



**A RESEARCH IN TURKISH CULTURE ON THE REFLECTIONS OF KUT-BASED  
TASK CONCEPT TO ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR IN  
COMPARISON WITH WESTERN CULTURE**

Mustafa Polat\*  
Çağdaş Akif Kahraman\*\*

**Abstract**

In Turkish thought, 'kut' (political power) is given to Kagan by God. The ruler is the ruler because God has given him 'kut' and the political power has the right to authority. The study is based on the idea that 'kut' provides a reference frame that 'duty' is sacred. This idea is based on both paradigms emic and ethics. In order to show the difference of duty's sacredness owing to kut between western and Turkish culture, Organizational Citizenship Behavior is used as a tool of test. The study is based on the assumption that the mean values obtained in empirical studies on Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Turkish Culture are higher than western cultures. The t-test results show that there is a significant difference ( $t(53,81)=4,307$ ;  $p<0,05$ ) between the studies of Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Turkish Culture and Western Culture. The average of Organizational Citizenship Behavior studies examined in Turkish Culture was found higher than average of Organizational Citizenship Behavior studies examined in Western Culture.

*Keywords:* Cross Culture, Culture, Emic, Ethic, Organizational Citizenship Behavior

**Introduction**

Today, there is strong evidence that the understanding of management is influenced by culture and the culture of the society affects the sense of management. As the extension of societies, the cultures of organizations, which are the most basic elements of modern working life, are also influenced by the dominant culture in the society to which the organization belongs.

It is important to know the cultural elements that affect the formation of organizational culture through indirect impact and to understand the dominant structure of that culture. Organizations operating in the Turkish cultural environment are also affected by the basic structures of Turkish culture. The study covers the reflection of 'kut' understanding, which is one of the elements of Turkish culture, to today's management science.

---

\* Prof.-OSTIM Technical University Department of Business Administration, mustafa.polat@ostimteknik.edu.tr  
ORCID: 0000-0003-2187-2820

\*\* PhD- Ministry of Defense, cakifkahraman@gmail.com ORCID: 0000-0002-2991-0548

## **The Understanding of Kut in Turkish Culture**

The word ‘Kut’ was used by Arsal (1947), Kafesoglu (1998) for ‘political domination’, meaning ‘the power of power, that is, the power to govern the state’(Genç, 1981). According to Ögel (2010), ‘kut’ is based on the idea and philosophy of the high state. It is based on a good destiny that is directed towards success, and thus an understanding of the state and good fortune. The word Kut was used in the understanding of fortune, luck and blessings. The same approach has continued in Seljuk Turks and Ottomans. Already the ‘blessed’ meaning of Kut is born from the interest of God (Ögel, 2010). The word Kut, which is also encountered in Oğuz Epic, meaning ‘political authority’, was used in Kutadgu Bilig in particular as the Turkish equivalent of the word ‘state’ directly (Arsal, 1947). The ruler, who has the authority to govern, acts as an ‘officer’ who carries out the responsibility for the reign of God ‘nasb’. It is possible for someone who has been Kut to remain ruler as long as he fulfills his duty. Otherwise, it is possible for the society to give up respect and obedience to the ruler (Kezer 1987). Khan's commandments are accepted as if they were God's commandments and they are fulfilled with the same belief (Genç, 1981). Therefore, the duty in Turkish culture is sacred. This conception of the Hun State conception, ‘my reign was decided by God’, The famous Khan of Göktürk state, Bilge Kagan, said: ‘I sat on the throne because God willed, I put the nations on four sides in order’. ‘God settled my father khan and my matron mother on the throne’ and ‘I was khan because I was blessed for God's will’; and it is possible to find the similar statements.

