

## TURKISH ADAPTATION OF THE PROSOCIAL ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIORS SCALE: A VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY STUDY<sup>1</sup>

PROSOSYAL ÖRGÜTSEL DAVRANIŞLAR ÖLÇEĞİNİN TÜRKÇE UYARLAMASI: GEÇERLİLİK VE GÜVENİRLİK ÇALIŞMASI

Faruk Kerem ŞENTÜRK<sup>2</sup> - Dilara ALTUNOK<sup>3</sup>

### Abstract

Altruistic behaviors have led to increased interest in the field of prosocial behavior by benefiting both the social structure and the organization. The requirement for organizational prosocial behaviors to become more visible and to be measured has led to the need for a scale with validity and reliability. This study aims to adapt the prosocial organizational behavior scale (POBS) developed by McNeely and Meglino (1994) to Turkish culture and language. An adaptation study was carried out in a 14-step systematic order. The data were collected from a sample of 600 people actively working in different sectors in the city center of Düzce. The properties of the scale were analysed through internal consistency coefficient, structural validity (EFA&CFA), scope validity, linguistic equivalence, convergent and discriminant validity methods. Results confirmed that POBS adapted in Turkish is a valid and reliable three-dimensional scale with 17 items.

**Keywords:** Prosocial Organizational Behavior, Prosocial Individual Behavior, Scale Adaptation

### Öz

Diğergamcı davranışlar hem toplumsal yapıya hem de örgüte fayda sağlayarak prososyal davranış alanına ilginin artmasına neden olmuştur. Örgütsel prososyal davranışların daha görünür hale gelebilmesi ve ölçülebilmesi ihtiyacı, geçerliliği ve güvenirliliği sağlanmış bir ölçek gereksinimi doğurmuştur. Bu çalışma, McNeely ve Meglino (1994) tarafından geliştirilen prososyal örgütsel davranış ölçeğini (POBS) Türk kültürüne ve diline uyarlamayı amaçlamaktadır. 14 aşamalı sistematik düzende bir uyarlama çalışması yapılmıştır. Veriler Düzce il merkezinde farklı sektörlerde aktif olarak çalışan 600 kişilik bir örneklemeden toplanmıştır. Ölçeğin özellikleri, iç tutarlılık katsayısı, yapı geçerliliği (AFA&DFA), kapsam geçerliliği, dilsel eşdeğerlik, yakınsak ve ayırt edici geçerlik yöntemleriyle analiz edilmiştir. Sonuçlar, Türkçeye uyarlanan POB ölçeğinin 17 maddelik, geçerli ve güvenilir üç boyutlu bir ölçek olduğunu doğrulamıştır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Prososyal Örgütsel Davranış, Prososyal Bireysel Davranış, Ölçek Uyarlama

<sup>1</sup> Bu çalışma Doç. Dr. Faruk Kerem ŞENTÜRK danışmanlığında Dilara ALTUNOK tarafından hazırlanan yüksek lisans tezinden derlenmiştir.

<sup>2</sup> Doç. Dr., Düzce Üniversitesi, İşletme Fakültesi, [kerementurk@duzce.edu.tr](mailto:kerementurk@duzce.edu.tr), Orcid: 0000-0002-3055-0797

<sup>3</sup> Bilim Uzmanı, [dilaraltunok@gmail.com](mailto:dilaraltunok@gmail.com), Orcid: 0000-0003-2658-0798

Makale Türü: Araştırma Makalesi – Geliş Tarihi: 23.06.2022 – Kabul Tarihi: 02.12.2022

DOI:10.17755/esosder.1134750

**Atf için:** *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 2023;22(85): 118-134

**Etik Kurul İzni:** Düzce Üniversitesi Bilimsel Araştırma ve Yayın Etik Kurulu 04.06.2020 tarih ve 2020/106 sayılı yazısı ile etik açıdan uygun görülmüştür.

## Introduction

Work life is often characterized by repeated interactions between people, with interdependencies spanning several years. Prosocial behaviors, which are defined as the behavior of helping others without obligation and voluntarily, emerge in line with these long-term relationships (Zettler, 2022). Researcher Michael Norton, in his speech at TEDxCambridge, states that as a result of his research, employees who make prosocial spending work both happier and more efficiently (Norton, 2011). In another experimental study, two different reminders were placed at handwashing stations in a hospital. Reminders for doctors and nurses were shared as “Hand hygiene prevents you from catching diseases” and “Hand hygiene prevents patients from catching diseases.” The researcher measured the amount of soap used at each station. Doctors and nurses at the station with the reminder referring patients used 45% more soap or hand sanitizer (Dominus, 2013). Therefore, the orientation towards prosocial behavior benefits both individuals and organizations. Behaviors of altruism are like gifts given to the other party. Such gifts often make people feel good and helping people is seen as one of the ways to be happy (Seligman, 2007). Prosocial behavior and the resulting emotional benefits are disseminated through social networks (Chancellor et al., 2018). Based on this, the existence of a scale that would make the concept usable in Turkish research would be useful.

