

A CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS OF PROACTIVE BEHAVIORS: IMPACTS ON INDIVIDUAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXTS

PROAKTİF DAVRANIŞLARIN KAVRAMSAL ANALİZİ: BİREYSEL VE ÖRGÜTSEL BAĞLAMLAR ÜZERİNDEKİ ETKİLERİ

Çiğdem Kaya¹

Abstract

This study examines the conceptual framework of proactive, interactive, inactive, and reactive behaviors in organizational settings, with a primary focus on proactive behavior. It investigates the origins, dimensions, and implications of proactive behaviors, highlighting the distinct roles they play in leadership, team dynamics, innovation, and strategy formation. The research identifies how individual and contextual factors contribute to proactive actions and their subsequent impact on organizational outcomes. Emphasizing the strategic advantages of proactivity, the study also acknowledges its potential challenges, such as conflict and resource strain. By integrating insights from various domains, this work advances the understanding of behavioral diversity in organizations and underscores the critical role of proactive behavior in driving change, innovation, and success.

Keywords: Proactive Behaviors, Leadership, Innovation, Extra Role Behavior, Role Breadth Self-Efficacy

JEL Classification: M10, M12, D23

Öz

Bu çalışma, örgütsel ortamlarda proaktif, interaktif, inaktif ve reaktif davranışların kavramsal çerçevesini incelemekte, özellikle proaktif davranışa odaklanmaktadır. Proaktif davranışların kökenleri, boyutları ve örgütsel bağlamdaki çıkarımları ele alınarak, liderlik, ekip dinamikleri, inovasyon ve strateji oluşturma süreçlerindeki farklı rolleri vurgulanmıştır. Araştırmada, bireysel ve bağlamsal faktörlerin proaktif davranışlara nasıl katkıda bulunduğu ve bu davranışların örgütsel sonuçlar üzerindeki etkileri incelenmiştir. Proaktifliğin stratejik avantajlarının altı çizilirken, aynı zamanda çatışma ve kaynak kısıtı gibi potansiyel zorluklar da tartışılmıştır. Farklı disiplinlerden elde edilen bulguların sentezlenmesiyle, bu çalışma örgütlerde davranışsal çeşitliliği ön plana çıkararak, proaktif davranışların değişim, inovasyon ve başarıyı yönlendirmedeki kritik rolünü ortaya koymuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Proaktif Davranışlar, Liderlik, Yenilik, Ek Rol Davranışı, Rol Genişliği Öz Yeterlilik

JEL Sınıflandırılması: M10, M12, D23

¹ Assoc. Prof. Dr. Istanbul Kültür University, Department of International Trade and Finance, cigdem.kaya@iku.edu.tr, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8307-3501>

Submitted : 16/11/2024
Accepted : 28/11/2024

Introduction

The word "proactive" was used by Austrian existential neuropsychiatrist Dr. Viktor Emil Frankl in his book "Man's Search for Meaning", published in 1946, when he suffered greatly in a Nazi camp and lost his entire family. The book describes a person who takes responsibility for his own life rather than looking for reasons in other people or external situations. Frankl emphasized the importance of courage, determination, individual responsibility and awareness of the existence of options regarding the context and situation.

Bateman and Crant (1993) are the researchers who work in the field of organizational behavior and who have developed the Proactive Personality Scale (PPS) and are cited in all studies on proactive behavior. PPS consists of 17 items (e.g. "I am good at identifying opportunities" and "If I believe I can do something, handicaps are not a problem"). Crant also has many publications on proactive personality (Bateman and Crant, 1993, 2000; Crant, 1995, 1996, 2000). Crant (2000) defines proactive behavior as taking the initiative to improve current situations or creating a new situation. According to Crant, proactive behavior involves challenging the status quo rather than passively adapting to current conditions. Proactive behavior is behavior that takes preventive measures before events or situations occur, initiates change, and is forward-looking.

A proactive personality actively identifies opportunities and demonstrates a strong drive for action. The person enjoys challenging the status quo and being able to persuade others to accept her ideas. The proactive rather than reactive individual energetically implements and develops strategies to effectively manage her environment (Deluga, 1998).

Two people in the same position may approach the task in very different ways. When one takes charge, he initiates new initiatives, produces constructive change, and manages proactively. The other strives to protect, to hold on, to be compliant, to keep her head above water, and to be the guardian of the status quo. The first works for constructive reform and tackles issues head-on. The second "goes with the flow" and passively manages the business as usual. The first person is proactive, the second is not. Being proactive is changing things with a deliberate intention to make them better. Proactive behavior separates individuals from the herd and the organization from the rest of the market (Bateman and Crant, 1999).

Reactive behavior is defined as responding to events (being affected), adapting to change, protecting personal and group decisions, and regulating the results of change (tempering) (Newstrom and Davis, 1993). Reactive individuals behave in response to a situation rather than how they want to behave in the future. Reactive individuals wait until an event occurs and organize themselves to better adapt to a new environment. Inactive behavior is the behavior of not taking any action, remaining inactive. Interactive behavior is the behavior in which people interact with each other. Since proactive behaviors have been studied much more than other types of behaviors in the literature, studies on proactive behaviors will be the predominant focus of this study. The Organizational Behavior literature on interactive reactive, and inactive behavior is limited. For example, reactive behavior is usually mentioned in comparative studies on proactive behavior (e.g., Larson, 1986).

Proactive behavior has emerged as an integrated research stream in the organizational behavior literature. There is no single definition, theory, or measurement; rather, researchers have associated different approaches to identify the antecedents and consequences of proactive behavior (Crant, 2000). Potential and actual job performance, leadership, careers, work teams, socialization, and the reputation of American presidents have been examined through the lens of initiative and proactivity. In the study, firstly, the sources of proactive, interactive, inactive and reactive behaviors of individuals were examined, and in the second part, the relationship between proactive behavior and behaviors such as leadership, entrepreneurship, and team performance and individual level personal initiative, role breadth self-efficacy, extra role behavior was expressed. In the third part, change and innovation were examined in relation to what kind of differences those with proactive personality cause in organizational processes. In the fourth part, it was tried to express how proactive, reactive, inactive and interactive people will follow strategies with four models that are included in the literature with several different classifications. In the fifth part, proactive behaviors were associated with power. In the last part, the advantages and disadvantages of proactive behaviors were included.

1. Sources of Proactive, Interactive and Reactive Behaviors

Personality structure has a fundamental effect on whether an individual is proactive, interactive, inactive, or reactive. For example, proactive personality has been defined as “a temperament structure that describes differences among people in the extent to which they take action to influence their environment” (Bateman & Crant, 1993, p.103). The concept of being proactive is based on the interactionist approach defined by Bandura’s social cognitive learning theory (1986). Social cognitive learning proposes a three-way system of reciprocal causality in explaining human behavior. Here, people, the environment, and behavior constantly influence each other. As a result, social cognitive learning theory combines the central characteristics of being proactive. For example, individuals can directly and intentionally influence their social and non-social environments (Bateman & Crant, 1993).

When it comes to personality traits, they are emotions, mental abilities, attitudes, personal characteristics, and the person’s self-concept. This integrated package is fundamental to our understanding of ourselves and others as unique and special individuals. Self-concept is how a person perceives herself socially, physically, and spiritually. In other words, because you have self-concept, you can define yourself as a separate person. Self-concept is not possible without the capacity to think. This gives us the role of cognition. Cognition provides any kind of belief or information about the environment, about oneself, or about one’s behavior. When discussing self-concept, three different topics have been explored. These are self-esteem (a person’s belief about her own value), self-efficacy (a person’s belief in successfully completing a certain task), and self-monitoring (a person’s observation of her own behavior and adaptation to the situation) (Kinicki & Kreitner, 2008).

