

Editör

Prof.Dr.Aşkın Keser (Bursa Uludağ Üniversitesi)

Editör Yardımcıları

Dr.Öğr.Üyesi Burak Faik Emirgil (Bursa Uludağ Üniversitesi)
Dr.Öğr.Üyesi Elif Kara (Bursa Uludağ Üniversitesi)
Dr.Ülviye Tüfekçi Yaman (Bursa Uludağ Üniversitesi)

Dergi Sekreteryası

Proje Asistanı Hasan Karakaya (Bursa Uludağ Üniversitesi)
Proje Asistanı Melih Tutar (Bursa Uludağ Üniversitesi)

Yayın Kurulu

Doç.Dr.Şenol Baştürk (Bursa Uludağ Üniversitesi)
Doç.Dr.Erdem Cam (Ankara Üniversitesi)
Doç.Dr.Zerrin Yöney Fırat (Bursa Uludağ Üniversitesi)
Prof. Dr. Aşkın Keser (Bursa Uludağ Üniversitesi)
Doç.Dr.Ahmet Sevimli (Bursa Uludağ Üniversitesi)
Doç.Dr.Gözde Yılmaz (Marmara Üniversitesi)
Dr.Öğr.Üyesi Memet Zencirkıran (Bursa Uludağ Üniversitesi)

Uluslararası Danışma Kurulu

Prof. Dr. Ronald Burke (York University-Kanada)
Prof. Dr. Glenn Dawes (James Cook University-Avustralya)
Prof. Dr. Jan Dul (Erasmus University-Hollanda)
Prof. Dr. Alev Efendioğlu (University of San Francisco-ABD)
Prof. Dr. Adrian Furnham (University College London-İngiltere)
Prof. Dr. Alan Geare (Emekli Öğretim Üyesi - University of Otago- Yeni Zelanda)
Prof. Dr. Ricky Griffin (TAMU-Texas A&M University-ABD)
Prof. Dr. Diana Lipinskiene (Kaunos University-Litvanya)
Prof. Dr. George Manning (Northern Kentucky University-ABD)
Prof. Dr. William (L.) Murray (Emekli Öğretim Üyesi - University of San Francisco-ABD)
Prof. Dr. Mustafa Ozbilgin (Brunel University-İngiltere)
Prof.Dr. Owen Stanley (James Cook University-Avustralya)
Prof. Dr. Işık Urla Zeytinoğlu (McMaster University-Kanada)

Ulusal Danışma Kurulu

Prof. Dr. Yusuf Alper (Bursa Uludağ Üniversitesi)
Prof.Dr.Serpil Aytaç (Fenerbahçe Üniversitesi)
Prof. Dr. Veysel Bozkurt (İstanbul Üniversitesi)
Prof. Dr. Toker Dereli (Işık Üniversitesi)
Prof. Dr. Nihat Erdoğan (Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi)
Prof. Dr. Ahmet Makal (Emekli Öğretim Üyesi-Ankara Üniversitesi)
Prof.Dr.Umut Omay (İstanbul Üniversitesi)
Prof. Dr. Ahmet Selamoğlu (Fenerbahçe Üniversitesi)
Prof. Dr. Nadir Suğur (Anadolu Üniversitesi)
Prof. Dr. Abdulkadir Şenkal (Kocaeli Üniversitesi)
Prof. Dr. Nursel Telman (Maltepe Üniversitesi)
Prof. Dr. Cavide Uyargil (İstanbul Üniversitesi)
Prof. Dr. Engin Yıldırım (Anayasa Mahkemesi)
Prof. Dr. S. Arzu Wasti (Sabancı Üniversitesi)

**A REVIEW ON PROSOCIAL ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR:
DIFFERENT CONCEPTUALIZATIONS AND FUTURE AGENDA**

**ÖRGÜTLERDE OLUMLU SOSYAL DAVRANIŞLAR ÜZERİNE BİR İNCELEME:
FARKLI KAVRAMSALLAŞTIRMALAR VE GELECEĞE YÖNELİK
DEĞERLENDİRMELER**

Research Assistant Serin İşıaık

FMV Işık University, Faculty of Economics, Administrative and Social Sciences, Department of Psychology

Prof. Dr. Seçil Bülbül

*Marmara University, Faculty of Business Administration, Department of Business Administration(English), Sub-
Department of Organizational Behavior*

Aralık/December, Cilt/Vol: 24 Sayı/Num:2 Sayfa/Page: 62-84.
ISSN: 2148-9874

Makalenin Geliş Tarihi/ Article Received: 29.09.2022

Makale Kabul Tarihi/Article Accepted: 29.11.2022

Makale İçin İletişim/Correspondence to:

*Research Assistant, FMV Işık University, Faculty of Economics, Administrative and Social Sciences,
Department of Psychology, serin.isiacik@isikun.edu.tr*

*Prof. Dr., Marmara University, Faculty of Business Administration, Department of Business
Administration(English), Sub-Department of Organizational Behavior*

Atıf Önerisi/How to Cite:

*İşıaık S., Bülbül S., A Review On Prosocial Organizational Behavior: Different Conceptualizations And Future
Agenda, İş,Güç Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi, 24(2), 62-84*

TARANDIĞIMIZ INDEXLER



**Dergide yayınlanan yazılardaki görüşler ve bu konudaki sorumluluk yazarlarına aittir.
Yayınlanan eserlerde yer alan tüm içerik kaynak gösterilmeden kullanılamaz.**

**All the opinions written in articles are under responsibilities of the authors.
The published contents in the articles cannot be used without being cited .**

**“İş, Güç” Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi - © 2000-2022
“Is, Güc” The Journal of Industrial Relations and Human Resources - © 2000-2022**

"İŞ, GÜÇ" ENDÜSTRİ İLİŞKİLERİ VE İNSAN KAYNAKLARI DERGİSİ
"IS, GUC" INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS AND HUMAN RESOURCES JOURNAL

İÇİNDEKİLER
YIL: 2022 / CİLT: 24 SAYI: 2

<u>SIRA</u>	<u>MAKALE BAŞLIĞI</u>	<u>SAYFA NUMARALARI</u>
1	Arş. Gör. Gizem Nur Bulut, İthal İkameci Birikim Modelinden İhracata Dayalı Sanayileşmeye: Türkiye’de Kapitalizm ve Emek Politikaları Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme	5-32
2	Arş. Gör. Naim Göktaş, Türkiye’de Grev Ertelemesi Uygulaması ve Grev Hakkının Varlık Sorunu	37-57
3	Arş. Gör Serin İşıaık, Prof. Dr. Seçil Bülbül, A Review on Prosocial Organizational Behavior: Different Conceptualizations and Future Agenda	62-84
4	İlke Tunçel, Prof Dr. İlknur Kumkale, Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Olgun, Irmak Çetin X ve Y Kuşağı Bağlamında Örgütsel Sinizm	89-117
5	Arş. Gör. Serkan Çelik, Küresel Kapitalizmin Yemek Kültürü ve Standartlaşan Gıdalara Karşı Bir Sosyal Hareket ve Politik Tutum Olarak Slow Food	122-143