The main purpose of this research is to adapt the prosocial organizational behavior scale into Turkish. Prosocial organizational behaviors which summarized as the state of acting by considering the welfare of others, has become a necessity in both social and business life today. Although the subject seems to be a sub-dimension of organizational citizenship behavior at first, it was seen that it should be considered as a different variable after studies conducted. Prosocial organizational behaviors increase organizational performance (Salim and Rajput, 2021), organizational justice (Hornung, 2010), democracy and solidarity perception within the organization (Weber et al., 2009) and also associated with intra-organizational cooperation and quality of working life (Kanten, 2014). By translating the scale into Turkish, it was aimed to revive questions related with altruistic behaviors in business field and to contribute to quantitative research in the field of prosocial behaviors. Scales related to POB were evaluated and scale developed by McNeely and Meglino (1994) was preferred because of its comprehensive structure. The scales of McNeely and Meglino (1994), O'Reilly and Chatman (1986), and Ackfeldt and Wong (2006) stand out in the field of prosocial organizational behaviors. O'Reilly and Chatman (1986) focus on organizational citizenship, while Ackfeldt and Wong (2006) focus on the concept of prosocial service in the context of customer-employee relationship. McNeely and Meglino's (1994) scale is the most comprehensive scale that separates the subject from the concept of organizational citizenship and deals with not only organizational but also individual prosocial behaviors in an organization. A detailed road map was followed both in the translation phases and in the validity and reliability phases, and it was ensured that it could be used as a valid and reliable scale.

### 1. Prosocial Organizational Behavior

Prosociality can be defined as the tendency to engage in behaviors that benefit other people. Prosocial behaviors begin in the pre-school period and while prosocial behaviors in the community intensify in this period, hidden prosocial behaviors are seen more frequently in adulthood (Ata and Artan, 2020). Different motivators may play a role behind such behaviors. Individuals may engage in prosocial behaviors to get away from their personal problems, improve the perception of value and meaning in their life, or increase the level of social cohesion (Midlarsky, 1991; Karadağ and Mutafçılar, 2009). People spend their lives in line

with the interactions of family, social environment and business life. A behavior developed in individual life spreads throughout life. Considering the direct and indirect positive effects of prosocial behaviors on society and the business world, academic studies to be conducted in this direction will be valuable.

Prosocial organizational behavior can be defined as the behavior exhibited by an organization member to increase the welfare of a person, group or organization as a part of the duty (Lee, 2001). It can also be considered as the tendency of employees to go beyond the job description as well as fulfill their organizational roles (Kanten, 2014). Prosocial organizational behaviors can also appear in the form of efforts to increase or protect the welfare of the individual, group or organization (Brief and Motowidlo, 1986).

The basis of prosocial organizational behavior goes back to the neo-classical management theory. The Hawthorne Studies carried out in this period considered the social and emotional aspects of working people and revealed that employees express themselves as members of the group, and their reactions occur as a result of being a group member, not considering own interests. As a result of the research, the behaviors of the members such as helping each other were explained by being a group member rather than their interests (Robbins and Judge, 2013).

Brief and Motowidlo (1986) defined productive work performance, strong communication between individuals and groups, cooperation, higher motivation in employees, higher customer satisfaction and increase in organizational productivity as functional consequences of prosocial organizational behaviors. Because of the unstructured nature of prosocial organizational behaviors (beyond the job description), it can be considered more important among different behavior patterns within the organization (Elkhdr, 2019). The behavior of an employee in the organization can be basically divided into two types as in-role and extra-role behavior. In-role behavior means core task and refers to the duties, responsibilities and activities that the individual undertakes in the organization (Zhu, 2013). Katz (1964) defined the concept as expected behaviors related to job performance determined in the work environment. Extra-role behaviors are behaviors that employees display in line with their own wishes and that have positive or negative effects on the organization in various aspects (Çetin and Fıkrkoca, 2010). Extra-role behaviors are important for organizational efficiency and include similar behaviors such as helping colleagues (Moorman et al., 1993).

Extra-role behaviors create a more positive effect compared to in-role behaviors, as they are performed by individuals voluntarily and without obligation. There are three main features of extra-role behaviors. 1-Roles are not predetermined. 2- Reward systems are not predetermined. 3- There is no punishment if it is not done (Van Dyne and LePine, 1998). Prosocial organizational behaviors in the adapted scale have 3 sub-dimensions; role-defined prosocial behavior, prosocial individual behavior and prosocial organizational behavior. While the role-defined part of the scale expresses the in-role behaviors mentioned above, the beyond-role behaviors are handled under two different dimensions as individual and organizational within the scope of the scale. This situation provides an opportunity to compare the individual orientations and altruistic behaviors of the employee in the workplace.

Developing ideas for a better functioning of the department and volunteering to solve the problems in the workplace without complaining are examples of prosocial organizational behavior, while behaviors such as supporting colleagues in their personal problems and celebrating their birthdays are examples of prosocial individual behaviors. Behaviors such as completing tasks on time, coming work on time, and using organizational resources without wasting are examples of role-defined prosocial behaviors. Awareness of such behaviors

should be developed within the organization to strengthen the solidarity and the ethical climate.

## 2. Method

The research was carried out with a quantitative method and an exploratory point of view, since it included a scale adaptation process. There is no consensus on the steps to be taken in scale adaptation studies. Different researchers (Öner, 1987; Herrera et al., 1993; Seçer, 2018) offer various suggestions on this subject. In order to take detailed steps within the scope of the adaptation study, the 14-steps process of Seçer (2018), whose detailed information is given in Table 1, was preferred.

**Table 1.** Scale Adaptation Stages

| Stages | Steps   |
|--------|---|
| 1      | Determining the need  |
| 2      | Determining the appropriate measuring tool  |
| 3      | Creation of the translation team  |
| 4      | Determination of language and field experts who will examine the translations       |
| 5      | Determination of the scale forms would be translated                                |
| 6      | Translation of the scale into Turkish   |
| 7      | Translation of the scale from Turkish into its original form                        |
| 8      | Comparison of the scale form translated into its original language and the original |
| 9      | Implementing to test language validity  |
| 10     | Post-implementation statistical analysis  |
| 11     | Giving the first form of the scale translated into Turkish                          |
| 12     | Pilot implementation  |
| 13     | Making statistical analyzes after the pilot implementation                          |
| 14     | Finalizing the scale  |

**Source:** Seçer, 2018.

All necessary steps have been taken by paying attention to the process specified in the table. First of all, the survey owner was contacted and permission was obtained for the adaptation study. Afterward, necessary permissions were obtained from Düzce University Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Committee on 04.06.2020 for the scale adaptation study. Details on the next steps are described in the following sections.

