

# Ownership of Organization Behavior

Subjects: **Management**

Contributor: Nai-Wen Chang

Ownership of organization behavior (OOB) is that the psychological influence of the tour leader will affect their behavior, and the psychological consequences of the tour leader will be affected by experience (such as seniority of the team leader or number of tour groups).

leader

accountability

tour ownership of organizational behavior

sustainable business model

## 1. Introduction

Organizational behavior (OB) is “the study of human behavior in organizational settings, the interface between human behavior and the organization, and the organization itself” <sup>[1][2]</sup>. OB research can be categorized in at least three ways, including the study of:

- Individuals in organizations (micro-level);
- Work groups (meso-level); and
- How organizations behave (macro-level) <sup>[3]</sup>.

Organizational studies also deal with different aspects of organizations. Although many of the most commonly used approaches are functionalist, critical research also provides alternative frameworks for understanding in the field. Organizational change is fundamental to the study of management <sup>[4]</sup>. Roots, Routes, and Results in Kostova: According to Pierce, Kostova, and Dirks <sup>[5]</sup>, it is common for people to psychologically experience the connection between self and various targets of possession, such as homes, automobiles, and other people <sup>[6]</sup>. The study extends the viewpoint of Kostova and enhances the personality of tour leaders to describe the situation of travel agencies.

OOB also includes personality traits that are the most stable and important components of personal characteristics in a person’s life <sup>[7][8]</sup>. Simply stated, personality traits refer to a psychological phenomenon that creates an external impression based on personal characteristics. Nevertheless, the characteristics of personality are not totally reflected externally; some parts are deeply held concepts that are hidden inside by that individual. Different personalities will produce different personal behaviors <sup>[9]</sup>. At present, the most widely accepted theory is the five-type personality, which includes extroverted, agreeable, conscientious, open-minded, and neurological personality types <sup>[7][8]</sup>. These five major personality types serve as the basic framework of personality <sup>[7][8][10]</sup>.

## 2. The Mediating Effect of Ownership of Psychological Behavior and Tour Leader Experience on Accountability in Order to Explore the Sustainable Business Model of the Tourism Industry

Both employee personality and organizational behavior (OB) have been demonstrated as key determinants of organizational success <sup>[11][12]</sup>. Moreover, while an employee's personality may be an important predictor of OB <sup>[13][14]</sup>, it may also be a better indicator of a firm's profit than OB <sup>[15][16]</sup>. Although there are different perspectives on the nexus of these two variables, one view is that accountability is a response derived from employee personality and OB <sup>[17][18]</sup>.

Accordingly, accountability has been viewed as playing an instrumental role in driving employee personality, as well as diffusing OB throughout the tourism industry <sup>[19][20]</sup>. The performance of a tour leader can either make or break a tour's quality <sup>[21][22][23]</sup>, as the tour leader is the essential interface between the local guides and the tour participants, serving as a front-line provider of travel services. Mossberg <sup>[24]</sup> asserted that the performance of the tour leader affects customer loyalty and word-of-mouth of the service. Consequently, the tour leader must take full accountability; that is, the leader fully understands the rights and responsibilities of providing professional services for package tour groups <sup>[25]</sup>.

### Accountability

Accountability has been studied in the tourism industry concerning a variety of related variables, including organizational behavior <sup>[26][27][28]</sup>, management <sup>[11][29]</sup>, and marketing <sup>[16][30]</sup>. In general, travel agency managers have been urged to become more accountable in order to better satisfy tourist needs and achieve their business performance objectives <sup>[15][31]</sup>. The dominant view is that accountability is positively related to performance <sup>[32][33]</sup>. Though the greater emphasis on accountability may be an intuitively attractive response to rapidly changing tourist conditions, empirical findings on the relationship between accountability and psychological ownership in the tourism industry have been mixed. Some studies have found general support for a positive association between accountability and organizational behavior, as it applies to a range of tourism businesses <sup>[34]</sup>.

A tour leader, also known as a tour manager, sometimes performs the tasks of a tour guide <sup>[28][35]</sup>. In East Asian countries, outbound travel often involves Group Independent Tours (GITs) <sup>[36][37]</sup>, and the tour leader plays a critical role in such tours <sup>[26][38]</sup>. Religious tours, cultural tours, reunion tours for veterans, and tours for professional and interest groups are just several examples of outings that require the services of a tour leader <sup>[39][40]</sup>. The tour leader accompanies members of the tour during their trip <sup>[41][42]</sup>, and is required by GPTs (Group Package Tour) to deliver core products and services, including guiding and keeping tourists happy.