In Turkish thought, God gives ‘Kut’ i.e. ‘political authority’. In this sense, it can be stated that sovereignty is taken from Gök (sky). According to the old Turkish conception of sovereignty, the monarch had certain qualities that God granted. According to this, the right to govern the state was donated by God as a divine grace to the Turkish monarch. In other words, the sovereignty is the sovereignty because God wills, ‘kut’ (the power of sovereignty), ‘ideal’ (destiny and fortune) and ‘yarlig’ (God's will and destiny) and the political power has the right to authority. So, the source of his right and authority to govern the state is God who blesses him, the origin of dominance is divine. In this respect, Turkish khan is almost like the representative of the sky on earth (Genç, 1987). The khan, who has the authority to govern, no longer acts as a theocratic representative in the name of divine grace or right, but as an ‘official’ who fulfills the responsibility of God's ‘nasb’ sovereignty. Therefore, Turkish rulers cannot be a superhuman entity. Responsibility for the duty is definite. As a matter of fact, it is possible for someone who has become a ‘kut, to remain ruler as long as he performs his duty. Otherwise, it is possible for the society to leave respect and obedience to that ruler (Kezer, 1987). In Turkish thought, ‘kut’ (political power) is given to Kagan by God. So, the sovereignty is taken from the ‘Sky’. In other words, the ruler is the ruler because God gave him ‘Kut’ and has the right to political power authority. In this respect, the Turkish Khan is like the representative of heaven on Earth (Genç, 1987). Khan's commandments are accepted as if they were God's commandments and they are fulfilled with the same belief. Therefore, the duty which is not only ruler but also ordinary ones in Turkish culture is sacred. That is to say all duties are sacred in Turkish Culture.

The study is based on the idea that ‘kut’, which is one of the fundamental elements of Turkish Management Culture, provides a reference frame that ‘duty’ is sacred and therefore organizations and employees in Turkish Culture act with the understanding that ‘duty is sacred’. This idea is based on both paradigms emic and ethics. To be able to find out and display this thought, the difference in terms of the holiness of the duty between Turkish and western cultures in an empirical way, we decided to compare Organizational citizenship behavior in different cultures, even if it is possible to use any other variables or methods.

Organizational citizenship behavior is defined as the behavior of a person doing more voluntarily than his or her designated task, which does not require punishment unless it is done, without waiting for a response (Podsakoff et al., 2000). Organizational citizenship behavior in Turkish culture is fundamentally sacred task, so every behavior related to the task is also sacred’ as a reflection of the understanding found to corresponds in the Turkish Culture. In other words, it is thought that an individual who is educated in Turkish culture will exhibit more organizational citizenship behavior than an individual who is educated in western cultures within the framework of the holiness of duty. In this context; It is based on the assumption that the mean values obtained in empirical studies on

organizational citizenship behavior in Turkish Culture are higher than western cultures that do not get in touch with Turkish Culture.

### **Organizational Citizenship Behavior**

Organizational citizenship behavior has been considered in the management and organization studies since the 1980s (Basım and Şeşen, 2006). The roles of the employees in the organization are determined by their job descriptions. However, roles that are not included in the job descriptions are also displayed by the employees. These roles that are not included in the job descriptions are called 'extra role behavior' or 'prosocial behavior' (Moorman and Blakely, 1995). Later, these roles were called organizational citizenship behavior (Smith et al., 1983). Organizational citizenship behaviors are behaviors that are not included in the job descriptions, do not require any punishment if not fulfilled, and that the employee voluntarily exhibits at his own volition (Podsakoff et.al., 2000). Organizational citizenship behavior can be an active role in the form of voluntary participation of employees to contribute to organizational activities or passive role in a way that avoids harmful behaviors for the organization (Baron, 2000). Organizational citizenship behavior is a variable that contributes positively to the organization in terms of its results (Podsakoff et.al., 2000).

Many aspects of organizational citizenship behavior have been identified. However, the most commonly used dimensions are Organ's (1988) ones. According to these dimensions, organizational citizenship behavior has five dimensions that are; altruism, conscientiousness, courtesy, civil virtue and gentleness. The altruism is aimed at helping other employees; conscientiousness is aimed at voluntarily exhibiting more than expected behaviors of employees; courtesy, to inform the person in advance on matters of interest to others; civil virtue, to take responsibility in matters concerning the organization; gentleness is a voluntary act to accept business difficulties and problems without complaining (Podsakoff et.al., 2000).

