

SELFISH GENE THEORY AND EMPLOYEE ENDURANCE IN ORGANIZATIONS: AN ADAPTATION STUDY BENCİL GEN KURAMI VE İŞLETMELERDE ÇALIŞAN DEVAMLILIĞI: BİR UYARLAMA ÇALIŞMASI

Savaş Şimşek¹
Hava Yaşbay Kobal²

Abstract

Experiments carried out or theories put forward in the light of positive sciences have recently been used in other branches of science. In parallel with this discourse, this study is the adaptation of the theory of evolution, which can be expressed as the survival of the fittest, first put forward by Darwin and tried to be explained by Dawkins in the light of scientific facts, to the continuity of employees in businesses. Employee continuity is adapted to selfish gene behavior patterns such as being conscious, altruistic behavior, interacting and communicating with others, being a “Hawk” or “Dove” depending on the situation, being trusting and confident, not to leave the herd, being productive, and being successful. When human beings are considered as an organism, it has been concluded that they act with a number of strengths to ensure the continuity of their working life and ensure their continuity in the workplace with these features. Because in today’s business world, the fact that many people who can do the same job can be easily hired shows us that competition between employees is not just about doing the job, but employee behavior also has an important place in workplace endurance.

Keywords: Selfish Gene, Being Conscious, Altruistic Behavior, Social Exchange Theory, Employee Endurance

JEL Classification: M00, M10, M12, M19

Özet

Pozitif bilimler ışığında yapılan deneyler veya ortaya atılan kuramlar, son dönemlerde sadece kendi dallarında değil, kendileri haricindeki diğer bilim dalları içinde de kullanılır olmuştur. Bu çalışma da bu söyleme paralel olarak, günümüzde de tartışma konusu olmaya devam eden ve öncelikle Darwin tarafından ortaya atılarak Dawkins tarafından bilimsel gerçekler ışığında açıklanmaya çalışılan güçlü olanın hayatta kalması şeklinde ifade edilebilecek evrim kuramının işletmelerde çalışan devamlılığına uyarlamasıdır. Çalışan devamlılığı; bilinçli olmak, özgeci davranış, diğerleriyle etkileşim ve iletişim içerisinde olmak, duruma göre “Şahin” ya da “Güvercin” olmak, güvenmek ve emin olmak, sürüden ayrılmamak, üretken olmak, başarılı olmak gibi bencil gen davranış kalıplarına uyarlanmıştır. İnsan da bir organizma olarak düşünüldüğünde çalışma hayatının da devamlılığını sağlamak için bir takım güçlü yönleri ile hareket ettiği ve işyerindeki devamlılığını bu özellikleri ile sağladığı sonucuna varılmıştır. Zira günümüz iş dünyasında aynı işi yapabilen birçok kişinin rahatlıkla işe alınabileceği gerçeğinden hareketle çalışanlar arası rekabetin sadece işi yapmak olmadığı, çalışan davranışlarının da işyeri devamlılığında önemli bir yeri olduğunu bize göstermektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Bencil Gen, Bilinçli Olmak, Özgeci Davranış, Sosyal Değişim Teorisi, Çalışan Devamlılığı

JEL Sınıflandırılması: M00, M10, M12, M19

¹ Associate Professor, İzmir Kavram Vocational College, Human Resources Department, ssim1971@gmail.com, 0000-0003-2340-3104

² Associate Professor, Hakkari University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Business Department, havayashbay@hakkari.edu.tr, 0000-0002-2589-785X

Submitted : 11.07.2025

Accepted : 21.09.2025

Introduction

When looking at “evolution” studies on living things, Charles Darwin’s study (1861) is considered a milestone. Although the statements put forward by Darwin in his work continue to be debated today, "The Origin of Species" will be accepted as the starting point in this study. Darwin stated that each species competes with others and that natural selection favors selfish, self-preserving behavior (Hoffman, 1981: 121). On the other hand, this study by Darwin shed light on contemporary studies that examined the subject in more depth. From this perspective, the “selfish gene” theory put forward by Richard Dawkins (2006) can be seen as a post-modern form of Darwin's work. As can be seen in both studies, it is understood that the main reasons for the long-term existence of a particular entity or gene are natural selection as well as their best adaptation to their environment.

When looked at from the perspective of behavioral sciences, the idea that employees may exhibit certain behavioral models in order not to lose their jobs or to maintain their position at work is emerging.

Because in our age, the fact that many people who can do the same job can be easily hired shows us that competition between employees is not just about doing the job, but employee behavior also has an important place in workplace endurance.