**A REVIEW ON PROSOCIAL ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR:
DIFFERENT CONCEPTUALIZATIONS AND FUTURE AGENDA¹**

**ÖRGÜTLERDE OLUMLU SOSYAL DAVRANIŞLAR ÜZERİNE BİR İNCELEME:
FARKLI KAVRAMSALLAŞTIRMALAR VE GELECEĞE YÖNELİK
DEĞERLENDİRMELER**

Research Assistant Serin İşıacı²

Prof. Dr. Seçil Bülbül³

ÖZET

Örgüt arařtırmaları farklı alıřan davranıř türlerini incelemektedir. Ancak ilgili alanyazında, iřyerindeki olumlu sosyal davranıřları ifade eden terimler konusunda bir karmařıklık vardır. alıřmalarda bu konuyla ilgili birok kavram kullanılmakta ve farklı bakıř aıları öne sürölmektedir. Örgütlerdeki olumlu sosyal davranıřların kullanımı ve ifade edilmesi aısından tutarlılıđın olmaması bu kavramın anlaşılması aısından problem yaratmaktadır. Bu nedenle, örgütlerde olumlu sosyal davranıř yerine kullanılan kavramlar arasındaki farklılıkları göstermek için bir derleme alıřmasına ihtiya vardır. Bu alıřma alana eřitli katkılar sağlamaktadır: İlk olarak, örgütlerde olumlu sosyal davranıřın farklı tanımları gözden geçirilmiřtir. İkinci olarak, kavram ile ilgili diđer bakıř aıları ve iliřkili kavramsallařtırmalar özetlenmiřtir. Ayrıca, kuramsal zorluklar ve gelecekteki alıřmalar için öneriler ele alınmıřtır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Örgütlerde Olumlu Sosyal Davranıřlar, Olumlu Sosyal Davranıřlar, Rol Dıřı Davranıřlar

¹ This paper is based upon the PhD thesis of the corresponding author.

² Research Assistant, FMV Iřık University, Faculty of Economics, Administrative and Social Sciences, Department of Psychology, serin.isiacik@isikun.edu.tr

³Prof. Dr., Marmara University, Faculty of Business Administration, Department of Business Administration(English), Sub-Department of Organizational Behavior

ABSTRACT

Organizational research examines different types of employee behaviors. There is, however, a complexity about which term refers to prosocial behaviors in work life. Relevant literature employs many concepts and adopts different perspectives to explain the idea. This way, the extent of prosociality is dismissed since it creates complexity for specifying prosocial organizational behavior. A literature review is needed to show the critical differences between the concepts used interchangeably with prosocial organizational behavior. Thus, the current study makes several contributions to the field: First, definitional issues surrounding prosocial behaviors were provided. Second, other perspectives and related conceptualizations were summarized. In doing so, theoretical challenges and a future agenda were addressed.

Keywords: Prosocial Organizational Behavior, Prosociality, Extra-Role Behavior

INTRODUCTION

Prosociality is valued because it is expected to maintain social cohesion and harmony. In general, prosocial behavior refers to behaving for the benefit of others (Bolino & Grant, 2016; Padilla-Walker & Carlo, 2014) and encompasses a broad range of behaviors such as sharing, helping, comforting, cooperating, donating blood, volunteering, and complementing (Batson & Powell, 2003; Brief & Motowidlo, 1986; Uzmen & Mağden, 2002; Weinstein & Ryan, 2010). Therefore, research on prosociality is specialized in different social contexts and age groups to understand the phenomena further (Flook, Zahn-Waxler, & Davidson, 2019; Graddy-Reed, 2018). For example, Carlo and Randall (2002) suggest six dimensions of prosocial behavior for adolescents: (a) Altruistic prosocial behavior is voluntary aid for taking care of others. (b) Obedient prosocial behavior is a type of behavior that comes after a verbal or nonverbal request. (c) Emotional prosocial behavior is helping behavior in the presence of emotional, environmental stimuli, such as seeing someone hurt in his or her legs. (d) Dire prosocial behavior is about taking action during emergencies and crises. (e) Public prosocial behavior is exhibited with motives such as gaining the respect and approval of other people, (f) Anonymous prosocial behaviors are performed without knowing who helped.

Thinking and behaving for others' welfare have also been discussed in the business context because organizations usually expect employees to go beyond the prescribed job definitions. Employees can engage in extra-role behaviors to benefit stakeholders, including other organizational members (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986; Bülül, 2013; Welbourne & Paterson, 2017). Relevant literature shows that employees exceed their formal job duties by working extra hours, helping co-workers, and attending non-mandatory work meetings. These behaviors can positively affect stakeholders, including other employees, leaders, organizations, and the environment (Francoeur, Paillé, Yuriev, & Boiral, 2021; Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, & Blume, 2009). However, prosociality research in the organizational context is a controversial issue. Since researchers use different labels and many psychological concepts (e.g., altruism) interchangeably to refer to the phenomenon (Zettler, 2022), reviews may face challenges. Also, the prevalence of prosociality in the business environment has been discussed in the literature. One perspective suggests that prosocial behavior is weaker in market-oriented economics (Rosenbaum, Billinger, Stieglitz, Djumanov, & Atykhanov, 2012), while another states that prosocial behavior can be transformed into business settings (Fosgaard, Fosgaard, & Foss, 2017). Because of the complexity and clutter of the relevant literature, this paper addresses definitional issues of prosociality in organizations by showing the theoretical

similarities and differences between different prosocial organizational behavior conceptualizations. Therefore, it is aimed to provide a review of prosociality in organizations and recommendations for future research to reduce the ambiguity of using different concepts and encourage researchers to rethink using prosociality when employing different concepts.

1.1. Definition of Prosociality

Three terms explain prosociality in the literature: prosocial behavior, motives, and impact. Prosocial behaviors usually explain actions to establish and protect the welfare of other parties (Bolino & Grant, 2016; Organ, 1997). Yet, there are some different points in defining prosocial behavior (Pfattheicher, Nielsen, & Thielmann, 2022). One definition perspective defines prosocial organizational behavior by describing it in terms of the intentions, that is, "the action intended to benefit others than oneself" (Batson & Powell, 2003, p. 463). Another standpoint defines prosociality as "any action that benefits another" (Schroeder & Graziano, 2015, p. 255). Definitions also integrated both the intention and consequence of prosociality by characterizing it as a behavior that intends to benefit others and benefits them (Eisenberg & Miller, 1987). Differently from this view, prosociality has been defined for its role in society (Dovidio, 1984). Penner, Dovidio, Piliavin, and Schroeder (2005, p. 366) explained it as "a broad range of actions defined by some particular segment of society and social groups as generally beneficial to other people."