According to Social Learning Theory, an individual acquires a new behavior through the interaction of cognitive processes and environmental cues and consequences. When we control this learning process by ourselves, we combine it with self-management. According to Bandura, a distinct feature of social learning is its distinct role in assigning self-regulatory capacities. People can prepare environmental supports by producing cognitive supports and can provide control over their own behaviors by producing consequences for their own actions (Gibson et al., 2009). In other words, individuals who can control their environment and cognitive representations of their environment become experts in their own behaviors (Kinicki and Kreitner, 2008). At this point, we

can express that proactive individuals are individuals who can control their environment and cognitive representations of their environment, as they are individuals who initiate change and take initiative before changes occur in the environment.

In 1989, the term proactive was popularized in business literature by Stephen Covey in his *7 Habits of Effective People* (being proactive, getting things done, doing priority work first, thinking in terms of win/win, expecting to understand first and then be understood, creating synergy, sharpening the saw - that is, organizing yourself). According to Covey, by being proactive, individuals can choose the right goals and the right results in life, take personal responsibility for actions, make timely decisions and achieve positive development, and thus become effective. The eighth one was adapted by Lee in 2005 and is to come up with ideas and then inspire others to come up with ideas (Kinicki and Kreitner, 2008).

Individuals have their own ways of acting and thinking, with their unique style and personality. Personality is the combination of balanced physical and mental characteristics that give an individual their identity. These characteristics or traits are the product of the interaction of genetic and environmental influences (Kinicki and Kreitner, 2008). When looking at personality dynamics, the Big Five Personality Dimensions stand out. Of these dimensions, extraversion refers to a strong need for social and interpersonal interaction and being open-hearted, talkative, and self-confident; agreeableness refers to being agreeable, reliable, and well-mannered; conscientiousness refers to being motivated, persistent, responsible, and trustworthy in goal-oriented behavior; emotional stability (its opposite is neuroticism) refers to being reasonable, tensionless, worry-free, and reliable; and openness to experience refers to being imaginative, enthusiastic, broad-minded, and intellectual (Turner and Fletcher, 2006; Gibson et al., 2009). Bateman and Crant (2000) found proactive personality to be positively related to extraversion (representing activities and initiative), conscientiousness (striving for success and taking responsibility), and openness (involving actions, ideas, and values), while Turner and Fletcher (2006) found proactive personality to be negatively related to neuroticism.

Another dimension of personality dynamics is the locus of control. The locus of control was first defined by Rotter in 1990. The locus of control is defined as individuals attributing the results of

their behavior to their own behavior or environmental conditions (such as luck) (Gibson et al., 2009). Attributing the results of their behavior to environmental factors is called the external locus of control, while attributing them to personal deficiencies and their own behavior is called the internal locus of control.

The last two dimensions of personality dynamics are attitudes, intelligence and cognitive abilities. Attitudes are tendencies that can be learned, whether appropriate or not, about any subject and are behaviors towards a certain subject. In the dimension of intelligence and cognitive ability, intelligence is expressed as the capacity to think, question and solve problems and is passed down from generation to generation. Environmental factors are also effective in intelligence. For example, if the mother is a substance addict, the baby in the womb will be negatively affected by this. According to research, the intelligence capacity in developed countries is higher. When the reasons for these are investigated, it has been revealed that they are education, socio-economic status, healthy life and technology. When it comes to mental ability, we see two types of mental ability. The first is mental ability, and the second is the work that emerges by using ability and intelligence. For example, doing a puzzle requires mental ability, and the completed puzzle is the task that emerges and is completed (Kinicki and Kreitner, 2008). Locus of control and mental abilities were measured with the proactive personality scale and were found to be unrelated to proactive personality (Bateman & Crant, 1993; Crant, 1995).

Parker and Collins (2010) aimed to clarify the similarities, differences, and interrelationships among different types of proactive behavior. They identified three high-level categories of proactive behavior based on managers' self-assessments: proactive business behavior, proactive strategic behavior, and proactive person-environment fit behavior. Each category was associated with specific types of actions aimed at creating change in the internal organization (e.g., voice behavior), aligning the organization with its environment (e.g., issue selling), and increasing fit between the individual and the organization (e.g., feedback seeking).

In a study conducted by Claes et al. (2005) to examine intercultural proactivity, Hofstede's value dimensions were studied on Finland (feminine traits, low uncertainty avoidance), Belgium (high individuality, high uncertainty avoidance) and Spain (high uncertainty avoidance) cultures.

According to the results of the study, cultures with low power distance are more proactive. High individuality supports proactive personality because it emphasizes personal initiative and innovation. Feminine/masculine traits are auxiliary elements that do not have a clear relationship with proactive personality. A low degree of uncertainty avoidance allows innovation and the courage of proactive people is seen in these cultures.

In conclusion, proactive, reactive, inactive and interactive behaviors stem from the personality traits of individuals mentioned above, cultural forces, social class or other groups they are a member of, family and environment and genetic characteristics (Gibson et al., 2009). Cultural forces refer to norms, values and attitudes; social class or other groups they are a member of, friends refer to people they are in contact with; family and environment refer to the position at birth, education, status and structure; and genetic characteristics refer to gender, biological rhythms and physical characteristics.

2. Studies on Proactive Behaviors

This section presents studies on leadership, team performance, and entrepreneurship related to proactive personality as well as studies on personal initiative, role breadth self-efficacy, and extra role behavior related to proactive personality.

2.1. Leadership

Leadership can be defined as the process by which a person influences and directs the activities of others in order to achieve certain personal or group goals under certain conditions (Koçel, 2007). Leadership perception and leadership effectiveness have also been associated with proactive personality (Crant and Bateman, 2000). The studies conducted are related to charismatic leadership and transformational leadership, as will be discussed in the subheadings of this article.

Another theory that can be expressed under the title of leadership and is associated with interactive behavior is the attribution theory of leadership (Offerman et al., 1998). Attribution Theory is the comparison of an attributed person's behaviors with others by considering both the behaviors and the factors influencing them to determine if they differ from others. If a behavior is perceived as a

leadership behavior, it is time to determine whether this behavior is specific to the person or a common behavior seen in that group. If the person's behavior is a distinctive behavior that is different from others', does not change in different times and situations and shows consistency, then this is a behavior specific to the person and the person is defined as a leader. When viewed from the perspective of the leader-follower, the leader can figure out how to treat her followers and how to guide them with the help of attribution theory. Based on where the reason for the followers' behaviors originates (her own cognitive abilities, her own behavior, performance, or environment), the leader determines how to treat her followers and what methods he will try to mobilize them (Artan, 1999).

In their study, Offerman et al. (1993) examined the effects of performance and attribution on the interactive behaviors of leaders and evaluated the results of the leader's attributions. The interaction that will exist between the two parties with the leader-member exchange, the leader's evaluation of the performance of her subordinates, and the subordinate's evaluation of the leader's behavior are interactive behaviors. In other words, if the leader attributes the poor performance of her subordinates to bad luck, she takes an action to change the group's work assuming that the group has no personal responsibility for the poor performance. If the leader attributes the poor performance to lack of effort, she can take an action to motivate the subordinates more. Attributions will function as a causal link between the leader's future interactive behavior and the subordinate's previous behavior. The effects of attributions will differ depending on the performance outcome. As a result, the study shows that leader attributions about the reasons for subordinate performance can affect the interaction between the subordinates and the leader (Offerman et al., 1993).

