

PSYCHOLOGICAL OWNERSHIP IN FAMILY BUSINESS **IN THE LIGHT OF SOCIAL IDENTITY THEORY**

Elif Baykal NARCIKARA*

Abstract

Having a sense of connection to tangible and intangible possessions is an innate tendency for most of people. In this point, psychological ownership acts as a predictor of human behaviour in organizational settings and has received increasing popularity from organization scholars. Infact, feelings of psychological ownership over a target are mostly nourished from the concepts of belongingness, self-efficacy, and self-identity. And it is an innate tendency and ensure organizational members to see their organizations as a part of their extended self. Having a sense of psychological ownership makes people more attached the target of possession and contributes to positive organizational outputs. It promote feelings of responsibility towards possession and often results in being highly caring, protective, and nurturing regarding the targets of ownership. In this study we focused on family businesses and effects of psychological ownership on organizational outputs and role of social identity in these effects. Due to the fact that in this kind of companies sharing legal ownership and being a member of the founder family bind people together in a common goal to which the target of possession is connected, and this situation in turn contributes to strong commitment to the family business and considerable levels of psychological ownership, that can be considered as one of the most important advantage of family firms over

Keywords:

Family Business;

Psychological Ownership;

Social Identity Theory;

Self efficacy;

Self Identity.

*** Assistant Professor, Management, İstanbul Medipol University, Beykoz, İstanbul, Turkey**

nonfamily firms. In family firms, collective psychological ownership felt towards the company creates positive cognitive evaluations and positive feelings about the business and encourage members to work more eagerly for the business and contribute to its goals and success.

1. Introduction

Dittmar (1992) claims that, most of us psychologically establish a link between the self and the different targets of possession. In this point the concept of ownership come to the scene. Etzioni (1991) claimed that ownership is a “dual creation, part attitude, part object, part in mind, part real” and should be studied as a psychological phenomenon. Furby (1991) claims that feelings of psychological ownership emerge even in young children due to the motive of controlling objects. This freedom to control one’s actions results in feelings of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997) and mostly results in a sense of psychological ownership concerning a particular task, job, or process. In our daily lives, we often feel attached to the objects that we own. Ownership creates a kind of psychological bond that makes us psychologically akin to the targets of possessions. Regarding the psychological effects of ownership, the psychological ownership literature focuses particularly to the psychological effects of ownership and claims that people may have positive emotions towards tangible and intangible targets of ownership (Dyne and Pierce, 2004). Psychological ownership tries to find the answer of the question, “To what degree do I feel this target is mine” (Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004).

Undoubtedly, it is not astonishing that people take better care of, and nurture the possessions they own. Organizational behavior researchers wanted to better understand the concept of psychological ownership due to the fact that people have an innate sense of ownership and the inclination to guard and progress the object of it (Avey et. al., 2009). Avey et. al (2009) propose that this concept falls within the boundaries of positive organizational behavior that studies positive sides of people and organizations and the innate capacity to develop and progress in them. Psychological ownership has overlapping elements with positive organizational behaviour, such as psychological capital. Like other psychological resources, psychological

ownership can be measured, invested in, developed, and managed for performance impact and competitive advantage (Avey. et. al., 2009).

2. Psychological Ownership

Psychological ownership is a kind of bond that make people feel a possessiveness toward the target of ownership despite the existence of any legal claim. This sense of ownership shows itself in the daily phrases used by individuals that connote possessiveness such as my home, my job, our car etc. (Wande Walle et. al., 1995). In fact, “target” in the related literature explains the object of attachment. Target may be something as small as a preferred table in an office, or as large as a club, an organization, industry or a country as a whole (Avey, et. al., 2009). Moreover, Pierce et al. (2001) claim that feeling psychological ownership is an innate inclination, that can occur towards both all kinds of targets, and this feeling have significant attitudinal, emotional, and behavioral results on the people experiencing these feelings (Avey. et. al., 2009). As Belk (1988) suggests, psychological ownership make people view their tangible and intangible assets as part of their extended self.

On the one hand, Pierce, Kostova, and Dirks (2003), psychological ownership is an attitude that has both affective and cognitive sides. It involves emotional attachment to the group or to the organization that transcends the cognitive evaluation of the firm. By this means, Pierce et al. (2001) insists that, psychological ownership is helpful in satisfying three basic human needs. First of these needs is the need for owning a ‘home’ (having a sense of place), secondly the need for feeling efficacy and effectance, and the last need is the need to satisfy self-identity. When these needs are satisfied, people feel more comfortable with the target of their possessions. They feel safer and they feel more powerful and dominant over the target. Psychological ownership triggers feelings of having control and power over both tangible and intangible possessions and contributes to feelings of self efficacy. Motivation to be efficacious in relation to environment is a significant factor underlying the need for feelings of psychological ownership. The relationships between individuals and environment sometimes contributes to needs of control, self efficacy and self competencethus psychological ownership and self become strongly related to each other (Furby, 1991).

Moreover, Pierce et al. (1991) three fundamental rights are necessary in creating psychological ownership. First of all; sharing some of the organization's financial values, second is the right to have control over the organization and third, is the right to be informed about the current status of the organization (Chi and Han, 2008). From this perspective, three formal ownership programmes are suggested by Chi and Han (2008); first and one of the most important of these programs is the profit-sharing plans that ensure having a share from financial returns of the company. Having a say in decision making gives employees the right to influence strategic decisions and gives access to critical information that helps employees to know more about the organization. According to Chi and Han (2008) people who are constantly exposed to these three formal ownership programmes are more prone to develop feelings of psychological ownership. For example: Wagner et al. (2003) suggests that profit-sharing plans are devised with the conviction that employees probably be more productive and efficient in case they have an invested interest in the success of the organization. On the one hand, applying participative management style also gives employees opportunities to gain a sense of control of the organization and contributes to feelings of ownership (Chi and Han, 2008). Furthermore, having information and being familiar with the organization, make employees gain a feeling of ownership (Pierce et al., 2001). Hence, participation to decisions are also very significant in designing suitable organizations that contributes to psychological ownership.