This is an adaptation study. Whatever the selfish gene does to ensure its endurance, employees must also show certain behavioral patterns. For this reason, the behavioral patterns of employees during their workplace endurance will be tried to be explained not only in terms of the “selfish gene” theory, but also in the light of theoretical facts close to this theory and previously put forward in behavioral sciences. In this context, the study will be grouped under three parts. The first part will focus on the theories put forward by Darwin and Dawkins, which form the starting point of the study. In the second part, theories that are thought to be parallel to the theories of Darwin and Dawkins within the scope of behavioral sciences will be mentioned. In the third part, the behavioral models that employees show to ensure their endurance in the workplace will be discussed in the light of the theories mentioned in the first and second parts, and the results will be given in the last part.

1. Literature Review

1.1. “Evolution” as Darwin and Dawkins’ Theories of Survival

Although the concept of “evolution” discussed by Darwin (1859, 1861) and Dawkins (2006) does not fully indicate what is intended to be expressed in this study, the explanations of these theories will shed light on us. So, what exactly is meant by this theory, which was put forward by Darwin and later tried to be developed and understood by many scientists? Trying to explain this question briefly will help to understand the issue better.

After evaluating the data obtained as a result of the geology and biology expedition to which he was assigned on December 27, 1831, for twenty years, Darwin published his work titled “The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection or the Preservation of Privileged Races”, briefly known as “The Origin of Species”, in 1859 (Darwin, 1896).

Darwin, who accepts natural selection as a prerequisite for "existence", mentions that some of the physical features that organisms use in their struggle for existence are favorable and some are unfavorable, depending on the environment in which they live. He reaches the following conclusion on this issue:

“This preservation of favourable variations and the rejection of injurious variations, I call *Natural Selection* (Darwin, 1861, p. 78).”

“Though nature grants vast periods of time for the work of natural selection, she does not grant an indefinite period; for as all organic beings are striving, it may be said, to seize on each place in the economy of nature, if any one species does not become modified and improved in a corresponding degree with its competitors, it will soon be exterminated” (Darwin, 1861, p. 95).

Darwin states that natural selection and existence depend on certain conditions. According to him, organisms must be of the same species, pure and uniform, in a certain number in a certain (isolated) area (geography), in a certain climate.

“We shall best understand the probable course of natural selection by taking the case of a country undergoing some physical change, for instance, of *climate*” (Darwin, 1861, p. 78).

“A large number of individuals, by giving a better chance for the appearance within any given period of profitable variations, will compensate for a lesser amount of variability in each individual, and is, I believe, an extremely important element of success. Though nature grants vast periods of time for the work” (Darwin, 1861, p. 95).

“Intercrossing plays a very important part in nature in keeping the individuals of the same species, or of the *same variety, true and uniform* in character. It will obviously thus act far more efficiently with those animals which unite for each birth...” (Darwin, 1861, p. 97).

Stating that natural selection is based on the relationship of interest between the organism and nature, Darwin (1861, p. 99) states that individuals who are in the same region and have characteristics that are suitable for change (local individuals) have superior structures than those who come to that region from outside.

The study, prepared by Darwin based on such a detailed observation, was later made more specific by Richard Dawkins and applied to the genes within organisms, and the genes that continued their existence were called “selfish genes” (Dawkins, 2006b). Dawkins explains his theory, which he presents as a continuation of the Darwinian intellectual system, as follows:

“The logic of Darwinism concludes that the unit in the hierarchy of life which survives and passes through the filter of natural selection will tend to be selfish. The units that survive in the world will be the ones that succeeded in surviving at the expense of their rivals at their own level in the hierarchy. That, precisely, is what selfish means in this context. The question is, what is the level of the action? The whole idea of the selfish gene, with the stress properly applied to the last word, is that the unit of natural selection (i.e. the unit of self-interest) is not the selfish organism, nor the selfish group or selfish species or selfish ecosystem, but the selfish gene (Dawkins, 2006b, p. 192)”.

In his work titled “The Selfish Gene”, in which he exemplifies the explanations in the fields of genetics and biology extensively, Dawkins accepts DNA as a building block of all organisms. According to Dawkins, who gives “organism structures (body)” as an example as the place where

these building blocks survive most easily, these structures (organic bodies) are "survival machines" for genes (Dawkins, 2006a, p. 20).