### 2.1. Measures

The prosocial organizational behavior scale developed by McNeely and Meglino (1994) was preferred to measure the prosocial organizational behaviors of the employees. The researchers applied the scale items by evaluating the prosocial behaviors of 100 female secretaries at a university by more than one rater. They received feedback from more than one rater because of preventing the participants from giving biased answers and showing different prosocial behaviors towards individuals at different levels. Evaluations were made out of 498 available responses. Detailed information on why this scale was chosen as the prosocial behavior scale is given in the introduction section.

POBS is a scale consisting of 3 dimensions and 20 items and 7 items in the scale represent prosocial organizational behavior, 7 items represent role-defined prosocial behavior and 6 items represent prosocial individual behavior. Participants were asked to indicate their

level of agreement with the scale items in a five-point Likert style as "strongly disagree" (1) and "strongly agree" (5).

## **2.2. Participants**

In order to make accessibility easier due to the COVID-19 epidemic in the world at the time of the research, the research population was determined as individuals working in Düzce Center. Since it is not possible to reach the whole universe and it cannot be known clearly, the sampling method has been used. Calculating the sample number, the formula which was taken from Karagöz (2014) was used and the sample was determined as  $(n)=384$ .

After the sample number was determined, the sampling method was decided. In this context, since the number of universe was not clear, the convenience sampling method was preferred. In this sampling method, the process of finding subjects continues until the desired sample size is reached (Altunışık et al., 2007). Therefore, 648 questionnaires were collected through the convenience sampling method, with a figure above the target number.

73.6% of the participants were male, 55.8% were single, 62.2% had no children and had a bachelor's degree (52%). While 36% of the participants are in employee status, the rest are managers at different levels. In addition, different sectors participated in the research.

Research data were collected between 11.06.2020 – 08.10.2020. Because of the COVID-19 epidemic, which is effective all over the world, it has been difficult to conduct a face-to-face survey. 71 of the questionnaires were collected face-to-face and 577 of them were collected online from individuals who were determined to work in Düzce via LinkedIn. A total of 648 questionnaires were collected, and 600 questionnaires were included in the analysis by subtracting 48 of the questionnaires for various reasons (working in different cities, being retired or a student and missing data).

## **3. Results**

Turkish validity and reliability analyses of the prosocial organizational behavior scale were conducted. Language, content, convergent, discriminant and construct validity were tested for scale validity, and CR and Cronbach alpha calculations were made to examine reliability.

First of all, a comprehensive research was conducted on prosocial organizational behavior and a Turkish scale was not found related to the subject. It was determined that some of the studies found did not perform the necessary validity and reliability analyses (Gönülaçar Bozkurt, 2017; Öcal and Sarnıç, 2017; Altınok, 2017; Kılınç et al., 2019). Then, the scale of prosocial organizational behaviors developed by McNeely and Meglino (1994) was decided to be adapted into Turkish because its comprehensive structure. Permission was obtained by contacting Professor Meglino via e-mail to start the adaptation process of the scale.

Afterward, experts were identified to translate the scale from its original language into Turkish. 3 academicians specialized in social sciences and fluent in English and a notary sworn English translator were included in the process.

In the next stage, the scale was examined by two people in the translation team and translated into Turkish. The first translation should always be done by at least two people working independently from each other (Coster and Mancini, 2015; Çapık et al., 2018). The scale items translated into Turkish were translated back into their original form by an expert academician and a notary sworn English translator.

In the eighth stage, the scale form translated into its original language was compared with the initial form. These translations, which were made independently of each other, were then evaluated together, and the most appropriate translation was selected for each item. At this stage, since the conjunction "and" used in two items in the scale and have different meanings in Turkish, these items were separated and two more items were added to the scale. Afterward, 22 items translated into Turkish were shared with 7 academicians who are experts in their fields to ensure content validity.

In the technique for content validity, Davis (1992) wants the scale items to be evaluated within the scope of one of the options "The item is appropriate", "The item should be slightly revised", "The item should be seriously revised" and "The item is not appropriate". It states that the ratio of the number of experts who marked "The item is appropriate" and "The item should be slightly revised" for any of the items to the total number of experts should be greater than .80, thus ensuring the content validity of the items. This means that the item will remain in the question pool (Grant and Davis, 1997; Davis, 1992). As a result of expert evaluations, the Item Content Validity Index (ICVI) for each of the 22 items was calculated. Although the acceptable ICVI values of the items to be included in the scale vary according to the number of experts, it is recommended that this value should not be below .78 (Polit and Beck, 2006). The ICVI values calculated for each of the items were .86 for items 2 and 7, and 1 for all other items. In this context, it can be said that the content validity of the items in the scale was verified.