In the extant literature studies related to psychological ownership combines ownership feelings with positive attitudes about the possession, responsibility shown for the target and the self-concept of the owner (Dyne and Pierce, 2004). Psychological ownership positively affects individuals' behaviours. Feeling psychological ownership for a social group or entity makes individuals engage in citizenship behaviors toward that social group or unit. For example; when individuals feel ownership towards their organizations they engage in organizational citizenship behaviours. Moreover, people feeling high levels of psychological ownership have greater tendency to burden risky conditions easily and more willing to make extra role sacrifices on behalf of a social group (Pierce, Kostova and Dirks, 2003). Although scarce in number there are some studies regarding these relationships. In the extant literature there is unfortunately a limited number of studies regarding psychological ownership. For example, the relationship between psychological ownership and organizational citizenship behavior has been credited by an

empirical study applied by VandeWalle, Van Dyne, & Kostova (1995) that shows a positive and meaningful correlation between these dimensions. In VandeWalle et al.'s (1995) study that examines levels of psychological ownership experienced by housing cooperative residents. Results of the study showed that relationships between psychological ownership experienced by residents and their commitment and satisfaction to the cooperative and their self-perceptions regarding their own extra-role behavior are positive. As a second example in Pendleton et al.'s (1998) research on four transportation companies which showed that feelings of psychological ownership is related to job satisfaction, job involvement, commitment, integration, and positive work-related behaviors. And the third empirical research is Parker, Wall, and Jackson's (1997) study on quality management which showed that psychological ownership is linked to concerns for unfinished work and makes people more goal oriented and ambitious (Dyne and Pierce, 2004).

When we look through related literature we see that there are four main components of psychological ownership. First component is accountability. According to Avey (2009) individuals experiencing higher feelings of psychological ownership often expect to hold the right to call other people to account for the probable problems on their possessions. And they expect to hold the right to share information and the right to influence the direction of the target. On the other hand, individuals also expect responsibilities for the self, which can be described as a sense of burden sharing. Second important component of psychological ownership is belongingness- a feeling that one belongs in the organization. When people feel like owners in a social group or organization, their need for belongingness is met by "having a place" in terms of their socio-emotional need is met (Avey. et. al., 2009). In the extant literature it is seen that groups (Abrams & Hogg, 2004) and targets of ownership often act as symbols required by people for being identified (Rousseau, 1998). And thirdly, people establish and transform their self-identity especially through interactions with tangible targets (Dittmar, 1992) and more intangible targets such as mission, vision or organizational goals (Rousseau, 1998). For example, individuals may view and define themselves as a Macbook user, a Ferrari owner, or mother of a teenage daughter. These possessions often describe one's identity. Perceptions of ownership over these targets contributes to identification by giving the impression of being unique, thus contributing to personal identity (Avey. et. al., 2009). According to Tajfel's (1986) social

identification theory, individuals are expressive of feelings and values. And due to the fact that people are highly expressive and search for opportunities to affirm and increase their self-identity, building self-identity can be viewed as a potential component of psychological ownership (Avey, et. al., 2009). In time they learn what should be included and what should be excluded in their self changes. When a specific possession is regarded as an extension of the self, this target becomes significant to one's self-identity and individual starts to define himself by this possession (Belk, 1988). And as a fourth important component, self efficacy can also be regarded as an important component. Target of possession helps to build self-efficacy and make people feel more self confident in organizational settings. To sum up, psychological ownership is a multi-dimensional concept that involves four main domains: self-efficacy, accountability, sense of belonging, and self-identity (Avey, et. al., 2009).

However there are also disadvantages of psychological ownership. Similar to an overly possessive child, individuals experiencing psychological ownership are often unwilling to share their possessions with other people or they often want exclusive control over them. And this in turn hinders cooperation in groups and organizations. It makes individuals too protective regarding the possession targeted and this creates problems between individuals whose interests conflict regarding the target. On the one hand, individuals can be too obsessed with increasing their psychological possessions and this in turn may turn to an obsession (Pierce, Kostova and Dirks, 2003). It also may lead to deviant behaviors in organizations, such as aggressive behaviors that violate group norms and create danger for the well-being of the organization or group and its members. Unnecessary rivalry, too much jealousy may occur. Moreover psychological ownership can also be associated with personal psychological problems. Excessive feelings of psychological ownership can lead to overwhelming problems caused by the burden of responsibility (Pierce, Kostova and Dirks, 2003). Too much attachment and devotion may harm and wear out individuals.

3. Social Identity Theory

The roots of psychological ownership as a research realm come from the studies of self and nonself regions in psychology (Ikävalko et. al. 2006). The basic psychological ownership model can be described as the total of three components; the owner namely the subject of possession,

the ownable object and the relationship between them these concepts namely the ownership (Ikävalko et. al. 2006). We proposed that it is a concept that should be handled with social identity perspective due to its elements that is related to perceptions regarding self identity in social groups and organizations.

According to Tajfel (1972), social identity helps us to theorize how people define themselves in intergroup contexts, how social categorization determines people's place in a society (p. 293). According to Tajfel (1972), social identity is something related to emotions and perceptions regarding the knowledge that one belongs to a certain group (p. 292). From this point of view, Tajfel suggested that three important elements contribute to one's social identity: first, cognitive awareness of one's membership in a social group, second, an evaluative component namely a positive/negative value attribution on group membership, and lastly an emotional component namely feelings of emotional involvement with the organization or group (Ellemers. et. al. 1999). Similarly, Turner (1975) claimed that members in a specific group strive to protect and increase their groups' positive distinctiveness and positive social identity by protecting their group boundaries (Hogg, 2001). Namely, groups and their members prefer to protect or promote their belief that "we" are better than "them" (Hogg, 2016).

Social identity theorists claim that social identity notion is a result of depersonalization effect of groups. This is explained in social attraction hypothesis of Hogg (1992; 1993). In this hypothesis it is claimed that ingroup members are liked more compared to outgroup members due to the fact that the former are perceptually put into a relatively positive ingroup prototype, because of the prototypical similarity to themselves, or because self-liking (self-esteem) thus viewed as prototypical extension of self (Hogg, 2001). An other factor contributing to feelings of social identity is subjective uncertainty reduction. Self-categorization processes and depersonalization based on prototypes reduce uncertainty due to perceptions, feelings, attitudes and behaviors that are often prescribed by an ingroup prototype which has consensual validation from most of the members of the group (Hogg, 2001). Hence it can be concluded that the main suggestion of social identity theory, is the fact that, the level to which group members identify with a certain social identity determines their motivation and tendency to behave in terms of their group membership. That is to say their feelings of active commitment to the group rather than the possibility to

distinguish between members of different social categories affect their behaviours (Ellemers et. al., 1999). According to Tajfel and Turner (1979), we can talk about a continuum between personal and social identity and identity of a person shifts along this continuum. It designates what influence a person's feelings and actions in a social atmosphere. Social identities are often more effective when group norms are in congruence with the norms of a behaviourally relevant group membership, especially when the identity is a salient basis for self-definition (Terry et. al., 1999).