Dawkins stated that the genes, about which he gave extensive information, display certain behaviors in order to ensure their continuity within organic bodies. These behaviors also show the evolution of the organism thanks to its adaptation to its environment through changes in genes. The behavioral patterns of the "selfish genes" in the theory put forward by Dawkins to maintain their existence can be stated as follows:

- Interacting with other genes (2006a, p. 24)
- Being conscious (2006a, p. 58-59)
- To be more successful than others (2006a, p. 60)
- Being in communication with others (2006a, p. 63)
- Being a "hawk" or a "dove" depending on the situation (2006a, p. 69)
- Act altruistically (2006a, p. 100)
- To trust and be sure (2006a, p. 105)
- To be productive (2006a, p. 109)
- Not to leave the herd (2006a, p. 169)

Dawkins compares evolution with a winner/loser dilemma to a casino and describes the currency used in this casino as a phenomenon of survival. According to him, the survival of the gene also means the survival of the individual (2006a, p. 55). When looked at from this perspective, it comes to mind that not only genes but also the people in which the genes are located may show behaviors similar to those mentioned above in order to adapt to their environment and continue their existence. Because humans, like other organisms, are composed of "genes". Their structural features will directly affect the people they live in.

1.2. Grouping of Behavior Patterns within The Scope of "Natural Selection" and "Selfish Gene" Theories

When we look at scientific fields, it is seen that explanations and theories from different branches of science are used to better understand some phenomena (McArthur & Baron, 1983; Dawkins, 2006a, Smith & Price, 1973; Lorenz, 2002). The behavioral patterns that the selfish gene shows to maintain its existence can be adapted to the behavior of employees within the organization on the basis of management and organization within the scope of the mentioned instrumentality. From this perspective, it may be possible to examine the above-mentioned behaviors from different angles and under different headings.

Table 1. Organizational Behavior Theories Corresponding to Behavior Patterns

Behavior Patterns	Basic Theory
Being conscious	Perception Theories
Communicating and interacting with others	
Being a “hawk” or a “dove” depending on the situation	
Not to leave the herd	Social Exchange Theory
Act altruistically	
To trust and be sure	
To be productive	Path-Goal Theory
To be successful	Achievement Orientation Theory
	Theory of Political Behavior

Being Conscious: People act in their own interests from the moment they come to life. As their bodies and mental structures develop, they begin to understand and evaluate life differently. In this context, people literally read their environment (Morrison & Bellack, 1981, p. 70). A person who reads his environment develops a selective sensitivity to all stimuli outside himself. In this sensitivity, which can be briefly described as perception, a person activates his consciousness by using environmental clues or signs through previous experiences (Boring, 1946, p. 105; Titchener, 1919). These inputs that are given meaning are stimuli. Many studies on human perception process focus on human and non-human stimuli and their characteristics (Titchener, 1919, p. 270; Proshansky & Murphy, 1942; Boring, 1946, p. 99; Bruner & Postman, 1947, p. 69; Postman et. al., 1948, p. 142; Bruner & Postman, 1948, p. 77; Russell & Fiske, 2010, p. 233). As can be understood from these studies, in addition to external stimuli, personal, intellectual and mental characteristics (personality, needs, desires, interests, abilities, etc.) within a person are also important in the

perception process (Krueger, 2018, p. 301). In short, these concepts, which are of vital importance in maintaining human life and can be defined as “consciousness” (Ornstein, 1977, p. 43), affect the actions adapted to them (King, 1932, p. 119; Ferguson & Bargh, 2004, p. 33).

In order to survive, humans must meet these needs to the maximum extent in the environment they live in (Schneider, 1987, p. 443). However, today, when more than one person will do a certain job, employers can not only look at the individuals’ maximum qualifications required to do the job, but also make a selection based on the individuals’ mental structures, behaviors and personalities (Bretz et al., 1993; Callaghan & Thompson, 2002; Kinnunen & Parviainen, 2016). Thanks to the awareness they have gained, individuals can determine which business or institution is suitable for them to do their profession. In this case, which can be briefly described as “person/organization fit” (Kristof, 1996, p. 4), the individual not only thinks that he has the qualifications to meet the needs of the organization, but also thinks about increasing his permanence in this organization. From this perspective, it is important which elements come to the fore in individuals’ perceptions. In addition to giving priority to the characteristics of organizations that they believe can achieve their goals in their job applications and whose values match their own (Vroom, 1966, p. 213; Gavin & Howe, 1975, p. 229; Greasley et al., 2005), individuals also prioritize the characteristics of organizations that have similar pasts to their own and those that have similar experiences with their own. They also want to work in organizations where individuals have similar personalities and exhibit similar behavior on certain issues (Holland, 1973, p. 9; Devendorf & Highhouse, 2008, p. 613). It is possible to accept that individuals’ desire to be an employee of an enterprise suitable for them is the first condition for them to be able to work continuously in that enterprise. Because they will only be able to ensure their permanence within such an organization (Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987, p. 270) and thus they will be able to continue their professional lives within the same company without looking for another job (Self & Dewald, 2011, p. 68).

