

**DOKUZ EYLÜL UNIVERSITY**  
**GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**  
**DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION**  
**MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM**  
**MASTER’S THESIS**

**SOCIAL VALUE ORIENTATION AS A MODERATOR BETWEEN  
CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY AND ORGANIZATIONAL  
CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR**

**Selen SELEK**

**Supervisor**

**Associate Professor Dr. Gökhan KARAGONLAR**

**İZMİR-2019**

## THESIS APPROVAL PAGE



## DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this master thesis titled as “Social Value Orientation as a Moderator between Corporate Social Responsibility and Organizational Citizenship Behavior” has been written by myself in accordance with the academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that all materials benefited in this thesis consist of the mentioned resources in the reference list. I verify all these with my honour.

Date .../.../.....

Selen SELEK

Signature

## **ABSTRACT**

**Master's Thesis**

**Social Value Orientation as a Moderator between Corporate Social  
Responsibility and Organizational Citizenship Behavior**

**Selen SELEK**

**Dokuz Eylul University**

**Graduate School of Social Sciences**

**Department of Business Administration**

**Master of Business Administration Program**

This research examines the moderating role of employees' social value orientations (SVO) in the relationship between corporate social responsibility (CSR) and organizational citizenship behaviors. Specifically, based on the literature on social value orientations I hypothesized that as employees' prosocial value orientation (vs. a proself orientation) increased, they would be more likely to show increased citizenship behaviors in response to their perceptions of their organization's social responsibility efforts. This key hypothesis was tested on a sample of 155 white collar employees from firms in a variety of industries. The findings do not support a moderating role for SVO. On the other hand, a main effect for CSR in general, and CSR toward employees in particular, was observed such that employees' perceptions of CSR were associated with increased organizational citizenship behaviors. Thus, our data suggest that regardless of their SVOs employees seem to reciprocate their organizations' CSR efforts with increased organizational citizenship behaviors.

**Keywords: Corporate Social Responsibility, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Social Value Orientation, Organizational Reputation, Construed External Image, Value Congruence, Organizational Identification, Organizational Commitment, Fairness.**

## **ÖZET**

**Yüksek Lisans Tezi**

**Kurumsal Sosyal Sorumluluk ve Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı İlişkisinde  
Toplumsal Değer Yöneliminin Düzenleyici Rolü**

**Selen SELEK**

**Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi**

**Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü**

**İngilizce İşletme Anabilim Dalı**

**İngilizce İşletme Yönetimi Programı**

Bu araştırma kurumsal sosyal sorumluluk ve örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları arasındaki ilişkide çalışanların toplumsal değer yöneliminin düzenleyici rolünü incelemektedir. Spesifik olarak, toplumsal değer yönelimi literatürünü baz alarak çalışanların toplum yanlısı değer yönelimleri (benlik yanlısı yönelimin zıttı) arttıkça örgütlerinin sosyal sorumluluk çabalarını algılamaları karşılığında vatandaşlık davranışları gösterme eğilimlerinin artacağı varsayımında bulundum. Bu ana varsayım çeşitli endüstrilerdeki firmalardan alınan 155 beyaz yakalı çalışan örneklemini üzerinde test edildi. Bulgular TDY'nin düzenleyici rolünü desteklememektedir. Diğer yandan, çalışanların KSS algısının onların artan örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarıyla ilişkili olduğu; genel KSS'nin, ve özellikle de çalışanlara yönelik KSS'nin, bir ana etkisi gözlemlenmiştir. Böylece, verimiz TDY'lerine bakılmaksızın çalışanların örgütlerinin KSS çabalarına artan örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarıyla karşılık verdiğine işaret etmektedir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Kurumsal Sosyal Sorumluluk, Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı, Toplumsal Değer Yönelimi, Örgütsel İtibar, Yüklenen Dış İmaj, Değer Uyumu, Örgütsel Özdeşleşme, Örgütsel Bağlılık, Adalet.

**SOCIAL VALUE ORIENTATION AS A MODERATOR BETWEEN  
CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY AND ORGANIZATIONAL  
CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR**

**CONTENTS**

THESIS APPROVAL PAGE.....	ii
DECLARATION.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZET.....	v
CONTENTS.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
TABLE OF APPENDICES.....	ix
INTRODUCTION .....	1

**CHAPTER ONE 4**

**LITERATURE REVIEW AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

1.1. CSR.....	4
1.1.1. General Aspect.....	4
1.1.2. Traditional vs. Modern Approach.....	5
1.1.3. Recent Studies on CSR.....	7
1.2. SVO.....	10
1.2.1. Understanding SVO and Its Measurement.....	10
1.2.2. Characteristics of Individuals' SVO.....	11
1.3. OCB.....	12
1.3.1. Definitions of OCB.....	12
1.3.2. Dimensions of OCB.....	13
1.3.2.1. Altruism .....	13
1.3.2.2. Courtesy .....	14
1.3.2.3. Sportsmanship .....	14
1.3.2.4. Conscientiousness (Compliance) .....	14
1.3.2.5. Civic Virtue.....	14
1.3.3. Recent Studies on OCB.....	15

1.4. HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT.....	19
1.4.1. The Relationship between CSR and OCB.....	19
1.4.2. The Moderating Role of SVO.....	24
 <b>CHAPTER TWO</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>METHODOLOGY AND FINDINGS</b>	
2.1. SAMPLE.....	28
2.2. MEASURES.....	28
2.2.1. Independent Variable (CSR).....	29
2.2.2. Dependent Variable (OCB).....	29
2.2.3. Moderator (SVO).....	29
2.3. STUDY OF TRANSLATION TO TURKISH LANGUAGE.....	30
2.4. FINDINGS.....	30
2.4.1. Reliability Analysis Findings.....	30
2.4.2. Hypothesis Testing Results.....	31
2.4.2.1. Test of Hypothesis 1.....	31
2.4.2.2. Test of Hypothesis 2.....	35
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION .....	38
REFERENCES .....	43
APPENDICES	

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>Table 1:</b> Descriptive Statistics, Correlation Matrix, and Reliabilities	p.33
<b>Table 2:</b> The Effect of CSR on OCB	p.34
<b>Table 3:</b> The Effect of the Interaction between CSR and SVO on OCB	p.36





## **TABLE OF APPENDICES**

<b>Appendix 1:</b> CSR Questionnaire	app. p.1
<b>Appendix 2:</b> OCB Questionnaire	app. p.3
<b>Appendix 3:</b> Triple Dominance Measure	app. p.5



## INTRODUCTION

Today's companies are in search for employees who offer them more than what standard job descriptions require. These employees are expected to bring extra value in the organization they work for. Albeit a company intends to capture these high profile, dedicated employees, first the company itself must be perceived as a valuable and trustable one by its stakeholders. Nowadays, some organizations recognize it and know that otherwise they stay out of the race. Importantly, Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) may generate the perception that the organization is valuable and trustable. CSR matters because it affects businesses in all respects, and businesses both produce much of what is good and sometimes cause great harm in a society (Werther & Chandler, 2006: Preface). They facilitate people's lives and raise the economical and social growth but, for instance, cause the greatest damage to the environment. As the most important component of the society, companies have a great power over anything and are even able to change it.

The influence of CSR on employees as the important internal stakeholder of an organization has been discussed newly. In the literature, few studies about the influence of CSR on employees' job attitudes and behaviors exist. There are some studies about the relationship between CSR and employee job satisfaction as part of job attitudes (Job satisfaction is a wide concept and researchers turn to operationalization such as labour turnover, employee retention, and more). In addition to this, the closest studies to the subject of this research more were about employee commitment (a worker's psychological attachment to his or her organization or employer) or wider ; employee engagement. However, it should be pointed out that the remarkable studies about the relationship between CSR and OCB which were conducted latterly are very few (The same is valid for the terms extra-role and/or prosocial behavior as the similar concepts to OCB). Brammer, Millington & Rayton's (2007) research suggests that CSR increases organizational commitment as much as job satisfaction (:1714). It shows the greatness of the impact of employee perceptions of CSR on organizational commitment. Accordingly, Türker (2009b)'s study reveals that individuals prefer to work in organizations that engage in CSR activities and also that CSR to various stakeholders (e.g., society,

natural environment, employees, next generations) is linked to increased affective organizational commitment among employees (:189, 201).

Mostly we can see that a broad number of studies establish a relation between CSR and company attractiveness/ reputation. Related to employees, researchers also linked CSR to 'employee quality' based on 'attractiveness and/or reputation' notions again. Researchers usually base Social Identity Theory on their studies to explain the relationship in this field. For example; Greening & Turban's (2000: 276) study suggests that firms may have greater competitive advantage if they're perceived as attractive in the eye of the prospective employees. These prospective employees are likely to be persuaded by the positive image CSR activities create in public. Except this self-image perspective, we should also note that according to Bauman & Skitka (2012: 73), CSR is promising to meet employees' needs for meaning. Also even if someone has a job type which does not contribute to another one's life in a positive way directly, CSR has a strong place.

Owing to CSR, organizational members would have increased organizational commitment. This increased commitment would produce favorable employee behaviors. On the other hand, as it can be understood, the effect of CSR should also depend on various other factors. For example, whether employees have a need for meaning or not is mostly related to the personality orientation of them. So employees try to give more than the formal requirements as they are affected by CSR due to different factors. These may be their personality -as a factor that affects the behavior-, or external factors, or both of them. Employees may commit to an organization that practices CSR activities for reputation (to be appreciated by the others), for self-esteem and/or just because of their personal tendencies.

When we consider CSR within the borders of reputation (even if this border is not very clear), it can be seen clearly that engaging in CSR efforts, especially today, is the important character of a prestigious company. For the current employees of the company, the reputation of the organization they work for is an initiative to provide them with developing some specific behaviors. According to Cialdini et al (1976: 366), people have a tendency to publicize a simple case of affiliation or membership with another person or group who has been successful or highly positive. They bask in the reflected glory of others. Here, as a component which can

create a highly positive image, CSR could create a bond that strengthen the employee tendency to be more active.

Whatever concept it is handled in, CSR activities are the integral part of the companies which are not only successful but also the leader ones and that can differentiate themselves. Thus, this study first purposes to understand how the CSR perceived by the employees is associated with the Organizational Citizenship Behavior (We use the term 'CSR perceived by the employees' because if employees are unaware of their organization's CSR activities, these activities will have no influence on their attitudes or behaviors (Ellis, 2008: 21)). Further, the positive influence of CSR on employees' willingness to engage in organizational citizenship behaviors may be moderated by employees' social value orientations (Messick & McClintock, 1968; Van Lange & Kuhlman, 1994). Social Value Orientation refers to a dispositional preference concerning the distribution of outcomes among self and others. In spite of the relevance of the concept of Organizational Citizenship Behavior -as the positive result of CSR- to Social Value Orientation, the relationship between CSR and OCB has not been tested taking the SVO as the moderator. So, in this study we argue that the positive effect of CSR as perceived by employees on their citizenship behaviors toward the organization would be greater among Prosocials who are concerned not only with their own outcomes but also with others' outcomes. Studies indicate that prosocials have greater endorsement of social responsibility than do Proselfs who are concerned only with the maximization of their self interest. Thus, the second purpose of this study is to examine the moderating role of individual differences in Social Value Orientation in the association of CSR with organizational citizenship behavior. OCB concept cannot be really considered separate from individual differences in concerning others. So, as a stable personality trait (Nauta et al., 2002: 201), SVO could be an important moderator in examining the relationship between two concepts.

For this research, we prefer to utilize Decomposed Games (Messick & McClintock, 1968) in measuring SVO. Because SVO is 'distinct from people's specific and variable preferences for outcome distributions in specific situations of conflicting interests' (Nauta et al., 2002: 201), Decomposed Games do not depend on a strategic decision. In this respect, it literally measures personality.

People are classified under one of three SVO categories as competitive, individualistic, and prosocial –or cooperative– (Kuhlman & Marshello, 1975: 922; Liebrand, 1984: 239) according to their choices in the decomposed games. While prosocial people are expected to show more citizenship behaviors in the organization, the present study claims that for people for which the SVO test –here, decomposed games (Messick & McClintock, 1968)– reveals a prosocial orientation, the positive relationship between CSR and OCB will be also stronger.

For discussion of the relationship between CSR and OCB, there is also a need to mention about collateral key concepts such as perceived external prestige (Mael and Ashforth, 1992) or its other name ‘construed external image’ (Dutton et al, 1994: 248), organizational reputation, organizational identification (Cheney, 1983b), value congruence, and organizational commitment. These all will be explained in later parts. For discussion of the moderator effect, fairness will be used.

## **CHAPTER ONE**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

#### **1.1. CSR**

##### **1.1.1. General Aspect**

According to Fortune Magazine’s poll in 1946, most business people agreed that they are responsible for actions of the organization beyond mere profit-loss statements (cited in Bowen, 1953: 44). Keith Davis (1960: 71) states in his Iron Law of Responsibility that social responsibilities of business people must be commensurate with their social power. That is, when a firm’s power increases, its degree of social responsibility increases as well. Related to the firm’s gainings due to CSR activities over the long term, Davis (1960: 63) argued that those people who abuse their power by violating societal expectations for CSR would lose their power in the long run.

One of the most important CSR researchers and the founder of modern approach, Carroll (1979: 500) notes that CSR involves economic, legal, ethical, and discretionary expectations that society has of organizations at a given point in time. Regarding the possibility of inter-parts movements, Carroll specially emphasised that there is no sharp lines between the categories (as he denotes Neil Churchhill, 1974: 266)). Carroll (1979: 501) also stated that a given action of the company may simultaneously involve more than one type of social responsibility. Carroll provides an example noting that if a manufacturer of toys decides they would produce toys which are safe, they would be economically, legally, and ethically responsible based on laws and expectations.

Even though some researchers do not consider legal category as a part of CSR (see McWilliams & Siegel (2001: 117)), the categories of CSR interpenetrated and cannot be separated in a rigid way just like Carroll mentioned in 1979 (:499). The concept includes the word 'responsibility' that embracing all the responsibilities of a business. For example, when the case is responsibility to the stakeholders, if a business does not pay taxes to government, it does not fulfill its responsibility to one of its external stakeholders and this at the same time would be illegal.

