

## Prosocial Organizational Behaviour

<sup>1</sup>Ms. Shifa Hasan, <sup>2</sup>Ms. Kanchan Tolani

<sup>1</sup>Student, Shri Ramdeobaba College of Engineering and Management, Nagpur.

<sup>2</sup>Assistant Professor, Shri Ramdeobaba College of Engineering and Management, Nagpur.

Email: hasansf@rknec.edu, Kanchan.tolani24@gmail.com

Received: 20<sup>th</sup> September 2018, Accepted: 11<sup>th</sup> October 2018, Published: 31<sup>st</sup> October 2018

### Abstract

Prosocial organizational behaviour has been outstretched by numerous researchers over a past few decades. In recent years, there has been a cumulative gratitude of the status of such behaviour at work place and has important implications in the organizations. Prosocial organizational behaviour is considered as one of the most crucial assets for the organisation to sustain in the market and for its development. This research paper highlights the various types of prosocial behaviour which are dysfunctional in nature and are essential for the active functioning of the organisation and on the root of which inferences are drawn for the same.

### Keywords

*Prosocial Organizational Behaviour, Righteousness, Commitment*

### Introduction

In present times, more emphasis has been placed over pro-social behaviour in the organisation. It has significant inferences in organizations where researchers consider it is important to study such behaviours. It is considered as an extensive concept which comprises many types of behaviours such as serving, uniting etc. but is not restricted to these.

According to Katz's (1964), he recognised prosocial behavioural configuration as the following - 1) configuration representing staying united in the organisation, a second representing surpassing specific standards of performance in the organisation and 3) representing a fragment of prosocial behaviour which represents deeds that go further than specified role requirements in the organization (Motowidlo, 1986, p.710).

Conversely, Katz and Kahn (1978) quantified that the behaviour done by work forces inside the organization, whether role approved or additional-role connected, is inclined by numerous factors - 1) psychosomatic forces to which each of the employees is exposed and 2), forces enthused by role burdens (Culliver, Sigler, McNeely, 1991). According to the study of worthy (1986) prosocial behaviour signifies additional exertion and thoroughness at work. Performances such as working on signifying ways to progress and guard the organization, or speaking constructively about the organization to interlopers are prosocial organizational behaviour which endorse and increase the proficiency of the organization.

On the other hand, the behaviours cited above are important for the organizations to persist. Pro-social organisational behaviour which is measured as an inclusive area to talk about will highlight the dysfunctional aspects of the pro-social organizational behaviour in this paper.

### Kinds of Prosocial Organizational Behaviours

Prosocial organizational behaviours and its types are thought-provoking subjects which have been considered by many researchers over a period of time. Prosocial behaviours can be described in many interpretations based on different values and organizational effectiveness. In common, prosocial organizational behaviour is that act which welfares individual or the organization itself. Although there is no bench mark for prosocial behaviour in fiction, the study of Brief and Motowidlo (1986) is considered as one of the most significant studies which spoke about prosocial organizational behaviours. It is considered as one of the nestlings which matured over the years.

Prosocial behaviour as defined by Brief and Motowidlo (1986) suggests the following: "the prosocial organizational behaviour is a behaviour which is (1) implemented by a member of an organization, (2) focused towards an individual, group, or organization with whom he or she intermingles while carrying out his or her organizational role, and (3) performs with the purpose of encouraging the wellbeing of the individual, group, or organization toward which it is involved" (p.711). Organ and Konovsky (1989), however, appealed that prosocial behaviours reproduce a combination of societal and monetary exchange relationships with the organization.

In response to the study of Brief and Motowidlo (1986), pointed out that there are thirteen unambiguous types of prosocial organizational behaviours out of which three have crucial dissimilarities between them. The first one is the aim to which prosocial acts are engaged. The second difference is about some prosocial behaviours are organizationally practical because they subsidize to the achievement of organizational objectives, while the third distinction is amongst prosocial behaviours that are role-prescribed.