Communicating and Interacting with Others: Hobbes (1953), who tried to explain intellectually and philosophically in his work “Leviathan” a saying that had been said long before him, “Homo homini lupus” (man is the wolf of man), states that people would destroy each other to protect themselves without a certain authority and that this was in their nature. On the other hand,

according to philosophers who evaluate pragmatist philosophy under the title of “self-interest”, human is a being with certain interests and acts to realize these interests (Bacon, 1900, p. 10; Hobbes, 1953, p. 81). When we combine both intellectual foundations, a situation emerges that “people can engage in all kinds of communication and interaction with other people to realize their interests, especially to protect themselves”. From this perspective, it is necessary to evaluate the individual's relationships with other individuals around him within the concept of “social exchange”. Because social exchange uses the personal interests of individuals in its formation and development (Blau, 1964, p. 92). Based on the selfish gene theory, it is possible to predict that employees may use some of their behaviors to their advantage by evaluating them within the scope of their “implicit interests” in order to increase their permanence in the organization. Explaining these movements under the classification made above will make it easier to understand the subject.

The concept of social exchange requires a certain communication and interaction between individuals. The relationship (communication and interaction) mentioned here is a type of action undertaken “voluntarily” in social exchange (Blau, 1964, p. 91). People primarily communicate with others they “prefer” (Blau, 1962, p. 42). According to Blau, when people meet, they first classify each other, evaluate the others and the meaning they have for them, and decide whether to be with these people or not. Therefore, based on these expressions, it can be said that the group of people with whom people communicate, are influenced and influenced by them is a homogeneous group consisting of people who have the same personality traits as themselves (Schneider, 1987, p. 441). Individuals also establish their informal relationships in small informal groups in their business lives. They do not go out of this group much. Among the most important factors that lead to the formation of informal groups, it can be stated that the individuals who form the group have common views (e.g., accepting official norms in the business environment as enemies) and common interests. The relationship of common thought and interest requires a kind of interdependence of the individuals forming the group (Emerson, 1962, p. 32). This type of commitment manifests itself as dependence on implicit interests. Parties with mutual dependence in social exchange are in positions such as guaranteeing or denying, facilitating or hindering the exchange in order to gain each other's satisfaction to some extent. Human behavior is goal-based (Weinstein & Deutschberger, 1963, p. 454). The factors that determine their goals are their interests. From this perspective, the main phenomenon in social exchange is receiving more than

given from other individuals. People who engage in social exchange not only seek the maximum benefit for themselves, they also want to see that the group does not gain more than they do (Homans, 1958, p. 606).

Being a “Hawk” or a “Dove” depending on the situation - Trusting and Being Confident: The actions of “trusting and being confident” and “being a hawk or a dove depending on the situation”, which are among the behavioral characters of the selfish gene that Dawkins tries to explain in his theory, are also behavioral patterns that can be evaluated within the social exchange theory. As mentioned above, social exchange involves a relationship that involves communication and interaction. In this relationship, the parties have “responsibilities” towards each other (Blau, 1964, p. 94). This responsibility includes the action of the other party to reciprocate the same or more in return for any action taken by one of the parties for the benefit of the other (doing a favor, giving a gift, keeping a promise, etc.). In fact, in this relationship based on reciprocity, the party that gives priority to the favor is sure and trusts that the other party will reciprocate this favor. Fulfilling reciprocity leads to increased trust between individuals (Blau, 1964, p. 99). On the other hand, this type of reciprocity also ensures that the parties are accepted as “trustworthy” within the group (Blau, 1964, p. 98). As Cicero said, “There is no duty more indispensable than returning a favor. People don't trust a person who forgets a favor” (1798: 37).

Not to Leave the Herd: The expression of not leaving the herd appears within the selfish gene theory as one of the actions that can be evaluated as social exchange in order to ensure desirability and permanence in social environments. Permanence within the group not only carries a characteristic such as “reliability”, but also includes flawlessness in the actions taken/initiated. In other words, individuals must be as faultless or flawless as possible within the group they are in. While the mistakes and flaws of individuals can be seen more clearly in the behavioral patterns shown individually, without being a member of a specific group, even if a mistake is made within the group (crowd), the cost of this mistake will be less (Simon, 1990, p. 1667). On the other hand, since the group (crowd) usually does what it does, many negative things will not be seen as mistakes (Ridley, 1998, p. 184). Thus, being a member of a certain group and not leaving that group is one of the important stages in increasing permanence, regardless of the social environment.