Tour leaders play several instrumental, mediatory (experience management), and interpretative/sustainability (destination/resource management) roles, and have various capacities and functions as a leader, communicator,

organizer, salesperson, consultant, entertainer, and representative of the travel agency [43][44]. They must be able to calmly handle crises, such as airline strikes or bus breakdowns, during the outbound period.

Organizational studies are “the examination of how individuals construct organizational structures, processes, and practices and how these, in turn, shape social relations and create institutions that ultimately influence people” [4]. Organizational studies comprise different areas that deal with the different aspects of organizations; many such approaches are functionalist, but critical research can also provide an alternative framework for understanding in the field. Organizational change is fundamental to the study of management [45].

Recently, most issues of accountability have focused on the organization of management duties and responsibilities, employee behavior and decision-making, and the results/procedure of the implementation and practice in the education domain. Relevant studies are detailed below:

- Organization of management duties and responsibilities: As an aspect of governance, this has been central to discussions related to problems in the public sector, non-profit and private (corporate) sectors, and individual contexts [46][47]. Sandwich strategy initiatives are increasingly facilitated, in terms of “closing the feedback loop”, enhancing the relationship with accountability from citizen voices [48]. Lys, Naughton, and Wang [49] revealed their finding that CSR performance relies on financial performance and corporate accountability, but also depends on CSR performance. A viable investigative method for the framework of algorithmic power and the applicability of transparency policies for algorithms has been discussed, alongside challenges in implementing algorithmic accountability [50][51]. The consistency and quality of information provided in the transfer of accountability (TOA) process between nurses led to findings on how to improve the procedure of TOA with no risks and poor handover [52]. The individual-level accountability concept of felt accountability and how to describe the perceptions of one’s personal accountability have also been assessed [53].
- Employee behavior and decision-making: Thompson [54] posited that many different individuals in large organizations contribute in many ways to decisions and policies; as such, it is difficult, even in principle, to identify who should be accountable for the results. Two ideal types of such hybrids—differentiated and integrated—and two key challenges of governance they face have been submitted: accountability for dual performance objectives, and accountability to multiple principal stakeholders [55][56]. The accountability framework has identified multiple levers for change, including quasi-regulatory and strengthened accountability systems [57][58]. The new accountability relationships between a local city hall, its citizens, and stakeholders, after executing austerity politics and its budget cuts for local authorities, have been shown to lead to social implications in terms of resource diversions and service cuts [59].
- Implementation and practice in the education domain: Coburn, Hill, and Spillane [60] argued that accountability and alignment constitute important ways to measure how these additional variables function (i.e., system-level, organizational, and individual capacities; organizational networks and environments; the specificity of policy; and the ambitiousness of the instructional ideas advanced by policy) within settings that vary systematically by the strength of the accountability system and level of alignment. The authors proposed a new approach that

reclaims and embraces accountability, and reconstructs its targets, purposes, and consequences in education [61]. The accountability pressure affecting various non-achievement student behaviors and the causal impact of this form of accountability pressure have been examined [62]. The relationships between the distribution of school expenditures, class size, qualified teachers, mathematics achievement, and performance-driven accountability policies in equity have been discussed [63][64]. Furthermore, some studies have attempted to provide an effective accountability system, which should give students, parents, and governments confidence in new frameworks for shaping new standards [65][66].

- Relevant Studies in the Hotel Industry: Munteanu, Bibu, Nastase, Cristache, and Matis [67] stated that sports and recreational facilities, traditional food and beverage businesses, employees' behaviors, and accountability systems affect service quality. A theoretical framework to determine the variables that explain the phenomenon of turnover intention, and that identifies the antecedents of employee turnover, has been proposed [68][69].
- Empowerment, Humility, Stewardship, Standing Back, Forgiveness, Courage, Accountability, Authenticity, and Affective Commitment: Those have been determined to be crucial in servant leadership issues [70][71]. This sector triggered the motives of this study. For travel industry leaders, when implementing the company's assigned foreign tourism missions, facing tourists, local tour guides, and suppliers of relevant resources, the leader of the team should consider accountability issues, and whether there are any intermediary factors that will affect the psychological predecessors of the team leader and even further influence the level of responsibility of the team leader.