4. Collective Psychological Ownership

Psychological ownership is a sense that goes beyond individual feelings experienced in private sphere. With this perspective, Jussila (2007) insisted on the necessity of developing a concept that considers psychological ownership as a collective-level phenomenon. Based on Altman (1975) and Brown's (1987) ideas on territoriality which can be considered as a bundle of social behaviors nourished from psychological ownership; Pierce and Jussila (2010) proposed that psychological ownership also exists at the group level. They used street gangs as an example of social groups that have a collective sense of psychological ownership over other nearby neighborhoods (Rantanen and Jussila, 2011). According to Pierce and Jussila (2010), collective psychological ownership can be defined as the collectively held sense of ownership among members of a group towards a target of possession that belongs to the group as a whole. Pierce and Jussila (2010) insists that human beings are social animals and due to the fact that collective possessions give meanings to their experiences in life, and guide individual's action as collective beings, the importance and motivation for collective ownership has a great place in the sense of social identity (Tajfel, 1982). Thereby, the need for social identity needs to be present for Collective psychological ownership to develop (Rantanen and Jussila, 2011, p.142). But Pierce and Jussila (2010) also point out that since collective ownership is an intersubjective construct and the inclination for collective ownership necessitates all of the feelings of efficacy and effectance, self-identity or stimulation.

Pierce and Jussila (2010) suggested three ways that results in collective psychological ownership. First of these routes is collectively recognized shared control over the target of ownership. For example a married couple having a daughter and having the right to control her collectively as a

result of their biological contribution in giving birth to the girl. Second route is collectively accepted shared knowledge of the target as a secret shared by a group of people for example formula of a special recipe in a luxuries restaurant known only by the chefs of that specific restaurant. And third route is collectively accepted and shared investment of different group members' selves into the target of ownership a long lasting project managed by a group of IT professionals. Often feeling psychological ownership in individual sphere contributes to collective psychological ownership and vice a versa. People become more possession conscious when they see that they share similar feelings with other people regarding the target of possession.

5. Psychological Ownership in Organizations

According to Mayhew et. al (2007) psychological ownership also include both job-based psychologig and organizational-based psychological ownership. That is to say as in the case in their individual sphere, poeple also experience feelings of ownership regarding their jobs, organizations and workplaces. In organizatonal settings the relationship between formal or legal ownership and psychological ownership is a bit complex. Psychological ownership is a complex psychological phenomenon involving connections between possessions and the sense of self and it derives from the individual's perception of ownership from a feeling of responsibility or accountability, or personal investment of time or effort (Pierce and Rodgers, 2004) whereas legal ownership is a legally recognised concept that can be easily conferred by others (Pickford, et. al. 2016). Moreover, psychological ownership, may occur despite the existence of formal ownership. There is no need to have legal ownership in order to feel psychological ownership.

Regarding psychological ownership in workplace, Brown et al. (2005) insists on the fact that individualsoften become territorial over ideas, roles, relationships, physical spaces, and other potential targets of ownership in organizations. When members in an organization form bonds of ownership over targets in the organization such as physical, informational or social objects, they often desire to designate theseassets as belonging solely to themselves.

According to extant literature major factors that hightens psychological ownership level of are often factors related to work environment structure suitable climate of self-determination and participative decision making culture (Bernhard and Driscoll, 2011). Although most of the work

on the antecedents of psychological ownership is related to work/job design (Pierce et al., 2009), in small firms, since they often do not have distinct job descriptions psychological ownership built more on the description of the owner rather than formal job (Bernhard and Driscoll, 2011). Extant literature on psychological ownership in organizational settings shows that psychological ownership for the organization is positively correlated to individual job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behaviour and organizational commitment. (O'Driscoll, Pierce, & Coghlan, 2006), and financial performance (Wagner et al., 2003). For example; Avey's (2009) study on psychological ownership in workplaces showed that psychological ownership is useful in terms of members' work attitudes and work behaviours such as Organizational commitment, intentions to stay in the organization, and job satisfaction. Results of the study showed that psychological ownership is also positively affected from transformational leadership (Avey. et. al., 2009).

6. Family Business

In the extant literature, family businesses namely family firms have been described as coherent organizations in which ownership, management, governance, and family systems interact (Aranoff, 2004). According to psychological ownership perspective (Pierce & Jussila, 2010), the fusion and relationship between the family and family business describes a social and physical fusion.

In family firms when family and business come together, boundaries become blurred (Rantanen and Jussila, 2011, p.139). In family firms the informal nature of familial relations is frequently carried over into the firm, serving to foster commitment and a sense of identification with the founder/business manager's dream (Olson, et. al. 2003). According to Astrachan & Shanker (2003) family involvement is a key factor distinguishing family firms from other organizational forms. According to Chang et. al. (2009) family involvement refers to the ways through which an owner family has the capacity to influence the family business by governance, ownership, management, and transgenerational succession (Rantanen and Jussila, 2011). However as businesses grow, the ties between family and management and the bonds between family and governance loosen and become more complicated. As the time goes on, family firms face challenges in many occasions; and, family becomes unable to provide the necessary executive

leadership (Aranoff, 2004). And as the ties between family members are loosened, importance of family business longevity and family business sustainability increases. As Ward (1997) indicates, life length and sustainability of a family business is closely related to its ability to anticipate and respond to change namely to its resilience. Ensuring the family members' attachment to their own business may become more difficult after the first founder generations. As generations change, if family members start to focus solely to financial returns and if they see their family business as interchangeable with any other possessions offering comparable returns, sustaining the family business becomes less meaningful (Aranoff, 2004). According to Carlock and Ward (2001) a family's commitment to their own business mostly involves a particular belief and support for the achievements of the organization and a willingness to contribute to these achievements, and a desire for a long lasting relationship with the family firm.