### **1.1.2. Traditional vs. Modern Approach**

When we examine the studies, it can be seen that the history of the research about CSR is not very early. The notion emerged primarily in western countries and the concept transforms in time.

Initially, the widely-held, dominant approach was that a corporation should make maximum profit and there was no another great expectation expressed by the groups and/or individuals. A company's only social responsibility was providing a maximum financial return to its shareholders. In this respect, for understanding CSR history, first we should know about the traditional opinion leaded by Milton Friedman.

In 1962, in his stakeholder theory Friedman emphasized that businesses' only social responsibility was to increase their profits without reporting unlawful means (:112). Friedman (1970: 122) explained its claim also in a sentence as "And, whether he (corporate executive) wants to or not, can he get away with spending his

stockholders', customers' or employees' money?" He thought that the answer was negative. According to him if the corporation makes a contribution, this prevents the stockholder from deciding on how he will dispose of his own money. With this approach, at the same time he supported 'free/liberal market'.

However this opinion was inadequate for some people because an organization cannot be thought independent from its environment and in particular from the ethical rules which both affect inside and outside the organization, lead the way and over time may be a part of legal rules. It should have been responsible for the well-being of all its stakeholders; employees, suppliers, society, government, natural environment, and the others. All stakeholders are important because as Hopkins (2003: 10) stated in his book 'The Planetary Bargain', 'CSR is concerned with treating the 'stakeholders' of the firm ethically or in a socially responsible manner.'. Firm has both internal and external stakeholders, thus shareholders are not its only stakeholder.

Arguments about whether a firm's only social responsibility is maximizing its return to shareholders became infrequent over time. It couldn't last long to recognize that firms' financial gain had to take place within the 'laws of the land' —all of the laws in force within a country or region— (Carroll, 1991: 39), and the content of the CSR concept expanded. An obligation of complying with the legal rules smoothed the path for other organizational responsibilities. In the course of time, both some formal (governmental) and informal agencies emerged and the expectations continued to change.

In 1991, Carroll suggested his prior study that includes four kinds of social responsibilities which create total CSR in detail. According to him, CSR consists not only in maximizing financial return to shareholders but is also a notion which includes different facets. Carroll formed a four-part pyramid of which each part shows a different perspective of CSR. The idea was that the corporation does not have only economic and legal, but also ethical and discretionary (philanthropic) responsibilities (:40).

In 2003, even though Carroll and Schwartz included discretionary category in expectation status because it became a part of economic/ethical domain (:516), in a research conducted in Turkey it was understood that discretionary part of CSR still

exists (Bay, 2006: 120,122; Bay & Küskü Akdoğan, 2012: 63). Hereby, we accept Carroll's prior study in 1991 as a base because philanthropy still is not a part of economic, legal, or ethical domain in Turkey and companies do it for benevolence.

Accordingly, fulfilling its economic and legal responsibilities keeps the firm's existence, then these two responsibilities are obligatory. An organization should be responsible to its shareholders within the framework of the law (Carroll, 1991: 41).

Ethical obligations can be seen as the expected ones. If an organization act in a way most of people regard as fair and moral, this brings an advantage in the long-term due to gaining the trust of people.

Discretionary (Philanthropic) responsibilities can be classified as the desired ones. They do not have the priority but are desired by the communities with each passing day.

### **1.1.3. Recent Studies on CSR**

CSR has financial, attitudinal, behavioral and performance related effects within the organization. Even if some of the studies achieve findings that are different from each other, when it is used properly, CSR will provide benefits and firms take its advantages in a variety of different subjects. A firm can benefit CSR in a way that it serves the organization's existential aim. Thus, a company which is engaged in a specific CSR dimension should have related resources. In an organization which makes a point if CSR dimensions it adopts are related with its resources and capabilities, the positive effect of CSR on its financial performance becomes stronger. Also, if the organization starts its CSR initiatives with internal CSR dimensions first and practices CSR initiatives more regularly, the positive effect of that organization's social responsibility on its financial performance becomes stronger again (Tang, Hull & Rothenberg, 2012: 1291,1292). According to a study, CSR reduces the annual quit rate by 3 per cent (Vitaliano, 2010: 569). And if a firm's R&D is higher, its CSR becomes higher (Erhemjamts, Li & Venkateswaran, 2013: 395, McWilliams & Siegel, 2000: 608). A company's CSR strengths are positively related to its investments, financial performance and strategy (Erhemjamts, Li & Venkateswaran, 2013: 395). However, according to a previous study, it was found that when the model is established accurately, thus, when the company's level of



R&D is included in the model, actually CSR alone has no effect on financial performance (McWilliams & Siegel, 2000: 608).

CSR also can be thought as extrinsic (the activities that employees think they are run for the interests of the company) and intrinsic (the activities that employees think they are run as unaffected). If the firm undertakes CSR activities to avoid the results of ignoring it which causes damage for itself, it means that its CSR activities are caused by extrinsic reasons. Intrinsic drivers are about the firm's principal attitude and culture. Only intrinsically motivated firms believe that CSR has financial return to them (Moore, de Silva & Hartmann, 2012: 107). However, if the employees perceive that their company undertakes both intrinsic and extrinsic CSR activities together, they demonstrate more in-role and extra-role behaviors. (Story & Neves, 2015: 118).

Through CSR, organizational identification and OCB increase. In a study, organizational identification was employed as a mediator of the relationship between CSR and OCB. According to this, perceived CSR has a direct effect on organizational identification. And Organizational identification positively and significantly affects OCB (Evans & Davis, 2014: 129). In a study which was conducted for the service sector, it was found that perceived CSR again has significant positive effect on organizational commitment, and the economic and philanthropic dimensions of CSR have more effect on organizational commitment (Roudaki & Arslan, 2017: 4).

Besides, except it was found a direct positive relationship between CSR and employee job satisfaction, organizational image can serve as a mediator in this relationship as well (Barakat, Isabella, Boaventura & Mazzon, 2016: 2334). CSR ensures that all stakeholders ascribe a positive reputation to the organization. CSR has a significant positive effect on organizational reputation (Maden, Arıkan, Telci & Kantur, 2012: 662). For all types of organizations, CSR is important in increasing positive organizational reputation. CSR activities are beneficial as they increase good reputation of the organization (Petkeviciene, 2015: 507).

CSR also helps employees find the meaning that they need within their organization. Through their intraindividual, intraorganizational, and extraorganizational sensemaking, CSR enables employees to find meaning in their

work (Aguinis & Glavas, 2019: 1065). Even in non-profit organizations, employees find the meaning with CSR in their work. However, CSR differently affects meaningfulness in non-profit and for-profit organizations. In non-profit organizations, employees find the meaning without an extra endeavour because they see CSR as in-role activity (Seivwright & Unsworth, 2016: 6). In for-profit organizations, CSR effect is more peripheral while the other type organization has an embedded CSR understanding (Seivwright & Unsworth, 2016: 4).

Employees' engagement to the company is another result of CSR. General CSR has a significant positive effect on engagement. If it is explained in detail by employing CSR dimensions, three CSR dimensions, thus, CSR to employees, CSR to customers, and CSR to government each significantly and positively affect employee engagement in the organization. However, CSR to social and non-social stakeholders dimension (CSR to society, to natural environment, to future generations, to non-governmental organizations) does not have a positive effect on employee engagement. Further, CSR to employees has been found as the dimension which has the strongest effect on employee engagement (Chaudhary, 2017: 331).

Companies at the same time can achieve competitive advantage through CSR. For example, a company which produces eco-friendly products both differentiates itself in the market and contributes to CSR initiatives within the industry. Toyota's hybrid technology or General Electric's water purification technology are this type of competitive advantages. Or when a restaurants chain purchases from the small domestic farms so that it differentiates itself and also promotes sustainability would be another example (Porter & Kramer, 2006: 85,91).

While all executives pay importance to legal expectation, extrinsic religious executives care discretionary (philanthropic) expectation of CSR. Intrinsic religious executives care ethical expectations of CSR. Furthermore, the more the executive is intrinsic religious, the less the importance paid to economic dimension (Van Der Duijn Schouten, Graafland & Kaptein, 2014: 451,452).

## **1.2. SVO**

### **1.2.1. Understanding SVO and Its Measurement**

A firm's strength in terms of social responsibility will affect its employees' attitudes and behaviors in the organization. When the employee perceives that her employment organization is socially responsible, ignoring some personal interests to support the firm's initiatives would not be a great effort for her (Rupp et al., 2006: 540). However, employees may be affected by these social responsibility initiatives in different levels. Some people have a higher degree of belief about/for what is right and can be more helpful, empathetic, collective than others. These people may look for the same opinion for the company they work for as well and when they find it, they endeavor and put extra effort with higher identification.

Starting from the idea that people vary in their perceptions and reactions, social interactions theories emerged. As a part of it, when it is looked into the degree of concerning others which influences choice of individuals in social interactions, SVO concept appeared. So, SVO concept is a prominent/remarkable one among these social interactions theories which were derived by the influence of Game Theory (Von Neumann & Morgenstern, 1944).

SVO is defined as stable preferences for certain patterns of outcomes for oneself and others (McClintock, 1978; Messick & McClintock, 1968). These preferences are stable because they do not change according to the conditions and are permanent at least for a long time. Hence, SVO is a 'trait' because it is an individual's general disposition.

To date, a variety of connected subjects to SVO have been examined. Scholars studied individual differences in social dilemmas under names such as Social Motives (McClintock, 1972), other-regarding preferences —preferences over another individual's material payoffs, in addition to one's own— (Roth, 1995b), collective interest (Van Lange et al., 2007: 540). After Pruitt's decomposed Prisoner's Dilemma game in 1967, independently, one year later, Messick & McClintock introduced Decomposed Games which is an instrument for determining

social motive of a person that influences her choice behavior in social dilemmas. A variety of different measures are the types of Decomposed Games.

Today, there are three predominant SVO measures. Two of these most common measures of SVO, thus, Triple Dominance Measure (Messick et al, 1968) and the Ring Measure (Liebrand, 1984: 246) are the branches of the Decomposed Games. The other most common measure, thus, Slider Measure (Murphy et al, 2011: 772) is not included to the Decomposed Games even though it derives from it. Its basis depends on Decomposed Games, however, the shape of the questionnaire which enables more combination is different from the measures of Decomposed Games.

The use of Triple Dominance Measure which is the basic sort of Decomposed Games is more common. Triple Dominance Measure consists of nine items of which each has the same type context. The category (here, being prosocial, individualist, or competitor) is determined by the six out of nine. As always, participants are anonymous and will not know each other. They do not and will not have an idea about each others' choices.

### **1.2.2. Characteristics of Individuals' SVO**

Messick et al. (1968) suggested three social value orientations as cooperation, individualism, and competition. Proselfs may be individualistic or competitive (Smeesters et al., 2003: 973).

Competitors even approve to receive a smaller amount for being superior than the other. They aim to maximize the positive difference between their outcomes and others' outcomes at the expense of their self-interest. Competitors pay attention to the greatness of the difference, thus, the relative outcome. According to one opinion, competitors may do it because they expect the same selfishness from others (Kelley & Stahelski, 1970a).

Individualists want the best outcome for themselves and they don't mind the difference between the outcome for themselves and the outcome of other person. They only try to maximize their own outcome.

Cooperators (Prosocials) care about outcome of the other person as well as their own outcome and try to maximize the outcome of both sides (for both herself

and the other person). They believe in equality and win-win results (Van Lange, 1999: 348). They exhibit greater self-restraint behaviors for both sides benefit in comparison with the noncooperators (Kramer, McClintock, & Messick, 1986: 576). Joint outcome is important for them.

Because our hypothesis will especially focus on prosocial oriented individuals within this research, it is important to know some more basic findings about prosocial people. According to previous studies, most people can be classified as prosocials. Prosocial individuals perceive cooperation as 'rational' (Van Lange et al., 1990: 34, 35), thus, they expect more cooperation from the intelligent people unlike the proselves who expect more cooperation from the unintelligents (Van Lange & Liebrand, 1991a: 287). Also, in case they see a cooperative behavior from other, they become more cooperative, in other saying, they reciprocate to it.

Within the experiment of Messick et al. (1983: 294) which treats joint resource usage, one-third of the subjects who think others overused the resource and at the same time, who have a high reciprocal trust diminished their harvests, thus, show more self-restraint behaviors. Then, Kramer, McClintock, and Messick (1986: 576) made a similar more distinguishing study and found that prosocial individuals decreased their harvests more in comparison to proselves in the situation of resource depletion. Accordingly, prosocials are more self-restraint. Separately, prosocial oriented people expect more cooperation from others than those the proselves expect (Van Lange, 1992: 371).

### **1.3. OCB**

#### **1.3.1. Definitions of OCB**

Before discovering the relationship, finally we should state what we mean by the 'OCB'. Researchers also tried to explain it using different names — extra-role behaviours (Van Dyne, Cummings & Parks, 1995) and prosocial organizational behaviours (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986: 713-716) —.

OCB refers to positive behaviors of employees that are not formally expected and rewarded by the organization but are conducted by employees voluntarily to improve organizational functioning (Organ, 1988a: 4).

Even though it is not very clear from this definition what is expected or formal about job and this may change upon era, it can be assumed that extrarole or prosocial acts are not directly specified by a job description and do not provide direct benefit with the individual (O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986: 493).

In 1997, Organ rewrote the definition as he argued that OCBs would improve the social and psychological environment where employees perform their traditional job duties (: 95).

If we go back in the roots more, the derivation of OCB even extends to the notion of “willingness to cooperate” which was mentioned by Barnard in 1938 (:viii, 85). After Katz (1964:131-146) divided individuals' behaviors as in-role and extra-role, OCB was defined as extra-role behaviors in 1980s (Zhu, 2013: 24). Though Morrison (1994: 1561) claimed that some OCB can be perceived as in-role by different individuals, the most common view is that the OCB is the extra-role behavior.

Bateman & Organ (1983: 588, 592) developed the concept of OCB to establish a relationship between employees' job satisfaction and performance. Since then, the concept has been studied. OCB has an important role for organizations as it ensures them to reach and sustain efficient and effective results.