## References

1. Fairley, S.; Gibson, H.; Lamont, M. Temporal manifestations of nostalgia: Le Tour de France. *Ann. Tour. Res.* 2018, 70, 120–130.
2. Košičiarová, I.; Kádeková, Z.; Štarchoň, P. Leadership and Motivation as Important Aspects of the International Company's Corporate Culture. *Sustainability* 2021, 13, 3916.
3. Moorhead, G.; Griffin, R.W. *Organizational Behavior Managing People and Organizations*; Dreamtech Press: Delhi, India, 2008.
4. Alghamdi, F. Total quality management and organizational performance: A possible role of organizational culture. *Int. J. Bus. Adm.* 2018, 9, 186–200.
5. Li, Y.-B.; Zhang, G.-Q.; Wu, T.-J.; Peng, C.-L. Employee's Corporate Social Responsibility Perception and Sustained Innovative Behavior: Based on the Psychological Identity of Employees. *Sustainability* 2020, 12, 8604.
6. Pierce, J.L.; Kostova, T.; Dirks, K.T. Toward a theory of psychological ownership in organizations. *Acad. Manag. Rev.* 2001, 26, 298–310.

7. Avetisyan, M. A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF CREATIVITY AND THE ROLE OF CHESS IN ITS DEVELOPMENT. *Main Issues Pedagog. Psychol.* 2020, 17, 99–104.
8. Costa, P.T.; McCrae, R.R. Neuroticism, somatic complaints, and disease: Is the bark worse than the bite? *J. Personal.* 1987, 55, 299–316.
9. Maier, C.; Laumer, S.; Wirth, J.; Weitzel, T. Technostress and the hierarchical levels of personality: A two-wave study with multiple data samples. *Eur. J. Inf. Syst.* 2019, 28, 496–522.
10. Kaspar, K.; Müller-Jensen, M. Information seeking behavior on Facebook: The role of censorship endorsement and personality. *Curr. Psychol.* 2019, 1–12.
11. Albayrak, T. Classifying daily tour service attributes by three-factor theory of customer satisfaction. *J. Qual. Assur. Hosp. Tour.* 2018, 19, 112–125.
12. Wu, H.-C.; Chang, Y.-Y.; Wu, T.-P. Pilgrimage: What drives pilgrim experiential supportive intentions? *J. Hosp. Tour. Manag.* 2019, 38, 66–81.
13. Jin, T.; Lin, V.S.; Hung, K. China's generation Y's expectation on outbound group package tour. *Asia Pac. J. Tour. Res.* 2014, 19, 617–644.
14. Yang, F.X.; Lau, V.M.-C. Experiential learning for children at World Heritage Sites: The joint moderating effect of brand awareness and generation of Chinese family travelers. *Tour. Manag.* 2019, 72, 1–11.
15. Ahrens, T.; Ferry, L. Debate: What support should local government expect from accounting during a sudden crisis such as Covid-19? *Public Money Manag.* 2020, 1, 2.
16. Su, C.-J.; Yang, J.-H.; Badaoui, K.; Cho, N. Tour Leaders' Impression Management and Job Performance: Exploring the Moderating Role of Tourists' Self-Monitoring. *Asia Pac. J. Tour. Res.* 2014, 19, 356–373.
17. Tsaur, S.-H.; Dai, Y.-Y.; Liu, J.-S. SOCO's impact on service outcomes of tour guides: The moderating effect of customers' shopping orientation. *Curr. Issues Tour.* 2018, 21, 917–933.
18. Liu, J.S.; Tsaur, S.-H. We are in the same boat: Tourist citizenship behaviors. *Tour. Manag.* 2014, 42, 88–100.
19. Teng, H.-Y. Job crafting and customer service behaviors in the hospitality industry: Mediating effect of job passion. *Int. J. Hosp. Manag.* 2019, 81, 34–42.
20. Cheng, J.-C.; Chen, C.-Y.; Teng, H.-Y.; Yen, C.-H. Tour leaders' job crafting and job outcomes: The moderating role of perceived organizational support. *Tour. Manag. Perspect.* 2016, 20, 19–29.
21. Zhang, F.; Parker, S.K. Reorienting job crafting research: A hierarchical structure of job crafting concepts and integrative review. *J. Organ. Behav.* 2019, 40, 126–146.