In family firms, as time passes members view one another as a team bonded together in a common goal to which the target of possession is connected, thus, in time the concept of "us" emerges and the family starts to see itself as a group and family members view themselves as a family in business (Zellweger et al., 2010). According to Sharma and Irving (2005) a result of psychological ownership is a strong individual commitment to the family firm, which is also a major advantage of family firms over nonfamily firms. However, the idea of fusion between family and business suggests that seeing themselves as "us" is not enough, the family should also develop collective feelings of shared ownership for their shared values and beliefs. That is to say collective psychological ownership is needed. As the family members feel collective psychological ownership, a fusion between the family and their business values starts to occur. And members - as family- and their business start to share the same values (Rantanen and Jussila, 2011). As a natural consequence of this situation according to Pierce and Jussila (2011), family and business become attached to each other and they are more likely to make positive cognitive evaluations of the business and work for the business and contribute to its goals and success.

7. Collective Psychological Ownership in Family Firms

Normally "an owner" is regarded as an individual person, however in family business the family is often seen as the owner (Ikävalko et al., 2006). In fact, only recently, researchers started to focus on psychological ownership in the family business atmosphere (Bernhard & Sieger, 2009;

Sieger, 2010, Bernhard & O'Driscoll, 2011). As mentioned before in family businesses family owners give more importance to socioemotional referent points rather than financial referent points. In this point the term socioemotional wealth come into scene, the term socioemotional wealth is an umbrella concept that emphasizes a family's emotional value gained from a firm (Gómez-Mejía et al., 2010). According to Gómez-Mejía et al. (2010) mainsuggestion of socioemotional wealth perspective is the fact that family businesses make decisions based on their socioemotional reference points, not just their economic truths and presumptions. Tajfel (1982) insists that social identification with a group makes group members be aware of their membership, value it, and be emotionally invested in it. In family firms members of the family are often more aware of their membership compared to non-family members that are working at family firms or at non-family firms. That is to say, family firm is part of a family's identity and ad deeply associated with stable and fmajor components of conceptualization of the self (Deephouse and Jaskiewich, 2013). According to Zellweger et al. (2011) in family firms, even if family members do not actively work in the family firm, awareness of membership is so strong due to the fact that they grow up with the firm, encounter too many details about the firm and benefit from the firm. They are somehow associated with the firm and benefit from the firm's socioemotional wealth, such as being treated respectfully in the community (Deephouse and Jaskiewich, 2013). As a result, as time passes, firm becomes an integral part of family members' personal identity and history. And it can be expected that this contributes to perceptions of psychological ownership towards the family firm. On the contrary, non-family members, cannot benefit from socioemotional wealth as a birth right, thus can not feel satisfactory levels of psychological ownership, often they can not benefit from life long employment or other benefits stemming from being a member of the family. Thus, in family firms subjective and perceived evaluations of family members regarding ownership of family business should be considered in socioemotional terms. High levels of psychological ownership feelings for the family business can be considered as a glue binding the family to the firm (Bernhard and Driscoll, 2011).

In this point, collective psychological ownership can be regarded as a construct useful in measuring family influence and by this way is significant in clarifying the definition of family business (Rantanen and Jussila, 2011). According to Pierce and Jussila (2010), collective psychological ownership is a socially constructed cognitive concept encompassing both an

emotional or affective components. That is to say it is a collective sense of ownership in which a “fusion” between the subject and the object of ownership exists. That is to say it is hard to distinguish between “us” and the target of ownership that is “ours”. This fusion can be promoted by formal ownership, but not necessarily automatically follow from it (Rantanen and Jussila, 2011). Therefore, it shows realized, rather than merely potential, employee interaction with the organization.

When we turn back to family business literature we see that, ownership is often thought of in terms of legal direct or indirect ownership, namely family owning the company actually or through other entities (Rantanen and Jussila, 2011). It is generally assumed that when the percentage of family shareholding is greater, family’s influence over the business is also greater (Rantanen and Jussila, 2011). As in the case with family influence, psychological ownership does not have one-to-one relationship with family shareholding. Having a sense of ownership does not necessitate having a share from the legal ownership of the company.

In family businesses when they have mutual sharings, family members are likely to develop collective sense of ownership towards the firms and businesses they already legally own. According to Pierce and Jussila (2010), if family members do not view themselves somewhat similar to each other and do not share same values, beliefs and experiences, the kind of collective sense expected from collective psychological ownership is unlikely to take place. Shared family values, beliefs and attitudes, and common long-standing, intergenerational, emotionally valenced histories and shared organizational cultures generate socially and emotionally constructed cognitive structures and results in individual shifts from individual to collective self identities (Rantanen and Jussila, 2011).

8. Positive Consequences of Psychological Ownership

According to Pierce et al. (1991) psychological ownership has many positive consequences regardless of members’ status related to formal ownership. As it is well known, financial ownership motivates individuals to perform at high levels. Similarly, psychological ownership is also related to high levels of performance due to its effects on extra role behaviours that is constructive work behaviours that are useful for organizations (Pierce et. al., 1991).

Regarding positive effects of psychological ownership; Doh and Quigley (2014) claim that open, participative management styles create a virtuous cycle, resulting in psychological ownership and high levels of performance. As leaders are more inclusive regarding their managerial style towards various important stakeholders, those stakeholders are more likely to trust the leader, feel committed to organizational goals, feel higher levels of psychological ownership and emotional connection to their organization and work, and become more motivated (Doh and Quigley, 2014). Psychological ownership is also associated with positive attitudinal and behavioural consequences, such as increased job satisfaction, commitment, and intention to remain in the organisation (Avey, Avolio, Crossley, & Luthans, 2009; Olckers, 2013).

In the extant literature, although scarce in number there are some studies regarding effects of psychological ownership on positive organizational outputs. WandeWalle et. al.'s (1995) research applied on 797 people who were residents of university housing cooperatives confirmed that there is a strong relationship between psychological ownership and extra role behaviour. And this relationship is mediated by organizational commitment. In an other study Md-Sidin et. al. (2010) examined the effects of psychological ownership, job performance, job satisfaction and organizational commitment on individual outputs of business school lecturers in Malaysia. In of this study, it was found confirmed that psychological ownership has an important effect on organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and job performance.