**Table 2.** Correlations Between Items

| Items           | r   | p    | Items           | r   | p    |
|-----------------|-----|------|-----------------|-----|------|
| Eng 1 - Tur 1   | .91 | .000 | Eng 12 - Tur 12 | .89 | .000 |
| Eng 2 - Tur 2   | .94 | .000 | Eng 13 - Tur 13 | .85 | .000 |
| Eng 3 - Tur 3   | .85 | .000 | Eng 14 - Tur 14 | .87 | .000 |
| Eng 4 - Tur 4   | .88 | .000 | Eng 14 - Tur 15 | .79 | .000 |
| Eng 5 - Tur 5   | .88 | .000 | Eng 15 - Tur 16 | .92 | .000 |
| Eng 6 - Tur 6   | .83 | .000 | Eng 16 - Tur 17 | .92 | .000 |
| Eng 7 - Tur 7   | .91 | .000 | Eng 16 - Tur 18 | .58 | .000 |
| Eng 8 - Tur 8   | .89 | .000 | Eng 17 - Tur 19 | .85 | .000 |
| Eng 9 - Tur 9   | .90 | .000 | Eng 18 - Tur 20 | .95 | .000 |
| Eng 10 - Tur 10 | .84 | .000 | Eng 19 - Tur 21 | .94 | .000 |
| Eng 11 - Tur 11 | .85 | .000 | Eng 20 - Tur 22 | .97 | .000 |

In the ninth stage, the scale adapted to Turkish and the scale in the original language (English) was administered to a group who could read and understand both languages, one week apart. Appropriate statistical analyzes between the scores of the same individuals on both scales provide statistical evidence for the validity of the translation. If the binary correlations between the items are .80 and above, it means that the translation is appropriate for those items (Erkuş and Selvi, 2019). In general, this route can be skipped due to the lack of a participant group who knows both languages well. However, some researchers emphasize that the implementation of this step is important in terms of linguistic equivalence (Sousa and Rojjanasrirat, 2011). In Table 2, the correlations between the scale items adapted into Turkish

and the scale items in the original language were evaluated. Since the 14th and 16th items in the original of the scale were translated into Turkish as two different items, the correlation values of the items in the Turkish equivalent of the 14th and 16th items were examined separately. As a result of the evaluation of 22 items, it was seen that the 15th and 18th items in Turkish were below the aforementioned .80 threshold value and all other items were above the accepted threshold. When the correlation results were evaluated in general, it was determined that all of them gave significant results. In this context, no item extraction process was carried out and the pilot implementation phase was started. Therefore, the ninth and tenth stages were also carried out by examining the correlation values. As a result of the evaluation made in the eleventh stage, the final version of the questionnaire was created in Turkish before the pilot application. In the last step, the validity (exploratory) and reliability of the scale were measured over 100 questionnaires by conducting a pilot study.

### **3.1. Pilot Analysis**

Exploratory factor analysis was performed on a sample data set of 100 participants. In the first stage, it was seen that 22 items were accumulated under 5 factors. According to Can (2014), factor loadings should be above .40 value. In this direction, the 5th, 11th, 16th and 20th items with low factor loadings were removed and the analysis were repeated.

KMO value should be higher than .50 for a healthy factor analysis (Kalaycı, 2010). The obtained KMO value (.867) revealed that the sample size was sufficient and the Bartlett test result (Sig.=0.000;  $p<0.001$ ) showed a high correlation between the variables. Accordingly, the prosocial organizational behavior scale consists of 18 items and 3 dimensions (role-defined prosocial behavior, prosocial organizational behavior and prosocial individual behavior).

While the factor that best represents the scale was role-defined prosocial behaviors (26%), the total variance rate explained was 65%. The variance rate explained in multidimensional scales should be more than 30% (Büyüköztürk et al., 2018). The three dimensions obtained as a result of the analysis and the ratio of explaining the total variance of these dimensions were found sufficient.

Factor loadings were in the range of .55 to .84. The factor loadings above .40 recommended threshold indicate the reliability of the factor (Can, 2014). Accordingly, as a result of the analysis, the factor loadings were at a sufficient level. After the pilot analysis, exploratory and confirmatory factor analyzes were performed on the data set with 600 participants.

### **3.2. Exploratory Factor Analysis**

As a result of the factor analysis performed on the 18-item scale, there was no change in the scale dimensions. However, one item (14th) was excluded from the scale due to the overlapping load. The KMO score (.931) proved that the sample size was sufficient and the Bartlett test showed a high correlation between the variables (Sig.=.000;  $p<.001$ ). Accordingly, the prosocial organizational behavior scale was confirmed in 17 items and 3 dimensions.

Sometimes it can be difficult to obtain information from the original factor loads. Therefore, it is more convenient to rotate them by a certain angle to make the factor structure simpler (Saraçlı, 2011:23). In line with the purpose of the research, since the aim is to create a model and to obtain the most appropriate number of "independent" factors, it is generally accepted to make factor extraction with the orthogonal varimax rotation (Kieffer, 1998; Yaşlıoğlu, 2017). Varimax method gives priority to the columns of the factor loadings matrix

to reach the simple structure and significant factors, so that the factor variances are maximized with less variables (Kline, 1994; Karagöz and Köstereliolu, 2008).

Role-defined prosocial behaviors dimension (26%) is the most representative dimension of the scale, followed by prosocial organizational behaviors (22%) and prosocial individual behaviors (18%). The total variance explained (68%) is above the accepted threshold value of 30% (Büyüköztürk et al., 2018). Factor loadings (between .85 and .52) are above the accepted threshold value of .40 (Can, 2014).

**Table 3.** Exploratory Factor Analysis

| Factors                                  | Items  | Communalities | Factor Loadings | Explained Variance | Eigenvalues |
|--|--|---------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------|
| Role-Defined<br>Prosocial Behaviors      | 7  | .587          | .732            | 26,754             | 4,548       |
|  | 8  | .767          | .612            |                    |             |
|  | 9  | .668          | .738            |                    |             |
|  | 10   | .723          | .713            |                    |             |
|  | 11   | .719          | .706            |                    |             |
|  | 12   | .743          | .83             |                    |             |
|  | 13   | .774          | .826            |                    |             |
| Prosocial<br>Organizational<br>Behaviors | 1  | .664          | .777            | 22,447             | 3,816       |
|  | 2  | .772          | .765            |                    |             |
|  | 3  | .667          | .816            |                    |             |
|  | 4  | .786          | .728            |                    |             |
|  | 5  | .799          | .729            |                    |             |
|  | 6  | .726          | .521            |                    |             |
| Prosocial Individual<br>Behaviors        | 15   | .285          | .681            | 18,373             | 3,123       |
|  | 16   | .304          | .766            |                    |             |
|  | 17   | .321          | .837            |                    |             |
|  | 18   | .317          | .855            |                    |             |
| Evaluation Criteria                      | KMO: .931<br>Approx. Chi-Square: 6683.278<br>Bartlett's Test of Sphericity: .000<br>Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.<br>Total Explained Variance: 67.574 |               |                 |                    |             |