Larson et al. (1986) used the terms proactive and reactive in the manager-leader distinction. Leaders are seen as proactive individuals who have an active behavior towards actions, use influence to achieve certain goals and desires, and determine the direction the business takes. On the other hand, managers are seen as reactive individuals who tend to be indifferent; their goals tend to go to "necessities rather than desires". Proactive leaders are defined as those who take charge, take initiative, initiate structure, and are determined, tough, consistent, have successes, charismatic, strong, and powerful. Proactive people initiate action, communication, suggestions,

meetings, and directives to accomplish a task. Managers tend to be reactive. They are less systematic, more informal, and more reactive (Larson et al., 1986).

2.1.1. Charismatic Leadership

Charisma is a concept that has long been used in social sciences to describe extraordinary leaders and leadership. Charisma helps explain the impressiveness of political, religious and social leaders (Crant and Bateman, 2000). Charisma is related to the individual attractiveness of the leader. The charisma of the leader plays an important role in influencing others and making them do what they want, and ensures the formation of loyal followers (Artan, 1999). Charismatic leaders are individuals who create behavioral and emotional changes in their followers, have technical expertise, persuasion and superior negotiation skills. Strong loyalty to the charismatic leader can result in the performance of the followers exceeding expectations (Luthans, 1995). Charismatic leaders see the future of organizations very differently from today, and in order to catch up with the future, they empower and develop their followers and ensure that they take responsibility. They create an environment of trust with the strong emotional bond between them. They use all communication channels to introduce themselves and their ideas. They set a model for their followers with both their ideas and behaviors (Artan, 1999). Charismatic leaders often emerge in times of distress or crisis. They establish an emotional (not just functional) bond with others, become a kind of hero, and appeal to the ideological values of their followers (Pfeffer, 1999).

Conger and Kanungo (1987) stated that leader behavior is based on the perceptions of observers. Charismatic leaders differ from other leaders in their ability to articulate and formulate an inspiring vision, and in their ability to demonstrate unconventional visions and effective actions. Charismatic leadership produces positive follower outcomes such as motivation, job satisfaction, and increased performance.

It has been empirically stated in studies that charismatic leaders outperform less charismatic leaders. Many studies have identified the determinants of subordinates' perceptions of charismatic leadership. Accordingly, personality traits are a key factor in distinguishing charismatic leadership from non-charismatic leadership. Characteristics associated with charismatic leadership are

sensitivity to follower needs, social sensitivity, self-confidence, risk-seeking tendency, creativity, and innovation. In another context, managers who are champions of technological innovation (a proactive behavior) exhibit more charismatic leadership behaviors than non-champions (Crant & Bateman, 2000).

Many behaviors associated with charismatic leadership appear to have roots in proactivity, and thus, it is believed that proactive personalities are expected to have the qualities that drive charisma. For example, charismatic leaders are active innovators and look to change the status quo and are self-confident. They have a vision for a different future, changing followers' beliefs and getting them excited about the vision (Conger & Kanungo, 1987). Proactive orientation is assumed to underlie innovation, self-confidence, and change efforts. Thus, proactive personality will be positively related to the qualities of charismatic leadership (Crant & Bateman, 2000).

In another study (Deluga, 1998) on the relationship between proactive behavior and leadership, the relationship between proactivity, charismatic leadership, and presidential performance in the American presidency was evaluated. The personality profiles of all the presidents from Washington to Reagan were read and it was decided that each had a proactive personality.

2.1.2. Transformational Leadership

Transformational leaders are leaders who inspire their subordinates with their charisma, enable them to achieve high goals, are logical, intelligent, solve problems carefully, and aim for development, change and innovation (Luthans, 1995). Since their individual charm, in other words their charisma, is the source of their power, their followers trust and respect them and identify with them. Thus, the demands of the leaders are fulfilled without hesitation. The leader also aims to empower his followers by giving them authority and responsibility, so that they can trust themselves and develop themselves. They often take their place in the history of the organization as a legend with the radical changes they make, especially in times of crisis or in times of confusion and uncertainty, and they are always praised (Artan, 1999).

As a result of interviews conducted by Tichy and Devanna with senior managers from large companies in 1992, they determined the characteristics that transformational leaders share.

According to the results of these interviews, transformational leaders define themselves as change agents, are courageous, believe in and trust people, are value determinants, believe in lifelong learning, have the ability to overcome situations of complexity, uncertainty and indecision, and are visionaries (Luthans, 1995). Logically, these behaviors are derived from the basic characteristics of proactive behavior. These characteristics include examining the environment thoroughly and identifying opportunities to change the structure, showing initiative and taking action, and resisting until the change is effective (Bateman and Crant, 1993).

Some empirical evidence has suggested that proactive personality is related to transformational and charismatic leadership. Bateman and Crant (1993) argued that transformational leadership is related to the prototypical characteristics of a proactive individual. In a study conducted with MBA students, a positive relationship was found between being selected by peers as a transformational leader and proactive personality. Den Hartog and Belschak (2012) examine the interactive effects of personal and contextual factors on employees' proactive behavior. Consistent with previous research, the findings of this study show positive main effects of transformational leadership, role breadth self-efficacy, and job autonomy on proactive behavior. They find that in high autonomy situations, transformational leadership positively influences proactive behavior for individuals with high self-efficacy, whereas in low autonomy situations, it positively influences proactive behavior for individuals with low self-efficacy. High self-efficacy individuals in low-autonomy situations may feel frustrated by the lack of freedom and disengage, as they rely more on their intrinsic abilities than external guidance. Low self-efficacy individuals in high-autonomy situations may feel overwhelmed by the freedom and lack of structure, struggling to take initiative without clear guidance or support. Transformational leadership adapts to these dynamics by filling the motivational or structural gaps that different individuals experience in varying autonomy contexts, thereby optimizing their proactive behaviors. This pattern highlights the complex interaction between personal and contextual factors in shaping proactive behavior.

2.2. Team Performance

Proactive personality and proactive behavior are important for the effectiveness of organizations, individuals, and teams. In the studies of Hyatt and Ruddy (1997), proactive behavior was shown

as a characteristic in the definitions and subscales of the characteristics assessed by the group development profile and the subscales within the scope of group members were determined as follows: they actively seek areas to continue development, they constantly revise their work processes, they seek alternative solutions to problems, they seek innovative solutions to problems, they draw attention to these issues before major problems arise. It is stated that teams are proactive when they try to do these (Hyatt and Ruddy, 1997). Empowered teams have been found to improve the quality of their work by initiating change in the work they are responsible for and to take frequent action on problems.

The concept of proactive personality was extended to the work team level in a field study of 101 work teams from four organizations with formal teamwork systems. Kirkman and Rosen's (1999) data showed that proactivity at the team level was positively related to team psychological empowerment. More proactive teams were positively related to higher levels of team cohesion, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction. This research is the first application of the proactive personality construct at the team level to provide empirical evidence for the importance of proactive behavior by work teams. When team members are psychologically empowered, their teams will be more proactive.