### **1.3.2. Dimensions of OCB**

Organ (1988) identified five OCB dimensions: Altruism, Courtesy, Sportsmanship, Conscientiousness (Compliance), and Civic Virtue.

#### **1.3.2.1. Altruism**

Altruism refers to the behaviors of helping other members of the organization such as helping colleagues who have excess workload or are fresh, or doing the work of colleague who is absent. These are helping behaviors which aims directly at specific people (Smith et al., 1983: 661).

#### **1.3.2.2. Courtesy**

Courtesy behaviors are the proactive behaviors which prevents work-related conflicts with others before they occur. When an employee is consulting other employees who might be affected by her actions, it would be a courtesy behavior. Before action, considering the effects of her action on the other employee of the organization and being responsible to other employees' interests prevents creating problems for others and waste of time.

#### **1.3.2.3. Sportsmanship**

Sportsmanship is the behaviors of avoiding complaining on organizational inconveniences and/or exaggerating unpleasant situations. Not focusing on minor negative situations which can be seen in every organization but tolerating on small hitches, and embracing a positive attitude are sportsmanship behaviors.

#### **1.3.2.4. Conscientiousness (Compliance)**

Conscientiousness refers to the behaviors that go beyond those expected by specific role requirements. Precise observance of general rules such as always arriving work on time and attentive use of time while at work, or volunteering for extra jobs are the conscientiousness behaviors.

#### **1.3.2.5. Civic Virtue**

Civic Virtue includes behaviors of participation in the political or governance issues of the organization (Organ et al., 2006: 24). These behavior include involvement in the greater perspective about the organization such as offering organization-related suggestions, positive speaking about the organization outside, attending meetings and events even if there is no obligation, and even taking steps for safety of the organization building. Generally when an employee really cares and wants the organization to be successful, s/he engages in the organization in a greater, even, strategic level.

Even if OCB was classified in different groups afterwards, these five dimensions of Organ(1988) still stands and are widely recognized.

### **1.3.3. Recent Studies on OCB**

To date, direct or indirect links have been established between a variety of different concepts and OCB. Studies usually show that perceived organizational support has a positive effect on OCB. According to studies, perceived organizational support significantly increases OCB (Randall, Cropanzano, Bormann & Birjulin, 1999: 165; Wayne, Shore, Bommer & Tetrick, 2002: 594). Another study again found that perceived organizational support affects OCB (Chiang & Hsieh, 2012: 180) and the other one discovered that perceived organizational support has a moderate effect on OCB (Ahmed & Nawaz, 2015: 875). Also, interpersonal trust, organizational trust and overall trust, each of them is the significant predictor of OCB. The strongest relationship is between the interpersonal trust and OCB (Petrella, 2013: 22). Consistent with it, the trust which is felt to supervisor (manager) increases the OCB of the subordinate (Deluga, 1995: 1).

As a very close concept, organizational justice also significantly affects OCB (Ojo, 2017: 44). There are different studies that found organizational justice positively affects OCB (Chernyak-Hai & Tziner, 2012: 67,78; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001: 308). Organizational justice is an important predictor of OCB and additionally, if the organization adopts collectivism, this relationship becomes stronger. So, collectivism is a significant moderator between organizational justice and OCB (Shahzad, Siddiqui & Zakaria, 2014: 910). Another study states that the hospital employees who demonstrate high collectivism show higher OCB. Within the same study, in correlation analyze, all the relationships between organizational justice dimensions (interactional, formal, distributive) and OCB dimensions was found as positive (Cohen & Avrahami, 2006: 897,899).

As stated in a study, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, leader supportiveness, and perceived fairness (justice) positively affect OCB. Also, job satisfaction affects extra-role behaviours more than it affects the in-role behaviours of non-managerial employees (Organ & Ryan, 1995: 775, 791, 793, 794).



The tasks that are designed as to be related to each other provide more OCB. Task interdependence has a significant positive effect on all five OCB dimensions (Ganesh & Gupta, 2006: 11; 2010: 180,182). When the comprehensive studies are handled, more enlightening results appear. For example, in a study on the relationship between self-concept related notions (in which also organizational identification is included) and OCB, when the concepts that are most associated with OCB, thus, job satisfaction, organizational justice, and task interdependence were handled, it was found that while the effect of job satisfaction on OCB does not always give the same result statistically, the statistical effects of the concepts of procedural justice and task interdependence on OCB are very strong. That is, it was determined that only two of these three notions that became a classic in the relationship with OCB still had a significant and positive effect on OCB after the self-concept related variables such as organizational identification were removed (Shim & Faerman, 2017: 547). Though supervisors mostly see the citizenship behaviors of the subordinates as attractive but not necessary behaviors (Salehzadeh, Shahin, Kazemi & Barzoki 2015: 612), the importance that is paid to OCB in performance evaluation process also is affected by the task interdependence. Thus, higher task interdependence ensures that the supervisors hold the OCB of the employees in higher esteem. Task interdependence significantly and positively affects OCB (Bachrach, Powell & Bendoly, 2004: A3).

On the other hand, when the concepts such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and procedural justice (procedural fairness) that generally have a relationship with OCB are handled simultaneously, it was found that only organizational commitment has a significant relationship with OCB (Schappe, 1998: 277,289). According to Perreira and Berta's study of which the path was established on the literature, health-care employees may feel affective commitment for their organization, career, co-workers, supervisor, tasks, profession, patients, and work and this affective commitment of them influences their OCB. And perceived organizational support influences affective commitment (2015: 16,17). According to another study, the value congruence between the employees and their organization has a direct positive relationship with OCB. Higher value congruence with the organization triggers higher OCB. However, within the same study it was found that

job satisfaction, affective commitment, normative commitment, and continuous commitment have no mediator role in this relationship (Leung, 2013: 26).

As another concept which was mentioned before, organizational identification significantly and positively affects OCB. Organizational identification is more related to OCB-O (Evans & Davis, 2014: 139,140). Positive organizational reputation helps employees' organizational identification increase, enables higher retention, thus, makes them continue to work at that workplace, demonstrate OCB behaviors such as beneficial recommendations to firm, take in-company voluntary activities (Akturan & Sevik, 2016: 115). So, organizational reputation also has a significantly positive effect on general OCB. When the effect of organizational reputation on each OCB dimension was examined, it was found that it affects four OCB dimensions positively (altruism, courtesy, civic virtue, consciousness), however, it cannot be founded an effect of organizational reputation on sportsmanship dimension (Akturan & Sevik, 2016: 120). As a similar concept, perceived external prestige also has a significant direct positive effect on OCB (Schaarschmidt, Walsh & Ivens, 2015: 326). Except this, a good organizational reputation perception of employees triggers more organizational pride in collectivist employees, and this results in more OCB. So, employees that have a higher collectivism tendency are more likely to feel organizational pride for their well-reputed firm (Oo, Jung & Park, 2018: 5,9,11) since the feeling of pride in collective individuals is more related to their group, and thus, arises from their contribution to the group.

Collectivism significantly and positively affects general OCB (both OCBO and OCBI). However, individualism has no effect on OCB. When the effects of collectivism and individualism on OCB motives were analyzed, it can be seen that collectivism has a significant positive effect on prosocial values and organizational concern motives of OCB while individualism has the same effect on the impression management motive of OCB (De Leon & Finkelstein, 2011: 403).

Another point is that, general OCB of the other employees favorably affects individual's OCB. Thus, an employee demonstrates more citizenship behaviors if the employees she works with exhibit these behaviors because the collective OCB has a

significant effect on individual OCB and this positive relationship becomes stronger if the employees' behaviors are consistent (Bommer, Miles & Grover, 2003: 192).

Characteristics of individuals are important to predict OCB of them. Within the individual characteristics, though work centrality, employee optimism, and emotional intelligence each are the important concepts which has a significant and positive effect on OCB, among them, emotional intelligence has the most important effect on OCB (Ugwu & Igbende, 2017: 7). More specific studies have the same results. Emotional intelligence of university professors has a strong positive effect on their citizenship behaviors (Vandewaa & Turnipseed, 2012: 1).

As another example, according to a study, if an individual's adaptive (healthy) perfectionism is higher, her OCB is higher. Also, self-efficacy level of men positively influences their OCB. Because women generally show OCB, self-efficacy level has no significant impact on women. These findings are interesting because all these concepts (healthy perfectionism, self-efficacy) are about individual herself and have been found more predictive than some classical concepts which are external factors such as organizational justice and perceived organizational support (Beauregard, 2012: 598). It is clear that characteristics of employees are highly important to predict OCB of them. Other recent study again found that self-efficacy affects OCB (Chen & Kao, 2011: 361). Also, the employees that have a secure attachment (low avoidance and low anxiety) style also demonstrate more OCB (Desivilya, Sabag & Ashton, 2006: 31).

Further, as part of the demographic characteristics of the individuals, tenure of the employees is an important predictor of OCB. Studies show that organizational tenure positively affects citizenship performance even after removing the effect of employee's biological age (Ng & Feldman, 2010: 1243). Similarly, another study found that tenure and age have a significant positive effect on OCB (Saepung, Sukirno & Siengthai, 2011 :171,172). Within the framework of OCB dimensions, however, according to Cohen & Avrahami, shorter tenured employees demonstrate more sportsmanship (2006: 898).

Both perceived organizational instrumentality (the degree of employees' belief that OCB increases the effectiveness of the organization) and perceived individual instrumentality (the degree of employees' belief that OCB will be good

for them in the individual manner) positively affect OCB, however, perceived organizational instrumentality affects OCB more. While perceived organizational instrumentality is related to OCBO, perceived individual instrumentality is related to OCBI and is a mediator between active constructive leadership (combination of transformational & contingent reward) and OCBI. Perceived organizational instrumentality mediates transformational leadership and OCB. Perceived individual instrumentality mediates the relationship of contingent reward leadership to OCB, whereas active constructive leadership influences OCBO (Jiao, Richards & Zhang, 2011: 11,21).

## **1.4. HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT**

### **1.4.1. The Relationship Between CSR and OCB**

People have a desire for a stable, high evaluation of themselves, whether for the self-esteem and/or for the esteem by others (Maslow, 1943: 381). They want to be a part of those groups with which they can get a positive, favorable image of themselves. Because their sense of membership in the organization affects their self-concepts (Dutton et al., 1994: 242), people feel glorious for their membership in the organizations which are evaluated as 'good' by themselves or by the others.

When individuals have positive attitudes toward a group, for example, their employment organization, they feel more attachment and this will reflect to their behaviors. According to Aguilera et al. (2007: 842), 'employees need to belong to be legitimate members of valued social groups'. Therefore, it also can be claimed that if their firm engages in CSR activities, employees will be more glad about their attachments with their company and have a tendency to advertise their ties and put extra effort with their tasks.

In their study which they discuss the actions of Port Authority of New York & New Jersey, Dutton & Dukerich (1991: 548) noted that 'organizational actions on social issues can be especially character-enhancing or damning'. Thus, those actions on social issues influences a firm's identity, image, and employees' self-concepts. These actions on social issues influence self-concepts through many factors. The

basic concepts that arouse the citizenship behaviors of employees due to social responsibility issues of the organization are the concepts of organizational reputation, construed external image, value congruence, organizational identification and organizational commitment.

( ) **Organizational Reputation** is defined as ‘outsiders’ beliefs about what distinguishes an organization’ (Dutton et al., 1994: 249). Considering its past actions, people ascribe some attributes to a firm (Weigelt & Camerer, 1988: 443).

As Peterson (2004: 299) states, employees expect their firm to have a positive reputation on social issues and evaluate it as ‘good’ if the firm meets these expectations. Their work attitudes are affected by this positive perception and these attitudes are revealed in employees’ behaviors. CSR (social responsiveness) generates firm reputation as it ensures to cooperate with all the groups which expect social initiatives from the company (Fombrun & Shanley, 1990: 235, 252). So it can evidently be seen that the greater a firm's contributions to social welfare, the better its reputation. And employees will be proud to identify with a well-reputed firm (Peterson, 2004: 299).

( ) **Construed external image** -or perceived external prestige (Smidts et al., 2001)- refers to “a member’s beliefs about outsiders’ perceptions of the organization” (Dutton et al., 1994: 248).

Individuals’ perceptions of what others think about their working organization shapes their self-concepts and personal identities (Dutton & Dukerich, 1991: 548). Just as the negative feelings of employees due to their negative perceptions about the outsiders’ opinion of the organization cause to, for example, increased competition among members or reduced effort on long-term tasks (Dutton et al. 1994: 240), so the positive perception of the employees about the outsiders’ opinion on the contrary may increase cooperation among employees and their willingness to represent the organization in different circles.

### **() Value Congruence**

Previous notions alone are not enough to explain the relationship. There may be individual's own values in congruence with the ones of her working organization which generate citizenship behaviors.

Popovich & Wanous (1982: 573) suggested that choosing a particular organization to work for is a concrete, public expression of a person's values. An individual desires to work for a company which is consistent with her values and not far from them. People express their self-concepts with their working organization. If we explain it through a factual basis, according to 2002 Work Foundation Research, 82 per cent of white-collar employees in UK do not accept to work for an organization whose values are not consistent with theirs. It is because people want to make a contribution to firms which they find meaningful (Stawiski, 2010: 7). To what extent employees believe that the firm behaves ethically and socially responsibly has an important role in influencing employee views regarding the positive image of a particular organization (Greening & Turban, 2000: 259). If the value congruence exists, then the employees may try to make higher contribution as demonstrating more citizenship behaviors within a socially responsible organization.

### **() Organizational Identification**

Whatever the reason is, in every situation, 'organizational identification' concept should be mentioned. It is such an important concept that some consider it as the 'task' of the organization (Pratt, 1998: 171).

The term 'identification' alone can be explained as a 'process of self-definition' (Carmeli et al, 2006: 94). However, Organizational Identification, as defined by Dutton et al. (1994: 239), refers to the extent to which employees define themselves using the same attributes that they believe define their organizations. Thus, it is a cognitive connection between employees and the organization (Dutton et al., 1994: 242).