Prosocial motivation is the desire to benefit and expend effort because of the concern for others (Bolino & Grant, 2016). Meta-analytical evidence shows that prosocial motivation usually precedes prosocial behavior (Liao, Su, Ptashnik, & Nielsen, 2022). Psychological states and goals by specific situations (e.g., being in contact with others who need help) and personality traits, values, and identities are in the scope of prosocial motivation (Pavey, Greitemeyer, & Sparks, 2011; Thielmann, Spadaro, & Balliet, 2020). The prosocial impact is the experience of making a positive difference in the lives of others (Grant & Sonnentag, 2010). In organizations, the prosocial impact may be related to prosocial motivation because prosocially motivated employees are more interested in providing benefits to others (Grant & Berg, 2012).

1.2. Prosociality in Organizations

Employees can go beyond their job roles and engage in several behaviors (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). Katz (1964) stated three propositions about job roles in organizations. Firstly, employees engage and stay in their organizations. They meet the

performance standards. Then, they exceed the role demands and engage in behaviors such as behaving cooperatively. The third pattern includes spontaneous employee actions for organizational benefit. While Katz (1964) did not explicitly study prosocial phenomena in organizations, in the later years, Staw (1984) discussed prosocial behavior in an organizational context by stating that individuals can be motivated to behave selflessly and altruistically in some organizational contexts, such as universities.

Nevertheless, Staw (1984) did not propose a conceptualization for prosocial organizational behavior. Based on this paradigm of Katz (1964) and previous research on prosocial behaviors (e.g., Latane & Darley, 1968a), Brief and Motowidlo (1986) described prosocial organizational behavior as the behavior which is performed by an employee while carrying out an organizational role to promote the welfare of another person, group, or organization. In general, they explained prosociality in organizations based on three recipients: Organizational members, organization, and consumers, and thirteen specific types of POB are listed below (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986):

1. Giving help to other organizational members on job-related issues.
2. Assisting organizational members with their problems (e.g., family issues)
3. Adopting leniency in personal decisions by behaving in favor of others
4. Helping consumers (i.e., customers or clients) by providing services and products
5. Helping consumers (i.e., customers, clients, and so forth) by providing services and products in an organizationally inconsistent way. For example, a salesperson can offer an inappropriate price
6. Helping consumers (i.e., customers, clients, and so forth) with their issues
7. Complying with organizational rules, policies, practices, and values
8. Making suggestions for organizational improvement
9. Making objections to illegal or/and unethical policies and procedures
10. Making an extra effort for the job
11. Being a volunteer for more tasks and assignments

12. Staying in the organization despite challenges

13. Positively representing the organization to outsiders

According to Brief and Motowidlo (1986), the prosocial organizational behavior described above can be both functional and dysfunctional for organizations. For example, Katz (1964) 's descriptions of behavioral patterns are the organizationally beneficial type of prosocial organizational behaviors (i.e., behaving in favor of the organization). Dysfunctional prosocial behavior includes helping a worker to benefit them directly, but it may be costly for organizational efficiency. Employees can benefit a customer by decreasing the price of a product while reducing the organizational utility (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986) or, conversely, breaking the law and societal moral norms to benefit the organization (Umphress & Bingham, 2011). Prosocial behaviors can also be either extra-role (i.e., going beyond the role requirements) or role prescribed (i.e., formal parts of the organizational role and job). Some occupations aim to help individuals, such as psychotherapists, and behaving for the benefit of others is in the scope of their job definitions (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986).

Although Brief and Motowidlo's (1986) approach was comprehensive because it has several prosocial behavior recipients and behaviors, it was not widely adopted by organizational researchers (Organ, 1997; Organ, 2018; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 2014). Several scholars described the concept differently from the initial definition by Brief and Motowidlo (1986). For example, in different studies, prosocial organizational behavior has sometimes been named moral behavior (Dozier & Miceli, 1985) and working cooperatively (Vos & Van Der Zee, 2011). In Turkish literature, prosocial organizational behavior has been explained from different perspectives. Studies have evaluated prosociality in the scope of positive organizational behavior (Akçay, 2018; Kanten & Yeşiltaş, 2013). In their research, Bülbül (2014) differentiated prosocial organizational behavior with its beneficiaries that target organizations such as compliance and protecting reputation and individuals with behaviors like helping a co-worker and a customer. In another study, prosocial organizational behavior was defined as being role-prescribed and extra-role (Öcal & Sarnıç, 2017). Table 1 shows a brief overlook of different prosocial organizational behavior definitions.

Table 1. Exemplary Definitions of Prosocial Organizational Behavior

Definition	
Socially desirable behaviors	(Baruch, O’Creevy, Hind, & Vigoda-Gadot, 2004)
A behavior performed by an employee while carrying out an organizational role to promote the welfare of another person, group, or organization.	(Brief & Motowidlo, 1986)
Behaviors that can be directed externally (e.g., customers and protecting organizational reputation) and internally (e.g., organization and other organizational members) depending on the target that is the organization and other individuals	(Bülbül, 2013)
Acts to produce and maintain the well-being of others including taking the initiative	(Campbell, 2000)
Voluntary behaviors outside the work contract	(De Dreu & Nauta, 2009)
A moral behavior that also can encompass political behaviors like whistleblowing	(Dozier & Miceli, 1985)
Functional and dysfunctional behavior that can be recognized by the organizational reward system. Also, it may be either role prescribed and extra role, and active and passive	(George, & Brief, 1992)
Assisting (i.e.,extra-role; actions that are not required for a particular organizational role) and compliance behaviors (i.e., role prescribed; willingness to follow organizational rules and procedures)	(Hatcher, Ross, & Collins, 1989)
Actions for the welfare of others in matters that are not within the scope of the individual's duty and responsibility. Also, these behaviors can be explained by traditions, ethics, and personal characteristics rather than performance.	(Öcal & Sarnıç, 2017)
Employee behaviors to ensure the peace of the individuals, groups or organization while fulfilling organizational roles.	(Özdevecioğlu, 2009)
An umbrella concept that includes both in-role and extra-role behaviors	(Pandey, Palo, & Varkkey, 2020)
Supportive actions with the intention of promoting the welfare of others	(Pelled, Cummings, & Kizilos, 2000)
Nontask behavior that benefits the organization	(Puffer, 1987)
Working cooperatively	(Vos & Van Der Zee, 2011)