Organizational scholars have also seen positive relationships between psychological ownership and affective commitment (O'Driscoll, Pierce, & Coghlan, 2006) and job satisfaction (Avey, Avolio, Crossley, & Luthans, 2009). Regarding this point in the study applied by Sieger et. al. (2011) on 310 family business employers from Germany and German-speaking Switzerland, who are not family members showed that psychological ownership has the potential to mediate the relationships between distributive justice and affective commitment in a family business. In an other study, Olckers and Elslin (2016) examined the relationships among workplace trust, psychological ownership and turnover intentions within a South African company and results of the study showed that psychological ownership is considerably related to workplace trust (positively) and turnover intentions (negatively).

High performing family firms generally achieve a combination of financial and nonfinancial goals (Olson et al., 2003). Sharma (2004) claims that the level of preparedness of the next generation and its psychological attitude towards ownership of the firm have a significant influence on the next generation's performance. American Family Business Survey (1997) also give support to the fact that next-generation employees of the family who think more positively about their company's future and who feel glad with being a part of that organization are more committed to maintaining sustainability and long-term ownership within the family business. As mentioned in psychological ownership theory, the essence of psychological ownership is "the feeling of possessiveness and of being psychologically tied to an object" (Pierce et al., 1991). Thus, employees and family members who feel and act like owners of the organization will take the responsibility of personal risks, actions and decisions affecting their organizations (Md- Sidin et. al., 2010) and will do their best in order to make their organizations successful.

Further more, psychological ownership also makes employees more accountable and behave more plausibly in organizational settings. They prefer to obey rules more willingly when they feel psychological ownership. For example; in Jafri's (2016) study that aimed understanding influence of psychological ownership on employee's perception of psychological contract breach on 250 employees working at different levels from two banks in Bhutan, results showed that employee's sense of ownership is significantly and inversely related to psychological contract breach.

Moreover, in their theory regarding psychology of change, Dirks and his friends proposed that psychological ownership may lead to both positive and negative orientations toward change in groups or organizations, contingent on the kind and level of change involved. According to their theory people are more likely to promote change of a target toward which they feel ownership when the change is self-initiated evolutionary and additive. In this point, Pare et. al.'s (2006) research examining psychological ownership is a considerable study in revealing importance of psychological ownership in times of change. In this study results showed that psychological ownership of a new system is positively associated with employer's perceptions of system utility and system user friendliness and their active involvement and participation in the change process.

9. Negative effects of Psychological Ownership

As mentioned before psychological ownership is associated with a wide range of positive behaviours including increased employee motivation, high levels of performance, Organizational commitment and Organizational loyalty; but it also has some negative side effects, such as territoriality, tendency to avoid delegation (Pickford et. al., 2016) and reluctance in sharing information. In understanding negative effects of psychological ownership, understanding what is territoriality is important. Territoriality is a concept that has two basic attributes: 1. Being strongly attached to territories and 2. defending territories. The first attribute claims that territoriality has its roots in psychological ownership. Namely, psychological ownership is the baseline of territoriality in psychological terms (Brown et. al., 2005). Territoriality toward an object or social entity will lead signaling and defending it from others. Territoriality helps disentangling the bond between psychological ownership and employee behaviors. In other terms, Brown et al. (2005) defined territoriality “as behavioral expression feelings of ownership toward a physical or social target” (p. 578).

According to Brown et. al. (2005) there are several kinds of territorial behavior, for example: behaviors regarding maintaining an attachment to an object, behaviors used to show boundaries of one’s own territory to others, and behaviors that defend one’s territories toward which feelings of ownership have developed. Brown and his colleagues (2005) argue that psychological ownership also promotes defensive behaviors. They claim that there are two kinds of defensive behaviours. First, anticipatory defensive behaviors that are overt actions intends to tell others that something is owned by the actor and second is reactionary defenses that tries to restore the territory to the actor (p. 584). Defending territoriality causes individuals to find alternatives to hinder or to react to territorial infringements (Peng. 2013, p. 402). For example; regarding task relevant information and knowledge, it is expected that employees want to have personal control over it since the knowledge is acquired or created by themselves. And since they employ it every day in work settings they are very familiar with the knowledge. Moreover, to acquire or create new knowledge, they often invest too much effort and time. That is why, individuals mostly experience sense of ownership over their know-how on the matters related to their tasks (Peng, 2013). Since sharing the target of ownership often means transferring the controlling power over

the target, individuals will try to keep their knowledge to protect their strong knowledge-based psychological ownership (Peng, 2013) With this perspective, Peng (2013) examined 190 IT professionals and results of this survey showed that knowledge-based psychological ownership is positively correlated to knowledge hiding. Results of the study showed that territoriality fully mediates the relationship between knowledge-based psychological ownership of individuals and knowledge hiding in organizations. Moreover, organization-based psychological ownership moderates the relationship between territoriality and knowledge hiding in organizations. The main purpose of the present research was to answer the question of why people sometimes embrace change and other times seem to outright reject it. The results of this research showed that psychological ownership can be useful in making people to remain open to others' suggestions for change but they also highlight that ownership can have negative consequences causing people to resist change. Results showed that psychological ownership can contribute to many different consequences, contingent on the situation. If change results in an extension or reduction of one's psychological possessions results also change. Psychological ownership, may also impede cooperation in organizations: "Much like the overly possessive child, individuals may be unwilling to share the target of ownership with others or may feel a need to retain exclusive control over it" (Pierce et al., 2003). In this point. Family businesses seems more dangerous. Being both a member and employee of the company, family members may feel "more"owner of the firm and may disturb non-family members by making them feel"less"owner of the firm. That is to say family members may want to protect the advantageous coming from being a member of the family by trying to put non family members out of their own territory of power and may give less power and less critical positions in the organization.

Furthermore in extreme cases employees having a sense of excessive levels of possessiveness toward particular organizational targets may sometimes ignore the norms and rules of their organization in order to protect their relationship with the target. It is claimed that fear of losing an important piece of the self in psychological terms may result in deviant behavior in organizational settings such as hiding information or stealing from the company etc. In addition, loss of such possessions may result in reactionary deviant behaviors such as lying, sabotage, destruction, or vandalism directed toward the target namely those kind of behaviors that aim to prevent others from attaching to the target that one feels belongs to himself (Pierce et. al., 2009).