A person in the same way may establish this bond with her organization if that organization considers its environment and pays importance to CSR. When the bond is established, this promotes citizenship behaviors of her (Dutton et al., 1994:

240). This is because employees who were identified with their socially responsible company not only behave congruent with it but also start to think and act like organization itself. They show participation (O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986: 497) and cooperation behaviors. They make much effort for the well-being of their company. For example they do not complain about overtime work to complete a task, and/or they help each other, and/or make additional recommendations to the company for its progress. We believe that if potential employees' perceptions of a firm's ethics and values highly affect the attractiveness of an organization in the eye of them (Greening & Turban, 2000: 259), current employees are affected by these values more. Employees who know about the 'good deeds' of their organization will be 'more eager to discuss their company with outsiders' (Stawiski et al., 2010: 3) – remember OCB indications–.

People's working organizations are a determining factor for their self-concept (Cable & Turban, 2003: 2249; Turban & Greening, 1997: 660). If they feel pride and respect with their organizations, their self-esteem will be higher and they show greater cooperative behavior (Tyler & Blader, 2000: 153, 156, 171). Feeling of proud related to be a part of this socially responsible organization (Rodrigo & Arenas, 2008: 271) will strengthen their sense of identification with the organization and subsequently OCB will be an outcome of this. Consequently, as O'Reilly & Chatman (1986: 495) states, it is obvious that there is a significant positive relation between the degree of identification and extra-role behaviors. Dutton et al. (1994: 240), Bergami & Bagozzi (2000: 555, 574) and Dukerich et al. (2002: 527) also confirmed that there is a positive relationship between these concepts.

Mael & Ashforth (1995: 312) says 'In identifying with the organization, people often internalize these (organization's) attributes as their own'. It could be recognized that it is possible to approach it in terms of social issues. According to Bartel's (2001: 379, 402) study about Pillsbury employees, with company's community outreach program, supervisors reported higher interpersonal cooperation among employees and higher work effort. If the company the employee works for perform CSR activities, the employee may feel a strong identification for her meaningful job and try more with her work. Strong identification with the job will return as the extra-role behaviors.

Today CSR is a favorable concept and employees may feel higher identification and self-esteem due to an association with a socially responsible organization. As Stawiski et al. (2010: 2) states, ‘if my company is saving the world, I am too.’ This perception ensures employees to value their job in the organization and identify with it.

### **() Organizational Commitment**

Since the ‘behaviors that exceed formal and/or normative expectations’ are the commitment-related behaviors (Mowday et al., 1979: 225), these committed employees will be willing to work extra hard on behalf of the organization.

As a concept which includes identification as one of its three components, (Pratt, 1998: 177), commitment is ‘one attitude that has been widely linked to the willingness to act on behalf of one’s group’ (Tyler & Blader, 2000: 55). Committed employees will become ready to give something from themselves (Mowday et al., 1982: 27). Especially employees’ affective commitment ---as such a highly related concept to the identification that has been seen nearly the same--- has a greater influence on extra-role behaviors (Meyer & Allen, 1991: 80, 81; Riketta, 2002: 265; Eisenberger et al., 2010: 1100) or OCB (Rifai, 2005: 147; Wasti, 2002: 526, 542). The concept refers to the “positive feelings of identification with, attachment to and involvement in the work organisation” (Meyer & Allen, 1984: 375).

CSR activities generate positive employee feelings about working organization and being a part of it. This will trigger employees to have a general stronger organizational commitment (Brammer et al., 2007: 1722; Peterson, 2004: 308, Stawiski et al., 2010: 2). When the employees perceive that their working organization has a social purpose, they would be glad to be in a higher effort for the benefit of the organization (George & Van de Ven, 2001: 42).

These five basic factors mentioned above enable us to understand how CSR affects OCB. Before developing the first main hypothesis, when we examine the literature, it can be seen that in addition to the limited amount studies which found direct positive relationship between CSR and OCB (e.g. Kerse & Seçkin, 2017: 850), there are studies which also include a mediator between the relationship and again found positive results (e.g. Zheng, 2010: 88; Gao& He, 2017: 304).



In line with this information, the first main hypothesis was developed:

**H1: There is a positive relationship between the general CSR perceived by the employees and OCB.**

Because the general CSR consists of seven dimensions, it would be useful to measure the effect of each dimension. For this aim, sub-level of the first hypothesis were developed as:

**H1a: There is a positive relationship between ‘CSR to employees’ dimension and OCB.**

**H1b: There is a positive relationship between ‘CSR to customers’ dimension and OCB.**

**H1c: There is a positive relationship between ‘CSR to society’ dimension and OCB.**

**H1d: There is a positive relationship between ‘CSR to government’ dimension and OCB.**

**H1e: There is a positive relationship between ‘CSR to natural environment’ dimension and OCB.**

**H1f: There is a positive relationship between ‘CSR to next generation’ dimension and OCB.**

**H1g: There is a positive relationship between ‘CSR to NGOs’ dimension and OCB.**

#### **1.4.2. The Moderating Role of SVO**

Prosocials reciprocate cooperation regardless of the characteristics such as honesty or intelligence of other person (Van Lange & Semin-Goossens, 1998: 853). Prosocials are affected by the situational effect less (Au & Kwong, 2004: 89), because as an individual, they usually prefer their behaviors to be moral and they care equal outcomes.

According to Van Dijk et al. (2012: 108), people adhere to equality because they value fairness. In symmetric resource dilemmas where group members have the equal conditions, individuals think being equal in outcomes is fairness (Wade-

Benzoni et al., 1996: 124). However, the importance level of fairness differs according to the value orientations of individuals. For some people fairness comes before their greed. As Folger (1998: 32) explains, ‘sense of virtue as its own reward’ may be a core reason behind this.

Individuals’ perspective for fairness affects their cooperative decisions in social dilemmas and prosocials believe that being cooperative is fair. As a cooperation motive, fairness is the main heuristic of prosocial behaviors. Thus, if a person is a prosocial who acts according to the morality and fairness considerations, as s/he is attracted to a workplace (setting) which conforms to her own belief and shares the same value/goals (Schneider, 1987: 441), s/he would be attracted to an organization which has a high CSR level. This person will demonstrate more citizenship behaviors, e.g., s/he will stay long at the organization, help co-workers, talk good about the organization, and participate in discretionary meetings within this type of organization.

Prosocial oriented people attach more importance to evaluative dimension and they see the situation as ‘good’ or ‘bad’. Thus, they see the process from the perspective of morality. Unlike prosocials, proselves approach to the social dilemma in terms of potency/might, and see the situation as being ‘strong’ or ‘weak’ (Liebrand et al., 1986: 203). Additionally, Samuelson (1993: 318) found that prosocials pay more regard to ‘fairness dimension’ while proselves make a decision considering ‘self-interest dimension’ more in social dilemmas under the same conditions. In short, prosocial people make a choice considering ‘fairness’ more compared to prosel self people who rather consider ‘self-interest’.

Prosel selfs may cooperate only for strategic reasons (Bogaert et al., 2008: 471) — when they know that in the contrary they cannot adapt to their socially responsible organization — because their prosocial oriented peers pay importance to cooperation and the general structure of the organization is socially responsible. So, they can be affected by the general atmosphere, otherwise they know that they cannot be approved within their working environment.

When we analyze the literature it can be seen that even morality related words activates cooperative behaviors of individuals in comparison to might/power related words in social dilemmas (Smeesters et al., 2003: 973; see also Hertel & Fiedler,

1994: 131) by affecting value orientations (Hertel & Fiedler, 1998: 69). Employees' attitudes and behaviors are even affected by its 'external' CSR which ensures that employees see their organization as concerned about being just to others (Aguilera et al., 2007: 839, 840; Jones et al., 2016: 4). So, employees surely will be affected by the moral atmosphere of their socially responsible organization. A socially responsible company may gain the maximum citizenship behaviors of its employees according to their value orientation. Especially prosocial employees who demonstrates more socially responsible behaviors (De Cremer & Van Lange, 2001: S14) and are a very valuable human resource for the companies will have more organizational citizenship behaviors.

Socially responsible organizations enable its employees to care for the comfort and welfare of each other and people in their communities (Glavas & Piderit, 2009: 56). Finding meaning at work will make them more committed. Not only they will want to retain in the organization but also will embrace and appreciate the organization that has a moral personality and they demonstrate more citizenship behaviors. As part of an organization which succeeded at developing CSR culture all employees will have a necessity to develop values and beliefs that make them more responsible (Prutina, 2016). This makes them more tolerated to each other and triggers compromising and self-sacrifice. Because in the end, cooperative interaction is a psychological and biological necessity above all (Johnson & Johnson, 1974: 218). Nevertheless, when it is looked into the literature it is possible to suppose that prosocial employees may internalize the importance and value of a socially responsible firm better and show higher OCB.

Before developing second main hypothesis, it should be remembered that prosocials are the individuals who respond to fairness more (Joireman et al., 2001), and are motivated by their moral values. And people who are motivated by their moral values view CSR as an absolute requirement (Basil & Weber, 2006: 61). In fact, especially in terms of philanthropic (discretionary) endeavors, CSR is already a prosocial-based notion. On the other hand, since it is known that the prosocial motives positively affect OCB (Rioux & Penner, 2001: 1306), and that the employees who are more concerned about CSR show higher commitment (Peterson, 2004: 302), and prosocials have more social responsibility (De Cremer & Van

Lange, 2001: S14), the relationship between CSR and OCB has a possibility of being strong for prosocial individuals. This has never been examined before and the second hypothesis of this study aims to measure it.

Then:

**H2: Employees' SVO affects the relationship between CSR and OCB. If the person is prosocial, the positive relationship between CSR and OCB will be also stronger.**

Similarly, sub-level of the second hypothesis were developed as:

**H2a: Employees' SVO affects the relationship between 'CSR to employees' dimension and OCB.**

**H2b: Employees' SVO affects the relationship between 'CSR to customers' dimension and OCB.**

**H2c: Employees' SVO affects the relationship between 'CSR to society' dimension and OCB.**

**H2d: Employees' SVO affects the relationship between 'CSR to government' dimension and OCB.**

**H2e: Employees' SVO affects the relationship between 'CSR to natural environment' dimension and OCB.**

**H2f: Employees' SVO affects the relationship between 'CSR to next generation' dimension and OCB.**

**H2g: Employees' SVO affects the relationship between 'CSR to NGOs' dimension and OCB.**

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **METHODOLOGY AND FINDINGS**

#### **2.1. SAMPLE**

Organizations were chosen on purpose among different sectors in Turkey. Those sectors were automotive, retail (multinational hypermarkets chain -grocery and general merchandise-), food, chemistry, durable consumer goods, and banking. Data were collected from different firms in Izmir and Istanbul because though these cities are the important metropolises of Turkey, at the same time, they differ in many respects. These cities are also hosting multinational firms.

All participants are college-graduate white-collar employees who also are working for the departments of sales, marketing, after-sales services, operation, finance, HR, law and R&D. The questionnaires were collected in two years due to privacy concerns of the organizations (Period was between summer of 2015 and winter of 2017). Because it was detected that the number of returns to mail survey was highly low, the questionnaires mostly were delivered as hard copy to the employees in person inside the organization. Some questionnaires were gathered within the company staff refectory during the lunch break. Individuals were told that the questionnaires were being delivered for the aim of a scientific research, participation was voluntary and their responses would be anonymous and approached in privacy. For ensuring anonymity to be more persuasive in the eye of them, demographic data except gender was not demanded from the participants. Among 155 participants, there was no need to remove any response as there is not any missing responses.

#### **2.2. MEASURES**

Within this study, three different measures were employed. Türker(2009a)'s CSR scale, Basım & Şeşen(2006)'s OCB scale, and Messick et al.(1968)'s Triple Dominance SVO Measure were used to understand the relationship between variables. Questionnaires used can be seen in appendices.

### **2.2.1. Independent Variable (CSR)**

Türker(2009a)'s 18-item scale was used to collect the data of independent variable (CSR) for our research. Türker's research showed that this scale has sufficient reliability and construct validity on Turkish samples. The questionnaire includes five-point likert scales (1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= No Idea , 4= Agree, 5= Strongly Agree). Sample items of this questionnaire are 'Our company implements flexible policies to provide a good work & life balance for its employees', 'Our company implements special programs to minimize its negative impact on the natural environment', 'Our company targets sustainable growth which considers future generations'. Through the questionnaire, CSR to employees, to customers, to society, to government, to natural environment, to next generation, and to NGOs were tried to be measured. The aim of this scale is to understand the employees' perceptions about their working organizations' social responsibility.

### **2.2.2. Dependent Variable (OCB)**

A scale that was developed by Basım & Şeşen (2006) is employed. It was formed by using two different study (Vey & Campbell, 2004; Williams & Shiaw,1999). The questionnaire includes 19 item and five-point likert scales (1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= No Idea , 4= Agree, 5= Strongly Agree). The scale has high reliability and construct validity. Sample items are 'I give my time to help others with work problems willingly', 'I don't consume a lot of time complaining about trivial matters'. The questions allow measuring the dimensions of OCB "Altruism" (5 items), "Conscientiousnes" (3 items), "Courtesy" (3 items), "Sportsmanship" (4 items) and "Civic Virtue" (4 items) separately.

### **2.2.3. Moderator (SVO)**

Triple Dominance Measure (Messick et al, 1968) of Decomposed Games is employed to determine the SVO of employees. Triple Dominance Measure consists of nine items (questions). The SVO of people is determined by the six out of these

nine items. Each question includes three options to choose only one. For example, for the first question, option A is a competitive choice, option B is an individualistic choice and option C is a cooperative choice. This is because an individual who prefers option A accept 480 for herself and 80 for the other individual. If she prefers option B, she accept 540 for herself and 280 for the other individual. If she prefers option C, she accept 480 for herself and 480 for the other individual. The responder was told that the other person would also make preferences for both sides, but they would not know each other and would not knowingly meet in the future. Consistent with prior organizational research (Bogaert et al., 2012, we conceptualized SVO with counts of prosocial choices on a scale from 0 to 9. Thus, the higher the score of an individual on the SVO scale, the stronger their prosocial orientation (vs. proself orientation).