Act Altruistically: Perhaps the most crucial point of the concept of social exchange is “altruism”. Stating that the concept, which has Latin origins, was first expressed by Auguste Comte as having a religious origin, Budd defines altruism as “sacrificing self for the sake of mankind” (1956: 40). According to another definition, altruistic behavior “promotes the welfare of others without conscious regard for one’s own self-interests” (Hoffman, 1981, p. 124). Wilson defines altruism as “self-destructive behavior performed for the benefit of others” (1975, p. 578).

In Darwin’s and Dawkins' theories based on the selfishness of the species, it was claimed that selfish actions were more preferable for survival. From here, the claim that altruism occurs through selfish motivations comes to the fore. According to researchers (Blau, 1964; Hoffman, 1981; Cialdini et al., 1987; Schwartz, 1993; Smith, 1981) who have this idea, altruism is essentially motivated by selfishness and it is stated that its purpose is to serve oneself. Accordingly, it has been claimed that pure altruism does not exist and that every altruistic behavior is essentially selfish (Blau, 1964, p. 17; Smith; 1981, p. 23). According to this approach, every altruistic action is done for future benefits, and what motivates a person to help another are the tangible and perceived benefits that he or she can receive, directly or indirectly.

Within the scope of the direct definitions of altruism mentioned above, its place in social exchange is determined by the feature of “selfishness” (Homans, 1958; Blau, 1964). Since social behavior is defined as “exchange based on providing gain for the individual” (Homans, 1958, p. 606), expectations are at the core of the theory in question, and altruistic behavior is a behavior with an expectation of reward in the future. An individual who does a favor to someone expects the same behavior from that person in the future (Aşkın, 1986, p. 150; Haskı-Levethal, 2009, p. 285). It is considered a duty to repay a benefit or to be grateful to the person who gives it (Blau, 1964, p. 4; Gouldner, 1960, p. 161). The beneficiary will try to reward the other to relieve himself of this obligation. If each perceives the benefit gained as valuable, this cycle will continue (Haskı-Levethal, 2009, p. 285).

To be Productive: When behavioral patterns in social environments are observed, in addition to the above-mentioned behaviors, the “productivity” characteristics of individuals in social environments also stand out. It is clear that it is not very common. When we look at the literature, it can be seen that the study conducted by Georgopoulos et al. (1957) on this subject examined

productivity at the individual level and explained it in terms of the individual's psychological behavioral characteristics. According to Georgopoulos and his colleagues, who express their theory as "path-goal theory", people have a set of common goals/goals and achieving these will meet a number of related needs of individuals. On the other hand, the behavior to achieve these goals also includes rational calculability and decision-making. According to the authors who consider productivity as a form of behavior, individuals use this behavior as a "tool" to achieve certain goals that they are motivated by (1957, p. 345).

To be Successful: Success is defined as "the achieving of the results wanted or hoped for" (dictionary.cambridge.org). This fact constitutes the basis of people's behavior. Success is a specific measurement tool for achieving a specific goal. When you reach the goal or purpose, you are successful, when you don't reach it, you are unsuccessful. The closer one gets to the goal or purpose, the more successful one is, and the further one gets from the goal or goal, the more unsuccessful one becomes. Atkinson explains the behavior of being successful in achievement motivation theory as follows:

“...In the simplest case, then, achievement-related behavior is always influenced by the resultant of the tendency to seek or approach success which we might consider the goal of the achievement motive, and the tendency to avoid” (1965, p. 11).

One of the distinct behavioral patterns of individuals to be successful in the social groups they are in or are members of is political behavior. Farrell and Petersen express political behavior in organizations as “...activities that are not required as part of one’s organizational role but that influence, or attempt to influence, the distribution of advantages and disadvantages within the organization” (1982, p. 405). When all these behaviors are examined in depth, it is understood that such behaviors are done to obtain a certain “power” within the organization. In this sense, power is expressed as “the capacity of an individual or group of individuals to modify the conduct of other individuals or groups in the manner in which he desires, and to prevent his own conduct from being modified in a way which he does not” (Tawney, 1952, p. 175). Therefore, although political behavior is not a desired form of behavior in organizations, it is a behavioral pattern that exists in individuals at each organizational level. The reason why it is not desired organizationally is the existence of "implicit intentions" of individuals. In these intentions, individuals either (a) to bring

about personal goals congruent with organizational goals or (b) to bring about personal goals incongruent with organizational goals (Schein, 1977, p. 66).