10. Conclusion

Pierce et al. (2009) claims that enlarged and enriched jobs structurally have the potential to increase and satisfy the motivation for psychological ownership. Similarly, complex kinds of jobs also contribute to sense of job-centered ownership. The overlapping roles and complex family relationships in family firms make them more complicated. Thus, family members in family firms tend to have more enriched and enlarged jobs. The fact that there is a duality in family businesses, referring to the family side and business side (Stafford, Duncan, Dane, and Winter, 1999), success of these companies lies in the interplay of these two sides (Cater and Young, 2016). Enriched and enlarged jobs in family firms ensures that interplay and results in the success of family firms and contributes to the feelings of psychological ownership on the side of the family-members. When family members feel a family–firm identity fit, they often exhibit high level of concern for corporate reputation and they often have a strong inclination to pursue nonfinancial goals and ultimately serve to protect family’s own identity claims (Zellweger, et. al. 2013). Infact, family identity is the meaning family members attach to the family for internal processes of self-verification (Weigert & Hastings, 1977) and it is the central property of familial relationships in the social context, where the social context contributes to the construction of identity (Zellweger, et. al. 2013).

Without doubt a family is a “world” of its own, in which selves emerge, act, thus in building the identity of family members, family firm may play a relevant role. Families’ goals reflect family’s identity and are strictly in relation with the firm (Zellweger, et. al. 2013). That is to say, identity serves as a statement of central character. It is claimed that the overlap of people who are both members of both the family and workers of the firm, the central and integral function of the business for the family’s biography, and inability of family members to leave the firm entirely often lead to a congruence of identities (Dyer & Whetten, 2006).

When we turn back to social identity theory we see that one of the most distinctive features of group life and intergroup relations is the fact that groups protect and promote the believes that “we” are better than “them” (Hogg, 2012). According to social identity theory group members are motivated to protect and enhance the positivity of their group in order to protect and enhance

their self-esteem (Martiny and Rubin 2016; p. 19) According to self esteem hypothesis of Tajfel, people obtain information about the value of their in-group by making intergroup comparisons with relevant out-groups and that these comparisons result in establishing positive in-group statuses. That is why, members in an organization favour in-group members because they want to make positive in group assesments regarding their company (Martiny and Rubin, 2016). Organizational identity involves the basic values of an organization that its members deem to be the most central, distinctive, and enduring (Albert & Whetten, 1985). Similarly, in family firms family members working in family firms identify themselves by making relevant comparisons with other members in the family firm and by comparing their firm with their rivals and feeling proud with their own firms. This results in heightened feelings of ownership on the side of the family members. Their identification with the family firms arouses higher levels of motivation maintaining the sustainability of their target of possession.

Family business research argues that family and organizational identity overlaps in creating a mutually shared understanding. They mutually answer the questions of “who we are” and “what we do” in “our business that belongs to our family. The overlap of people who are members of both the family and the firm lead to a congruence of identities (Dyer & Whetten, 2006). Being identified both with the family and with the organization individuals attach more eagerly to their organizations and they often prefer to do their best for the sustainability and betterment of their organization. Ownership acts as a motivator when the firm belongs to the family. It contributes to an impression of belonging to the firm with a higher level of attachment. A special link occurs between the family firm and family member that satisfy organizational members through defining themselves in terms of membership to the family and the firm simultaneously.

11. Managerial Implications

Identity serves as a central character (Albert & Whetten, 1985) in all kinds of organizations. When we look back to family firms, we see that a family identity is always distinctive due to the existence of family’s unique common history. Identity-building elements of family history involves memories of good and bad times, memories of achievements, or signs of inherited possessions, anecdotes and artifacts from earlier times and these elements serve as a biographical museum for family members. In other words, a family is a “world” of its own, in which identity

is built by a particular common history (Zellweger 2011). In other words, in the identity building process of a controlling family, having a part of ownership may play a relevant role. Using this feeling as a mechanism for higher levels of identification and attachment to the firm is both useful and meaningful. In order to heighten this feeling managers should integrate family members into the family firm. They should design more sophisticated and integrative succession systems that give more critical positions and roles to young members of the family. Taking part in the family business system from early ages will make family members feel higher levels of ownership and they will spend more effort for the firm. On the one hand, trusting the succession system and feeling secure in this system will ensure a more peaceful family business atmosphere that will reinforce collective psychological ownership feelings.

Moreover, establishing justice among family members and distributing resources and rewards in a more just manner will contribute to feelings of ownership among family members. People feeling sure about the justice of reward and punishment systems will be more willing to serve for their company and will not hesitate to take part in activities that necessitate extra role performance. Being satisfied with the fairness of the company will urge members to make long term plans regarding their career in the particular family firm.

References

- [1] Abrams, D., & Hogg, M. A. (2004). Metatheory: Lessons from social identity research. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 8(2), 98-106.
- [2] Albert, S. & Whetten, D. (1985). Organizational identity. In L.L. Cummings & B.M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 7, pp. 263–295). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- [3] American family business survey (1997). The Arthur Andersen/Mass Mutual American family business survey. <http://www.arthurandersen.com/CFB.97surv.asp>.
- [4] Aronoff, C. (2004). Self-perpetuation family organization built on values: Necessary condition for long-term family business survival. *Family Business Review*, 17(1), 55-59.
- [5] Astrachan, J. H., & Shanker, M. C. (2003). Family businesses' contribution to the U.S. Economy: A closer look. *Family Business Review*, 16, 211–220.