### 3.3. Confirmatory Factor Analysis

First of all, missing data that disrupted the general order of the scale were checked. Since the Shapiro-Wilk test gives healthy results in the small –sized sample while Kolmogorov-Smirnov test in a medium-sized sample, the normal distribution of the data set was evaluated based on the kurtosis and skewness scores (Kim, 2013; Genceli, 2007). The absolute value of the skewness of all variables below 3 and the absolute value of the kurtosis below 10 reveal a distribution close to the normal distribution (Kline, 2010). The kurtosis and skewness scores of 17 items belonging to the prosocial organizational behavior scale were given in Table 4. The data were normally distributed based on the kurtosis and skewness values of the scale items were in the threshold range.



TURKISH ADAPTATION OF THE PROSOCIAL ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIORS SCALE: A  
VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY STUDY

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was used to evaluate construct validity. The overall CFA model suggested that the scale had a good model fit ( $[x^2/df] = 3.821$ ,  $[RMSEA] = .069$ ,  $[CFI] = .951$ ,  $[GFI] = .922$ ,  $[PGFI] = .687$ ,  $[NFI] = .936$ ,  $[TLI] = .942$ ,  $[RMR] = .045$ ). The factor loadings of the items were between .62 and .92 and higher than .60 and above the accepted threshold, confirming convergent validity (Yang et al., 2012).

**Table 4.** Kurtosis and Skewness Values of the Scale Items

| Item | Skewness | Kurtosis | Item  | Skewness | Kurtosis |
|------|----------|----------|-------|----------|----------|
| PRO1 | -0,879   | 0,257    | PRO10 | -1,494   | 2,551    |
| PRO2 | -1,713   | 3,509    | PRO11 | -1,581   | 2,835    |
| PRO3 | -1,102   | 1,146    | PRO12 | -1,409   | 2,191    |
| PRO4 | -1,498   | 2,281    | PRO13 | -1,602   | 3,081    |
| PRO5 | -1,423   | 2,328    | PRO15 | -0,773   | -0,084   |
| PRO6 | -1,439   | 2,232    | PRO16 | -0,958   | 0,241    |
| PRO7 | -1,71    | 2,645    | PRO17 | -0,861   | 0,085    |
| PRO8 | -1,823   | 4,125    | PRO18 | -0,945   | 0,438    |
| PRO9 | -2,589   | 7,079    |       |          |          |

### 3.4. Discriminant Validity

We estimated discriminant validity by comparing the square root of the value of the AVE with the correlations. The limitations in the data collection phase and the need for stricter validation assessments make the Fornell and Larcker (1981) technique represent the best method to apply (Farrell, 2010).

**Table 5.** Means, Standart Deviations and Intercorrelations Between the Constructs and AVE Square Roots

|                                       | Mean | SD  | ML          | POB         | MW          |
|---------------------------------------|------|-----|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| 1. Role-Defined Prosocial Behaviors   | 4.41 | .67 | <b>.751</b> |             |             |
| 2. Prosocial Organizational Behaviors | 4.19 | .76 | .662**      | <b>.781</b> |             |
| 3. Prosocial Individual Behaviors     | 3.89 | .91 | .477**      | .565**      | <b>.782</b> |

**Note.** \*\*p < 0.01. The square root of AVE for the construct is presented in bold.

This analysis demonstrated that the square root of the value was significantly greater than the correlations between construct pairs, satisfying the criterion for discriminant validity suggested by Fornell and Larcker (1981).

### 3.5. Convergent Validity and Reliability

After the model gave good fit values, AVE was used to test the convergent validity of each construct, and Cronbach's Alpha and CR values were checked to test the reliability. Convergent validity states that the items related to the variables are related to each other and the factor they create (Yaşlıoğlu, 2017). CR is a criterion takes into account the factor loadings and error variances of the items in a factor and gives a clue about the construct reliability of the factor and thus the convergent validity. AVE is the criterion of convergent validity between items representing a factor (Gürbüz, 2019).

According to Fornell and Larcker (1981), for convergent validity, the AVE value should be greater than .50, the CR value should be greater than .70, and  $CR > AVE$ . In addition, values obtained slightly below .50 of the AVE value are also acceptable. According to Hair et al. (1998), when the CR is greater than .60, it is acceptable for the AVE to be less than .50.

**Table 6.** Factor Loads, CR, AVE and Cronbach Alpha Values of the POBS

| Dimensions                         | Items | Standardized Factor Loadings | CR   | AVE  | Cronbach alfa |
|------------------------------------|-------|------------------------------|------|------|---------------|
| Role-Defined Prosocial Behaviors   | PRO7  | .631                         | .90  | .565 | .904          |
|                                    | PRO8  | .747                         |      |      |               |
|                                    | PRO9  | .701                         |      |      |               |
|                                    | PRO10 | .770                         |      |      |               |
|                                    | PRO11 | .761                         |      |      |               |
|                                    | PRO12 | .804                         |      |      |               |
|                                    | PRO13 | .829                         |      |      |               |
| Prosocial Organizational Behaviors | PRO1  | .726                         | .903 | .611 | .90           |
|                                    | PRO2  | .825                         |      |      |               |
|                                    | PRO3  | .746                         |      |      |               |
|                                    | PRO4  | .837                         |      |      |               |
|                                    | PRO5  | .849                         |      |      |               |
|                                    | PRO6  | .692                         |      |      |               |
| Prosocial Individual Behaviors     | PRO15 | .628                         | .861 | .613 | .853          |
|                                    | PRO16 | .702                         |      |      |               |
|                                    | PRO17 | .845                         |      |      |               |
|                                    | PRO18 | .922                         |      |      |               |

The factor loadings of the scale were above .50 (Gürbüz, 2019) and that all AVE values were above .50 indicated convergent validity. CR values above .70 and Cronbach Alpha values between .85 and .90 pointed out the reliability of the scale.