1.3. Employee Endurance and Adaptation of Selfish Gene Behavior Patterns

According to Dawkins, there must first be an environment in which the selfish gene can continue. If we explain this situation organizationally, we will encounter the relationship between people and the organization. In modern societies, individuals have to work to obtain a certain financial gain in order to spend their lives. The businesses and organizations they operate in are important areas for achieving such earnings. Therefore, just as the human being is the survival machine for the selfish gene, the machine that is necessary for people to survive is organizations.

The individual has to find the best organization that will ensure the continuity of his life. This is where consciousness, an important feature of it, comes into play. Before entering an organization, individuals should carefully consider which organization is a good working environment for them, what kind of effort they need to make to stay there, and who they can contact there. This is where that individual's perception and the consciousness formed accordingly come into play. It is important with what consciousness individuals enter organizations.

The interaction and communication of employees within the organization has been tried to be examined in terms of social exchange theory, as mentioned above. Since social exchange is based on a certain reciprocity, it is important for what purpose the individual will engage in communication. In order to stay in the organization and ensure its continuity, employees make their peers dependent on them.

As can be seen, the basis of employees' altruistic behavior is to mislead others. From this perspective, it can be said that political behavior is also included in the altruistic behavior pattern shown in the workplace. According to Kacmar and Ferris (1993, p. 70), all definitions of political behavior have a common feature. These definitions all describe the same phenomenon: individuals or groups deliberately acting in a way that will protect or enhance their own self-interests. Stating that it is rational to be selfish, Ridley touches upon this important issue:

“The prisoner’s dilemma presents us with a stark example of how to achieve cooperation among egoists – cooperation that is not dependent on taboo, moral

constraint or ethical imperative. How can individuals be led by self interest to serve a greater good? The game is called the prisoner's dilemma because the commonest anecdote to illustrate it describes two prisoners each faced with the choice of giving evidence against the other and so reducing his own sentence. The dilemma arises because if neither defects on the other the police can convict them both only on a lesser charge, so bot would be better off if they stayed silent, but each is individually better off if he defects (1998, p. 54).”

When evaluated from the perspective of organizations, it is understood that employees have certain expectations as a result of their contributions to their organizations. Positive actions taken by the organization towards employees contribute to the establishment of high-quality exchange relationships by motivating employees to engage in behaviors that have positive results for the organization (Lavelle et al., 2007; Markovsky et al., 1993; Rhoades et al., 2001; Van Dyne et al., 1994, p.768-769). It can be said that the social exchange relationship will continue as long as the parties meet each other's expectations.

Employees can only become hawks or doves through the political behavior patterns they display in the relationships they engage in, through their perceptions and attention, thus protecting themselves. One of the most important characteristics of employees in organizations is to create an idea that they are successful towards their environment. Michael Shermer states that among people's many tendencies, the tendency to focus on our own success, which he describes as appropriation tendencies, is actually an effort to create personal public opinion (2022, p. 333). In other words, every individual who wants not only to achieve success but also to maintain their permanence in the organization creates personal public opinion by trying to show the positive aspects of themselves to the workplace environment.

Like the selfish gene, the fact that employees display selfish behavior patterns in order to continue their existence in organizations without harming themselves actually shows that they implicitly "abuse" everyone in their social circle at work, both managers and other colleagues, in order to protect their own interests. The exploitation is defined as using others as means to one's own ends (Ross,1930, p. 131). Ross states that the individual abuses others in several ways. These include ego-based abuse, sexual, religious and economic abuse. Without including others in this

classification, economic-based abuse should be emphasized here. Because the behaviors of employees to extend their stay in the business in order to continue their lives by providing the continuation of financial resources and to ensure the continuity of their assets can generally be included in this classification. In the statements made by Ross, economic abuse is expressed as “making others work for you or taking for your use the fruits of their unrequited toil”. In addition, the rule “exploitation is more open, ruthless, and stubborn between the unlike than between the like” which Ross (1930, p. 143) lists among the abuse rules, is also valid for selfish behavior rules in the workplace. The group in the workplace is relatively homogeneous and people do not worry too much about the abuse towards them. Those who act covertly selfish to ensure their own survival also benefit from this feature, because only covert abuses are permanent (Ross, 1930, p. 145).

Conclusion

The most important way to explain and understand history is to establish a formulation that can evaluate historical facts and events in terms of cause-effect relationships. The main secret of how the selfish gene theory can be adapted to the behavior of employees is hidden in the historical formulas based on this cause-effect relationship. The stages that humans have gone through since their emergence are generally evaluated based on the abilities that humans have acquired to survive. As a result, human life has evolved from a hunter-gatherer type economic structure to an economic structure where technology has reached the highest level, and this development still continues. As technology increasingly dominates human life, the human element in some business lines has been replaced by technology. In other words, professions in some business lines are now performed by robots activated by pressing a button, instead of humans.