- [6] Avey, J., Avolio, B., Crossley, C. and Luthans, F. (2009). Psychological Ownership: Theoretical Extensions, Measurement and Relation to Work Outcomes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30(2), pp.173-191.
- [7] Baer, M., & Brown, G. (2012). Blind in one eye: How psychological ownership of ideas affects the types of suggestions people adopt. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 118(1), 60-71.
- [8] Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman. ^[L]_[SEP]
- [9] Belk, R. W. (1988). Possessions and the extended self. *Consumer Research*, 15, 139–168.
- [10] Bernhard, F., & O'Driscoll, M. P. (2011). Psychological ownership in small family-owned businesses: Leadership style and nonfamily-employees' work attitudes and behaviors. *Group & Organization Management*, 36(3), 345-384.
- [11] Bernhard, F., & Sieger, P. (2009). Family influence and psychological ownership: The mediating effects of control. Paper presented at the 9th IFERA world family business research conference.
- [12] Brown, G., Lawrence, T. B., & Robinson, S. L. (2005). Territoriality in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 30, 577–594. ^[L]_[SEP]
- [13] Campbell Pickford, H., Joy, G., & Roll, K. (2016). *Psychological Ownership: Effects and Applications*.
- [14] Carlock, R. S., & Ward, J. L. (2001). *Strategic planning for the family business — Parallel planning to unify the family and business*. Houndsmill, NY: Palgrave.
- [15] Carlock, R., & Ward, J. (2001). *Strategic planning for the family business: Parallel planning to unify the family and business*. Springer.
- [16] Cater, J., & Young, M. (2016). Family factors in small family business growth. *Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship*, 21(4), 56.
- [17] Chang, E. P., Memili, E., Chrisman, J. J., Kellermanns, F. W., & Chua, J. H. (2009). Family social capital, venture preparedness, and start-up decisions: A study of Hispanic entrepreneurs in New England. *Family Business Review*, 22(3), 279-292.
- [18] Chi, N. W., & Han, T. S. (2008). Exploring the linkages between formal ownership and psychological ownership for the organization: The mediating role of organizational justice. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 81(4), 691-711.
- [19] Chua, J. H., Chrisman, J. J., & Sharma, P. (1999). Defining the family business by behavior. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 23(4), 19-19.

- [20] Cram, F., & Paton, H. (1993). Personal possessions and self-identity: the experiences of elderly women in three residential settings. *Australian Journal of Aging*, 12, 19–24. 
- [21] Deephouse, D. L., & Jaskiewicz, P. (2013). Do family firms have better reputations than non-family firms? An integration of socioemotional wealth and social identity theories. *Journal of Management Studies*, 50(3), 337-360.
- [22] Dipboye, R. L. (1977). A critical review of Korman's self-consistency theory of work motivation and occupational choice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 18, 108–126.
- [23] Dittmar, H. (1992). *The social psychology of material possessions: To have is to be*. New York: St. Martin's Press. 
- [24] Doh, J. and Quigley, N. (2014). Responsible Leadership and Stakeholder Management: Influence Pathways and Organizational Outcomes. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 28(3), pp.255-274.
- [25] Dyer, W. G., & Whetten, D. A. (2006). Family firms and social responsibility: Preliminary evidence from the S&P 500. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 30(6), 785-802.
- [26] Ellemers, N., Kortekaas, P., & Ouwerkerk, J. W. (1999). Self-categorisation, commitment to the group and group self-esteem as related but distinct aspects of social identity. *European journal of social psychology*, 29(23), 371-389.
- [27] Etzioni Amitai (1991) *The Socio-Economics of Property*, A Special Issue of *Journal of Social Behaviour and Personality*, *To Have Possessions: A Handbook on Ownership and Property*, 6:6, 465-468.
- [28] Furby, L. (1991). Understanding the psychology of possession and ownership: A personal memoir and an appraisal of our progress. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 6, 457–463.
- [29] Gómez-Mejía, L. R., Makri, M. and Kintana, M. L. (2010). 'Diversification decisions in family-controlled firms'. *Journal of Management Studies*, 47, 223–52.
- [30] Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of theories of social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 62–80). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. 
- [31] Hogg, M. A. (1992). *The social psychology of group cohesiveness: From attraction to social identity*. New York: New York University Press.

- [32] Hogg, M. A. (2001). A social identity theory of leadership. *Personality and social psychology review*, 5(3), 184-200.
- [33] Hogg, M. A. (2007). Uncertainty-identity theory. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 39, pp. 69–126). San Diego, CA: Academic.
- [34] Hogg, M. A. (2012). Uncertainty-identity theory. In P. A. M. Van Lange, A. W. Kruglanski, & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation* (pp. 113–132). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- [35] Hogg, M. A. (2016). Social identity theory. In *Understanding Peace and Conflict Through Social Identity Theory* (pp. 3-17). Springer International Publishing.
- [36] Hogg, M. A. (1993). Group cohesiveness: A critical review and some new directions. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 4, 85-111.
- [37] Ikävalko, M., Pihkala, T., & Jussila, I. (2006, November). Psychological ownership and family businesses—Identifying the common ground through discriminant analysis. In *RENT xx—Conference on Research in Entrepreneurship and Small Business*. Brussels, Belgium.
- [38] Jafri, M. H. (2016). Influence of Psychological Ownership on Psychological Contract Breach. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 3(2), 150-160.
- [39] Jussila, I., & Tuominen, P. (2010). Exploring the consumer co-operative relationship with their members: an individual psychological perspective on ownership. *International Journal of Co-operative Management*, 5(1), 23-33.
- [40] Martins, E., Pundt, A., Horsman, C. S., & Nerdinger, F. W. (2008). Organizational culture of participation: Development and validation of a measure. *German Journal of Human Resource Research*, 22, 195-215.
- [41] Martiny, S. E., & Rubin, M. (2016). Towards a clearer understanding of social identity theory's self-esteem hypothesis. In *Understanding Peace and Conflict Through Social Identity Theory* (pp. 19-32). Springer International Publishing.
- [42] Mayhew, M. G., Ashkanasy, N. M., Bramble, T., & Gardner, J. (2007). A study of the antecedents and consequences of psychological ownership in organizational settings. *The Journal of social psychology*, 147(5), 477-500.
- [43] McIntyre, N., Srivastava, A., & Fuller, J. A. (2009). The relationship of locus of control and motives with psychological ownership in organizations. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 383-401.

