated with both psychological ownership and creative employee behaviors. This was a more novel finding, since attitudinal and behavioral consequences of the turnover intention have rarely been studied before. Our findings imply that turnover cognitions inhibit employees from taking ownership of their organization and then engaging in creating new solutions for the sake of the business. Moreover, our assertion that psychological ownership is positively related to creative behavior is also supported. In addition, this specific finding contributes to a recently growing body of literature on the attitudinal antecedents of creativity and innovation (e.g., Liu et al., 2019; Pierce & Peck, 2018; Yoon et al., 2020).

Our study’s most important contribution is the confirmation of the full mediating role of psychological ownership...
Figure 1. The theoretical model of hypothesized relations.

Figure 2. Relationships and effects of predictors on creative behavior.
Note. Only person–organization (P–O) fit and turnover intention affect creative behavior.
**p < .01 (two-tailed test).
that bridges our two antecedents to the dependent variable. In other words, psychological ownership was found to mediate the effects of both P–O fit and turnover intention on employees’ creative behavior. The discovery of this central and bridging attitude aids in better understanding the details of interconnections among related perceptions, intentions, and behaviors. Likewise, as a positive consequence, employees cannot engage in creative behaviors without developing possessiveness toward their organization, even if they consider themselves to fit with the company. However, as a negative consequence, if they lose their intention to stay, their possessiveness will weaken, and this would decrease their creative efforts. Therefore, employees possessing an attitude of psychological ownership are very precious for their companies and managers, and this attitude can also be fostered by increasing their perceptions of fitting to and intentions of staying with their organization. Thus, psychological ownership as the mediator can filter the negative effects of turnover intention and bring about the positive effects of P–O fit on employee creativity.

Practical and managerial implications
Managers and practitioners generally utilize the concept of P-O fit when selecting and placing talented applicants and employees to foresee and guarantee their future performance and commitment. Our findings emphasize additional and reciprocal benefits of this concept, especially pertaining to its positive effects on psychological ownership and creative behaviors. Managers paying more attention to selecting...
appropriately fitting employees and augmenting this fit afterward seem to promise much more employee creativity within an organization. Together with and based on this fit, psychological ownership plays a central role in employees’ creative behaviors. Spending managerial time and energy on building a strong culture of employee identification with their organization should be one of the strategic priorities in the digital transformation age, since only strong attachment and possessiveness on the part of the employees would result in the dedication and concentration necessary for creative efforts to sustain future competitiveness. Otherwise, detached and estranged employees—even if they are talented—may not effectively engage in creative behaviors. In this regard, selecting applicants who best fit the organization at the outset and then convincing them to stay in the long run would amplify their possessive ties toward the organization, and in turn, their managers may ultimately expect and exploit the creative solutions to be developed by these psychological owners. Therefore, as the practical implications of this study, managers and organizations can be advised to invest heavily on the psychological ownership of their human capital by trying to detect and remove all kinds of negative perceptions or intentions that may hinder this feeling of possessiveness at the workplace. Accordingly, any sense—groundless or not—of overqualification, misfit, dissatisfaction or detachment on the part of the employees together with other intentions and attitudes should be measured periodically within the company and reported to the top management with specific preventive and corrective action plans to trigger creative efforts.

Limitations
This study also has some limitations that should be acknowledged. Since our study utilized a cross-sectional design, structural equation modeling only allowed us to test whether the model fits the data without considering causal relationships (Staufenbiel & König, 2010). We advise the use of longitudinal or experimental data in future research because intentions and perceptions might alter occasionally (Dar & Rahman, 2020). A second limitation is that the purposeful convenience sampling used in this research might raise some concerns about the generalizability of the findings to a target population (Gorard, 2001). Additionally, self-report surveys may lead to the problem of common method variance, but some authors have pointed out that this problem is generally exaggerated (Spector, 2006). In this concern, we still admit that employees’ self-evaluations especially about their own creative behavior may somewhat lead to social desirability bias or may only be limited to their ability to reflect.

Further Research Implications
Future studies could be conducted according to managers’ evaluations and appraisals of their subordinates’ level of creative behavior. A third limitation is that we used psychological ownership as the only mediator; however, other personal or social constructs can also mediate the relationship. Positive attitude and level of acceptance can be added to future research models, and their relationship with turnover intention and creative behavior can be studied in detail. In addition, personality and perception can be added to the model as other possible drivers. Finally, this research was carried out in a country with a collectivist culture, where relationship-based constructs may be more salient than in individualistic cultures (Hofstede, 2001; Niu & Sternberg, 2003). Therefore, further similar studies are required to retest our findings in other cultural settings.

Conclusion
We can assert as a conclusion that this research highlights the central and bridging role of psychological ownership in employees’ creative behavior. Although P–O fit and turnover intention positively or negatively influence this behavior, stimulating employees’ psychological ownership attitudes may encourage it much more directly. Employees are thus more likely to be creative when they claim ownership. Therefore, organizations should provide the necessary motivation and autonomy for employees to perceive their workplace as their home. In this regard, managers should design a positive organizational milieu where psychological owners flourish and translate their positive understandings about fitting and staying into striving for creativity.
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