Besides variations in the descriptions, some researchers developed different prosocial organizational behavior-based terminology. McNeely and Meglino (1994) proposed three types

of prosocial organizational behavior: role-prescribed prosocial behavior, prosocial organizational behavior, and individual prosocial behavior. Role-prescribed organizational behavior refers to actions that an occupational role demands. In other words, if employees do their job effectively, this can be considered role-prescribed prosocial behavior (Culliver, Sigler, & McNeely, 1991). Prosocial organizational behaviors focus on the behavior that benefits the organization, including engaging in extra-role tasks, while individual prosocial behavior is about contributing to the welfare of another organizational member, such as helping a co-worker. In Bettencourt and Brown's (1997) research, prosocial behavior is explained by adopting three dimensions: role-prescribed, extra-role, and cooperation. Role-prescribed prosocial behavior is characterized as desirable and expected employee behaviors since it exemplifies the organization's and related job descriptions' obligations. Complying with organizational policies and procedures and performing work roles is the scope of these behaviors. Extra-role prosocial behaviors refer to voluntary behaviors that go beyond formal roles. This type of prosocial behavior usually is voluntary and not officially rewarded in organizations. Putting extra effort into organizational processes is an example of extra-role prosocial behaviors. Cooperation is helpful behavior towards other individuals in organizations. Employees can assist others in their personnel or job-related matters. Different from these conceptualizations, Morrison (2006) suggested prosocial rule-breaking behavior as a new term that describes positive, constructive deviant behavior and a voluntary departure from organization norms—for example, performing job duties efficiently, helping another employee, and providing better service to customers. These behaviors are effective on other organizational members and organizations (Kanten, Pazarçık, Kanten, & Durmaz, 2020). In Farmer and Van Dyne's (2016) study among workers of a non-profit organization, organizational prosocial helping behavior was used as a "prosocial helping identity directed specifically at beneficiaries associated with a particular organization" (p. 770). In another terminology, unethical pro-organizational behavior was proposed as the actions that intend to promote the benefits of the organization and its members at the expense of core societal values, laws, or standards of proper conduct (Umphress & Bingham, 2011).

In addition to using prosocial behavior as a notion, scholars employed various terms interchangeably with prosociality.

1.3. Prosocial Organizational Behavior and Related Constructs

Several constructs are used to explain prosocial behaviors in organizations based on performance since organizational behavior has traditionally been studied in terms of

performance (Robbins, Judge, & Campbell, 2010). Mainly, there are two principal segments of job performance. In-role performance covers behaviors that produce goods and services in the organization (Van Scotter, Motowidlo, & Cross, 2000). Extra-role performance shows behaviors not required by any particular job (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997; Organ, 1988). Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB; Bateman & Organ, 1983) is one of the most used concepts for prosociality and extra-role behaviors in organizations. OCB was first defined as employees' unrewarded extra-role contribution to the organization (Organ, 1988). Organ (1997) later described OCB as a behavior that supports the psychological and social environment in which task performance takes place because of the critics that OCB can be seen both in the role and extra-role behaviors (Morrison & Phelps, 1999; Vey & Campbell, 2004). The general sub-dimensions of OCB are altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, and civic virtue. Altruism is discretionary interpersonal helping behavior in organizations. Courtesy is the behavior that aims to prevent possible problems before occurring. Examples of courtesy are gestures and notifying someone about a delay (Organ & Ryan, 1995). Conscientiousness goes beyond the formal role requirements and duties. Examples are arriving at work early and not wasting organizational resources (e.g., electricity, water, and equipment; Podsakoff et al., 2000). Sportsmanship avoids complaining about undesirable work conditions and organizational crises. Civic virtue contributes to organizational governance processes with employee behaviors such as attending meetings even if it is not required (Ocampo, Acedillo, Bacunador, Balo, Lagdameo, & Tupa, 2018; Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2005).

Conceptual studies also proposed different perspectives of OCB by offering two types of OCB: Change-oriented OCB and affiliative-oriented OCB. Change-oriented OCB is a constructive employee effort to offer and implement necessary changes in work (Choi, 2007; Morrison & Phelps, 1999). By change-oriented OCB, employees suggest improvements to work procedures and correct organizational errors (Bettencourt, 2004). Affiliative citizenship behavior is a suitable type of interpersonal behavior that contributes to the overall effectiveness of groups and other individuals, such as voluntary extra-role behavior to protect colleagues and superiors in fulfilling their work functions. According to a recent meta-analysis, an OCB has three focuses: change, individuals, and organizations (Chiaburu, Oh, Stoverink, Park, Bradley, & Barros-Rivera, 2022). More specifically, OCB may center change and revise organizational policies, benefiting other individuals and organizations distinctly.

Williams and Anderson (1991) divided OCB into two broad categories: OCB-O and OCB-I. OCB-O refers to behaviors that benefit organizations, such as following the informal

rules of the company. OCB-I benefits others in the organization, such as caring about other employees. OCB-I consists of the altruism and courtesy dimension of Organ's (1988) 's OCB dimensions, whereas OCB-O captures sportsmanship, civic virtue, and conscientiousness (LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002). Interpersonal citizenship behaviors (ICB; Settoon & Mossholder, 2002) is related to OCB-I (Williams & Anderson, 1991). Person-focused ICB (P-ICB refers to interpersonal facilitation (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997; Van Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch, 1994). An employee helps a co-worker resolve a problem and complete a project (Organ, 1988). These behaviors are based on concern for others and providing emotional support. Nevertheless, task-focused interpersonal citizenship behavior (T-ICB) targets work-related challenges. Examples of T-ICB include assisting a co-worker with heavy workloads and giving work-related advice (Settoon & Mossholder, 2002).

Besides citizenship behaviors, other terms are related to and used to refer to prosociality (Bayrakçı & Kayalar, 2016; Podsakof et al., 2000). Extra-role behavior is generally used instead of OCB and prosociality (Meydan, Şeşen, Basım, 2011). It refers to employee behavior beyond the role requirements. These behaviors are voluntary, and there are no formatted rewards and punishments for these behaviors (Kılıklı & Çarıkçı, 2011). Relatedly, contextual performance behavior is not in the formal job requirement, but it supports technical and organizational functioning and effectiveness, including being a volunteer for extra work (Küçük & Taştan, 2019; Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). Mentoring as an extra role behavior contributes to the mentee's progress (Bear & Hwang, 2015). Through knowledge-sharing behavior, an employee helps others with information exchange and sharing (Connelly & Kelloway, 2003). Table 2 shows an overview of concepts that overlap with prosocial organizational behavior.