Therefore, it is clear that the professions that people have taken up and for which they have spent a long time and spent their brain and manual power will no longer be needed in the near future. In this case, it seems inevitable that many employees will experience job loss, and even that there will no longer be an environment where they can practice the profession they learned. It should be kept in mind that this may be a result not only of technological developments but also of local or global negativities. Because the Covid-19 global epidemic has caused a significant portion of employees all over the world to lose their jobs. For this reason, employees will try to maintain their positions in the workplace until the last moment and will exhibit various behaviors to achieve this. Similar

to the characteristic features of the selfish gene, the attitudes and behaviors of employees to increase their permanence in the workplace may be further exacerbated. Employers also need to be ready for this situation. Although performance measurements are made, these are only numerical, and employers should evaluate the good or bad psychological and sociological-based behaviors of employees while doing their jobs in a multi-faceted way. In this way, a contribution to organizational justice will also be made.

Since this study is considered from a qualitative perspective, it should be considered as a precursor to subsequent quantitative studies. In this context, a selfish behavior scale can be developed through a scale study on selfish employee behavior, or different behavioral patterns in addition to those given above can be added to the selfish behavior theory. Conducting such a study will benefit business managers in inevitable staff reductions in all businesses.

Finally, it is thought that the concepts of power and altruism can be examined in more detail in future studies, and that studies aimed at confirming or falsifying this argument through empirical studies will contribute to the development of the theory.

References

- Amburgey, T. L., Kelly, D., & Barnett, W. P. (1990). Resetting the clock: The dynamics of organizational change and failure. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, (1), 160–164, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2393254>
- Aşkın, M. (1986). Sosyal öğrenme kuramı açısından olumlu ve olumsuz sosyal davranışlar. *Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 1(1), 147-153. <http://hdl.handle.net/11452/17044>
- Atkinson, J. W. (1965). *Some general implications of conceptual developments in the study of achievement-oriented behavior*. In Jones, M. R. (Ed.), *Human motivation: A symposium*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Bacon, F. (1900). *The essays of Bacon*. London: Arthur M. Hampreys.
- Başarı. <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/success> (E.T. 09.12.2023)
- Blau, P. M. (1962). Patterns of choice in interpersonal relations. *American Sociological Review*, 27(1), 41–55, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2089717>
- Blau, P.M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. USA: John Wiley and Sons.
- Boring, E.G. (1946). The perception of objects. *American Journal of Physics*, 14(2), 99-107.

- Bretz, J., Robert D., Rynes, S. L., & Gerhart, B. (1993). Recruiter Perceptions of Applicant Fit: Implications for Individual Career Preparation and Job Search Behavior. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 43(3), 310–327. <https://doi:10.1006/jvbe.1993.1050>.
- Bruner, J. S., & Postman, L. (1947). Emotional selectivity in perception and reaction. *Journal of Personality*, 16, 69–77. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1947.tb01076.x>.
- Bruner, J. S., & Postman, L. (1948). An approach to social perception. In Dennis, W. (Ed.), *Current trends in social psychology*. (p. 71-118). Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh Press.
- Budd, L. J. (1956). Altruism arrives in America. *American Quarterly*, 8(1), 40, <https://doi:10.2307/2710296>.
- Callaghan, G., & Thompson, P. (2002). “We recruit attitude”: The selection and shaping of routine call centre labour. *Journal of Management Studies*, 39(2), 233–254. <https://doi:10.1111/1467-6486.00290>.
- Change. <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/change> (E.T.13.10.2023)
- Chappell, J.M, Hartnett, J.G., Iqbal, A., Iannella, N., & Abbott, D. (2015). A brief study of time. *Physics.Gen-Ph*, 1-17.
- Cialdini, R. B., Schaller, M., Houlihan, D., Arps, K., Fultz, J., & Beaman, A. L. (1987). Empathy-based helping: Is it selflessly or selfishly motivated?. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 52(4), 749. <https://doi:10.1037//0022-3514.52.4.749>.
- Cicero, M.T. (1798). *Essay on moral duty*. Edinburg: Bell & Bradfute.
- Darwin, C. (1861). *On the origin of species*. New York: D. Appleton and Company.
- Darwin, F. (1896). *The life and letters of charles Darwin*. New York: D. Appleton and Company.
- Dawkins, R. (2006a). *The selfish gene*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc.,
- Dawkins, R. (2006b). *The god delusion*. Great Britain: Bantam Press.
- Devendorf, S. A., & Highhouse, S. (2008). Applicant-employee similarity and attraction to an employer. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 81(4), 607–617, <https://doi:10.1348/096317907x248842>.
- Emerson, R. M. (1962). Power-dependence relations. *American Sociological Review*, 27(1), 31–41, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2089716>.
- Evolution. <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/evolution> (E.T. 13.10.2023)