2.3. Entrepreneurship

Entrepreneurship, in its most general sense, is the process of creating value by creating a unique resource package to benefit from an opportunity and is also defined as catching an opportunity that has not been noticed by a person or persons before (Brazeal and Herbert, 1999). In the literature, three dimensions of entrepreneurship are generally mentioned in the definitions related to entrepreneurship. The dimensions of entrepreneurship are in the form of a strategic orientation that includes risk taking, proactivity and innovation activities. Entrepreneurship requires being proactive and taking a reasonable amount of risk (Covin and Slevin 1989). Being proactive, on the other hand, requires using initiative and taking risks. Companies that adapt to being proactive will be more open to opportunities and this will make them more entrepreneurial (Kuratko et al., 2007). Bateman and Crant (1993) defined proactivity as taking action by taking initiative to evaluate opportunities that occur in the environment and efforts to catch the changes that occur in the

environment, as stated before. In relation to this definition, being proactive is seen in organizations' attempts to become leaders in the market, offering more new products or services than their competitors, and introducing technologies earlier (Covin and Slevin, 1989). Therefore, it can be expected that the performance of inactive or reactive firms will be low because they do not take sufficient actions to foresee future situations and do not create opportunities. The innovation dimension is that firms become more dynamic and more competitive with new and original ideas (Covin and Slevin, 1989). Proactive individuals are proactive in taking risks and in innovation because they take action for the future.

Crant (1996) examined the relationship between behavioral intentions towards entrepreneurial career, defined as having one's own business, and individual differences using the Proactive Personality Scale. Using a sample of 181 students in the study, he found that entrepreneurial intentions, gender, education, having an entrepreneurial family, and proactive personality were significantly related. According to the study, the strongest relationship was between entrepreneurial intentions and the proactive personality scale. Emphasizing that entrepreneurship has certain individual dimensions, he found that proactive personality and entrepreneurship were positively related, women explained less entrepreneurial intentions than men, education was positively related to entrepreneurial intentions, and those with entrepreneurial families had more entrepreneurial intentions than those without. He stated that when the effects of gender, education, and family reasons were controlled, the proactive personality scale explained a significant amount of variance in entrepreneurial intentions.

Gupta and Bhawe (2007) conducted another study focusing on the role of proactive personality in moderating the impact of the common 'masculine' stereotype about entrepreneurs on entrepreneurial intentions. By introducing a stereotype threat, the study examined the responses of eighty young women. The findings revealed that women with highly proactive personalities were more strongly influenced by exposure to the prevalent stereotype about entrepreneurs, experiencing a notable decline in their intentions to pursue entrepreneurship compared to women with less proactive personalities. For example, high-achieving women in mathematics are detrimentally affected by the presence of a negative stereotype when compared to equally high-achieving women who do not care about mathematics on a math test. They are intrinsically motivated to do the task

well and are driven to increase their own business outcomes. This leads us to expect that stereotype threat is stronger for those who are more proactive than for those who are less proactive. In other words, template threat significantly detrimentally affects the entrepreneurial intentions of more proactive women compared to less proactive women. Women with proactive personalities are more inclined to take initiative and affect change in their current situation compared to less proactive women. However, the study found that although more proactive women generally have higher entrepreneurial intentions, they also tend to be more affected by template threat (Gupta & Bhawe, 2007).

Becherer and Maurer (1999) examined the relationship between the proactive temperament of the chairmen and their entrepreneurial behavior using a sample of 215 small-scale business executives. Entrepreneurial behavior was measured by the type of ownership (starting, purchasing, inheriting) and the term starting a business, using the proactive personality scale of Bateman and Crant (1993). The relationship between the firm's entrepreneurial stance and proactivity, the firm's performance, and the extent to which the chairmen delegate authority were also examined. The level of chairmen's proactivity was related to each dimension of entrepreneurship. The strongest relationship was between starting a new business and proactivity. Proactivity was directly and significantly related to the firm's entrepreneurial stance and changes in the firm's sales. There were significant differences in proactive temperament between business executives who entered a new business and those who did not. No relationship was found between proactivity and transfer of authority style or changes in profits (Becherer and Maurer, 1999).

2.4. Personal Initiative

Personal initiative is a behavioral pattern that involves taking action and taking a self-initiating approach to work (showing initiative and being strongly motivated) that goes beyond formal job requirements (Frese et al., 1996, 1997). It is characterized by five components: 1) is aligned with the organizational mission; 2) requires a long-term focus; 3) is action and goal oriented; 4) is persistent in the face of obstacles; and 5) is self-started and proactive.

Personal initiative was measured using interview-based methodology and questionnaires in the studies of Frese et al. (1996, 1997). Because questionnaires tend to measure self-concepts, they cannot measure behavior. Also, since their study was between East and West Germany, there would be differences in interpretation of the scale, so interview and questionnaire methods were used. Proactive behavior was measured by whether people took an active approach to overcoming obstacles as a result, whether they maintained their initiative, or whether they delegated solutions to others. Personal initiatives were examined in East and West Germany. The study found that socialist East Germany had lower personal initiative than West Germany. Employee perceptions of job control and job complexity were lower in the East. Frese et al. (1996) interpreted these results as complexity and control affecting initiative through skill development and motivational processes.

Employees' proactive behavior was previously emphasized to be related to taking initiative, as defined by Crant (2000). Different types of behaviors and temperaments are reflected in the degree of proactive attitude of the employee (Crant, 2000). While Bateman and Crant (1993) focused on the individual's temperament towards being proactive, Frese and Fay (2001) focused on behavioral syndromes such as personal initiative and proactive behaviors. Such behaviors are aimed at developing given work procedures and methods in the form of developing individuals in advance regarding future work. They are also aimed at developing a self-starting approach towards work and performance (Frese et al., 1996; Parker, 2000). Initiative varies among individuals. Studies have shown that organizational variables and workplace factors affect the levels of personal initiative shown (Fay and Frese, 2001). Personal initiative requires a highly proactive temperament. Personal initiative refers to a general proactive goal orientation aimed at achieving organizationally desired goals, such as more personal goals (e.g. career) (Frese & Fay, 2001).

2.5. Role Breadth Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy is the belief in one's abilities that will enable him/her to manage the situations expected of him/her. The employee's feeling sufficient to go beyond the job description (role breadth) is the most important dimension of being proactive, and this dimension is the person's self-confidence in taking on a more proactive and comprehensive role by going beyond the

traditional and technical requirements of the job (Parker, 1998; Parker et al., 2006; Hwang, et al., 2015). In this context, individuals' perceptions of their competence expectations, in other words their self-efficacy, affect their taking action and their determination to deal with problems (Parker et al., 2006). Employees who feel sufficient to go beyond the job description act proactively in their work, understand the relationships between different functions and job roles, and can see the whole. At the same time, they gain the ability to solve problems in their area of influence, set goals for themselves, and can resolve conflicts constructively. Role breadth self-efficacy includes people's feelings and beliefs about what they can do rather than what they do. The sense of efficacy determines how intensely and for how long an individual will exert effort to do his or her job in the best possible way (Parker, 1998).

Parker et al. (2006) tested role breadth self-efficacy with a sample of cable manufacturing workers in England. Personality and work environment antecedents affect proactive work behavior through cognitive motivational mechanisms. In the study that resulted from 60 cable manufacturing workers with self-reported proactive work behaviors (proactive idea implementation and proactive problem solving), proactive personality, flexible role orientation and role breadth self-efficacy were significantly associated with proactive work behavior through self-benefit. Job autonomy, employee and coworker trust, flexible role orientation were also associated with proactive behavior. According to the research, the ability to exceed job description is shaped by the conditions within the organization. When organizations can provide suitable working conditions, they also have the opportunity to elicit proactive behavior in their employees.