Table 2. An Overview of the Concepts Overlap with Prosocial Organizational Behavior

Concept and Definition	
OCB is a behavior that supports the psychological and social environment in the organization where performance takes place	(Organ, 1997)
Contextual performance: Performing extra effort to complete tasks, such as volunteering for extra-assignments and defending organizational aims	(Borman & Motowidlo, 1997)
Interpersonal helping refers to voluntary and spontaneous actions to help and resolve a co-worker's task-related issues	(Chou, Chang, & Han, 2019)
Organizational spontaneity includes protecting the organization, helping others, making constructive suggestions, developing oneself, and spreading goodwill.	(George & Jones, 1997)
Knowledge sharing is the process by which an employee's knowledge is converted into a form that can be understood and used by other organizational members	(Ipe, 2003)
Mentoring refers to formally or informally guiding another person to the personal and professional success	(Kalbfleisch, 2002)
Whistle-blowing refers to disclosing illegal or immoral practices under the control of their employer to other people or organizations who may be able to solve	(Near & Miceli, 1985)
Organizational compliance is described as complying with corporate regulations, rules, and procedures regardless of being monitored.	(Podsakoff et al., 2000).
Individual initiative is about exceeding task role activities, such as being enthusiastic about taking extra responsibilities and being innovative.	(Podsakoff et al., 2000)
Organizational environmental citizenship behavior is an employee discretionary behavior. The organizational reward system does not explicitly recognize that. It directly benefits the natural environment and indirectly contributes to the benefits of the organization and individuals.	(Robertson & Barling, 2017)
ICB: Discretionary behavior that are not explicitly recognized by the official reward system, but contributes to the organizational functioning	(Settoon & Mossholder, 2002)
Extra-role behaviors helping others, and voice behaviors, such as sharing ideas, making constructive suggestions	(Van Dyne & LePine, 1998),
Voice is informal and discretionary employee communication about problems, concerns or opinions of work-related issues to others to bring about improvement or change.	(Van Dyne & LePine, 1998)
Interpersonal facilitation: helping, assisting, and cooperating with others	(Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996).

1.4. The Difference between Prosocial Organizational Behavior and Related Concepts

Prosocial behavior has a broad scope, and many concepts are used parallel to prosocial behavior. Because of the variety, relevant fields of psychology classify it based on several perspectives (Penner et al., 2005). For example, in developmental psychology research, studies on prosociality rely on social-cognitive assessments (e.g., goals and emotions) and the ability to represent various mental states that show significant developmental patterns (Wellman & Liu, 2004).

While prosociality keeps its presence in the organizational research literature, researchers have transformed it into a different conceptualization. The most widely used term has been citizenship behavior. While early thinking about OCB was influenced by prosocial behavior and subsequent research (Organ, 1988; Organ, Podsakoff, & Scott, 2005), organizational context is a dominant social environment that shapes the behaviors of individuals, and the 'spontaneous' nature of prosociality may be inadequate to explain behaving for the benefit of organizational stakeholders. By its definition, OCB has its own restricted space (i.e., performance unrewarded behaviors), and there are only two targets of OCB (i.e., other employees and the organization). However, prosocial behavior in the organizations usually focus on various organizational stakeholders (Brief & Motowodlio, 1986; Bülbül, 2013), and OCB is limited to capture all possible parties. Alternatively, research has used specific terminology to target other parties in terms of citizenship, such as green organizational citizenship behavior (Hooi, Liu, & Lin, 2021). Despite the common usage, citizenship-based definitions and other terms, such as organizational spontaneity and extra-role behaviors, are conceptualized as discretionary (George & Jones, 1997). Prosocial organizational behaviors do not necessarily be distinct from one's organizational duties. Especially in today's work environment, sticking into job roles and defining behaviors based on in-role and voluntarily discretionary may be irrelevant to the employee prosociality. Individuals even feel pressure to do some tasks, even if they are not included in their official job description. They may do it without consent because of an upcoming performance evaluation or not to be jeopardized (Liu, Zhao, & Sheard, 2017; Vigoda-Gadot, 2006). Therefore, there are some critiques of prosociality and its effects on organizations.

1.5. Critiques of Prosociality in Organizations

Although prosocial organizational behavior intends to benefit others, this behavior often can only capture some stakeholders simultaneously. While a behavior benefits another party, it

may hurt another person or organization (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986). Employees often damage one party to benefit another (Molinsky & Margolis, 2005). Five types of negative impacts of prosocial behaviors in the organizational context have been introduced (Bolino & Grant, 2016). Firstly, there is discourse regarding the relationship between prosociality and justice. For example, employees can be biased toward specific individuals to benefit them, such as by giving discounts to specific customers (Gino & Pierce, 2009). Secondly, behaving prosocial can cause distortive thoughts in the person. An individual may feel morally licensed to act unethically after engaging in prosocial behaviors. More specifically, prosocial behavior can be a source to behave unethically since the person has already done something good (Klotz & Bolino, 2013). Thirdly, individuals may feel pressure to behave prosocially (Weinstein & Ryan, 2010). Vigoda-Gadot (2006) proposed compulsory citizenship behaviors as an extra role behavior and the consequence of the social or managerial pressures within the organization. Likewise, employees may also experience citizenship fatigue, feeling tired and exhausted from engaging in OCB (Bolino & Grant, 2016). Fourthly, even research suggests some role in prosocial behavior, and literature also states that prosocial behavior usually requires substantial time and energy investments which is likely to influence one's task performance negatively and eventually employees' careers (Koopman, Lanaj, & Scott, 2016). OCB research shows that individuals who spend more time performing OCBs have less time to perform the task and have lower salary increases and slower promotion rates than employees who spend less time performing OCBs (Bergeron, Shipp, Rosen, & Furst, 2013). Other studies show a curvilinear relationship between task performance and citizenship behaviors (Ellington, Dierdorff, & Rubin, 2014). In other words, high levels of prosocial behavior may take away from task performance, especially when employees lack interpersonal and time-management skills. Fifthly, prosocial behaviors can leave recipients feeling indebted or dependent on the person who benefited them (Beehr, Bowling, & Bennett, 2010), which resulting in vulnerability. Although extensive evidence suggests that prosocial behaviors help those who want to gain status (Kafashan, Sparks, Griskevicius, & Barclay, 2014), people may hurt their reputations. Research has documented that observers may see people who benefit from them as a threat to their self-images (Minson & Monin, 2012) and expel them from the group (Parks & Stone, 2010).

1.6.Theoretical challenges and a future agenda

Scholars primarily focused on OCB as a prosocial organizational behavior (Bolino & Grant, 2006) and chose their measurement tool accordingly (e.g., Wan, Carlson, Quade, &

Kacmar, 2022). However, several disagreements have emerged in the OCB literature, including the extra-role nature of OCB and whether it is unrewarded. Even though Organ (1997) redefined OCB by taking a step back to describe it as discretionary and defined it as a behavior that supports the social and psychological context of the organization, researchers may still prefer to conceptualize OCB as discretionary and less likely to be formally rewarded. Likewise, there are contrasting views about the number of OCB dimensions (Podsakoff et al., 2000). The best way to categorize the various types of OCB (Williams & Anderson, 1991), conceptualizing OCB as a multidimensional or unitary construct (LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002), and the benefits of investigating OCB-related terms such as helping and taking the initiative (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). It is essential for research on prosocial behavior to review OCB literature to get to know the discussions and the possible scope of prosociality.