### **2.3. STUDY OF TRANSLATION TO TURKISH LANGUAGE**

Because CSR and OCB scales are in Turkish there was no requirement to do any translation study for these two scales. Since SVO questionnaire (Triple Dominance Measure) is numeral, it is universal.

### **2.4. FINDINGS**

#### **2.4.1. Reliability Analysis Findings**

According to the reliability analysis, cronbach's  $\alpha$  alpha was found .86 for OCB and .93 for general CSR. Because the study also aims to measure whether there is a significant effect of each CSR dimension on OCB, the reliability of each CSR dimension were computed. So, Cronbach's  $\alpha$  for 5-item CSR to employees was computed as .886, for 3-item CSR to customers as .808, for 2-item CSR to society as .863, for 2-item CSR to government as .857, for 2-item CSR to natural environment as .834, for 2-item CSR to next generation as .785, and for 2-item CSR to NGOs as .910. This demonstrates that the internal consistency for OCB is reliable and internal consistency for General CSR is strong. Also it is mostly reliable and at least

acceptable for each one of the CSR dimensions. Reliabilities also can be seen in parantheses in Table 1 which also shows means, standard deviations and correlations.

## **2.4.2. Hypothesis Testing Results**

### **2.4.2.1. Test of Hypothesis 1**

For the first hypothesis (H1), the relationship between general CSR and OCB was examined independent of the SVO effect. The result showed that the general CSR has positive and statistically significant effect on OCB. According to the result, H1 was supported.

For H1,

General CSR explains 20% of the variance of OCB ( $R\text{-square} = .201 = 20.1\%$ ). Within the table,  $p < .05$  and  $F(1,153)=38.6$  denote a sufficiently large F-value which shows that the variance between the means of the groups are significantly different. Because the F-test result is significant, coefficients can be analyzed. The table demonstrates that the general CSR has positive (unstandardized  $\beta = .31$ ) and statistically significant ( $p < .001$ ) effect on OCB. If it is explained in more detail,  $(OCB) = 2.88 + .31(\text{General CSR})$  shows that the employees' citizenship behavior at the organization is estimated to be .31 higher for an organization with one more level of perceived CSR. Without no CSR, OCB is 2.9 (the slope is equal to 2.9). Because the p-value of the general CSR is smaller than .001 ( $p = .000$ ), this positive effect of the general CSR on OCB is statistically significant (see Table 2).

I also examined the relationships between each one of the CSR dimensions and OCB in a separate model. The results showed that merely the CSR to employees has a statistically significant effect on OCB. So, H1a was supported.

CSR to employees, CSR to customers, CSR to society, CSR to government, CSR to natural environment, CSR to next generation, and CSR to NGOs taken together explain 24% of the variance of OCB ( $R\text{-square} = .24 = 24\%$ ). Anova shows that  $F(7,147)=6.63$  and the p-value of the regression is smaller than .05 ( $p < .05$ ). It means that at least one population mean is significantly different. Because the F-test result is significant for CSR dimensions together, the coefficients can be used to



analyze each dimension alone. Based on this, the formula is  $(OCB) = 3 + .19(\text{CSR to employees}) + .1(\text{CSR to customers}) + .01(\text{CSR to society}) - .04(\text{CSR to government}) + .035(\text{CSR to natural environment}) - .005(\text{CSR to next generation}) + .003(\text{CSR to NGOs})$ . As noted previously CSR has positive and statistically significant effect on OCB, it can be recognized that CSR to employees dimension highly contributed to this effect.

For H1a,

CSR to employees has positive ( $B = .19$ ) and statistically significant ( $p < .001$ ) effect on OCB. If it is explained in more detail, the employees' citizenship behavior at the organization is estimated to be .19 higher for an organization with one more level of perceived CSR to employees. Because the p-value of the CSR to employees dimension is smaller than .001 ( $p = .000$ ), this positive effect of CSR to employees on OCB is highly significant controlling for other CSR categories (CSR to customers, to society, to government, to natural environment, to next generation, to NGOs). Results also reveal that no other CSR categories predict OCB.

For H1b,

When the SPSS output is analyzed, it can be seen that the employees' citizenship behavior at the organization is estimated to be .1 higher for an organization with one more level of perceived CSR to customers. However, because the p-value of the CSR to customers is higher than .05 ( $p = .16$ ), this effect is not significant. So, it is clear that CSR to customers has a positive ( $B = .1$ ) but not significant ( $p > .05$ ) effect on OCB.

For H1c,

The coefficient demonstrates that the employees' citizenship behavior at the organization is estimated to be .01 higher for an organization with one more level of perceived CSR to society. However, the p-value of the CSR to society is higher than .05 ( $p = .86$ ), thus, this effect is not significant. So, CSR to society has a positive ( $B = .01$ ) but not significant ( $p > .05$ ) effect on OCB.

**Table 1:** Descriptive Statistics, Correlation Matrix, and Reliabilities

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Gender	.50	.50	-										
2. Corporate Social Responsibility	3.82	.65	.04	(.93)									
3. Organizational Citizenship Behavior	4.06	.45	-.06	.45**	(.86)								
4. Social Value Orientation	5.27	3.56	-.05	.08	.08	(-)							
5. CSR to Employees	3.34	.84	-.08	.83**	.47**	.12	(.89)						
6. CSR to Customers	4.20	.73	.12	.79**	.35**	.03	.54**	(.81)					
7. CSR to Society	4.08	.81	.07	.78**	.32**	-.02	.51**	.61**	(.86)				
8. CSR to Government	4.36	.86	.08	.55**	.15	.02	.28**	.61**	.33**	(.86)			
9. CSR to Natural Environment	3.91	.77	.02	.74**	.29**	.12	.46**	.46**	.64**	.35**	(.83)		
10. CSR to Next Generation	3.72	.95	.04	.84**	.34**	.09	.63**	.59**	.56**	.47**	.649**	(.78)	
11. CSR to NGOs	3.65	.99	.07	.75**	.32**	-.002	.57**	.44**	.67**	.11	.626**	.59**	(.91)

*Note:* \*\* $p < 0.01$

**Table 2:** The Effect of CSR on OCB (Regression Analysis Result of H1)

	Unstandardized B	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
Constant	2.876		14.811	.000
General CSR	.311	.449	6.213	.000
R Square			.201	
Adjusted R Square			.196	
F			38.596	
Sig.			.000	

For H1d,

The coefficient demonstrates that the employees' citizenship behavior at the organization is estimated to be .04 lower ( $B = -.04$ ) for an organization with one more level of perceived CSR to government. However, the p-value of the CSR to government is higher than .05 ( $p = .43$ ), thus, this effect is not significant. So, CSR to government has a negative and not significant effect on OCB.

For H1e,

The coefficient demonstrates that the employees' citizenship behavior at the organization is estimated to be .035 higher for an organization with one more level of perceived CSR to natural environment. However, because the p-value of the CSR to natural environment is higher than .05 ( $p = .58$ ), this positive effect is not significant. So it is clear that CSR to natural environment has a positive ( $B = .035$ ) but not significant ( $p > .05$ ) effect on OCB.

For H1f,

The coefficient demonstrates that the employees' citizenship behavior at the organization is estimated to be .005 lower for an organization with one more level of perceived CSR to next generation. However, because the p-value of the CSR to next generation is higher than .05 ( $p = .92$ ), it is not significant. Thus, CSR to next generation has a negative ( $B = -.005$ ) and not significant ( $p > .05$ ) effect on OCB.

For H1g,

The coefficient demonstrates that the employees' citizenship behavior at the organization is estimated to be .003 higher for an organization with one more level of perceived CSR to NGOs. However, the p-value of the CSR to NGOs is higher than .05 ( $p = .95$ ), thus, it is not significant. So, CSR to NGOs has a positive ( $B = .003$ ) but not significant ( $p > .05$ ) effect on OCB.

#### **2.4.2.2. Test of Hypothesis 2**

For the second hypothesis (H2), the effect of the interaction between general CSR and SVO on OCB was examined. The result showed that the interaction between general CSR and SVO does not have a positive and statistically significant effect on OCB. According to the result, H2 was not supported.

For H2,

The interaction between general CSR and SVO explains 20.55% of the variance of OCB ( $R\text{-square} = .2055 = 20.55\%$ ).  $F(3,151)=13$  and  $p < .05$  are interpreted as the variance between the means of the groups are significantly different so that the p-value of the interaction can be analyzed. According to this, the p-value of the interaction is higher than .05 ( $p = .59$ ). It means that the effect of the interaction between general CSR and SVO on OCB is not statistically significant (see Table 3). As in hypothesis 1, I examined the interaction between SVO and each CSR category in separate analyses. These analyses failed to reveal significant interaction effects.

For H2a,

The interaction between CSR to employees and SVO explains 24% of the variance of OCB ( $R\text{-square} = .2413 = 24.13\%$ ).  $F(9,145)=5$  and  $p < .05$  are interpreted as the variance between the means of the groups are significantly different, thus, the interaction can be analyzed. According to this, the coefficient of the interaction is positive (.0007), however, the interaction is not significant ( $p > .05$ ). In other words, the positive effect of the interaction between CSR to employees and SVO on OCB is not statistically significant because the p-value of the interaction is higher than .05 ( $p = .95$ ). It should

**Table 3:** The Effect of the Interaction between CSR and SVO on OCB (Result of H2)

	Coefficients	t	p
Constant	4.0662	124.637	.000
SVO	.0059	.6366	.5254
General CSR	.3117	6.1360	.000
Interaction	-.0076	-.5357	.5930
R Square		.2055	
F		13.02	
p		.000	

be remembered that without the moderator (SVO), the relationship was statistically significant.

For H2b,

The interaction between CSR to customers and SVO explains 25.4% of the variance of OCB (R-square= .2538= 25.38%).  $F(9,145)=5.5$  and  $p < .05$ , thus, the variance between the means of the groups are significantly different. The p-value of the interaction is higher than .05 ( $p = .12$ ). Then, the effect of the interaction between CSR to customers and SVO on OCB is not statistically significant.

For H2c,

The interaction between CSR to society and SVO explains 24.2% of the variance of OCB (R-square= .2419= 24.19%).  $F(9,145)=5$  and  $p < .05$ , thus, the variance between the means of the groups are significantly different. Even though the coefficient of the interaction is equal to .004, the p-value of the interaction is equal to .7 ( $p > .05$ ). Then, the effect of the interaction between CSR to society and SVO on OCB is positive but this effect is not statistically significant.

For H2d,

The interaction between CSR to government and SVO explains 24.4% of the variance of OCB (R-square= .2441= 24.41%).  $F(9,145)=5.2$  and  $p < .05$  mean the variance between the means of the groups are significantly different. The p-value of

the interaction is higher than .05 ( $p = .5$ ). Then, the effect of the interaction between CSR to government and SVO on OCB is not statistically significant.

For H2e,

Result shows that the interaction between CSR to natural environment and SVO explains 24% of the variance of OCB ( $R\text{-square} = 0.2413 = 24.13\%$ ).  $F(9,145) = 5.1$  and  $p < .05$ , thus, the variance between the means of the groups are significantly different. When the model is analyzed, it can be seen that the p-value of the interaction is higher than .05 ( $p = .96$ ). Then, the effect of the interaction between CSR to natural environment and SVO on OCB is not statistically significant.

For H2f,

The interaction between CSR to next generation and SVO explains 25.5% of the variance of OCB ( $R\text{-square} = .2546 = 25.46\%$ ).  $F(9,145) = 5.5$  and  $p < .05$  show the variance between the means of the groups are significantly different. However, the p-value of the interaction is higher than .05 ( $p = .11$ ). Then, the interaction between CSR to next generation and SVO does not have a statistically significant effect on OCB.

For H2g,

According to the model summary, the interaction between CSR to NGOs and SVO explains 25% of the variance of OCB ( $R\text{-square} = .2473 = 24.73\%$ ).  $F(9,145) = 5.3$  and  $p < .05$ , thus, the variance between the means of the groups are significantly different. The p-value of the interaction is higher than 0.05 ( $p = .28$ ), then, the effect of the interaction between CSR to NGOs and SVO on OCB is not statistically significant.

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Within this study, the effect of CSR on OCB was examined by the moderator SVO and independent from it for different sectors in Turkey. The first hypothesis was developed to measure the effect of CSR on OCB. The second hypothesis was developed to discover whether the SVO of the employees has an effect on this relationship. In other words, as developing the second hypothesis, it was expected the relationship will be positively affected if the employee's orientation is prosocial rather than proself (competitive or individualistic).

Within the study, also it was aimed to measure whether each one of the seven CSR dimensions alone has a positive effect on OCB. Sub-level hypotheses of both H1 and H2 were developed to understand that which CSR dimensions has a significant positive effect on OCB both in interaction with SVO and independent from it.

Analyzing the dimensions of CSR expanded the study which already has a wide content. Considering even the studies about the single relationship between CSR and OCB is limited, this study has a prominent place in the literature as it both analyzed the moderator effect of SVO and the effect of each CSR dimension.

The result of H1 test showed that the general CSR has positive and statistically significant effect on OCB. As expected, the result not only confirmed the first hypothesis but also the previous literature.

Except that, when the sub-level hypotheses of H1 were analyzed (when the effect of each CSR dimension on OCB was analyzed), it was recognized that CSR to employees is the most contributing dimension in achieving the first main hypothesis result as CSR to employees dimension has a positive and statistically significant effect on OCB. So, it is obvious that when the employees perceive their firm as strong in 'CSR to employees', in other words, if their organization's CSR has a direct relation to themselves, they demonstrate more OCB. If their firm cares its employees and supports them with their career, private life, general well being, and provide opportunities, employees' citizenship behaviors increase. The firms which increase CSR programmes for employees, for example, support employees who want to acquire education, encourage them to develop their skills and careers, offer

flexible policies to help them have a work-private life balance (child-care leave, limitation on overtime work), consider and respect to their needs and wants, and try to make fair decisions related with them will be able to take advantage of higher OCB. Firms should recognize that their employees can be very important competitive advantage for them. They should make employees feel that their organization cares them. In organizations which recognize it the sense of belonging will be higher and they can create loyal and productive employees that way.