In the study by Ohly and Fritz (2007), four forms of work motivation were tested by reviewing the literature on the antecedents of proactive behavior at work: job self-efficacy, role breadth self-efficacy, intrinsic work motivation, and role orientation. The study was conducted with a sample of 98 software development employees using coworkers who also rated proactive behavior. Correlations showed that intrinsic motivation and job self-efficacy were unrelated to coworker evaluations of proactive behavior, but role orientation and role breadth self-efficacy were related. The study emphasizes the importance of role breadth self-efficacy in developing proactive behavior at work.

2.6. Extra Role Behavior

Morrison and Phelps (1999) examined extra role behavior, which is expressed as taking responsibility. Extra role behavior is defined as a voluntary behavior that is intended to affect organizational functional change. The study was conducted with both self-assessment and coworker data from 275 white-collar employees from different organizations. It was measured with a 10-item questionnaire. An example item could be “this person generally tries to establish new work methods that are more effective for the company.” Extra role behavior is a behavior associated with feeling responsible, self-efficacy, and openness to perceptions of upper management as interpreted by coworkers. The results of the study show that organizations can motivate their employees by giving them a positive change and removing the limitations in their work (Morrison and Phelps, 1999). Employees believe in their own capabilities and see upper management as supportive of change efforts. In addition, organizations are a structure that is compatible with the idea that they need employees who are willing to challenge the status quo by making changes. Taking responsibility is change-oriented and development-oriented and, in this respect, is related to proactive behavior (Crant, 2000).

3. The Effect of Proactive Personality on Organizational Processes

Proactive personality, as defined in the study, initiates forward-looking change, takes initiative and continues with determination. The effects of these personality traits on organizational processes will be presented under the headings of change and innovation.

3.1. Change

In general, change refers to bringing something from one level to another. Organizational change also means changing from a current situation to a different situation in matters related to organizational activities (Koçel, 2007). Organizational change may be in the form of a change in structure, a change in technology, a change in physical appearance and a change in people (Robbins, 1998). Change has been classified in different ways: planned-unplanned change, macro-micro change, change spread over time-sudden change, proactive-reactive change, comprehensive-narrow-scoped change, active-passive change, step-by-step change-radical change. Of these

classifications, proactive change refers to changing the organization's business activities and procedures according to the predicted environmental conditions; therefore, the organization is ready when the predicted conditions occur. Reactive change, on the other hand, is making changes in order to adapt to the conditions encountered (reacting to the conditions encountered). Active change is when an organization innovates and influences and changes its external environment, while passive change is when an organization makes changes within itself to adapt to the conditions developing in its external environment (Koçel, 2007).

Being proactive involves not just expecting change, but creating it. It does not only include the important characteristics of adaptability and flexibility to an uncertain future. Being proactive is taking the initiative to improve the business. At the other extreme, non-proactive behavior involves lagging behind, trying to do what is permitted, and passively waiting for externally imposed changes (Bateman and Crant, 1999).

People can engage in many actions related to change, but not all of them are truly proactive. First, change can be evoked without intending a positive or negative outcome. This is not proactive behavior. Second, people can attribute psychologically reframed or reinterpreted situations to cognitive restructuring. This is also not proactive behavior, because it changes perceptions without changing reality. Third, when people make a decision to enter a new business, merger, or investment, or to enter a new market, this decision is a conscious decision and is proactive behavior. Fourth, and most importantly, people intentionally and directly change existing situations in order to create new situations. This is what is meant by true proactive behavior (Bateman & Crant, 1999).

To explore these behaviors, Bateman and Crant (1999) interviewed proactive business people, such as corporate presidents and entrepreneurs, in North Asia, Central Europe, and North America. They found that, like other proactive individuals, they considered change opportunities, set effective, change-oriented goals, anticipated and prevented problems, did different things or did things differently, took action, and engaged in behaviors that persevered and achieved success.

Bateman and Crant (1993) examined personal temperament toward proactive behavior in influencing environmental change. Using 148 MBA students, scores on the proactive scale were

related to the need for achievement, the need for dominance, the extracurricular and civic activities the students undertook, social activities, major personal achievements, and transformational leadership characteristics. The proactive personality, as stated, is one who is relatively unconstrained by situational forces and who affects environmental change. People create and change their environments in the interactionist perspective. Other people are not so classified and are relatively passive. They react, adapt, and are shaped by their environments. Proactive people seek opportunities and take initiative, take action, and persevere. They are the ones who change or find the mission of their organizations, solve problems, and break new ground (Bateman & Crant, 1993).

3.2. Innovation

Innovation is generally about a process that involves generating unconventional ideas and approaches, institutionalizing or implementing new products or processes, and identifying a problem or an opportunity. Innovation has been defined as an extra-role view of individual performance in organizations. They define this structure as a behavior that demonstrates creativity and innovation in one's job and the organization as a whole. Employees who are committed to innovation work to implement and develop new routines, processes, and ideas at work (Seibert et al., 2001). In the studies of Bateman and Crant (1993), a relationship between proactive personality and innovative behavior has been suggested. While defining the characteristics of proactive personality, the tendency to identify opportunities for development has also been expressed. Proactive individuals are more in favor of structural change and innovation in organizations, situations, and people than their less proactive counterparts. Parker (1998) stated that proactive personality is positively and significantly related to the participation of individuals in the organizational development of a company. There have been studies in the literature emphasizing the positive relationships between product innovation and proactive behavior (e.g. Seibert et al., 2001).

Seibert et al. (2001) developed a model of the proactive personality and career success link using data from 180 full-time employees and their supervisors. Two timed measurements were made, and in the first, proactive personality was associated with innovativeness, political knowledge, and

career initiative, and in the second, with innovativeness, political knowledge, career initiative, and the expression of innovative thinking. Parker (1998) found that innovations and organizational practices were associated with proactive personality using data from a glass manufacturing company that implemented several management initiatives. Proactive personality was positively and significantly associated with the use of meetings to disseminate strategic information, voluntary membership in development groups, and beliefs that those who had an expanded and enriched job. The central focus of the study was role breadth self-efficacy. The relationships between proactive personality and organizational practices were highlighted, suggesting organizational interventions that may have more positive effects for proactive individuals.

4. Proactive, Reactive, Interactive and Inactive Strategies

In case of change in the current job descriptions of the businesses, basic strategies called growth, downsizing, stagnation and mixed strategies are applied. In other words, the business expands, shrinks, continues its business as it is or applies these basic strategies repeatedly by making changes in the goods and services it produces, the markets it operates in or the production functions and processes. These basic strategies are applied in different forms and sizes in businesses. These subgroups of basic strategies are; dependent-independent, related-unrelated, horizontal-vertical and active-passive basic strategies. Of these, active and passive strategies are related to the attitude and timing approaches in the implementation of basic strategies. Active strategy has an aggressive attitude and timing, passive strategy has an adaptive attitude and timing (Ülgen and Mirze, 2007).

Active strategies are strategies that managers and strategists decide on and implement before events force and direct them (Ülgen and Mirze, 2007). It is similar to Crant (2000)'s definition of proactive personality. Active strategies are the leading and guiding strategic practices that managers put into practice before events occur (Ülgen and Mirze, 2007). Strategies that businesses apply reactively and adaptively in the face of events after events occur and everything falls into place are passive strategies (Ülgen and Mirze, 2007). Larson et al. (1986) defined proactive strategy as strategists taking action before pressure is applied to respond to environmental threats and opportunities. Proactive behavior is behavior that directly changes the environment. Like all behaviors, it has both personal and situational reasons. Bateman and Crant (1993) stated that the proactive dimension of

behavior is rooted in people's need to control and skillfully manage their environment. Individuals follow a proactive strategy with these aspects.