According to other dimensions, organizational citizenship behavior is dealt with in two dimensions (Williams and Anderson, 1991). These; organizational citizenship behavior, which consists of dimensions of self-esteem and kindness, and is displayed for individuals within the organization-organizational citizenship behavior-organization dimensions consisting of individual and consciousness, civil organizational citizenship behavior variable is considered as 5-dimensional in some studies and 2-dimensional in some studies. In this study, both kinds of studies were taken into consideration.

### **Method**

In order to test the hypothesis, the studies on the average of the variable of organizational citizenship behavior were obtained from 'The Academic Search Complete' database of the academic studies conducted on the organizational citizenship behavior in the western culture and in the Turkish culture and the mean of the organizational citizenship behavior variable in the related studies were taken. While determining the relationship between the KUT concept and OCB, it was thought that the factors examined by the selected articles would be effective in the context of manager, trust, leadership, and justice in line with the Kut concept, and for this reason, these articles were selected. In order to determine the differences validly with t test, at least 30 samples are needed. Because of that samples of both sides are more than 30. These averages were compared with independent sample t test to determine whether there was a significant difference and by looking at the mean values, it was determined in which culture the organizational citizenship behavior variable was higher. In this study, organizational citizenship behavior studies conducted in 33 Turkish and 31 Western samples (see appendix) were compared. The sources used and the means of organizational citizenship behavior are shown in appendix.

## Hypothesis

In this study, it is assumed that culture can affect organizational behavior research and Turkish culture and western culture are compared in the context of organizational citizenship behavior. Organizational citizenship behavior has been determined to be influenced by national culture (Moorman and Blakely, 1995). Moorman and Blakely (1995) in their study of the effect of individualist and collectivist behavior on organizational citizenship behavior from the national cultural dimensions, found that collectivist culture contributes to the display of organizational citizenship behavior. Since Turkish culture is a collectivist culture and the duty is considered sacred, it can be said that it will be exhibited that more organizational citizenship behavior than the western culture, where individualistic features are more dominant.

If we examine the relationship between Organizational citizenship behavior dimensions with Kut concept it can be said that every dimension of OCB has some conceptual relations with Kut. For example the altruism is aimed at helping other employees, conscientiousness is aimed at voluntarily exhibiting more than expected behaviors of employees and courtesy is aimed to inform the person in advance on matters of interest to others. Likewise, Kut concept includes doing the best in duty and doesn't ask if the behaviour is written on the employee's work description. Kut asks only to do the best, because duty is sacred and holiness is more than work description. Other dimensions of OCB can be thought in the same way like civil virtue and gentleness. Having more responsibility and dealing with organizational problems ensure organization to be more successful and create a place where all the employees are happy and makes a fair environment for all managers and employees. Actually Turkish management mentality which includes Kut concept, has the same purpose for all the citizens, like fair and happy in country. This mentality covers not only government but also all kinds of managerial areas, like business management. By these explanations of the relationship between Kut concept and OCB, this hypothesis can be created:

Hypothesis: Due to the fact that the task is considered sacred, more organizational citizenship behavior is exhibited in Turkish culture than western cultures.

## Results

In the analyzes, the results of organizational citizenship behavior studies conducted in 33 Turkish and 30 Western samples were compared with independent sample t test. Levene's test showed that the variance between the variables was not equal and the analyzes were continued in this way. The result of the analysis is in Table-1.

**Table 1. Independent Sample t Test Results**

<i>Culture</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>P</i>
<i>Turkish</i>	33	4.08	.34	53.81	4.307	.000
<i>Western</i>	30	3.62	.48			

There was a significant difference between the studies of organizational citizenship behavior in Turkish Culture and Western Culture ( $t(53.81) = 4.307; p < 0.05$ ). The average of organizational citizenship behavior studies examined in Turkish Culture (Mean = 4.08; SD =, 34) was found higher than the average of organizational citizenship behavior studies examined in Western Culture (Mean = 3.62; SD =, 48). The result obtained; in the Turkish culture where the sense of duty is high, it is pointed out that the tasks related to the task are made more willing than the western culture within the framework of organizational citizenship behavior variable.