22. Quiroga, I. Characteristics of package tours in Europe. *Ann. Tour. Res.* 1990, 17, 185–207.
23. Bin Saeed, B.; Afsar, B.; Hafeez, S.; Khan, I.; Tahir, M.; Afridi, M.A. Promoting employee's proenvironmental behavior through green human resource management practices. *Corp. Soc. Responsib. Environ. Manag.* 2019, 26, 424–438.
24. Wang, K.-C.; Hsieh, A.-T.; Chen, W.-Y. Is the tour leader an effective endorser for group package tour brochures? *Tour. Manag.* 2002, 23, 489–498.
25. Mossberg, L.L. Tour leaders and their importance in charter tours. *Tour. Manag.* 1995, 16, 437–445.
26. Hwang, J.; Lee, J.H. Relationships among senior tourists' perceptions of tour guides' professional competencies, rapport, satisfaction with the guide service, tour satisfaction, and word of mouth. *J. Travel Res.* 2019, 58, 1331–1346.
27. Frías-Jamilena, D.M.; Sabiote-Ortiz, C.M.; Martín-Santana, J.D.; Beerli-Palacio, A. Antecedents and consequences of cultural intelligence in tourism. *J. Destin. Mark. Manag.* 2018, 8, 350–358.
28. Chen, M.Y.-C.; Lam, L.W.; Zhu, J.N. Should companies invest in human resource development practices? The role of intellectual capital and organizational performance improvements. *Pers. Rev.* 2020, 50, 460–477.
29. Tsaur, S.-H.; Teng, H.-Y. Exploring tour guiding styles: The perspective of tour leader roles. *Tour. Manag.* 2017, 59, 438–448.
30. Luoh, H.-F.; Tsaur, S.-H. The effects of age stereotypes on tour leader roles. *J. Travel Res.* 2014, 53, 111–123.
31. Cheng, J.-C.; Chen, C.-Y.; Yen, C.-H.; Teng, H.-Y. Building customer satisfaction with tour leaders: The roles of customer trust, justice perception, and cooperation in group package tours. *Asia Pac. J. Tour. Res.* 2017, 22, 395–407.
32. Tsaur, S.H.; Ku, P.S. The effect of tour leaders' emotional intelligence on tourists' consequences. *J. Travel Res.* 2019, 58, 63–76.
33. Matiza, T. Post-COVID-19 crisis travel behaviour: Towards mitigating the effects of perceived risk. *J. Tour. Futures* 2020.
34. Tsaur, S.-H.; Lin, W.-R. Hassles of tour leaders. *Tour. Manag.* 2014, 45, 28–38.
35. Chang, J.-C. Changing roles and cognitive dissonance of the guided tour bus drivers in Taiwan. *JTHM* 2017, 5, 12–22.
36. Foroudi, P.; Tabaghdehi, S.A.H.; Marvi, R. The gloom of the COVID-19 shock in the hospitality industry: A study of consumer risk perception and adaptive belief in the dark cloud of a pandemic. *Int. J. Hosp. Manag.* 2021, 92, 102717.

37. Wang, K.C.; Jao, P.C.; Chan, H.C.; Chung, C.H. Group package tour leader's intrinsic risks. *Ann. Tour. Res.* 2010, 37, 154–179.
38. Wong, J.-Y.; Lee, W.-H. Leadership through service: An exploratory study of the leadership styles of tour leaders. *Tour. Manag.* 2012, 33, 1112–1121.
39. Schmidt, M.F.; Gonzalez-Cabrera, I.; Tomasello, M. Children's developing metaethical judgments. *J. Exp. Child Psychol.* 2017, 164, 163–177.
40. Smith, S.L.J. The tourism product. *Ann. Tour. Res.* 1994, 21, 582–595.
41. Bowie, D.; Chang, J.C. Tourist satisfaction: A view from a mixed international guided package tour. *J. Vacat. Mark.* 2005, 11, 303–322.
42. Carrillo, B.; Barbieri, C.; Knollenberg, W.; Edwards, M.B. The stress from my tour leading job: Differences between genders. *J. Hosp. Tour. Manag.* 2020, 44, 211–214.
43. Black, R.; Weiler, B.; Chen, H. Exploring theoretical engagement in empirical tour guiding research and scholarship 1980–2016: A critical review. *Scand. J. Hosp. Tour.* 2019, 19, 95–113.
44. Weiler, B.; Black, R. *Tour Guiding Research: Insights, Issues and Implications*; Channel View Publications: Bristol, UK, 2015; p. 62.
45. Suddaby, R.; Foster, W.M. History and organizational change. *J. Manag.* 2017, 43, 19–38.
46. Atwal, G.; Williams, A. Luxury brand marketing—the experience is everything! In *Advances in Luxury Brand Management*; Palgrave Macmillan: Cham, Switzerland, 2017; pp. 43–57.
47. Williams, A. Tourism and hospitality marketing: Fantasy, feeling and fun. *Int. J. Contemp. Hosp. Manag.* 2006, 18, 482–495.
48. Fox, J.; Acheron, J.; Guillán, A. Doing accountability differently. A proposal for the vertical integration of civil society monitoring and advocacy. *U4 Issue* 2016, 4, 67.
49. Lys, T.; Naughton, J.P.; Wang, C. Signaling through corporate accountability reporting. *J. Account. Econ.* 2015, 60, 56–72.
50. Diakopoulos, N. Algorithmic accountability: Journalistic investigation of computational power structures. *Digit. J.* 2015, 3, 398–415.
51. Lepri, B.; Oliver, N.; Letouzé, E.; Pentland, A.; Vinck, P. Fair, transparent, and accountable algorithmic decision-making processes. *Philos. Technol.* 2018, 31, 611–627.
52. Guiyab, M.; Paramalingam, V.; Swift, S.; Savedra, P.; Barratt, L.; Den Bok, J. Transfer of Accountability between the Emergency Department (ED) and the Intensive Care Unit (ICU). *Can. J. Crit. Care Nurs.* 2017, 28, 62–63.
53. Hall, A.T.; Frink, D.D.; Buckley, M.R. An accountability account: A review and synthesis of the theoretical and empirical research on felt accountability. *J. Organ. Behav.* 2017, 38, 204–224.