Hamel and Prahalad (1994), in their article called *Competing for Future*, included some questions that will help determine whether the company is future-oriented. The answers are given in two columns under the questions. The answers to the question “What are the views of the business manager about the future in comparison with your competition?” are shown in two columns. The left column is traditional and reactive, the right column is different and forward-looking. Another sample question is “Which business issue attracts the attention of managers more?” The answer on the left is redesigning basic processes, the answer on the right is reproducing basic strategies; the last sample question is “What is the strength of your company?” The answer on the left is efficiency in implementation, and the answer on the right is innovation and growth. If the answers of the company manager are weighted in the left column, this means that the company is spending too much energy on preserving the past and is not creative enough for the future.

As organizational processes change, strategy formation varies in how managers personally participate in designing what strategy is for and analyzing the firm's situation. Managers use four basic styles of strategy making. The first is the expert strategist approach. Here, some managers assume the role of chief strategist and exert strong, unassisted influence over situation assessments, strategic alternatives, and strategic details. This does not mean that they personally do all the work, but rather that they use a proactive hand in shaping strategy as chief strategist. The second is the delegation approach. Here, the manager may delegate some or all of the strategy-making task to trusted subordinates. This style of strategy making allows for input and broad participation from most managers and areas. The great weakness of delegation is that its success depends on the operational judgment and strategy-making skills of those tasked with strategy-making – for example, if subordinates' strategy-making efforts are more concerned with how to address today's problems than with taking an entrepreneurial stance and adapting their resources to seize tomorrow's opportunities, it is reactive and can increase a very short-term orientation (Thompson and Strickland, 1999). In the collaborative approach, managers involve their subordinates in key roles in strategy formation. Strategies are prepared and implemented together with the manager

and subordinates. In the Champion Approach, managers or strategists are not involved in strategy formation at all. It is an approach to choosing original and creative strategies by encouraging subordinates (Ülgen and Mirze, 2007).

A similar classification is seen in Mintzberg's Strategic Decision-Making Methods. According to Mintzberg, the first of the strategic decision-making methods is Entrepreneurial Mode. Here, the strategy is made by a strong individual. The focus is on opportunities, problems are secondary. The strategy is guided by those who make bold decisions and find their own vision. The dominant goal is organizational growth. The second is Adaptive Mode. This decision-making method is characterized by reactive solutions to existing problems rather than proactively seeking new opportunities. Strategy develops the institution by moving it forward. This method is specific to most universities, very large hospitals, the vast majority of government departments and large institutions. The third is Planning Mode. This decision-making method includes systematically collecting appropriate information for situation analysis, producing applicable alternative strategies, and logical choices of the most appropriate strategies. It includes both proactive search for new opportunities and reactive solutions to existing problems. Fourth, in some cases, an organization may follow a fourth approach called logical incrementalism, which is a synthesis of entrepreneurial, adaptive, and planning methods of strategic decision making. Top management may have a fairly clear idea of the organization's mission and goals, but in developing strategies, it chooses to use an interactive process, whereby the overall strategy learns and gains experience from incremental engagement rather than through global organizations (Wheelen and Hunger, 1998).

In addition to these categories, the model that defines the institution's status or strategy for management issues should be expressed. The model, which is referred to as the RDAP (reactive, defensive, accommodative, proactive) strategy in the literature, was also used by Wartick and Cochran in 1985, following Carroll's work in 1979, and the terms reactive, defensive, accommodative and proactive were used. It was also transformed into the RDAP scale by Clarkson in 1988 and 1991. Reactive, defensive, accommodative, and proactive strategies were presented to characterize the institution's status or strategy for social sensitivity. For example, creating a strategy in line with the state's social policy was characterized as "accommodative", and Johnson &

Johnson's acceptance of responsibility in the Tylenol crisis and the immediate recall of products before the incident became too big was characterized as proactive (Clarkson, 1995).

Table 1. Reactive-Defensive-Accommodative-Proactive (RDAP) Scale (Clarkson, 1995)

Evaluation	Situation or strategy	Performance
Reactive	Reject responsibility	Do less than necessary
Defensive	Accept responsibility and fight it	Do the minimum necessary
Accommodative	Accepting responsibility	Doing everything that is necessary
Proactive	Do their responsibilities without being told	Do more than is necessary

Proactive, accommodative, defensive, and reactive strategies are all legitimately defensible, the last two being less likely to satisfy shareholders. When these four are considered individually, most resources are likely to be required in the proactive strategy and few in the reactive strategy. For example, proactively signaling employee interest by providing compensation, profit sharing, stock options, and bonus payments requires more resources than the defensive strategy in providing mandatory benefits and securing payment of wages. Similarly, proactively investing in training and development requires more resources than the reactive strategy (Iawahar and McLaughlin, 2001).

5. Relationship Between Proactive Behaviors and Gaining Power

Power is the ability to influence individuals' behaviors, change the course of events, overcome resistance, and make people do things they would not do otherwise (Pfeffer, 1999). According to McClelland's Need for Achievement Theory, a person behaves under the influence of the need for achievement, the need for affiliation, and the need for gaining power. A person with a high need for achievement sets difficult goals and tries to achieve them and acquire the necessary knowledge and skills to be different. The need for affiliation refers to establishing relationships with others, entering a group, and developing social relationships. A person with a strong need for power will exhibit behaviors such as expanding their sources of power and authority, influencing others, and protecting their power (Koçel, 2007).

An individual with a high need for power is more competitive and more assertive than an individual with a low need for power, and they prefer situations that will motivate them (Gibson et al., 2009). Therefore, individuals with a proactive personality are superior to reactive individuals in gaining power. Because they are more aggressive than reactive individuals, they take initiative and have a more competitive structure with their innovative characteristics. Individuals with a high perception of power distance accept that power is not distributed equally and therefore individuals give more importance to elements such as status and title. As a result, the distance between them is maintained. In the study, it was emphasized that individuals in cultures with a low perception of power distance will be more proactive. Therefore, it can be stated that individuals with a low perception of power distance will be closer to people in power and thus have a higher probability of gaining power.

In addition, the characteristics expressed as the Big Five Personality Traits such as extroversion and openness to experience are the characteristics found in proactive individuals. When individuals try to gain power, they want to be members of powerful groups and to be associated with powerful people. In order to achieve this, the individual must have strong social and interpersonal interactions and be extroverted. Therefore, these characteristics, which are the source of proactive behavior, can help the individual in gaining power.

In Stupak and Leitner's (2001) studies, proactivity and charisma are given as examples of tactics for gaining power. Being proactive is expressed as taking action without prior permission and increasing power by going too far, and it is emphasized that the proactive person takes the initiative. Therefore, a proactive person will be able to apply tactics on the way to gaining power with the characteristics they have. Charisma, on the other hand, refers to using qualities such as being approachable and reliable in order to be a respected or known person. Therefore, agreeableness, which is also one of the Big Five Personal Characteristics, is related to proactive personality in the context of charisma, and individuals with proactive personality are more active in gaining power. As a result, it can be stated that proactive individuals can gain power by challenging the status quo, changing current situations, and influencing people.

6. Advantages and Disadvantages of Proactive Behavior

The dual nature of individual proactive behavior includes both potential positive effects, such as discovering new opportunities, and short- and medium-term negative consequences, such as conflict with leadership or organizational disruption. Although proactive behavior can lead to positive organizational outcomes, its impact often depends not only on the individual's behavior or motivations, but also on the organizational context and the perceptions of leaders and colleagues. For proactive behavior to be effective, individuals must carefully evaluate situations, and organizations must foster environments that support proactive actions and provide appropriate guidance and incentives (Li and Huang, 2021).