## **Conclusion**

Based on the results of this study, which is relied on the hypothesis that culture affects organizational life, it is considered that it will be useful to work on the main elements of Turkish culture and their reflections on management culture in an ethical-emic perspective. For example, the issue of “trust” in social and organizational meaning can be handled on the basis of Turkish culture and reflections empirically from social culture to organizational culture. It is appreciated that examining the most fundamental element of culture and language, which is the least changing element of language and proverbs by means of content analysis, and empirically testing the findings to be obtained as a result of the examination can provide important clues in terms of evaluating the reflections of culture on management understanding.

It is possible for managers to know the cultural origins of the masses they use and lead in achieving their organizations, to realize the main points of action of these cultures and to benefit from the results obtained from such studies, and to be effective in ensuring individual-organization harmony. Similarly, it is considered that those who are administrators in other cultures will have benefits from the studies carried out in that culture.

This study is based on the idea of ‘sacred duty’ relied on the Turkish management culture. This idea is predicate on both paradigms, ethical and emic. In Western cultures, there is no idea of ‘sanctity’ about the mission, on the contrary to Turkish culture. Scales developed in western culture, regardless of culture, are used throughout the studies conducted in the field of management and organization and interpreted from an ethical point of view. However, as emphasized in this study, in fact, ethical results should be interpreted from an emic perspective. With this in mind, the organizational citizenship behavior variable found in the studies conducted in western and Turkish cultures was discussed and whether the differences between the cultures were compared. As a result, it was found that the average of organizational citizenship behavior was higher in the Turkish culture where the duty was considered sacred and there was a significant difference between the cultures in terms of organizational citizenship behavior average.

The study also includes several limitations. The study was carried out by considering the ‘kut’ understanding, which is one of the elements of Turkish culture, and the ‘Organizational Citizenship Behavior variable, which is considered to be a reflection of this understanding in contemporary management. Therefore, the results should be evaluated in this context. In the study sample only in Turkey it was discussed in the framework of study about organizational citizenship behavior, therefore, is limited samples discussed. It is considered that conducting similar studies in all geographical regions of Turkish culture may eliminate the drawbacks of this constraint. In the empirical dimension of the study, 33 studies in Turkish culture and 31 studies in Western culture were examined. The results obtained are limited in proportion to the number of studies examined. The inclusion of all studies on organizational citizenship behavior will be a source of more meaningful results. Finally, the constraints expressed in the studies discussed in this study also apply to this study.

In social science research, it is accepted that the effect of social desirability can affect the outcome and is stated as a constraint and in this study, it was assumed that this effect could be neglected for both samples. Moreover, in this study, as a result of the cross-cultural comparison conducted within the framework of organizational citizenship behavior variable, it can be said that the results of the studies conducted with ethical understanding should be evaluated and interpreted in emic context as well.

## References

- Arsal, S.M. (1947). *Türk Tarihi ve Hukuk (Vol. 1)*. İstanbul: İ. Akgün Matbaası.
- Baron, J. (2000). *Thinking and Deciding*. United States: Cambridge University Press.
- Basım, H.N. & Şeşen, H. (2006). Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı Ölçeği Uyarlama ve Karşılaştırma Çalışması. *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi* 61(4).
- Genç, R. (1981). *Karahanlı Devlet Teşkilâtı: XI. Yüzyıl: Türk Hâkimiyet Anlayışı ve Karahanlılar (Vol. 373)*. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları.
- Kafesoğlu, İ. (1988). *Türk Milli Kültürü*. İstanbul: Boğaziçi Yayınları.
- Kezer, A. (1987). *Türk ve Batı Kültüründe Siyaset Kavramı (Vol. 82)*. Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı.
- Moorman, R.H. & Blakely, G.L. (1995). Individualism-Collectivism as an Individual Difference Predictor of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 16(2): 127-142.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome*. Lexington Books/DC Heath and Com.
- Ögel, B. (2010). *Türk Mitolojisi, Kaynakları ve Açıklamaları ile Destanlar, I-II. Cilt*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A Critical Review of The Theoretical and Empirical Literature and Suggestions for Future Research. *Journal of Management* 26(3): 513-563.
- Smith, C.A., Organ, D.W. & Near, J.P. (1983). Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature and Antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 68(4): 653-663.
- Williams, L.J. Stella E.A. (1991). Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment as Predictors of Organizational Citizenship and In-Role Behaviors. *Journal of Management* 17(3): 601-617.