The result of H2 test showed that the interaction between general CSR and SVO does not have a positive and statistically significant effect on OCB. When the sub-level hypotheses of H2 were analyzed (when the effect of the interaction between each one of the CSR dimensions and SVO together on OCB was analyzed), again, the result couldn't reach any significant effect. It can be said that SVO made no significant difference. Results show that regardless of their SVO, employees demonstrate OCB behaviors in a socially responsible organization. Whether they are prosocial or proself, this general increase in the employees' OCB shows the importance of a socially responsible firm.

CSR efforts of the organizations enable them to create the employee type that they want to have. The organizations that have socially responsible endeavors will be able to make their members the employees who demonstrate citizenship behaviors and these employees carry their organization further. Especially, when the employees know that their organization cares about themselves they demonstrate higher citizenship behaviors. Thus, 'CSR to employees' dimension has a significant positive effect on citizenship behaviors. In today's business world, some firms disregard this most important dimension of CSR.

To date, no research has been done based on these three variables together. Since even the studies which only measure CSR and OCB relationship are very few, there is limited resource. More study within this area, especially as the master's and doctoral thesis, is required. This research also has an importance in terms of finding that which CSR dimension has a significant effect. While the firms trying to escape from the costs, they tend to ignore the gainings they receive from investing in their employees. It may cost much for the firms, however, they should be aware that the return from the employees which increases productivity is worth for it.



Firm should see its employees as the individuals who have different type of needs which are discussed within Maslow's hierarchy of needs. More than the employee's prestige need should be met by a successful organization. A firm should know that it cannot reach its full potential in productivity if it doesn't care the self-actualization needs of its employees who spend most of their times at work. These self-actualization needs of employees can only be met if the organization cares the dimension of CSR to employees. For example, encouraging employees both for professional and personal growth and make it continuous with its company policy help an organization and its employees to reach their potential. Providing its employees with extra education or organizing creativity-enhancing workshops or duties all help an organization to benefit the things the employee is capable of. Positively affecting its employee's life is not a one-sided benefit because when the employees cannot reach their potential, organization also cannot reach its own potential. According to Right Management's career development study, today a good career management alone provides employees with becoming fifty per cent more productive. An organization which provides its employees with opportunities to grow achieves success. These opportunities enclose, at its simplest, from being an organization which has policies that support gender equality to being an organization which knows that each employee is unique and thus, practicing specific growth methods for them as making each employee feel that s/he is a valued member of the company.

According to Organ et al. (2006: 134), OCB perception differs according to the cultural contexts. Because the data of this study merely was collected in Turkey, the statistical findings of it are not universal. However, the study comprises a variety of different sectors and this increases the generalizability of the results.

In the future, it would be fruitful if this study can be conducted in other countries. Different methods might be thought and developed to collect data from the firms. Prosocial-oriented employees maybe accepted to response the questionnaire more. This might decrease the heterogeneity of the SVO data. This might neutralizes the effect of SVO variable. Instead of individuals' responses to the OCB questionnaire for themselves, a different process also can be preferred, because a person may not be really objective about herself. As individuals try to show their

positive sides, employees might tend to response the questionnaire not very honestly. So, especially there may be employees who don't answer the SVO survey realistically. If it is possible, more demographic data can be demanded. As collecting data, women and men might be tried to achieve equal in number. In further studies, also CSR questionnaire might be improved more as putting extra dimensions such as 'CSR to competitors' if necessary, or the questions of some CSR dimensions might be increased in number for the purpose of adding new dissimilar questions if it is proper statistically. Also it might be beneficial to examine which OCB dimension CSR affects more. Another point is that the SVO survey should be comprehended well by the respondents (for example if the numbers on the survey represent examination marks instead of money, it makes difference) or the SVO data loses its explanation power.

This research tried to understand whether the perceived social responsibility of the companies has a contribution to create better employees who demonstrate citizenship behaviors. Results showed that CSR has a significant positive effect on OCB but this relationship is not significantly affected by the employee's value orientation. Results also showed 'CSR to employees' dimension has a significant positive effect on OCB. Thus, companies' CSR endeavors which directly purpose employees make significant difference. The study also discusses why CSR affects OCB referring some actors such as organizational reputation, construed external image, organizational identification, organizational commitment, and value congruence. Because previous researches generally do not look into how or why CSR affects OCB, it was important to mention about these concepts to enrich the relationship.

In the light of this information, this research also tried to make the notion of corporate social responsibility become and perceived as a more important and serious concept for the organizations. The findings both will contribute to literature and the private sector because they are remarkable to make CSR a concept which should be given more weight by the organizations.

Today, it is possible to enable people to understand the importance of the concept of CSR better through researches on this subject. These researches have a capability of strengthening the awareness of people. Moreover, the studies which

examine the dimensions of CSR in more detail are required. For example, within this research, on the basis of each CSR dimension, it can be seen that some CSR dimensions alone has a positive but not significant effect on OCB. The dimensions of CSR to customers, CSR to natural environment, CSR to society, and CSR to NGOs each positively affects the citizenship behaviors of the employees, however, their effects are not significant. So, it could be better to increase in importance of these dimensions in the eye of the employees. The concept of general CSR already has positive and significant effect on the citizenship behaviors of the employees, and CSR to employees dimension alone has positive and significant effect on OCB, however, the perceived importance of each CSR dimension which positively affects OCB should be increased until the effects of each one of these dimensions become significant. So, CSR dimensions which alone has positive but not significant effect on OCB should be subject to the future studies according to their effect orders. As CSR to customers dimension came second in the general effect order within this research, it would be appropriate and related to do the next study as giving weight on especially this dimension.

## REFERENCES

- Aguilera, R.V., Rupp, D. E., Williams, C. A., and Ganapathi, J. (2007) Putting the S Back in Corporate Social Responsibility: A Multilevel Theory of Social Change in Organizations. *The Academy of Management Review*. 32(3): 836–863.
- Aguinis, H., and Glavas, A. (2019). On Corporate Social Responsibility, Sensemaking, and the Search for Meaningfulness Through Work. *Journal of Management*. 45(3): 1057-1086.
- Ahmed, I., and Nawaz, M. M. (2015). Antecedents and Outcomes of Perceived Organizational Support: A Literature Survey Approach. *Journal of Management Development*. 34(7): 867-880.
- Akturan, A., and Sevik, N. (2016). The Effect of Corporation Reputation on Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. *International Journal of Commerce and Finance*. 2(1): 113-123.
- Au, W. T., and Kwong, J. Y. Y. (2004). Measurements and Effects of Social-Value Orientation in Social Dilemmas: A Review. *Contemporary Psychological Research on Social Dilemmas* (pp. 71-98). Editors Ramzi Suleiman, David V. Budescu, Ilan Fischer, and David M. Messick. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bachrach, D.G., Powell, B.C., and Bendoly, E. (2004). Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Performance Evaluations: The Impact of Task Interdependence. Academy of Management Annual Meeting Proceedings (pp. A1-A6), The Academy of Management. New Orleans, Louisiana. August 6-11, 2004.
- Barakat, S.R., Isabella, G., Boaventura, J.M.G., and Mazzon, J.A. (2016). The Influence of Corporate Social Responsibility on Employee Satisfaction. *Management Decision*. 54(9): 2325-2339.
- Barnard, C. I. (1938). *The Functions of the Executive*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bartel, C. A. (2001). Social Comparisons in Boundary-Spanning Work: Effects of Community Outreach on Members' Organizational Identity and Identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 46(3): 379–413.

Basım, H. N., and Şeşen, H. (2006). Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı Ölçeği Uyarlama ve Karşılaştırma Çalışması. *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi*. 61(4): 83-101.

Basil, D.Z., and Weber, D. (2006). Values Motivation and Concern For Appearances: The Effect of Personality Traits on Responses to Corporate Social Responsibility. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*. 11(1): 61–72.

Bateman, T. S., and 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.

Bauman, C. W., and Skitka, L. J. (2012). Corporate Social Responsibility as a Source of Employee Satisfaction. *Research in Organizational Behavior*. 32(1): 63 - 86.

Bay, E., and Küskü Akdoğan, F. (2012). Sorumluluk Mu, Karlılık Mı? İsteğe Bağlı Kurumsal Sosyal Sorumluluk Faaliyetleri. *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*. 45(1): 51-75.

Bay, E. (2006). *İsteğe Bağlı Kurumsal Sosyal Sorumluluk Bileşeninin Türkiye Kapsamında İncelenmesi*. (Unpublished Master’s Thesis). İstanbul: İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü.

Beauregard, T. A. (2012). Perfectionism, Self-Efficacy and OCB: The Moderating Role of Gender. *Personnel Review*. 41(5): 590-608.

Bergami, M., and Bagozzi, R.P. (2000). Self-Categorization, Affective Commitment and Group Self-Esteem as Distinct Aspects of Social Identity in the Organization. *British Journal of Social Psychology*. 39(4): 555-577.

Bogaert, S., Boone, C., and Declerck, C. (2008). Social Value Orientation and Cooperation in Social Dilemmas: A Review and Conceptual Model. *British Journal of Social Psychology*. 47(3): 453–480.

- Bogaert, S., Boone, C., and Van Witteloostuijn, A. (2012). Social Value Orientation and Climate Strength as Moderators of the Impact of Work Group Cooperative Climate on Affective Commitment. *Journal of Management Studies*. 49(5): 918-944.
- Bommer, W. H., Miles, E. W., and Grover, S. L. (2003). Does One Good Turn Deserve Another? Coworker Influences on Employee Citizenship. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 24(2): 181-196.
- Bowen, H. R. (1953). Social Responsibilities of the Businessman. New York: Harper&Row.
- Brammer, S., Millington, A., and Rayton, B. (2007). The Contribution of Corporate Social Responsibility to Organizational Commitment. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 18(10): 1701-1719.
- Brief, A.P., and Motowidlo, S.J. (1986). Prosocial Organizational Behaviors. *The Academy of Management Review*. 11(4): 710-725.
- Cable D.M., and Turban D.B. (2003). The Value of Organizational Reputation in the Recruitment Context: A Brand-Equity Perspective. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*. 33(11): 2244-2266.
- Carmeli, A., Gilat, G., and Weisberg, J. (2006). Perceived External Prestige, Organizational Identification and Affective Commitment: A Stakeholder Approach. *Corporate Reputation Review*. 9(2): 92–104.
- Carroll, A. B. (1979). A Three-Dimensional Conceptual Model of Corporate Performance. *Academy of Management Review*. 4(4): 497-505.
- Carroll, A. B. (1991). The Pyramid of Corporate Social Responsibility: Toward the Moral Management of Organizational Stakeholders. *Business Horizons*. 34(4): 39–48.
- Chaudhary, R. (2017). Corporate Social Responsibility and Employee Engagement: Can CSR Help in Redressing the Engagement Gap?. *Social Responsibility Journal*. 13(2): 323-338.

Chen, C.H.V., and Kao, R.H. (2011). A Multilevel Study on the Relationships Between Work Characteristics, Self- Efficacy, Collective Efficacy, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Case of Taiwanese Police Duty-Executing Organizations. *The Journal of Psychology*. 145(4): 361-390.

Cheney, G. (1983b). On the Various and Changing Meanings of Organizational Membership: A Field Study of Organizational Identification. *Communication Monographs*. 50(4): 342–362.

Chernyak-Hai, L., and Tziner, A. (2012). Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: Socio-Psychological Antecedents and Consequences. *Revue Internationale de Psychologie Sociale*. 3(25): 53-92.

Chiang, C.F., and Hsieh, T.S. (2012). The Impacts of Perceived Organizational Support and Psychological Empowerment on Job Performance: The Mediating Effects of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*. 31(1): 180–190.

Cialdini, R. B., Borden, R. J., Thorne, A., Walker, M. R., Freeman, S., and Sloan, L. R. (1976). Basking in Reflected Glory: Three (Football) Field Studies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 34(3): 366-375.

Cohen, A., and Avrahami, A. (2006). The Relationship between Individualism, Collectivism, the Perception of Justice, Demographic Characteristics and Organisational Citizenship Behaviour. *The Service Industries Journal*. 26(8): 889–901.

Cohen-Charash, Y., and Spector, P.E. (2001). The Role of Justice in Organizations: A Meta-Analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*. 86(2): 278–321.

Davis, K. (1960). Can Business Afford to Ignore Social Responsibilities?. *California Management Review*. 2(3): 70-76.

De Cremer, D., and Van Lange, P.A.M. (2001). Why Prosocials Exhibit Greater Cooperation Than Proselfs: The Roles of Social Responsibility and Reciprocity. *European Journal of Personality*. 15(S1): S5-S18.

De León, M.C., and Finkelstein, M.A. (2011). Individualism/collectivism and organizational citizenship behavior. *Psicothema*. 23(3): 401-406.

Deluga, R.J. (1995). The Relation Between Trust in the Supervisor and Subordinate Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Military Psychology*. 7(1):1-16.

Desivilya, H.S., Sabag, Y., and Ashton, E. (2006). Prosocial Tendencies in Organizations: The Role of Attachment Styles and Organizational Justice in Shaping Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*. 14(1): 22-42.

Dukerich, J.M., Golden, B.R., and Shortell, S.M. (2002). Beauty is in the Eye of the Beholder: The Impact of Organizational Identification, Identity, and Image on the Cooperative Behaviors of Physicians. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 47(3): 507–533.

Dutton, J.E., and Dukerich, J.M. (1991). Keeping an Eye on the Mirror: Image and Identity in Organizational Adaptation. *The Academy of Management Journal*. 34(3): 517-554.

Dutton, J.E., Dukerich J.M., and Harquail C.V. (1994). Organizational Images and Member Identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 39(2): 239-263.

Eisenberger, R., Karagonlar, G., Stinglhamber, F., Neves, P., Becker, T. E., Gonzalez-Morales, M. G., and Steiger-Mueller, M. (2010). Leader-Member Exchange and Affective Organizational Commitment: The Contribution of Supervisor's Organizational Embodiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 95(6): 1085-1103.

Ellis, A. D. (2008). *The Impact of Corporate Social Responsibility on Employee Attitudes and Behaviors* (Doctoral Dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations Publishing. UMI Number: 3311747.