Looking at the positive effects of individual proactive behavior for both individuals and organizations, at the individual level, proactive behavior is associated with improved attitudes, higher job satisfaction, improved performance, increased job involvement, and greater career success. Individual proactive behavior also promotes innovation, learning, and socialization, resulting in better evaluations and higher rewards from leaders. For organizations, proactive behavior fosters high-quality leader-member exchange relationships, improves team dynamics, and increases organizational performance by promoting positive change and reducing constraints. In general, proactive behavior not only benefits individuals by increasing their job satisfaction and career prospects, but also contributes to the broader organizational context by increasing team effectiveness and driving organizational success (Grant et al., 2009; Li and Huang, 2021).

When looking at the negative effects of individual proactive behavior on both individuals and organizational contexts, at the individual level, proactive behavior can lead to stress, resource depletion, and emotional exhaustion, especially when driven by external motivations or not supported by the organization. It can also lead to lower performance evaluations by leaders who may perceive such behavior as a threat or ill-timed, and it can cause resentment in colleagues due to the disruption of established workflows and role boundaries. Furthermore, proactive behavior can lead to conflict within teams, especially when it challenges norms or introduces changes that colleagues resist, and can ultimately reduce organizational effectiveness. Therefore, it can be stated that the positive and negative effects of proactive behavior depend on situational, interpersonal, and organizational factors, and that the nature of proactive behavior is complex (Grant et al., 2009; Li and Huang, 2021).

Spychala and Sonnentag (2011) examined the antecedents of task conflict in the workplace, focusing on the roles of situational constraints and two types of proactive work behaviors (promotion-oriented initiative and prevention-oriented initiative). The results showed that situational constraints, even when perceived at low levels, were positively associated with increases in task conflict. Furthermore, promotion-oriented initiative was associated with increases in task conflict, while prevention-oriented initiative was associated with decreases in task conflict over time. The findings suggest that proactive behaviors have more complex consequences than previously assumed, as different types of proactive behaviors can have opposing effects on task conflict. The study also highlighted that task conflicts can be influenced by situational factors and employees' proactive behaviors, with proactive behavior potentially reducing or exacerbating existing conflicts depending on the nature of the initiative. The research contributed to a deeper understanding of proactive work behavior and its dynamic impact on workplace conflicts.

Conclusion

This study has comprehensively analyzed the origins, dimensions, and implications of proactive, interactive, inactive, and reactive behaviors within organizational contexts. The findings illustrate that these behaviors stem from individual personality traits, cultural influences, social environments, familial factors, etc. Among these, proactive behavior emerges as a transformative force that significantly impacts leadership, entrepreneurship, and team performance, as well as constructs like personal initiative, role breadth self-efficacy, and extra-role behaviors.

Proactive behavior is highlighted for its capacity to foster change and innovation, enabling individuals and organizations to stay ahead in dynamic environments. Those with a proactive personality not only drive organizational transformation but also tend to employ distinct strategies that align with forward-thinking models, setting them apart from reactive, inactive, and interactive counterparts. These strategies allow proactive individuals to anticipate and shape future challenges and opportunities, providing them with a competitive edge in leadership and organizational processes.

Moreover, the study establishes a strong connection between proactive behavior and power dynamics. Proactive individuals are more adept at influencing others, acquiring authority, and navigating organizational hierarchies due to their initiative, charisma, and ability to challenge the status quo. However, the dual nature of proactive behavior also necessitates careful consideration of its potential drawbacks, including interpersonal conflicts, resource depletion, and resistance from peers or leadership.

Maan et al. (2020) investigates how perceived organizational support affects job satisfaction, with psychological empowerment serving as a mediator and proactive personality serving as a moderator. Based on data from 936 employees in the manufacturing and service sectors, the authors show that perceived organizational support positively affects both psychological empowerment and job satisfaction. The positive effect of perceived organizational support on job satisfaction is weaker among employees with high proactive personality. Proactive employees naturally engage in extra-role behaviors that foster a sense of psychological empowerment, such as creating constructive work environments and identifying new opportunities. Due to their self-motivated nature, proactive individuals are less dependent on organizational support as they tend to shape their work conditions independently. As a result, a proactive personality weakens the link between perceived organizational support and psychological empowerment, as these employees feel more empowered, relying less on organizational assistance. This highlights how proactive personality can reduce the need for external support in fostering empowerment. These views suggest that by providing strong organizational support, organizations can increase psychological empowerment and job satisfaction, especially among less proactive employees.

Proactive behavior encompasses a variety of behaviors, including seeking feedback, making suggestions, taking personal initiative, proactive problem solving, issue selling, and networking. These behaviors range from whistleblowing to career advancement through proactive learning to helping colleagues in need (Belschak and Den Hartog, 2017). Therefore, in dynamic work environments, the need for proactive employees who not only respond to change but also anticipate potential problems and take initiative to improve organizational effectiveness is increasing.

In conclusion, while proactive behavior offers numerous advantages at both individual and organizational levels, its effectiveness depends on situational and contextual factors. Organizations aiming to harness the benefits of proactive behaviors must foster an environment that balances autonomy, support, and clear guidance, ensuring that proactive actions align with collective goals. Future research should explore the nuanced interplay of these behavioral categories to enhance their practical applications across diverse organizational settings.

This study focuses on proactivity, but future research could examine how reactive, inactive, and interactive behaviors function in organizational contexts, offering a fuller understanding of when each is most effective. Additionally, addressing contemporary workplace challenges like remote work, digital transformation, and evolving leadership paradigms could enhance the study of proactivity in today's dynamic environments. Finally, exploring how cultural differences influence proactive behavior, comparing individualistic (e.g., the U.S., Germany) and collectivist societies (e.g., Turkey, China), could provide deeper insights into its expression and outcomes in diverse organizational settings.

References

- Artan, İ. (1999). "Liderlik [Leadership]", Davranışlarımızdan Seçmeler (Örgütsel Yaklaşım), Suna Tevrüz, İnci Artan, Tülay Bozkurt (Eds). 1. Basım, Beta.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall
- Bateman, T. S. & Crant, J. M. (1993). The Proactive Component of Organizational Behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14: 103-118.
- Bateman, Thomas S. & Crant, J. Michael. (1999). Proactive Behavior: Meaning, Impact, and Recommendations. *Business Horizons*, May-June: 63-70.
- Becherer, R. C. & Maurer, J. G. (1999). The Proactive Personality Disposition and Entrepreneurial Behavior Among Small Company Presidents. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 38 (1): 28-36.