## Appendix

Studies held in Turkish Culture		
No	References	OCB mean
1	Akdoğan, A.A. & Köksal, O. (2014). Aidiyet Algısının Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı Üzerindeki Etkisinde Yöneticiye Güvenin Aracılık Rolü. <i>Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi</i> 18(1): 25-43.	3.98
2	Akgündüz, Y. & Çakıcı, A.C. (2015). Algılanan Örgütsel Desteğin Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışlarına Etkisinde Örgütsel Stresin Aracılık Rolü: Beş Yıldızlı Otel İşletmelerinde Bir Araştırma. <i>Journal of Alanya Faculty of Business/Alanya İletme Fakültesi Dergisi</i> 7(2): 29-41.	4.21
3	Altinkurt, Y. & Yılmaz, K. (2012). Okul Yöneticilerinin Kullandığı Güç Kaynakları İle Öğretmenlerin Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışları Arasındaki İlişki. <i>Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri</i> 12(3): 1833-1852.	3.92
4	Arslantaş, C.C. (2008). Yöneticiye Duyulan Güvenin Ve Psikolojik Güçlendirmenin Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı Üzerindeki Etkilerini Belirlemeye Yönelik Görgül Bir Çalışma. <i>TISK Academy/TISK Akademi</i> 3(5): 100-117.	4.06
5	Aslan, Ş. (2008). Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı İle Örgütsel Bağlılık Ve Mesleğe Bağlılık Arasındaki İlişkilerin Araştırılması. <i>Yönetim ve Ekonomi: Celal Bayar Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi</i> 15(2): 163-178.	4.63

6	Aydoğan, E. & Deniz, G. (2018). İşgörenlerin Dışsal Prestij Ve Örgütsel Destek Algısının Pozitif Örgütsel Çıktılar Üzerindeki Etkisi: Butik Otel İşletmelerinde Bir Araştırma. <i>Hacettepe Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi</i> 36(1): 17-37.	4.44
7	Bolat, O.İ. et.al. (2009). Güçlendirici Lider Davranışları Ve Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı Arasındaki İlişkinin Sosyal Mübadele Kuramından Hareketle İncelenmesi. <i>Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi</i> 12(21): 215-239.	4.75
8	Çavus, M.F. & Develi, A. (2015). İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi Uygulamalarının Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı Üzerindeki Etkileri. <i>TISK Academy/TISK Akademi</i> 10(20): 230-149.	3.51
9	Çelik, M. & Çıra, A. (2013). Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışının İş Performansı Ve İşten Ayrılma Niyeti Üzerine Etkisinde Aşırı İş Yükünün Aracılık Rolü. <i>Ege Akademik Bakış</i> 13(1): 11-20.	4.25
10	Çelik, M. et.al. (2017). The Investigation of Dark Side of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. <i>Journal of Academic Research in Economics</i> 9(2): 226-245.	4.57
11	Dalgın, T. & Talak, S. (2016). Liderlik Uygulamaları Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışları İlişkisinde Örgütsel Adalet Algısının Düzenleyici Etkisi: Konaklama İşletmeleri Üzerine Bir Araştırma. <i>Gaziantep University Journal of Social Sciences</i> 15(2): 359-393.	4.57
12	Fındıklı, M. M. A. (2015). Exploring The Consequences Of Work Engagement: Relations Among OCB-I, LMX And Team Work Performance/İşe Adanmışlığın Sonuçlarını Keşfetmek: İş Arkadaşlarına Yönelik Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı, Lider-Üye Etkileşimi Ve Takım Performansı İlişkileri. <i>Ege Akademik Bakis</i> 15(2): 229-238.	4.2
13	Güney, T. et.al. (2015). Çalışanların Duygularını Yönetme Becerilerinin Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı Üzerindeki Etkisi: Sabiha Gökçen Havalimanı Çalışanları Üzerine Bir Araştırma. <i>Balıkesir University Journal of Social Sciences Institute</i> 18(34): 99-132.	3.35
14	Ipek, C. & Saklı, A.R. (2012). Çay Sektöründeki Kamu Çalışanlarının Örgütsel Kültür Ve Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı Algıları/Organizational Culture And Organizational Citizenship Behavior Perceptions Of The Public Personel Of Tea Sector. <i>Ege Akademik Bakis</i> 12(2): 251-266.	3.92
15	İplik, E. et.al. (2014). Çalışanların Örgütsel Destek Algılarının Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı Üzerindeki Etkisinde Örgütsel Özdeşleşmenin Rolü. <i>Uluslararası İktisadi ve İdari İncelemeler Dergisi</i> 6(12): 109-122.	3.26
16	İşsever, H. et.al. (2016). Kamu Hastanelerinde Çalışan Hemşirelerde Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı. <i>Tuberculosis</i> 12(3): 29-38.	4.36
17	Kaya, A. (2015). The Relationship Between Spiritual Leadership And Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A Research on School Principals' Behaviors. <i>Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice</i> 15(3): 597-606.	3.78
18	Kerse, G. & Seçkin Z. (2017). Kurumsal Sosyal Sorumluluk Algısının Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışına Etkisi: İmalat Sektörü Çalışanları Üzerinde Ampirik Bir	4.19