- [43] Md-Sidin, S., Sambasivan, M., & Muniandy, N. (2009). Impact of psychological ownership on the performance of business school lecturers. *Journal of Education for Business*, 85(1), 50-56.
- [44] Miller, D., Breton-Miller, L., & Lester, R. H. (2011). Family and lone founder ownership and strategic behaviour: Social context, identity, and institutional logics. *Journal of Management Studies*, 48(1), 1-25.
- [45] Miller, D., Steier, L., & Le Breton-Miller, I. (2003). Lost in time: Intergenerational succession, change, and failure in family business. *Journal of business venturing*, 18(4), 513-531.
- [46] Morgan, T. J., & Gomez-Mejia, L. R. (2014). Hooked on a feeling: The affective component of socioemotional wealth in family firms. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, 5(3), 280-288.
- [47] Morris, M. H., Williams, R. O., Allen, J. A., & Avila, R. A. (1997). Correlates of success in family business transitions. *Journal of business venturing*, 12(5), 385-401.
- [48] O'Driscoll, M. P., Pierce, J. L., & Coghlan, A. M. (2006). The psychology of ownership: Work environment structure, organizational commitment and citizenship behaviours. *Group & Organization Management*, 31(3), 388-416.
- [49] Olckers, C., & Enslin, C. (2016). Psychological ownership in relation to workplace trust and turnover intent. *Journal of Psychology in Africa*, 26(2), 119-126.
- [50] Olson, P. D., Zuiker, V. S., Danes, S. M., Stafford, K., Heck, R. K., & Duncan, K. A. (2003). The impact of the family and the business on family business sustainability. *Journal of business venturing*, 18(5), 639-666.
- [51] Olson, P.D., 1999. Predictors of self-sufficiency for entrepreneurial families. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.
- [52] Paré, G., Sicotte, C., & Jacques, H. (2006). The effects of creating psychological ownership on physicians' acceptance of clinical information systems. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 13(2), 197-205.
- [53] Parker, S. K., Wall, T. D., & Jackson, P. R. (1997). 'That's not my job': developing flexible employee work orientations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40, 899-929.
- [54] Pendleton, A., Wilson, N., & Wright, M. (1998). The perception and effects of share ownership: empirical evidence from employee buy-outs. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 36(1), 99-123.

- [55] Peng, M. W. (2013). *Global strategy*. Cengage learning.
- [56] Pierce, J. and Rodgers, L. (2004). The Psychology of Ownership and Worker-Owner Productivity. *Group & Organization Management*, 29(5), pp.588-613.
- [57] Pierce, J. L., Jussila, I., & Cummings, A. (2009). Psychological ownership within the job design context: Revision of the job characteristics model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30(4), 477-496.
- [58] Pierce, J. L., Jussila, I., & Li, D. (2010). A tool for the measurement of collective psychological ownership and construct validation evidence. University of Minnesota Duluth, Labovitz School of Business and Economics Working Paper.
- [59] Pierce, J. L., Kostova, T., & Dirks, K. (2001). Toward a theory of psychological ownership in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 26, 298–310. ^[1]_{SEP}
- [60] Pierce, J. L., Kostova, T., & Dirks, K. T. (2003). The state of psychological ownership: Integrating and extending a century of research. *Review of general psychology*, 7(1), 84.
- [61] Pierce, J. L., Rubinfeld, S. A., & Morgan, S. (1991). Employee ownership: A conceptual model of process and effects. *Academy of Management Review*, 16, 121–144.
- [62] Rantanen, N., & Jussila, I. (2011). F-CPO: A collective psychological ownership approach to capturing realized family influence on business. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, 2(3), 139-150.
- [63] Rousseau, D. M., & Shperling, Z. (2003). Pieces of the action: Ownership and the changing employment relationship. *Academy of Management Review*, 28, 553–570.
- [64] Sharma, P. (2004). An overview of the field of family business studies: Current status and directions for the future. *Family business review*, 17(1), 1-36.
- [65] Sharma, P., Chrisman, J. J., Pablo, A. L., & Chua, J. H. (2001). Determinants of initial satisfaction with the succession process in family firms: A conceptual model. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 25(3), 17-36.
- [66] Stafford, K., Duncan, K.A., Danes, S.M., & Winter, M. (1999). A research model of sustainable family business. *Family Business Review*, 12, 197-208. ^[1]_{SEP}
- [67] Tajfel, H. (1982). Social psychology of intergroup relations. *Annual review of psychology*, 33(1), 1-39.

- [68] Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds), *The social psychology of intergroup relations*, pp. 33±47. Monterey, CA: Brooks-Cole.
- [69] Taylor, S.E., & Fiske, S.T. (1975). Point-of-view and perceptions of causality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 32, 439-445.
- [70] Terry, D. J., Hogg, M. A., & White, K. M. (1999). The theory of planned behaviour: self-identity, social identity and group norms. *British journal of social psychology*, 38(3), 225-244.
- [71] Van Dyne, L., & Pierce, J. L. (2004). Psychological ownership and feelings of possession: Three field studies predicting employee attitudes and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 25(4), 439-459.
- [72] Van Dyne, L., & Pierce, J. L. (2004). Psychological ownership and feelings of possession: Three field studies predicting employee attitudes and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 25(4), 439-459.
- [73] VandeWalle, D., Van Dyne, L., & Kostova, T. (1995). Psychological ownership: an empirical examination of its consequences. *Group and Organization Management*, 20(2), 724–749.
- [74] Wagner, S. H., Parker, C. P., & Christiansen, N. D. (2003). Employees that think and act like owners: Effects of ownership beliefs and behaviors on organizational effectiveness. *Personnel Psychology*, 56, 847-871.
- [75] Wagner, S. H., Parker, C. P., & Christiansen, N. D. (2003). Employees that think and act like owners: The effects of ownership beliefs and behaviors on organizational effectiveness. *Personnel Psychology*, 56, 847–871.
- [76] Ward, J. L. (1997). Growing the family business: Special challenges and best practices. *Family Business Review*, 10(4), 323-337.
- [77] Weigert, A. J., & Hastings, R. (1977). Identity loss, family, and social change. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82(6), 1171-1185.
- [78] Zellweger, T. M., Eddleston, K. A., & Kellermanns, F. W. (2010). Exploring the concept of familiness: Introducing family firm identity. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, 1, 54–63.
- [79] Zellweger, T. M., Nason, R. S., Nordqvist, M. and Brush, C. G. (2011). ‘Why do family firms strive for nonfinancial goals? An organizational identity perspective’. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, doi: 10.1111/j.1540-6520.2011.00466.x.