Erhemjamts, O., Li, Q., and Venkateswaran, A. (2013). Corporate Social Responsibility and Its Impact on Firms' Investment Policy, Organizational Structure, and Performance. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 118(2): 395-412.

Evans, W.R., and Davis, W. (2014). Corporate Citizenship and the Employee: An Organizational Identification Perspective. *Human Performance*. 27(2): 129-146.

Folger, R. (1998). Fairness as a Moral Virtue. *Managerial Ethics: Moral Management of People and Processes* (pp. 13–34). Editor Marshall Schminke. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Fombrun, C., and Shanley, M. (1990). What's in a Name? Reputation Building and Corporate Strategy. *Academy of Management Journal*. 33(2): 233-258.

Friedman, M. (13.09.1970). The Social Responsibility of Business is to Increase Its Profits. *The New York Times*. pp. 33, 122–124. <http://graphics8.nytimes.com/packages/pdf/business/miltonfriedman1970.pdf> , (10.08.2018).

Friedman, M. (1962). *Capitalism and Freedom*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Ganesh, M.P., and Gupta, M. (2006). Study of Virtualness, Task Interdependence, Extra-Role Performance and Team Climate in Indian Software Development Teams. Proceedings of the 20th Australian New Zealand Academy of Management (ANZAM) Conference on “Management: Pragmatism, Philosophy, Priorities” (pp. 1-19), Central Queensland University. Rockhampton. December 6-9, 2006.

Ganesh, M.P., and Gupta, M. (2010). Impact of Virtualness and Task Interdependence on Extra-Role Performance in Software Development Teams. *Team Performance Management: An International Journal*. 16(3/4): 169-186.

Gao, Y., and He, W. (2017). Corporate Social Responsibility and Employee Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Pivotal Roles of Ethical Leadership and Organizational Justice. *Management Decision*. 55(2): 294-309.

George, W.W., and Van de Ven, A.H. (2001). Medtronic's Chairman William George on How Mission-Driven Companies Create Long-Term Shareholder Value. *The Academy of Management Executive*. 15(4): 39-47.

Glavas, A., and Piderit, S. K. (2009). How Does Doing Good Matter? Effects of Corporate Citizenship on Employees. *The Journal of Corporate Citizenship*. 2009(36): 51-70.

Greening, D.W., and Turban, D.B. (2000). Corporate Social Performance As A Competitive Advantage In Attracting A Quality Workforce. *Business and Society*. 39(3): 254-280.

Hertel, G., and Fiedler, K. (1994). Affective and Cognitive Influences in a Social Dilemma Game. *European Journal of Social Psychology*. 24(1): 131-145.

Hertel, G., and Fiedler, K. (1998). Fair and Dependent Versus Egoistic and Free: Effects of Semantic and Evaluative Priming on the 'Ring Measure of Social Values'. *European Journal of Social Psychology*. 28(1): 49-70.

Hopkins, M. (2003). *The Planetary Bargain: Corporate Social Responsibility Matters*. London: Earthscan.

Jiao, C., Richards, D.A., and Zhang, K. (2011). Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: OCB-Specific Meanings as Mediators. *Journal of Business and Psychology*. 26(1): 11-25.

Johnson, D.W., and Johnson, R.T. (1974). Instructional Goal Structure: Cooperative, Competitive, or Individualistic. *Review of Educational Research*. 44(2): 213-240.

Joireman, J.A., Van Lange, P.A.M., Van Vugt, M., Wood, A., Vander Leest, T., and Lambert, C. (2001). Structural Solutions to Social Dilemmas: A Field Study on Commuters' Willingness to Fund Improvements in Public Transit. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*. 31(3): 504-526.

Jones, D. A., Willness, C. R., and Heller, K. W. (2016). Illuminating the Signals Job Seekers Receive From an Employer's Community Involvement and Environmental

Sustainability Practices: Insights Into Why Most Job Seekers Are Attracted, Others Are Indifferent, and A Few Are Repelled. *Frontiers in Psychology*. 7: 1-16.

Katz, D. (1964). The Motivational Basis of Organizational Behavior. *Behavioral Science*. 9(2): 131-146.

Kelley, H. H., and Stahelski, A. J. (1970a). Social Interaction Basis of Cooperators' and Competitors' Beliefs About Others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 16(1): 66-91.

Kerse, G., and Seçkin, Z. (2017). Kurumsal Sosyal Sorumluluk Algısının Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışına Etkisi: İmalat Sektörü Çalışanları Üzerinde Ampirik Bir Araştırma. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*. 22(3): 839-853.

Kramer, R. M., McClintock, C. G., and Messick, D. M. (1986). Social Values and Cooperative Response to a Simulated Resource Conservation Crisis. *Journal of Personality*. 54(3): 576-592.

Kuhlman, D. M., and Marshello, A. F. (1975). Individual Differences in Game Motivation as Moderators of Preprogrammed Strategy Effects in Prisoner's Dilemma. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 32(5): 922-931.

Leung, W.M. (2013). The Effect of Value Congruence on Work Related Attitudes and Behaviors. (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Chattanooga, Tennessee: University of Tennessee at Chattanooga.

Liebrand, W. B. G. (1984). The Effect of Social Motives, Communication and Group Size on Behaviour in an N-Person Multi-Stage Mixed-Motive Game. *European Journal of Social Psychology*. 14(3): 239-264.

Liebrand, W. B. G., Jansen, R. W. T. L., Rijken, V. M., and Suhre, C. J. M. (1986). Might over Morality: Social Values and the Perception of Other Players in Experimental Games. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*. 22(3): 203-215.

- Maden, C., Arkan, E., Telci, E.E., and Kantur, D. (2012). Linking Corporate Social Responsibility to Corporate Reputation: A Study on Understanding Behavioral Consequences. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 58: 655-664.
- Mael, F. A., and Ashforth, B. E. (1995). Loyal From Day One: Biodata, Organizational Identification, and Turnover among Newcomers. *Personnel Psychology*. 48(2): 309-333.
- Mael, F., and Ashforth, B.E. (1992). Alumni and Their Alma Mater: A Partial Test of the Reformulated Model of Organizational Identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 13(2): 103-123.
- Maslow, A.H. (1943). A Theory of Human Motivation. *Psychological Review*. 50(4): 370-396.
- McClintock, C. G. (1972). Social Motivation: A Set of Propositions. *Behavioural Science*. 17(5): 438-454.
- McClintock, C. G. (1978). Social Values: Their Definition, Measurement, and Development. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*. 12(1): 121-137.
- McWilliams, A., and Siegel, D. (2000). Corporate Social Responsibility and Financial Performance: Correlation or Misspecification?. *Strategic Management Journal*. 21(5): 603-609.
- McWilliams, A., and Siegel, D. (2001). Corporate Social Responsibility: A Theory of the Firm Perspective. *The Academy of Management Review*. 26(1): 117-127.
- Messick, D.M., and McClintock, C.G. (1968). Motivational Bases of Choice in Experimental Games. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*. 4(1): 1-25.
- Messick, D.M., Wilke, H., Brewer, M.B., Kramer, R.M., Zemke, P.E., and Lui, L. (1983). Individual Adaptations and Structural Change as Solutions to Social Dilemmas. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 44(2): 294-309.

Meyer, J. P., and Allen, N. J. (1984). Testing the “Side-Bet Theory” of Organizational Commitment: Some Methodological Considerations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 69(3): 372-378.

Meyer, J.P., and Allen, N.J. (1991). A Three-Component Conceptualization of Organizational Commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*. 1(1): 61-89.

Moore, L.L., de Silva, I., and Hartmann, S. (2012). An Investigation into the Financial Return on Corporate Social Responsibility in the Apparel Industry. *The Journal of Corporate Citizenship*. (45): 105-122.

Morrison, E.W. (1994). Role Definitions and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Importance of the Employee's Perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*. 37(6): 1543-1567.

Mowday, R.T., Porter, L.W., and Steers, R.M. (1982). *Employee-Organization Linkages: The Psychology of Commitment, Absenteeism, and Turnover*. New York: Academic Press.

Mowday, R.T., Steers, R.M., and Porter, L.W. (1979). The Measurement of Organizational Commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 14(2): 224-247.

Murphy, R. O., Ackermann, K. A., and Handgraaf, M. J. J. (2011). Measuring Social Value Orientation. *Judgment and Decision Making*. 6(8): 771–781.

Nauta, A., De Dreu, C. K. W., and Van der Vaart, T. (2002). Social Value Orientation, Organizational Goal Concerns and Interdepartmental Problem-Solving Behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 23 (2): 199–213.

Ng, T.W.H., and Feldman, D.C. (2010). Organizational Tenure and Job Performance. *Journal of Management*. 36(5): 1220-1250.

Ojo, A.A.E. (2017). Organizational Justice and Self-Esteem as Predictors of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. *IFE Psychologia: An International Journal*. 25(2): 32–46.

Oo, E.Y., Jung, H., and Park, I.-J. (2018). Psychological Factors Linking Perceived CSR to OCB: The Role of Organizational Pride, Collectivism, and Person–Organization Fit. *Sustainability*. 10(7): 1-16.

O'Reilly, C. A., and Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational Commitment and Psychological Attachment: The Effects of Compliance, Identification, and Internalization on Prosocial Behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 71(3): 492-499.

Organ, D. W. (1988a). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome*. Lexington: Lexington Books.

Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: It's Construct Clean-Up Time. *Human Performance*. 10(2): 85–97.

Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., and MacKenzie, S. B. (2006). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature, Antecedents, and Consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Organ, D.W., and Ryan, K. (1995). A Meta-Analytic Review of Attitudinal and Dispositional Predictors of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Personnel Psychology*. 48(4): 775-802.

Perreira, T., and Berta, W. (2015). Increasing OCB: The Influence of Commitment, Organizational Support and Justice. *Strategic HR Review*. 14(1/2): 13-21.

Peterson, D.K. (2004). The Relationship Between Perceptions of Corporate Citizenship and Organizational Commitment. *Business and Society*. 43(3): 296-319.

Petrella, M.V. (2013). The Effects of Trust on Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A Meta-Analysis. (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Richmond: Graduate School of Eastern Kentucky University.

Popovich, P., and Wanous, J. P. (1982). The Realistic Job Preview as Persuasive Communication. *The Academy of Management Review*. 7 (4): 570–578.

Porter, M.E., and Kramer, M.R. (2006). Strategy and Society: The Link Between Competitive Advantage and Corporate Social Responsibility. *Harvard Business Review*. 84(12): 78-92.

Pratt, M. G. (1998). To Be or Not To Be: Central Questions in Organizational Identification. *Identity in Organizations: Building Theory through Conversations* (pp. 171-207). Editors David A. Whetten and Paul C. Godfrey. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Pruitt, D. G. (1967). Reward Structure and Cooperation: The Decomposed Prisoner's Dilemma Game. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 7(1): 21-27.

Prutina, Ž. (2016). The Effect of Corporate Social Responsibility on Organizational Commitment. *Management*. 21(Special Issue): 227-248.

Randall, M.L., Cropanzano, R., Bormann, C.A., and Birjulin, A. (1999). Organizational Politics and Organizational Support as Predictors of Work Attitudes, Job Performance, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 20(2): 159–174.

Rifai, H. A. (2005). A Test of the Relationships Among Perceptions of Justice, Job Satisfaction, Affective Commitment and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Gadjah Mada International Journal of Business*. 7(2): 131-154.

Riketta, M. (2002). Attitudinal Organizational Commitment and Job Performance: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 23 (3): 257–266.

Rodrigo, P., and Arenas, D. (2008). Do Employees Care About CSR Programs? A Typology of Employees According to Their Attitudes. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 83(2): 265–283.

Roth, A. E. (1995b). Bargaining Experiments. *Handbook of Experimental Economics* (pp. 253–348). Editors John H. Kagel and Alvin E. Roth. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- Roudaki, J., and Arslan, M. (2017). Impact of Perceived CSR on Organizational Commitment: A Perspective of Service Employees. *Austin Journal of Business Administration and Management*. 1(3): 1-5.
- Rupp, D. E., Ganapathi, J., Aguilera, R. V., and Williams, C. A. (2006). Employee Reactions to Corporate Social Responsibility: An Organizational Justice Framework. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 27 (4): 537-543.
- Saepung, W., Sukirno, and Siengthai, S. (2011). The Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) in the Retail Industry in Indonesia. *World Review of Business Research*. 1(3): 162-178.
- Salehzadeh, R., Shahin, A., Kazemi, A., and Barzoki, A.S. (2015). Is Organizational Citizenship Behavior An Attractive Behavior For Managers? A Kano Model Approach. *Journal of Management Development*. 34(5): 601-620.
- Samuelson, C.D. (1993). A Multiattribute Evaluation Approach to Structural Change in Resource Dilemmas. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*. 55(2): 298–324.
- Schaarschmidt, M., Walsh, G., and Ivens, S. (2015). Perceived External Reputation as a Driver of Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Replication and Extension. *Corporate Reputation Review*. 18(4): 314-336.
- Schappe, S.P. (1998). The influence of Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, and Fairness Perceptions on Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *The Journal of Psychology*. 132(3): 277-290.
- Schneider, B. (1987). The People Make the Place. *Personnel Psychology*. 40(3): 437-453.
- Schwartz, M. S., and Carroll, A. B. (2003). Corporate Social Responsibility: A Three-Domain Approach. *Business Ethics Quarterly*. 13(4): 503–530.
- Seivwright, A.N., and Unsworth, K.L. (2016). Making Sense of Corporate Social Responsibility and Work. *Frontiers in Psychology*. 7: 1-8.



Shahzad, A., Siddiqui, M. A., and Zakaria, M. (2014). Linking Organizational Justice with Organization Citizenship Behaviors: Collectivism as Moderator. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences*. 8(3): 900-913.

Shim D.C., and Faerman S. (2017). Government Employees' Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Impacts of Public Service Motivation, Organizational Identification, and Subjective OCB Norms. *International Public Management Journal*. 20(4): 531-559.