Common Method Bias was examined with Harman's single-factor approach (Podsakoff and Organ, 1986). Following this technique, researchers introduce all the scale items into an exploratory factorial analysis and examine the unrotated factor solution to obtain the number of components with eigenvalues greater than 1 that explain the aggregate variance. The assumption here is that, if CMB exists, only one component will account for more than 50% of the covariance between the items and the criterion constructs (Podsakoff et al., 2003; Rodríguez-Ardura and Meseguer-Artola, 2020). An unrotated factor analysis using

the eigenvalue-greater-than-one criterion revealed three different factors that accounted for 67,5 percent of the variance. The first factor captured 48 percent of the variance in the data. Since a single factor did not emerge and the first factor did not account for %50 of the variance, CMB does not appear to be a problem.

#### **4. Discussion**

In this study, a 14-step roadmap was followed in order to adapt the prosocial organizational behavior scale into Turkish. In this context, the scale items were translated from the original language to the target language, conceptual and linguistic item equivalences were determined, and validity and reliability analyzes were made.

As a result of the analyzes, it was determined that the adapted scale was represented by 17 items and the items were gathered under 3 factors. Behaviors, which are defined as the expectations of the organization from the employee, express the dimension of role-defined prosocial behaviors. Employees' positive social behaviors that provide benefits voluntarily and consciously without expecting any return in order to contribute to other employees in the organization expresses the dimension of prosocial organizational behaviors. The state of exhibiting behaviors that are compatible with the organizational culture and that will help colleagues in both their work and private lives express prosocial individual behaviors. It was seen that the structure obtained was similar to the structure in the original scale.

While some of the researchers addressing prosocial organizational behaviors in Turkish literature used McNeely and Meglino's (1994) scale (Gönülaçar Bozkurt, 2017; Kılınç et al., 2019), some (Altınok, 2017) used O'Reilly and Chatman's (1986) scale and few (Öcal and Sarnıç, 2017; Kanten, 2014) used Ackfeldt and Wong's (2006) scale. Among these scales, O'Reilly and Chatman's (1986) scale deals with the issue within the scope of organizational citizenship, while Ackfeldt and Wong's (2006) scale evaluates the issue through the customer-employee relationship in the context of prosocial service. The scale that deals with the issue on the basis of prosocial organizational behavior was McNeely and Meglino's (1994) scale. However, it can be stated that the validity and reliability studies of the scales used in the Turkish literature are deficient. Gönülaçar Bozkurt (2017), Gönülaçar Bozkurt and Özdaşlı (2021) used only the individual prosocial behavior part of the scale in two separate studies, it was not adapted to the Turkish language, linguistic equivalence was not provided, confirmatory factor analysis was not performed, and exploratory factor analysis findings were given incompletely. On the other hand, Kılınç et al. (2019) used the scale but did not perform any validity and reliability analysis. However, McNeely and Meglino (1994) originally divided prosocial behaviors into two categories based on the intended benefit. The first is designed to help other individuals (eg, helping a coworker with a problem), and the second to help the organization (eg, suggesting ideas to improve things) (Dirican, 2013). Therefore, there are many errors in the Turkish usage of the scale. The Turkish scale emerged as a result of this study was provided language, content, convergent, discriminant and structural validity as well as CR and Cronbach alpha values were calculated and verified. It has been verified that the scale is a valid and reliable scale that can be used to measure the individual and organizational prosocial behaviors of employees in Turkish culture.

The scale will be beneficial for business managers who want to reinforce altruistic behaviors within the organization and to see the individual and organizational prosocial behavior tendency of employees. In addition, a valid and reliable prosocial organizational behavior scale that can be used in Turkish in the academic field will also benefit researchers.