Research initially evaluated prosociality with positive aspects, such as positive organizational behavior literature used it as a positive employee behavior (Donaldson, Lee, & Donaldson, 2019; Kanten & Yeşiltaş, 2013). Yet, other prosocial organizational behaviors, such as whistle-blowing, and voice, also occur in organizations that may need to be more favorable for organizational stakeholders (Morrison, 2014). Researchers usually fail to characterize them explicitly as prosocial behaviors since they may also increase particular parties' welfare. By recognizing that these behaviors share common points concerning contributing to others, researchers can develop a more comprehensive and consistent portrait of prosocial behaviors. Accordingly, it is recommended that researchers need to specialize in one specific form of prosocial behavior to gain ideas from and export these discoveries back to the broader conversation (Bülbül, 2013). Although Brief and Motowodlio (1986) proposed such a conceptualization, the following empirical papers have directed to different definitions and conceptualizations.

Due to the width of organizational stakeholders and employees and prosocial behavior may change based on the concerned party (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986), future research may need to highlight the variances of prosocial behavior based on different stakeholders. For example, pro-environmental organizational behaviors (Francoeur, Paillé, Yuriev, & Boiral, 2021) and prosocial organizational behavior can be conceptually different. A novel conceptualization may need to reveal prosocial behavior that targets specific organizational stakeholders. Therefore, showing and broadening the scope of prosocial organizational behavior is crucial to deepen the general understanding of its antecedents and outcomes and develop an accurate conceptualization of these behaviors. This could have substantial implications for measuring

prosocial behavior comprehensively. Thus far, research on prosociality should consider the costs and benefits of using broad labels (e.g., prosocial behavior) or specific labels (e.g., interpersonal helping) due to the reason that it has critical implications for research design, including measurement, data analysis, and conceptual background. Considering redefining prosocial behaviors in the organizational framework can be helpful for construct cleaning. Some prosocial behaviors, such as taking the initiative for organizational benefits, should be categorized differently than behaviors like helping a co-worker.

CONCLUSION

Individuals tend to help other individuals and organizations where they work. Over the years, extensive research examined the antecedents, consequences, and different versions of these behaviors (e.g., Podsakoff et al., 2000; Liao et al., 2022). In particular, prosocial behaviors in organizations can be related to one's role in the organization (e.g., a human resource specialist or psychological counsel), and is directed toward other individuals, organizations, and clients (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986; Bülbül, 2013; Organ, 1997). Despite the research that proposed several properties and types (i.e., compassion, mentoring, and knowledge sharing; Bolino & Grant, 2016) of prosocial behaviors, scholars have used some concepts instead of prosocial behavior. Discrepancy remains about how many different dimensions of the concepts that refer to prosociality in an organization exist (Podsakoff et al., 2000) and the benefits of revealing the specific types of prosocial behaviors (Batson & Powell, 2003; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). This paper aims to show some fundamental theoretical aspects of prosocial phenomena in organizations. Concerns stay prevalent regarding the current understanding of prosocial organizational behaviors. Based on the discussions and gaps in the literature, informative and in-depth research is needed to clearly explain prosociality with its focus (i.e., different organizational stakeholders) in organizations.

REFERENCES

- Akçay, V. H. (2018). Örgütlerde prososyal davranışlar, sinizm ve psikolojik sermaye ilişkisi: Örgütle özdeşleşmenin moderatör etkisi. *Business and Economics Research Journal*, 9(2), 381-394.
- Aydın Küçük, B., & Taştan, S. (2019). The Examination Of The Impact of Workplace Envy On Individual Outcomes of Counterproductive Work Behaviors and Contextual Performance: The Role of Self Control. *Suleyman Demirel University Journal of Faculty of Economics & Administrative Sciences*, 24(3).
- Baruch, Y., O’Creevy, M. F., Hind, P., & Vigoda- Gadot, E. (2004). Prosocial behaviour and job performance: Does the need for control and the need for achievement make a difference? *Social Behaviour and Personality*, 32(4), 399-412.
- Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee “citizenship”. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26(4), 587-595.
- Batson, C. D., & Powell, A. A. (2003). *Altruism and prosocial behavior*. In T. Millon & M. J. Lerner (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology: Personality and social psychology*, Vol. 5, pp. 463–484). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Batson, C. D., Klein, T. R., Highberger, L., & Shaw, L. L. (1995). Immorality from empathy-induced altruism: When compassion and justice conflict. *Journal of personality and Social Psychology*, 68(6), 1042.
- Bayrakçı, E., & Kayalar, M. (2016). İfşa Davranışının Prososyal Davranışlar Bağlamında Değerlendirilmesine Yönelik Teorik Bir İnceleme. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Vizyoner Dergisi*, 7(15), 120-131.
- Bear, S. E., & Hwang, A. (2015). Who mentors? Contextual prosocial motivation and willingness to be a mentor. *Human Resource Development International*, 18(1), 58-75.
- Beehr, T. A., Bowling, N. A., & Bennett, M. M. (2010). Occupational stress and failures of social support: when helping hurts. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 15(1), 45.
- Bergeron, D. M., Shipp, A. J., Rosen, B., & Furst, S. A. (2013). Organizational citizenship behavior and career outcomes: The cost of being a good citizen. *Journal of Management*, 39(4), 958-984.
- Bettencourt, L. A. (2004). Change-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors: The direct and moderating influence of goal orientation. *Journal of Retailing*, 80(3), 165-180.
- Bettencourt, L. A., & Brown, S. W. (1997). Contact employees: Relationships among workplace fairness, job satisfaction and prosocial service behaviors. *Journal of Retailing*, 73(1), 39-61.
- Bolino, M. C., & Grant, A. M. (2016). The bright side of being prosocial at work, and the dark side, too: A review and agenda for research on other-oriented motives, behavior, and impact in organizations. *Academy of Management Annals*, 10(1), 599-670.

- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 99-109.
- Brief, A. P., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1986). Prosocial organizational behaviors. *Academy of Management Review*, 11(4), 710-725.
- Bülbül, İ. A. (2013). *How May i Help You?" the Role of Self-Construal, Work Design and Organizational Climate in Predicting Prosocial Behavior in Organizations* (Doctoral dissertation, Marmara Universitesi (Turkey)).
- Campbell, D. J. (2000). The proactive employee: Managing workplace initiative. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 14(3), 52-66.
- Carlo, G., & Randall, B. A. (2002). The development of a measure of prosocial behaviors for late adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 31(1), 31-44.
- Chiaburu, D. S., Oh, I. S., Stoverink, A. C., Park, H. H., Bradley, C., & Barros-Rivera, B. A. (2022). Happy to help, happy to change? A meta-analysis of major predictors of affiliative and change-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 132, 103664.
- Choi, J. N. (2007). Change-oriented organizational citizenship behavior: effects of work environment characteristics and intervening psychological processes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 28(4), 467-484.
- Chou, S. Y., Chang, T., & Han, B. (2019). In the eyes of the helper and recipient: A help-giving and help-receiving model in organizations. *Editorial Policy*, 31(4).
- Connelly, C. E., & Kelloway, E. K. (2003). Predictors of employees' perceptions of knowledge sharing cultures. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*.
- Culliver, C., Sigler, R., & McNeely, B. (1991). Examining prosocial organizational behavior among correctional officers. *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice*, 15(1-2), 277-284.
- De Dreu, C. K., & Nauta, A. (2009). Self-interest and other-orientation in organizational behavior: implications for job performance, prosocial behavior, and personal initiative. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(4), 913.
- Donaldson, S. I., Lee, J. Y., & Donaldson, S. I. (2019). The effectiveness of positive psychology interventions in the workplace: A theory-driven evaluation approach. *Theoretical Approaches to Multi-Cultural Positive Psychological Interventions*, 115-159.
- Dovidio, J. F. (1984). Helping behavior and altruism: An empirical and conceptual overview. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 17, 361-427.
- Dozier, J. B., & Miceli, M. P. (1985). Potential predictors of whistle-blowing: A prosocial behavior perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(4), 823-836.
- Eisenberg, N., & Miller, P. A. (1987). The relation of empathy to prosocial and related behaviors. *Psychological Bulletin*, 101(1), 91.

- Ellington, J. K., Dierdorff, E. C., & Rubin, R. S. (2014). Decelerating the diminishing returns of citizenship on task performance: The role of social context and interpersonal skill. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 99*(4), 748.
- Farmer, S. M., & Van Dyne, L. (2016). Organization-specific prosocial helping identity: Doing and belonging as the basis of “being fully there.” *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 38*(6), 769–791
- Fleming, C. J. (2020). Prosocial rule breaking at the street level: The roles of leaders, peers, and bureaucracy. *Public Management Review, 22*(8), 1191-1216.
- Flook, L., Zahn-Waxler, C., & Davidson, R. J. (2019). Developmental differences in prosocial behavior between preschool and late elementary school. *Frontiers in Psychology, 10*, 876.
- Fosgaard, M. R., Fosgaard, T. R., & Foss, N. J. (2017). Consumer or citizen? Prosocial behaviors in markets and non-markets. *Social Choice and Welfare, 49*(2), 231-253.
- Francoeur, V., Paillé, P., Yuriev, A., & Boiral, O. (2021). The measurement of green workplace behaviors: A systematic review. *Organization & Environment, 34*(1), 18-42.
- George, J. M., & Brief, A. P. (1992). Feeling good-doing good: A conceptual analysis of the mood at work-organizational spontaneity relationship. *Psychological Bulletin, 112*(2), 310.
- George, J. M., & Jones, G. R. (1997). Organizational spontaneity in context. *Human performance, 10*(2), 153-170.
- Gino, F., & Pierce, L. (2009). The abundance effect: Unethical behavior in the presence of wealth. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 109*(2), 142-155.
- Graddy-Reed, A. (2018). Do hybrid firms out-provide traditional business structures? An examination of prosocial behavior in North Carolina firms. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 47*(6), 1223-1248.
- Grant, A. M., & Sonnentag, S. (2010). Doing good buffers against feeling bad: Prosocial impact compensates for negative task and self-evaluations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 111*(1), 13-22.
- Grant, A. M., & Berg, J. M. (2012). *Prosocial motivation*. In K. S. Cameron & G. M. Spreitzer (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of positive organizational scholarship* (pp. 28–44). Oxford University Press.
- Hatcher, L., Ross, T. L., & Collins, D. (1989). Prosocial behavior, job complexity, and suggestion contribution under gainsharing plans. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 25*(3), 231-248.
- Hooi, L. W., Liu, M. S., & Lin, J. J. (2021). Green human resource management and green organizational citizenship behavior: do green culture and green values matter?. *International Journal of Manpower*.
- Ipe, M. (2003). Knowledge sharing in organizations: A conceptual framework. *Human Resource Development Review, 2*(4), 337-359.

- Kafashan, S., Sparks, A., Griskevicius, V., & Barclay, P. (2014). *Prosocial behavior and social status*. In *The psychology of social status* (pp. 139-158). Springer, New York, NY.
- Kalbfleisch, P. J. (2002). Communicating in mentoring relationships: A theory for enactment. *Communication Theory, 12*(1), 63-69.
- Kanten, P., & Yeşiltaş, M. (2013). Pozitif Örgütsel Davranışlar Üzerine Kavramsal Bir İnceleme. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Vizyoner Dergisi, 4*(8), 83-106.
- Kanten, P., Pazarcık, Y., Kanten Selahattin., & Durmaz, M. G. (2020). İşyeri arkadaşlığının prososyal kural ihlali davranışı üzerindeki etkisinde affetme ikliminin rolü. *Turizm Akademik Dergisi, 7*(2), 241-254.
- Katz, D. (1964). The motivational basis of organizational behavior. *Behavioral Science, 9*(2), 131-146.
- Kılıklı, M., & Çarıkcı, İ. H. (2019). Eksta Rol Davranışının Ölçeğinin Türkçeye Uyarlanması: Geçerlik VE Güvenirlik Çalışması. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, 24*(4), 831-846.
- Klotz, A. C., & Bolino, M. C. (2013). Citizenship and counterproductive work behavior: A moral licensing view. *Academy of Management Review, 38*(2), 292-306.
- Koopman, J., Lanaj, K., & Scott, B. A. (2016). Integrating the bright and dark sides of OCB: A daily investigation of the benefits and costs of helping others. *Academy of Management Journal, 59*(2), 414-435.
- Latane, D., & Darley, J. M. (1968a). Bystander intervention in emergencies: diffusion of responsibility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 8*(4), 377-383.
- LePine, J. A., Erez, A., & Johnson, D. E. (2002). The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behavior: a critical review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(1), 52.
- Liao, H., Su, R., Ptashnik, T., & Nielsen, J. (2022). Feeling good, doing good, and getting ahead: A meta-analytic investigation of the outcomes of prosocial motivation at work. *Psychological Bulletin, 148*(3-4), 158.
- Liu, Y., Zhao, H., & Sheard, G. (2017). Organizational citizenship pressure, compulsory citizenship behavior, and work–family conflict. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal, 45*(4), 695-704.
- McNeely, B. L., & Meglino, B. M. (1994). The role of dispositional and situational antecedents in prosocial organizational behavior: An examination of the intended beneficiaries of prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*(6), 836.
- Meydan, C. H., Şeşen, H., & Basım, H. N. (2011). Adalet algısı ve tükenmişliğin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları üzerindeki öncüllük rolü. *ISGUC The Journal of Industrial Relations and Human Resources, 13*(2).
- Minson, J. A., & Monin, B. (2012). Do-gooder derogation: Disparaging morally motivated minorities to defuse anticipated reproach. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 3*(2), 200-207.