- Belschak F. D., & Den Hartog D. N. (2017). Foci of proactive behavior. In: Parker SK, Bindl UK (eds) *Proactivity at Work: Making Things Happen in Organizations*. New York: Routledge, 169–189.
- Brazeal, D. & Herbert, T. (1999). The Genesis of Entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 23: 29-46.
- Claes, R.; Beheydt, C. & Lemmens, B. (2005). Unidimensionality of Abbreviated Proactive Personality Scales Across Cultures, *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 54 (4): 476–489.
- Clarkson, M. B. (1995). A Stakeholder Framework for Analyzing and Evaluating Corporate Social Performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 20 (1): 92-117.
- Conger, J. A. & Kanungo, R. N. (1987). Toward a Behavioral Theory of Charismatic Leadership in Organizational Settings, *Academy of Management Review*, 12: 637-647.
- Covin, J. G., Slevin D. P. (1989). Strategic Management Of Small Firms in Hostile And Benign Environments, *Strategic Management Journal*, 10(1): 75–87.
- Crant, J. M. ve Bateman, T. S. (2000). Charismatic Leadership Viewed From Above: The Impact of Proactive Personality. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21: 63-75.
- Crant, J. M. (1995). The Proactive Personality Scale and Objective Job Performance Among Real Estate Agents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80: 532-537.
- Crant, J. M. (1996). The Proactive Personality Scale As a Predictor of Entrepreneurial Intentions. *Journal of Small Business Management*. 34 (3): 42-49.
- Crant, J. M. (2000). Proactive Behavior in Organizations. *Journal of Management*, 26 (3): 435-462.
- Deluga, R. (1998). American Presidential Proactivity, Charismatic Leadership, and Rated Performance. *Leadership Quarterly*, 9: 265-291.
- Den Hartog, D. N., & Belschak, F. D. (2012). When does transformational leadership enhance employee proactive behavior? The role of autonomy and role breadth self-efficacy. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(1), 194-202. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024903>
- Frankl, V. E. (1946), "Man's Search for Meaning", Beacon Press.
- Frese, M., Kring, W., Soose, A., & Zempel, J. (1996). Personal Initiative at Work: Differences Between East and West Germany. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39: 37-63.

- Frese, M., Fay, D., Hilburger, T., Leng, K., & Tag, A. (1997). The Concept of Personal Initiative: Operationalization, Reliability and Validity in Two German Samples. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 70: 139-161.
- Frese, M., & Fay, D. (2001). Personal Initiative: An Active Performance Concept for Work In The 21st. Century. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 23: 133–188.
- Gibson, J. L.; Ivancevich, J. M.; Donnelly, J. H. & Konopaske, R. 2009. *Organizations: Behavior, Structure, Processes*. 13. Baskı, McGraw Hill.
- Grant, A. M., Parker, S., & Collins, C. (2009). Getting credit for proactive behavior: Supervisor reactions depend on what you value and how you feel. *Personnel Psychology*, 62(1), 31–55. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2008.01128.x>
- Gupta, V. K., & Bhawe, N. M. (2007). The Influence of Proactive Personality and Stereotype Threat on Women’s Entrepreneurial Intentions. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 13 (4): 73-85.
- Hamel, G. & Prahalad C. K. (1994). Competing for the Future. *Harvard Business Review*, July-August: 122-128.
- Hwang, P. C., Han, M. C., & Chiu, S. F. (2015). Role Breadth Self-Efficacy and Foci of Proactive Behavior: Moderating Role of Collective, Relational, and Individual Self-Concept. *The Journal of Psychology*, 149(8), 846–865. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.2014.985284>
- Hyatt, D. E.; & Ruddy, T. M. (1997). An Examination Of The Relationship Between Work Group Characteristics And Performance: Once More Into The Breech. *Personel Psycbology*: 50: 553-585.
- Iawahar, I. M.; & McLaughlin, G. L. (2001). Toward A Descriptive Stakeholder Theory: An Organizational Life Cycle Approach. *Academy ot Management Review*, 26 (3): 397-414.
- Kinicki, A. & Kreitner, R. (2008). *Organizational Behavior*. 3. Baskı, New York: McGraw Hill.
- Kirkman, B. L., & Rosen, B. (1999). Beyond Self-management: Antecedents and Consequences of Team Empowerment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42: 58-74.
- Koçel, T. (2007). *İşletme Yöneticiliği [Business Management]*, 11. Baskı, İstanbul: Arıkan.
- Kuratko, D. F., Hornsby, J. S. & Goldsby, M. G. (2007). The Relationship of Stakeholder Salience, Organizational Posture, and Entrepreneurial Intensity to Corporate Entrepreneurship. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 13 (4): 56-72.

- Larson, L.; Bussom, R. S.; Vicars, W.; & Jauch, L. (1986). Proactive Versus Reactive Manager: Is the Dichotomy Realistic?. *Journal of Management Studies*, 23 (3): 385-400.
- Li L., Huang G. (2021). “Advantages and disadvantages” of individual proactive behavior in organizations. *Advances in Psychological Science*, 29(8): 1484-1496.
- Luthans, F. (1995). *Organizational Behavior*, 7. Baskı, McGraw-Hill.
- Maan, A. T., Abid, G., Butt, T. H., Ashfaq, F., & Ahmed, S. (2020). Perceived Organizational Support and Job Satisfaction: A Moderated Mediation Model of Proactive Personality and Psychological Empowerment. *Future Business Journal*, 6, Article No. 21. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s43093-020-00027-8>
- Morrison, E. M.; & Phelps, C. C. (1999). Taking Charge at Work: Extra-role Efforts to Initiate Workplace Change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42: 403–419.
- Newstrom, J. W., Davis, Keith (1993); *Organizational Behavior-Human Behavior at Work*, 9. Edition, McGraw-Hill.
- Offermann, L. R.; Schroyer, C. J.; & Gren, S. K. (1998). Leader Attributions for Subordinate Performance: Consequences for Subsequent Leader Interactive Behaviors and Ratings’. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 28 (13): 1125-1139.
- Ohly, S. & Fritz, C. (2007). Challenging The Status Quo: What Motivates Proactive Behaviour?. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 80: 623–629.
- Parker, S. K., & Collins, C. G. (2010). Taking Stock: Integrating and Differentiating Multiple Proactive Behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 36(3), 633-662. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206308321554>
- Parker, S. K.; Williams, E. S.; & Turner, N. (2006). Modeling The Antecedents of Proactive Behavior At Work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91: 636–652.
- Parker, S. K. (1998). Enhancing Role Breadth Self-efficacy: The Roles of Job Enrichment and Other Organizational Interventions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83: 835–852.
- Parker, S. K. (2000). From Passive to Proactive Motivation: The Importance of Flexible Role Orientation and Role Breadth Self-efficacy. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 49: 447–469.
- Pfeffer, J. (1999). *Güç Merkezli Yönetim [Managing With Power: Politics and Influence In Organizations]*, İstanbul: Boyner Holding Yayınları.

- Robbins, S. P. (1998). *Organizational Behavior: Concepts, Controversies, Applications*, 8th Edition, Prentice-Hall: New Jersey.
- Seibert, S. E; Kraimer, M. L. & Crant, J. M. (2001). What Do Proactive People Do? A Longitudinal Model Linking Proactive Personality and Career Success. *Personnel Psychology*, 54: 845-874.
- Spychala, A. & Sonnentag, S. (2011). The Dark and The Bright Sides of Proactive Work Behaviour and Situational Constraints: Longitudinal Relationships with Task Conflicts. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*. 20. 654-680. 10.1080/1359432X.2010.487646.
- Stupak, R. J. & Leitner, P. M. (2001). Managers and Leaders: An Active Strategy for Understanding and Using Power. *Journal of Power and Ethics*, 2 (2): 130-143.
- Thompson, A. & Strickland, A. J. (1999). *Strategic Management, Concept and Cases*, 11. Baskı, McGraw-Hill International Edition.
- Fletcher, T. D., Major, D. A., & Turner, J. E. (2006). Linking Proactive Personality and the Big Five to Motivation to Learn and Development Activity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91 (4): 927–935.
- Ülgen H., Mirze, S.K. (2004). *İşletmelerde Stratejik Yönetim [Strategic Management in Businesses]*. 3. Baskı, İstanbul: Literatür Yayıncılık.
- Wheelen T. L. & Hunger, J. D. (1998). *Strategic Management and Business Policy*, 6. Baskı, Addison-Weskey.