## References

- Ackfeldt, A. L.; Wong, V. (2006). The antecedents of prosocial service behaviours: An empirical investigation. *The Service Industries Journal*, 26(7), 727-745.
- Altınok, A. E. (2017). Örgütsel bağlılık ve örgütsel prososyal davranışların işten ayrılma niyeti ile ilişkisi. (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). İstanbul Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Altunışık, R.; Coşkun, R.; Bayraktaroğlu, S.; Yıldırım E. (2007). Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma yöntemleri – SPSS Uygulamalı, (5. Baskı), Sakarya: Sakarya Yayıncılık.
- Ata, S.; Artan, İ. Z. (2021). Ergen prososyallik ölçeği: geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Turk J Child Adolesc Ment Health*, 28(1), 38-44.
- Brief, A. P.; Motowidlo, S. J. (1986) Prosocial organizational behaviors. *Academy of Management Review*, 11(4), 710-725.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş.; Çakmak, K. Ç.; Akgün, Ö. E.; Karadeniz, Ş.; Demirel, F. (2018). Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri, (28. Basım). İstanbul: Pegem Akademi.
- Can, A. (2014). SPSS ile bilimsel araştırma sürecinde nicel veri analizi. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Chancellor, J.; Margolis, S.; Lyubomirsky, S. (2018). The propagation of everyday prosociality in the workplace. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 13(3), 271-283.
- Coster, W. J.; Mancini, M. C. (2015). Recommendations for translation and cross-cultural adaptation of instruments for occupational therapy research and practice. *Revista de Terapia Ocupacional da Universidade de Sao Paulo*, 26(1), 50-57.
- Çapık, C.; Gözüm S.; Aksayan, S. (2018). Kültürlerarası ölçek uyarlama aşamaları, dil ve kültür uyarlaması: güncellenmiş rehber. *Florence Nightingale Hemşirelik Dergisi*, 26(3), 199-210.
- Çetin, F.; Fıkırkoca, A. (2010). Rol ötesi olumlu davranışlar kişisel ve tutumsal faktörlerle öngörülebilir mi?. *Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 4(65), 41-66.
- Davis, L. L. (1992). Instrument review: Getting the most from a panel of experts. *Applied Nursing Research*, 5(4), 194-197.
- Dirican, A. H. (2013). Duygusal zekanın örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı ve üretkenlik karşıtı davranışlar üzerine etkisi (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Gebze Yüksek Teknoloji Enstitüsü, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Gebze.
- Dominus, S. (2013, March 27). Is giving the secret to getting ahead? *New York Times*, <https://www.nytimes.com/2013/03/31/magazine/is-giving-the-secret-to-getting-ahead.html>, 17.03.2022.
- Elkhdr, H. R. H. (2019). Örgütsel bağlılık ve prososyal örgütsel davranış için işgören eğitim programlarının incelenmesi. (Doktora Tezi). Kastamonu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Kastamonu.
- Erkuş, A.; Selvi, H. (2019). Psikolojide Ölçme ve ölçek geliştirme III – Ölçek uyarlama ve norm geliştirme. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.
- Farrell, A. M. (2010). Insufficient discriminant validity: A comment on Bove, Pervan, Beatty, and Shiu (2009). *Journal of business research*, 63(3), 324-327.

- Fornell, C.; Larcker, D.F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(1), 39-50.
- Genceli, M. (2007). Kolmogorov-smirnov, lilliefors and shaphiro-wilk tests for normality. *Sigma Journal of Engineering and Natural Sciences*, 25(4), 306-328.
- Grant, J. S.; Davis, L. L. (1997). Selection and use of content experts for instrument development. *Research in nursing & health*, 20(3), 269-274.
- Gönülaçar Bozkurt, G. (2017). Çalışanların iş tatmininin örgütsel prososyal davranışlara etkisi: burdur ili örneği. (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Üniversitesi, Burdur.
- Gönülaçar Bozkurt, G., & Özdaşlı, K. (2021). İş tatmininin örgütlerde olumlu sosyal davranışlara etkisi üzerine bir araştırma. *Kamu Yönetimi Enstitüsü Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 1(1), 99-128.
- Gürbüz, S. (2019). AMOS ile yapısal eşitlik modellemesi. Ankara: Seçkin Yayınevi.
- Hair, J. F.; Black, W. C.; Babin, B. J.; Anderson, R. E.; Tatham, R. L. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 5(3), 207- 219.
- Herrera, R.S.; Delcampo, R.L.; Ames, M.H. (1993), A serial approach for translating family science instrumentation. *Family Relations*, 42, 357-360.
- Hornung, S. (2010). Alienation matters: Validity and utility of Etzioni's theory of commitment in explaining prosocial organizational behavior. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 38(8), 1081-1095.
- Kalaycı, Ş. (2010). SPSS uygulamalı çok değişkenli istatistik teknikleri. Ankara: Asil Yayın Dağıtım.
- Karadağ, E.; Mutafçılar, İ. (2009). Prososyal davranış ekseninde özgecilik üzerine teorik bir çözümleme. *FLSF Felsefe ve Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, (8), 41-69.
- Karagöz, Y. (2014). SPSS 21.1 Uygulamalı biyoistatistik, (1.Basım). Ankara: Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.
- Karagöz, Y.; Kösterelioğlu, İ. (2008). İletişim becerileri değerlendirme ölçeğinin faktör analizi metodu ile geliştirilmesi. *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, (21), 81-97.
- Kanten, P. (2014). Effect of quality of work life (owl) on proactive and prosocial organizational behaviors: A research on health sector employees. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 19(1), 251- 274.
- Katz, D. (1964). The motivational basis of organizational behavior. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, 9(2), 131-146.
- Kieffer, K. M. (1998). Orthogonal versus oblique factor rotation: A review of the literature regarding the Pros and Cons. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Kılınç, M.; Yiğit, V.; Doğanşah, Y. (2019). Sağlık çalışanlarında örgütsel muhalefet ve örgütsel prososyal davranışlar arasındaki ilişkinin tespit edilmesine yönelik bir araştırma. *Avrasya Sosyal ve Ekonomi Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 6(12), 143-158.
- Kim, H. Y. (2013). Statistical notes for clinical researchers: assessing normal distribution (2) using skewness and kurtosis. *Restorative Dentistry & Endodontics*, 38(1), 52-54.