- Molinsky, A., & Margolis, J. (2005). Necessary evils and interpersonal sensitivity in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 30(2), 245-268.
- Morrison, E. W. (2006). Doing the job well: An investigation of pro-social rule breaking. *Journal of Management*, 32(1), 5-28.
- Morrison, E. W., & Phelps, C. C. (1999). Taking charge at work: Extrarole efforts to initiate workplace change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(4), 403-419.
- Near, J. P., & Miceli, M. P. (1985). Organizational dissidence: The case of whistleblowing. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 4(1), 1-16.
- Ocampo, L., Acedillo, V., Bacunador, A. M., Balo, C. C., Lagdameo, Y. J., & Tupa, N. S. (2018). A historical review of the development of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and its implications for the twenty-first century. *Personnel Review*.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome. Lexington Books/D. C. Heath and Com.
- Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 85-97.
- Organ, D. W. (2014). *Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. In Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Contextual Performance* (pp. 85-97). Psychology Press.
- Organ, D. W. (2018). Organizational citizenship behavior: Recent trends and developments. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 80, 295-306.
- Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 48(4), 775-802.
- Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (2005). *Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences*. Sage Publications.
- Öcal, H., & Sarnıç, A. (2017). Dönüştürücü Liderliğin Prososyal Örgütsel Davranış Üzerindeki Etkileri VE İmalat Endüstrisinde bir Araştırma. *Journal of Economics & Administrative Sciences/Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 19(2).
- Özdevecioğlu, M. 2009. Örgütlerarası vatandaşlık davranışları: Teorik çerçeve ve bir ölçek geliştirme çalışması. *Erciyes Üniversitesi İİBF Dergisi*, 33,44-67.
- Padilla-Walker, L. M., & Carlo, G. (2014). The study of prosocial behavior. *Prosocial development: A multidimensional approach*, 3.
- Pandey, J., Palo, S., & Varkkey, B. (2020). Influence of Organizational Climate on Prosocial Organizational Behavior. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 55(4).
- Parks, C. D., & Stone, A. B. (2010). The desire to expel unselfish members from the group. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 99(2), 303.
- Pavey, L., Greitemeyer, T., & Sparks, P. (2011). Highlighting relatedness promotes prosocial motives and behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 37(7), 905-917.

- Pelled, L. H., Cummings, T. G., & Kizilos, M. A. (2000). The influence of organizational demography on customer-oriented prosocial behavior: An exploratory investigation. *Journal of Business Research*, 47(3), 209-216.
- Penner, L. A., Dovidio, J. F., Piliavin, J. A., & Schroeder, D. A. (2005). Prosocial behavior: Multilevel perspectives. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.*, 56, 365-392.
- Pfattheicher, S., Nielsen, Y. A., & Thielmann, I. (2022). Prosocial behavior and altruism: A review of concepts and definitions. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 44, 124-129.
- Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Blume, B. D. (2009). Individual-and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(1), 122.
- Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (2014). Impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance: A review and suggestions for future research. *Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Contextual Performance*, 133-151.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 513-563.
- Puffer, S. M. (1987). Prosocial behavior, noncompliant behavior, and work performance among commission salespeople. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72(4), 615.
- Robbins, S. P., Judge, T. A., & Campbell, T. T. (2010). *Organizational behaviour*. Pearson education.
- Robertson, J. L., & Barling, J. (2017). Toward a new measure of organizational environmental citizenship behavior. *Journal of Business Research*, 75, 57-66.
- Rosenbaum, S. M., Billinger, S., Stieglitz, N., Djumanov, A., & Atykhanov, Y. (2012). Market economies and pro-social behavior: Experimental evidence from Central Asia. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 41(1), 64-71.
- Schroeder, D. A., & Graziano, W. G. (Eds.). (2015). The field of prosocial behavior: An introduction and overview. In D. A. Schroeder & W. G. Graziano (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of prosocial behavior* (pp. 3–34). Oxford University Press.
- Settoon, R. P., & Mossholder, K. W. (2002). Relationship quality and relationship context as antecedents of person-and task-focused interpersonal citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 255.
- Staw, B. M. (1984). Organizational behavior: A review and reformulation of the field's outcome variables. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 35(1), 627-666.
- Thielmann, I., Spadaro, G., & Balliet, D. (2020). Personality and prosocial behavior: A theoretical framework and meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 146(1), 30.
- Umphress, E. E., & Bingham, J. B. (2011). When employees do bad things for good reasons: Examining unethical pro-organizational behaviors. *Organization Science*, 22(3), 621-640.

- Uzmen, S., & Mağden, D. (2002). Okulöncesi eğitim kurumlarına devam eden altı yaş çocuklarının prososyal davranışlarının resimli çocuk kitapları ile desteklenmesi. *Marmara Üniversitesi Atatürk Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 15(15), 193-212.
- Van Dyne, L., & LePine, J. A. (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(1), 108-119.
- Van Dyne, L., Graham, J. W., & Dienesch, R. M. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(4), 765-802.
- Van Scotter, J., Motowidlo, S. J., & Cross, T. C. (2000). Effects of task performance and contextual performance on systemic rewards. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(4), 526.
- Vey, M. A., & Campbell, J. P. (2004). In-role or extra-role organizational citizenship behavior: Which are we measuring?. *Human Performance*, 17(1), 119-135.
- Vigoda-Gadot, E. (2006). Compulsory citizenship behavior: Theorizing some dark sides of the good soldier syndrome in organizations. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 36(1), 77-93.
- Vos, M., & van der Zee, K. (2011). Prosocial behavior in diverse workgroups: How relational identity orientation shapes cooperation and helping. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 14(3), 363-379.
- Wan, M., Carlson, D. S., Quade, M. J., & Kacmar, K. M. (2022). Does work passion influence prosocial behaviors at work and home? Examining the underlying work–family mechanisms. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 43(9), 1516-1534.
- Weinstein, N., & Ryan, R. M. (2010). When helping helps: autonomous motivation for prosocial behavior and its influence on well-being for the helper and recipient. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98(2), 222.
- Welbourne, T. M., & Paterson, T. A. (2017). Advancing a richer view of identity at work: The role-based identity scale. *Personnel Psychology*, 70(2), 315-356.
- Wellman, H. M., & Liu, D. (2004). Scaling of theory-of-mind tasks. *Child Development*, 75(2), 523-541.
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17(3), 601-617.
- Zettler, I. (2022). A glimpse into prosociality at work. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 44, 140-145.