54. Thompson, J.A. Proactive personality and job performance: A social capital perspective. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 2005, 90, 1011.
55. Ebrahim, A.; Battilana, J.; Mair, J. The governance of social enterprises: Mission drift and accountability challenges in hybrid organizations. *Res. Organ. Behav.* 2014, 34, 81–100.
56. Weaver, R.L. The Impact of COVID-19 on the Social Enterprise Sector. *J. Soc. Entrep.* 2020, 1–9.
57. Swinburn, B.; Kraak, V.; Rutter, H.; Vandevijvere, S.; Lobstein, T.; Sacks, G.; Gomes, F.; Marsh, T.; Magnusson, R. Strengthening of accountability systems to create healthy food environments and reduce global obesity. *Lancet* 2015, 385, 2534–2545.
58. Vecchio, R.; Cavallo, C. Increasing healthy food choices through nudges: A systematic review. *Food Qual. Prefer.* 2019, 78, 103714.
59. Ahrens, T.; Ferry, L. Financial resilience of English local government in the aftermath of COVID-19. *J. Public Budg. Account. Financ. Manag.* 2020, 32, 813–823.
60. Coburn, C.E.; Hill, H.C.; Spillane, J.P. Alignment and accountability in policy design and implementation: The Common Core State Standards and implementation research. *Educ. Res.* 2016, 45, 243–251.
61. Oamek, K. Review of Reclaiming accountability in teacher education. *Educ. Rev.* 2019, 26.
62. Holbein, J.B.; Ladd, H.F. Accountability pressure: Regression discontinuity estimates of how No Child Left Behind influenced student behavior. *Econ. Educ. Rev.* 2017, 58, 55–67.
63. Lee, J.; Wong, K.K. The impact of accountability on racial and socioeconomic equity: Considering both school resources and achievement outcomes. *Am. Educ. Res. J.* 2004, 41, 797–832.
64. Rosenblatt, Z. Personal accountability in education: Measure development and validation. *J. Educ. Adm.* 2017, 55, 18–32.
65. Bae, S. Redesigning systems of school accountability: A multiple measures approach to accountability and support. *Educ. Policy Anal. Arch.* 2018, 26, 8.
66. Darling-Hammond, L.; Wilhoit, G.; Pittenger, L. Accountability for college and career readiness: Developing a new paradigm. *education policy analysis archives.* *Educ. Policy Anal. Arch.* 2014, 22, 86.
67. Munteanu, A.-I.; Bibu, N.; Nastase, M.; Cristache, N.; Matis, C. Analysis of practices to increase the workforce agility and to develop a sustainable and competitive business. *Sustainability* 2020, 12, 3545.
68. Alkahtani, A.H. Investigating factors that influence employees' turnover intention: A review of existing empirical works. *Int. J. Bus. Manag.* 2015, 10, 152.

69. Satardien, M.; Jano, R.; Mahembe, B. The relationship between perceived organisational support, organisational commitment and turnover intention among employees in a selected organisation in the aviation industry. *SA J. Hum. Resour. Manag.* 2019, 17, 1–8.
70. Ansari, N.; Anjum, T.; Farrukh, M.; Heidler, P. Do Good, Have Good: A Mechanism of Fostering Customer Pro-Environmental Behaviors. *Sustainability* 2021, 13, 3781.
71. Singh, G.K.P.A.; Subramaniam, A.; Mahomed, A.S.B.; Mohamed, R.; Ibrahim, S. Role of Authentic Leadership, Servant Leadership and Destructive Leadership Behaviour on Employee Engagement in Malaysian Hospitality Industry. *Soc. Sci.* 2020, 10, 113–125.

---

Retrieved from <https://encyclopedia.pub/entry/history/show/27461>