- Kline, P. (1994). *An easy guide to factor analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Kline, R. B. (2010). *Principles and practise of structural equation modeling*. (3. Basım) New York: Guilford Publications.
- Lee, H. J. (2001). Willingness and capacity: The determinants of prosocial organizational behaviour among nurses in the UK. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 12(6), 1029–1048.
- McNeely, B.L.; Meglino, B.M. (1994). The role of dispositional and situational antecedents in prosocial organizational behavior: An examination of the intended beneficiaries of prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(6), 836–844.
- Midlarksy, E. (1991). “Helping as coping”, In. M. S. Clark (Ed.), *Review of personality and social psychology: Prosocial Behavior* (cilt 12, sayfa 238–264). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Moorman, R. H.; Niehoff, B. P.; Organ, D.W. (1993). Treating employees fairly and organizational citizenship behavior: sorting the effects of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and procedural justice. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 6, 209–225.
- Norton, M. (2011, November). How to buy happiness?. [https://www.ted.com/talks/michael\\_norton\\_how\\_to\\_buy\\_happiness/transcript](https://www.ted.com/talks/michael_norton_how_to_buy_happiness/transcript), 17.03.2022.
- O'Reilly, C. A.; 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.
- Öcal, H.; Sarnıç, A. (2017). Dönüştürücü liderliğin prososyal örgütsel davranış üzerindeki etkileri ve imalat endüstrisinde bir araştırma. *AKÜ İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 19(2), 107-125.
- Öner, N. (1987). Kültürlerarası ölçek uyarlamasında bir yöntembilim modeli. *Psikoloji Dergisi*, 6(21), 80-83.
- Podsakoff, P. M.; Organ, D. W. (1986). Self-reports in organizational research: Problems and prospects. *Journal of Management*, 12(4), 531-544.
- Podsakoff, P. M.; MacKenzie, S. B.; Lee, J. Y.; Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: a critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879-903.
- Polit, D. F.; Beck, C. T. (2006). The content validity index: are you sure you know what's being reported? critique and recommendations. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 29, 489-497.
- Rodríguez-Ardura, I.; Meseguer-Artola, A. (2020). How to prevent, detect and control common method variance in electronic commerce research. *Journal of theoretical and applied electronic commerce research*, 15(2), 1-5.
- Robbins, S.; Judge, T., (2013). *Organizational behavior*. Boston: Person Education.
- Salim, A.; Rajput, N. A. R. (2021). The relationship between transformational leadership, prosocial behavioral intentions, and organizational performance. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics, and Business*, 8(1), 487-493.

- Saraçlı, S. (2011). Faktör analizinde yer alan döndürme metotlarının karşılaştırmalı incelenmesi üzerine bir uygulama. Düzce Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü Dergisi, 1(3), 22-26.
- Seçer, İ. (2018). Psikolojik test geliştirme ve uyarlama süreci. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Seligman, M. E. P. (2007). Gerçek mutluluk. (Çev: S. Kunt Akbaş), Ankara: HYB Yayınları.
- Sousa, V. D.; Rojjanasrirat, W. (2011). Translation, adaptation and validation of instruments or scales for use in cross-cultural health care research: a clear and user-friendly guideline. Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice, 17(2), 268- 274.
- Van Dyne, L.; LePine, J. A. (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. Academy of Management Journal, 41(1), 108-119.
- Weber, W. G.; Unterrainer, C.; Schmid, B. E. (2009). The influence of organizational democracy on employees' socio-moral climate and prosocial behavioral orientations. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 30(8), 1127-1149.
- Yang, Z.; Su, C.; Fam, K.-S. (2012). Dealing with institutional distances in international marketing channels: Governance strategies that engender legitimacy and efficiency. Journal of Marketing, 76(3), 41–55.
- Yaşlıoğlu, M. M. (2017). Sosyal bilimlerde faktör analizi ve geçerlilik: keşfedici ve doğrulayıcı faktör analizlerinin kullanılması. İstanbul Üniversitesi İşletme Fakültesi Dergisi, 46, 74-85.
- Zettler, I. (2022). A glimpse into prosociality at work. Current Opinion in Psychology, 44, 140-145.
- Zhu, Y. (2013). Individual behavior: In-role and extra-role. International Journal of Business Administration, 4(1), ss. 23-27.

**Ek 1: Final Version of the Scale Adapted to Turkish**

| <b>PROSOSYAL ÖRGÜTSEL DAVRANIŞLAR ÖLÇEĞİ</b>     |   |
|--|---|
| <b>PROSOSYAL<br/>ÖRGÜTSEL<br/>DAVRANIŞLAR</b>    | 1 Çalıştığım yer hakkında çevremdeki insanlara olumlu şeyler söylerim.      |
|  | 2 İşletmeme fayda sağlayacak yeni fikirlere açığım.                         |
|  | 3 İşletmede karşılaştığım geçici sorunları sitem etmeden çözmeye çalışırım. |
|  | 4 Çalıştığım bölümü geliştirmek için fikirler sunarım.                      |
|  | 5 İşletmeyi olası problemlerden korumak için önlem alırım.                  |
|  | 6 Çalıştığım yerdeki insanlara karşı düşünceliyimdir.                       |
| <b>ROL TANIMLI<br/>PROSOSYAL<br/>DAVRANIŞLAR</b> | 7 İşe zamanında gelirim.  |
|  | 8 Astlarıma iş dağılımını adil bir şekilde gerçekleştiririm.                |
|  | 9 İşe gelemeyeceğim durumlarda bunu üstlerime bildiririm.                   |
|  | 10 İşletmede çalışma süremi verimli kullanırım.                             |
|  | 11 Benden istenilen işi en hızlı şekilde tamamlarım.                        |
|  | 12 İşletme politikalarına uygun hareket ederim.                             |
|  | 13 Cenaze ve hastalık gibi durumlarında iş arkadaşlarıma destek olurum.     |
| <b>PROSOSYAL<br/>BİREYSEL<br/>DAVRANIŞLAR</b>    | 14 Maddi durumu iyi olmayan iş arkadaşlarıma destek olurum.                 |
|  | 15 İş arkadaşlarıma yemek ısmarlarım.                                       |
|  | 16 İş arkadaşlarımla ve astlarımla kişisel problemleriyle ilgilenirim.      |
|  | 17 İş arkadaşlarıma kişisel yardımlarda bulunurum.                          |