Smeesters, D., Warlop, L., Van Avermaet, E., Corneille, O., and Yzerbyt, V. (2003). Do Not Prime Hawks With Doves: The Interplay of Construct Activation and Consistency of Social Value Orientation on Cooperative Behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 84(5): 972–987.

Smidts, A., Pruyn, A.T.H., and Van Riel, C.B.M. (2001). The Impact of Employee Communication and Perceived External Prestige on Organizational Identification. *The Academy of Management Journal*. 44 (5): 1051–1062.

Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., and Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature and Antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 68(4): 653-663.

Sontaite-Petkeviciene, M. (2015). CSR Reasons, Practices and Impact to Corporate Reputation. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 213: 503 – 508.

Stawiski, S., Deal, J. J., and Gentry, W. (2010). *Employee Perceptions of Corporate Social Responsibility: The Implications for Your Organization*. Retrieved from Center for Creative Leadership. QuickView Leadership Series. <https://www.ccl.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/EmployeePerceptionsCSR.pdf>, (11.08.2018).

Story, J., and Neves, P. (2015). When Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Increases Performance: Exploring the Role of Intrinsic and Extrinsic CSR Attribution. *Business Ethics: A European Review*. 24(2): 111-124.

- Tang, Z., Hull, C.E., and Rothenberg, S. (2012). How Corporate Social Responsibility Engagement Strategy Moderates the CSR–Financial Performance Relationship. *Journal of Management Studies*. 49(7): 1274-1303.
- Turban, D.B., and Greening, D.W. (1997). Corporate Social Performance and Organizational Attractiveness to Prospective Employees. *The Academy of Management Journal*. 40(3): 658-672.
- Türker, D. (2009a). Measuring Corporate Social Responsibility: A Scale Development Study. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 85(4): 411–427.
- Türker, D. (2009b). How Corporate Social Responsibility Influences Organizational Commitment. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 89(2): 189-204.
- Tyler, T.R., and Blader, S.L. (2000). *Cooperation in Groups: Procedural Justice, Social Identity, and Behavioral Engagement*. Philadelphia: Psychology Press.
- Ugwu, F.O., and Igbende, D.A. (2017). Going Beyond Borders: Work Centrality, Emotional Intelligence and Employee Optimism as Predictors of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Cogent Psychology*. 4(1): 1-10.
- Van Der Duijn Schouten, C.M., Graafland, J., and Kaptein, M. (2014). Religiosity, CSR Attitudes, and CSR Behavior: An Empirical Study of Executives' Religiosity and CSR. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 123(3): 437-459.
- Van Dijk, E., de Kwaadsteniet, E.W., and Koning, L. (2012). About Behaving (Un)ethically: Self-Interest, Deception, and Fairness. *Behavioral Business Ethics: Shaping an Emerging Field* (pp. 105-122). Editors David De Cremer and Ann E. Tenbrunsel. New York: Routledge.
- Van Dyne, L., Cummings, L. L., and McLean Parks, J. (1995). Extra-Role Behaviors: In Pursuit of Construct and Definitional Clarity (A Bridge Over Muddied Waters). *Research in Organizational Behavior*. 17: 215-285.
- Van Lange, P. A. M., and Kuhlman, D. M. (1994). Social Value Orientations and Impressions of Partner's Honesty and Intelligence: A Test of the Might Versus Morality Effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 67(1): 126-141.

- Van Lange, P. A. M., and Liebrand, W. B. G. (1991a). Social Value Orientation and Intelligence: A Test of the Goal Prescribes Rationality Principle. *European Journal of Social Psychology*. 21(4): 273–292.
- Van Lange, P. A. M. (1992). Confidence in Expectations: A Test of the Triangle Hypothesis. *European Journal of Personality*. 6(5): 371–379.
- Van Lange, P. A. M. (1999). The Pursuit of Joint Outcomes and Equality in Outcomes: An Integrative Model of Social Value Orientation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 77(2): 337–349.
- Van Lange, P. A. M., De Cremer, D., Van Dijk, E., and Van Vugt, M. (2007). Self-Interest and Beyond: Basic Principles of Social Interaction. *Social Psychology: Handbook of Basic Principles* (pp. 540-561). Editors Arie W. Kruglanski and E. Tory Higgins. New York: Guilford Press.
- Van Lange, P. A. M., Liebrand, W. B. G., and Kuhlman, D. M. (1990). Causal Attribution of Choice Behavior in Three N-Person Prisoner's Dilemmas. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*. 26(1): 34–48.
- Van Lange, P.A.M., and Semin-Goossens, A.(1998). The Boundaries of Reciprocal Cooperation. *European Journal of Social Psychology*. 28(5): 847-854.
- Vandewaa, E.A., and Turnipseed, D.L. (2012). Emotional Intelligence and Organizational Citizenship Behavior of University Professors. *The International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences*. 6(7): 1-12.
- Vitaliano, D.F. (2010). Corporate Social Responsibility and Labor Turnover. *Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business in Society*. 10(5): 563-573.
- Von Neumann, J., and Morgenstern, O. (1944). *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior*. New York: Wiley.
- Wade-Benzoni, K.A., Tenbrunsel, A.E., and Bazerman, M.H. (1996). Egocentric Interpretations of Fairness in Asymmetric, Environmental Social Dilemmas:

Explaining Harvesting Behavior and the Role of Communication. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*. 67(2): 111-126.

Wasti, S. A., (2002). Affective and Continuance Commitment to the Organization: Test of an Integrated Model in the Turkish Context. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*. 26(5): 525-550.

Wayne, S.J., Shore, L.M., Bommer, W.H., and Tetrick, L.E. (2002). The Role of Fair Treatment and Rewards in Perceptions of Organizational Support and Leader–Member Exchange. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 87(3): 590–598.

Weigelt, K., and Camerer, C. (1988). Reputation and Corporate Strategy: A Review of Recent Theory and Applications. *Strategic Management Journal*. 9(5): 443-454.

Werther Jr, W.B., and Chandler, D. (2006). *Strategic Corporate Social Responsibility: Stakeholders in a Global Environment*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Zheng, D. (2010). *The Impact of Employees' Perception of Corporate Social Responsibility on Job Attitudes and Behaviors: A Study in China*. (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Singapore: Singapore Management University.

Zhu, Y. (2013). Individual Behavior: In-role and Extra-role. *International Journal of Business Administration*. 4(1): 23-27.



# **APPENDICES**

## APPENDIX 1. CSR Questionnaire

Aşağıda yer alan ifadelere ne derece katıldığınızı belirten 1’den 5’e kadar olan kutucuklardan birini seçiniz. [1 = Hiç katılmıyorum, 5 = Tamamen katılıyorum]

	Hiç Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Fikrim Yok	Katılıyorum	Tamamen Katılıyorum
Şirketimiz, eğitim almak isteyen çalışanlarını destekler.	1	2	3	4	5
Şirketimiz çalışanların yeteneklerini ve kariyerlerini geliştirmelerini teşvik edici politikalara sahiptir.	1	2	3	4	5
Şirketimiz, çalışanların iş-özel yaşam dengesini kurmalarını sağlayan esnek politikalar uygular.	1	2	3	4	5
Şirketimiz, çalışanların istek ve ihtiyaçlarına önem veren bir yönetime sahiptir.	1	2	3	4	5
Yönetimin çalışanlar hakkında aldığı kararlar genellikle adildir.	1	2	3	4	5
Şirketimiz, ürün veya hizmetleri hakkında müşterilere tam ve doğru bilgi sunmaktadır.	1	2	3	4	5
Şirketimiz, tüketici hakları konusunda yasal düzenlemelerin ötesinde bir duyarlılığa sahiptir.	1	2	3	4	5
Şirketimiz müşteri memnuniyetine büyük önem verir.	1	2	3	4	5
Şirketimiz topluma yönelik sosyal sorumluluklarına büyük önem verir.	1	2	3	4	5
Şirketimiz topluma katkı sağlayacak organizasyon ve projelere katkı sağlamaya çalışmaktadır.	1	2	3	4	5
Şirketimiz, her zaman vergilerini zamanında ve eksiksiz öder.	1	2	3	4	5
Şirketimiz, devlete karşı yasal yükümlülüklerini zamanında ve eksiksiz yerine getirmeye önem verir.	1	2	3	4	5
Şirketimizde çevreye olan olumsuz etkileri azaltan çeşitli programlar uygulanmaktadır.	1	2	3	4	5
Şirketimiz doğal çevreyi korumaya ve geliştirmeye dönük faaliyetlere aktif olarak katılmaktadır.	1	2	3	4	5
Şirketimiz, gelecek nesilleri de gözetken bir sürdürülebilir büyümeyi hedefler.	1	2	3	4	5
Şirketimiz gelecek nesillere yönelik sosyal yatırımlar yapmaya çalışır.	1	2	3	4	5

Şirketimizde tüm çalışanların gönüllü çalışmalara ve hayır kurumu faaliyetlerine katılması teşvik edilir.	1	2	3	4	5
Şirketimiz değişik alanlarda çalışan dernek ve vakıfları, çeşitli yollarla teşvik eder.	1	2	3	4	5



## APPENDIX 2. OCB Questionnaire

[1 = Hiç katılmıyorum, 5 = Tamamen katılıyorum]

	Hiç Katılmıyo	Katılmıyoru m	Fikrim Yok	Katılıyorum	Tamamen Katılıyorum
Günlük izin alan bir çalışanın o günkü işlerini ben yaparım.	1	2	3	4	5
Aşırı iş yükü ile uğraşan bir şirket çalışanına yardım ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
Yeni işe başlayan birisinin işi öğrenmesine yardımcı olurum.	1	2	3	4	5
İşle ilgili problemlerde elimde bulunan malzemeleri diğerleri ile paylaşmaktan kaçınmam.	1	2	3	4	5
İş esnasında sorunla karşılaşan kişilere yardım etmek için gerekli zamanı ayırırım.	1	2	3	4	5
Zamanımın çoğunu işimle ilgili faaliyetlerle geçiririm.	1	2	3	4	5
Şirketim için olumlu imaj yaratacak tüm faaliyetlere katılmak isterim.	1	2	3	4	5
Mesai içerisinde kişisel işlerim için zaman harcamam.	1	2	3	4	5
Diğer çalışanların hak ve hukukuna saygı gösteririm.	1	2	3	4	5
Beklenmeyen problemler oluştuğunda diğer çalışanları zarar görmemeleri için uyarırım.	1	2	3	4	5
Birlikte görev yaptığım diğer kişiler için problem yaratmamaya gayret ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
Önemsiz sorunlar için şikayet ederek vaktimi boşa harcamam.	1	2	3	4	5
Mesai ortamı ile ilgili olarak problemlere odaklanmak yerine olayların pozitif yönünü görmeye çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5
Mesaide yaşadığım yeni durumlara karşı gücenme ya da kızgınlık duymam.	1	2	3	4	5
Şirket içinde çıkan çatışmaların çözülmesinde aktif rol alırım.	1	2	3	4	5
Üst yönetimce yayımlanan duyuru, mesaj, prosedür ya da kısa notları okurum ve ulaşabileceğim bir yerde bulundururum.	1	2	3	4	5
Şirketin sosyal faaliyetlerine kendi isteğimle	1	2	3	4	5



katılım.					
Şirket yapısında yapılan deęişimlere ayak uydururum.	1	2	3	4	5
Her türlü geliştirici faaliyet icra eden araştırma ve proje gruplarının içerisinde yer alırım.	1	2	3	4	5



### APPENDIX 3. Triple Dominance Measure

Bu bölümde kısaca “Diğer kişi” olarak isimlendirdiğimiz bir başka kişi ile kura ile eşleştiginizi düşünmenizi istiyoruz. Bu diğer kişi tanımadığınız ve gelecekte de karşılaşmayacağınızı bildiğiniz ve hiç karşılaşmayacağınız birisi. Hem siz hem de “Diğer kişi ” A, B, veya C seçeneklerini seçerek bazı tercihler yapacaksınız. Sizin tercihleriniz hem kendiniz için hem de “Diğer kişi” için puanlar getirecek. Aynı şekilde, “Diğer kişi”nin tercihleri de hem kendisi için hem de sizin için puanlar getirecektir. Her puanın bir değeri vardır: Ne kadar çok puan alırsanız sizin için o kadar iyi olacaktır; aynı şekilde “Diğer kişi” ne kadar çok puan alırsa onun için de o kadar iyi olacaktır.

Aşağıda yapacağınız işlemle ilgili bir örnek görmektesiniz.

	A	B	C
Siz	500	500	550
Diğer Kişi	100	500	300

Bu örnekte, eğer siz A’yı seçerseniz kendiniz 500 puan alırsınız ve diğer kişi 100 puan alır; eğer B’yi seçerseniz siz 500 puan alırsınız ve diğer kişi 500 puan alır; ve eğer C’yi seçerseniz siz 550 puan alırsınız ve diğer kişi 300 puan alır. Yani, seçimlerinizin hem kendi aldığınız puanı hem de diğer kişinin aldığı puanı etkilediğini görmektesiniz.

Ayrıca, seçimlerinizi yaparken bu çalışmada doğru ya da yanlış cevap olmadığını unutmayınız ve lütfen her ne sebeple olursa olsun en çok tercih ettiğiniz seçeneği seçiniz.

Şimdi aşağıdaki dokuz dağılım için tercihlerinizi yapabilirsiniz. Her bir dağılım için A, B, ve C tercihlerinden size uygun olan yalnızca birini daire içine alınız.

	A	B	C
1) Siz	480	540	480
Diğer Kişi	80	280	480

	A	B	C
2) Siz	560	500	500
Diğer Kişi	300	500	100

	A	B	C
3) Siz	520	520	580
Diğer Kişi	520	120	320

	A	B	C
4) Siz	500	560	490
Diğer Kişi	100	300	490

	A	B	C
5) Siz	560	500	490
Diğer Kişi	300	500	90

	A	B	C
6) Siz	500	500	570
Diğer Kişi	500	100	300

	A	B	C
7) Siz	510	560	510
Diğer Kişi	510	300	110

	A	B	C
8) Siz	550	500	500
Diğer Kişi	300	100	500

	A	B	C
9) Siz	480	490	540
Diğer Kişi	100	490	300