	Araştırma. <i>Suleyman Demirel University Journal of Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences</i> 22(3): 839-853.	
19	Kesen, M. (2016). Linking Organizational Identification With Individual Creativity: Organizational Citizenship Behavior As A Mediator. <i>Journal of Yaşar University</i> 11(41): 56-66.	4.02
20	Meydan, C.H. & Basım H.N. (2015). Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışında Kontrol Odağı, Örgütsel Adalet Algısı Ve Örgütsel Bağlılığın Etkisi. <i>Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi</i> 15(1): 99-116.	3.69
21	Morçin, E.S. & Morçin İ. (2013). Etkileşimci Liderliğin Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışına Etkisi: Adana'daki Seyahat Acenteleri Örneği. <i>Visionary E-Journal/Vizyoner Dergisi</i> 4(9):70-80.	3.82
22	Oktay, F. (2016). Çağdaş Örgütlerde Kurumsal İmaj Ve Yenilikçi Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Bağlamında Bir Analiz. <i>Marmara Üniversitesi Öneri Dergisi</i> 12 (45): 341-356.	4.03
23	Öztürk, Y.E. & Özata, M. (2013). Hemşirelerde Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı İle Tıbbi Hataya Eğilim Arasındaki İlişkinin Araştırılması. <i>Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi</i> 18(3): 365-381.	4.05
24	Özyer, K. & Alıcı, İ. (2015). Duygusal Zekâ İle Örgütsel Bağlılık Ve Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı İlişkisi Üzerine Ampirik Bir Araştırma. <i>Zeitschrift für die Welt der Türken/Journal of World of Turks</i> 7(1): 69-85.	4.25
25	Polatçı, S. & Cindiloğlu, M. (2013). Kişi-örgüt Uyumunun Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışına Etkisi: Duygusal Bağlılığın Aracılık Rolü. <i>Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi</i> 18(3): 299-318.	4
26	Şahin, S. & Açar, V. (2017). İnternet Bağımlılığı Ve Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı: Hastanelerde Uygulanan Bir Araştırma. <i>Uluslararası Yönetim İktisat ve İşletme Dergisi</i> 13(5): 1094-1103.	3.92
27	Samancı, S. & Basım, H.N. (2018). Akademisyenlerin Örgütsel Adalet Algıları Ve Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışları: Psikolojik Sermayenin Aracılık Rolü. <i>Business and Economics Research Journal</i> 9(2): 363-380.	4.49
28	Selim, E. & Ayas, N. (2015). Hizmet Odaklılığın Çalışanların Tutum Ve Davranışlarına Ve Örgütün Performansına Etkileri: Hizmet Sektöründe Bir Alan Araştırması. <i>Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi</i> 20(3): 73-98.	3.97
29	Yeşiltaş, M. & Keleş, Y. (2009). İşgörenlerin Eğitim Düzeyleri Ve Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışları Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesine Yönelik Bir Araştırma. <i>İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi</i> 11(2): 1-24.	4.23
30	Yeşiltaş, M. et.al. (2011). Otel İşletmelerinde Algılanan Örgütsel Prestijin Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışları Üzerindeki Etkileri. <i>CÜ İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi</i> 12(2): 171-189.	4.25
31	Yeşilyurt, H. % Koçak, N. (2014). İş Doyumu Ve Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı Arasındaki İlişkinin Otel İşletmeleri Açısından İncelenmesi. <i>Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi</i> 16(2): 303-324.	4.16