Amongst the thirteen kinds of prosocial organizational behaviours which Brief and Motowidlo (1986) identified, only limited of them are extremely desirable. Furthermore, when Staw (1984) endorsed that prosocial behaviours need not be constrained to doings towards individuals but can also contain actions toward the organization as a unit, Brief and Motowidlo (1986) revealed that prosocial performances directed towards individuals are not essentially in the finest welfares of the organization.

On the other hand, Brief and Motowidlo (1986) projected the indulgent of prosocial configurations of gesture in organizations that can lead to developments in organisational strategy and organizational design and at the same time support organizations lead a more effective and content lives. The chief under scoring goal of this research paper is to climax the significant role of prosocial organizational behaviour in the smooth and effective functioning of any organization and improving the quality of life of those directly and indirectly involved in the same.

### Material and Methods

This research paper is based on secondary data and is qualitative in nature. In this paper, the researcher has gone through previous studies and only the dysfunctional aspects were taken into consideration and a theoretical framework was designed on the basis of the same.

### Results and Discussion

The theory of pro-social behaviour is considered as a weighed down thought in all the areas of business organisations. It is considered as a virtuous mechanism for the business organisations if they have this notion that can differentiate themselves thriving from other organisations in the same ground. It generates a proper atmosphere to foster work flow and inspires the employee to lead a more productive and a fertile life. It also helps the organisation reach its goals. Both the functional aspects and the dysfunctional aspects are considered good and should be pragmatic at the work place. It triggers as a crucial strength for any organisation to sustain in the market.

### Conclusion

From this research paper we conclude that, evolution of forces have influenced a prodigious level of prosocial behaviour in the organisations starting from teamwork to humanity that is shown by the employees employed in the organisation. It is reflected as a key component for organisational effectiveness that primes to enhancement in the work environment through a series of actions performed by its employees. In this research paper, pro-social behaviour that can be inculcated in an employee is revealed through organisational policies such as righteousness and assurance towards the job and towards its employees.

### Scope for Further Research

Through this research paper we tried to find out only the dysfunctional aspects of the pro-social organisational behaviour. Comparable work can be conceded out by the researchers to find out the connection between pro-social behaviour and customer related behaviour, employee related behaviour and whistle blowing which is measured as an important aspect that the paper inspires to be studied in upcoming time. This research paper also bounces the scope for studying variables which have influence on the gratification level of employees (for e.g. environmental aspects like superior-subordinate relationship and individual factors like sentiment or character) and to experiment their impact on diverse kinds of prosocial behaviour in the organisation.

### References

1. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/bs.3830090206>
2. [http://www.scirp.org/\(S\(lz5mqp453edsnp55rrgjt55\)\)/reference/ReferencesPapers.aspx?ReferenceID=669860](http://www.scirp.org/(S(lz5mqp453edsnp55rrgjt55))/reference/ReferencesPapers.aspx?ReferenceID=669860)
3. [http://www.scirp.org/\(S\(i43dyn45teexjx455qlt3d2q\)\)/reference/ReferencesPapers.aspx?ReferenceID=1419075](http://www.scirp.org/(S(i43dyn45teexjx455qlt3d2q))/reference/ReferencesPapers.aspx?ReferenceID=1419075)
4. [http://www.scirp.org/\(S\(i43dyn45teexjx455qlt3d2q\)\)/reference/ReferencesPapers.aspx?ReferenceID=649445](http://www.scirp.org/(S(i43dyn45teexjx455qlt3d2q))/reference/ReferencesPapers.aspx?ReferenceID=649445)
5. <https://books.google.co.in/books?id=gncLA0fHBjcC&pg=PA413&lpg=PA413&dq=staw+1984&source=bl&ots=6ExrmhXvJk&sig=gHebnsCLupspdkTTLC-xshRMxq8&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwin59XDrM7dAhUIpY8KHWL1CscQ6AEwBXoECAYQAQ#v=onepage&q=staw%201984&f=false>