32	Yıldız, S. (2014). Örgütsel Adaletin Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışına Etkisinde İş Tatmininin Aracı Rolü/The Mediating Role Of Job Satisfaction In The Effect Of Organizational Justice On The Organizational Citizenship Behavior. <i>Ege Akademik Bakis</i> 14(2): 199-210.	4.14
33	Yılmaz, A. & Döven, M.S. (2016). Liderlik Davranışının Örgütsel Vatandaşlığa Ve Alt Boyutlarına Etkisi: Perakende Sektöründe Bir Araştırma. <i>Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi</i> 21(3): 845-864.	3.81
<b>Studies held in Western Culture</b>		
<b>No</b>	<b>References</b>	<b>OCB mean</b>
1	Bergeron, D. et.al. (2014). The Dual Effects Of Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Relationships To Research Productivity And Career Outcomes In Academe. <i>Human Performance</i> 27(2): 99-128.	3.31
2	Boiral, O. & Paillé, P. (2012). Organizational Citizenship Behaviour for The Environment: Measurement and Validation. <i>Journal of Business Ethics</i> 109(4): 431-445.	2.78
3	Bourdage, J.S. et al. (2012). Motives for Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Personality Correlates and Coworker Ratings of OCB. <i>Human Performance</i> 25(3): 179-200.	3.43
4	Burns, WR T. & DiPaola, M.F. (2013). A Study of Organizational Justice, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, and Student Achievement in High Schools. <i>American Secondary Education</i> 42(1): 4-23.	3,19
5	Cheung, F.Y.-L. & Cheung, R. Y.-H. (2013). Effect of Emotional Dissonance on Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Testing The Stressor-Strain-Outcome Model. <i>The Journal of Psychology</i> 147(1), 89-103.	3.79
6	Clark, O.L. et.al. (2014). Role Definition As A Moderator of The Relationship Between Safety Climate and Organizational Citizenship Behavior Among Hospital Nurses. <i>Journal of Business and Psychology</i> 29(1): 101-110.	4.5
7	De León, M.C.D. & Finkelstein, M.A. (2011). Individualism/Collectivism and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. <i>Psicothema</i> 40(10): 1633-1643.	3.75
8	Duffy, J.A. & Lilly, J. (2013). Do Individual Needs Moderate The Relationships Between Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Organizational Trust & Perceived Organizational Support? <i>Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management</i> 14(3): 185-197.	3.99
9	Ehrhart, M.G. et.al. (2015). Going Above and Beyond For Implementation: The Development and Validity Testing of The Implementation Citizenship Behavior Scale, ICBS. <i>Implementation Science</i> 10(1): 65.	2.06
10	Eisele, P. & D'Amato, A. (2011). Psychological Climate and Its Relation To Work Performance and Well-Being: The Mediating Role of Organizational Citizenship Behavior, OCB. <i>Baltic Journal of Psychology</i> 12(1-2): 4-21.	4.45

11	Evans, W.R. et.al (2010). The Impact of Perceived Corporate Citizenship on Organizational Cynicism, OCB, and Employee Deviance. <i>Human Performance</i> 24(1): 79-97.	3.85
12	Finkelstein, M.A. (2012). Individualism/Collectivism and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: An Integrative Framework. <i>Social Behavior and Personality: An international journal</i> 40(10): 1633-1643.	2.91
13	Jiao, C. et.al. (2011). Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: OCB-Specific Meanings as Mediators. <i>Journal of Business and Psychology</i> 26(1): 11-25.	3.99
14	Konovsky, M.A. & Organ, D.W. (1996). Dispositional and Contextual Determinants of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. <i>Journal of Organizational Behavior</i> 17(3): 253-266.	3.97
15	Lester, S.W. et.al. (2008). The Role of Other Orientation in Organizational Citizenship Behavior. <i>Journal of Organizational Behavior</i> 29(6): 829–841.	3.76
16	Lim, A.S. & Chiaburu, D.S. (2008). Manager Trustworthiness or Interactional Justice? Predicting Organizational Citizenship Behavior. <i>Journal of Business Ethics</i> 83: 453-67.	3.75
17	Louw, K.R. et.al. (2016). Mastery Approach and Performance Approach: The Differential Prediction of Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Workplace Deviance, Beyond HEXACO Personality. <i>Motivation and Emotion</i> 40(4): 566-576.	3.81
18	Miao, R.-T. (2011). Perceived organizational Support, Job Satisfaction, Task Performance and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in China. <i>Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management</i> 12(2): 105-127.	3.81
19	Nwanzu, C.L. (2017). A Comparative Study of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour in Service and Manufacturing Organizations. <i>IFE Psychologia: An International Journal</i> 25(1): 59-76.	3.84
20	Paillé, P. & Grima, F. (2011). Citizenship and Withdrawal in The Workplace: Relationship Between Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Intention to Leave Current Job and Intention to Leave The Organization. <i>The Journal of Social Psychology</i> 151(4): 478-493.	3.68
21	Rioux, L. & Pavalache-Ilie, M. (2013). Workplace Attachment and Organizational Commitment-Are They Predictors of Organizational Citizenship Behavior? Study on French Health Care Workers. <i>Annals of AII Cuza University. Psychology Series</i> 22(1): 5-18.	3.77
22	Schnake, M. & Dumler, M.P. (1997). Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Impact of Rewards and Reward Practices. <i>Journal of Managerial Issues</i> : 216-229.	3.42
23	Shaffer, J.A. et.al. (2015). A Moderated Mediation Model of Personality, Self-Monitoring, and OCB. <i>Human Performance</i> 28(2): 93-111.	3.45
24	Shepherd, R.L. (2017). Federally Mandated Furloughs: The Effect on Organizational Commitment and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. <i>Defense Acquisition Research Journal: A Publication of the Defense Acquisition University</i> 24(1): 162-189.	4.28

25	Shragay, D. & Tziner, A. (2011). The Generational Effect on The Relationship Between Job Involvement, Work Satisfaction, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. <i>Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones</i> 27(2): 143-157.	3.75
26	Spector, P.E. & Che, X.X. (2014). Re-Examining Citizenship: How the Control of Measurement Artifacts Affects Observed Relationships of Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Organizational Variables. <i>Human Performance</i> 27(2): 165-182.	3.35
27	Tillman, C. et.al. (2014). A Tale of Perception: The Role of Perceived Intent on OCBs and Interpersonal Relationships. <i>Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management</i> 15(3): 168-189.	3.75
28	Tofighi, M. et.al. (2015). Relationship Between Emotional Intelligence and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Critical and Emergency Nurses in South East of Iran. <i>Ethiopian Journal of Health Sciences</i> 25(1): 79-88.	3.24
29	Turnipseed, D.L. & Vandewaa, E.A. (2012). Relationship Between Emotional Intelligence and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. <i>Psychological Reports</i> 110(3): 899-914.	3.92
30	Wang, Q. & Bowling, N.A. (2016). A Comparison of General and Work-Specific Personality Measures As Predictors of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. <i>International Journal of Selection and Assessment</i> 24(2): 172-188.	3.66