- Farrell, D., & Petersen, J. C. (1982). Patterns of political behavior in organizations. *The Academy of Management Review*, 7(3), 403. <https://doi.org/10.2307/257332>.
- Ferguson, M.J., & Bargh, J.A. (2004). How social perception can automatically influence behavior. *Trend in Cognitive Sciences*, 8(1), 33-39.
- Fraser, J.T., Haber, F.C., & Müller G.H. (1972). *The study of time*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Gavin, J. F., & Howe, J. G. (1975). Psychological climate: Some theoretical and empirical considerations. *Behavioral Science*, 20(4), 228–240. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bs.3830200404>.
- Georgopoulos, B. S., Mahoney, G. M., & Jones, N. W., Jr. (1957). A path-goal approach to productivity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 41(6), 345–353. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0048473>
- Greasley, K., Bryman, A., Dainty, A., Price, A., Soetanto, R., & King, N. (2005). Employee perceptions of empowerment. *Employee Relations*, 27(4), 354–368. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01425450510605697>
- Gouldner, A.W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review*, 25(2), 161-178. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2092623>
- Haskı-Leventhal, D. (2009). Altruism and volunteerism: The perceptions of altruism in four disciplines and their impact on the study of volunteerism. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 39(3), 271-299. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5914.2009.00405.x>
- Hobbes, T. (1953). *Leviathan*. JGreat Britain: M.Dent & Sons. Ltd.
- Hoffman, M.L. (1981). Is altruism part of human nature?. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1, 121-137. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.40.1.121>
- Holland, J.L. (1973). *Making vocational choices; A theory of careers*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Homans, G. C. (1958). Social behavior as exchange. *American Journal of Sociology*, 63(6), 597–606. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2772990>
- Lavelle, J. J., Rupp, D. E., & Brockner, J. (2007). Taking a multifoci approach to the study of justice, social exchange, and citizenship behavior: The target similarity model. *Journal of Management*, 33(6), 841-866.

- Markovsky, B., Skvoretz, J., Willer, D., Lovaglia, M. J., & Erger, J. (1993). The seeds of weak power: An extension of network exchange theory. *American Sociological Review*, 197-209. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2095966>
- Michele Kacmar, K., & Ferris, G. R. (1993). Politics at work: Sharpening the Focus of Political Behavior in Organizations. *Business Horizons*, 36(4), 70–74. [https://doi:10.1016/s0007-6813\(05\)80123](https://doi:10.1016/s0007-6813(05)80123).
- Kahn, R. L. (1956). The prediction of productivity. *Journal of Social Issues*, 12, 41–49. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1956.tb00367.x>
- King, C.D. (1932). *The psychology of consciousness*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co, Ltd.
- Kinnunen, T., & Parviainen, J. (2016). Feeling the right personality. Recruitment consultants' affective decision making in interviews with employee Candidates. *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies*, 6(3), 5–21. <https://doi.org/10.19154/njwls.v6i3.5525>
- Kristof, A.L. (1996) Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology*, 49, 1-49. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1996.tb01790.x>
- Krebs, D. L. (1970). Altruism: An examination of the concept and a review of the literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, 73(4), 258–302. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0028987>.
- Krueger, J. (2018). Direct Social Perception. In Newen, A.; De Bruin, L. & Gallagher, S. (Eds.), *The oxford handbook of 4E cognition*. 301-321.
- Lorenz, K. (2005). *On aggression*. London: Routledge.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50, 370-396. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0054346>
- McArthur, L.Z., & Baron, R.M. (1983). Toward an ecological theory of social perception. *Psychological Review*, 90(3), 215-238. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.90.3.215>
- Morrison, R.L., & Bellack, A.S. (1981). The role of social perception in social skill. *Behavior Therapy*, 12, 69-79. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0005-7894\(81\)80107-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0005-7894(81)80107-4).
- Muchinsky, P. M., & Monahan, C. J. (1987). What is person-environment congruence? Supplementary versus complementary models of fit. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 31(3), 268–277. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791\(87\)90043-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(87)90043-1)

- Musser, G. (2010). *The paradox of time: Why it can't stop, but must*. (E.T.: 11.10.2023), <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/could-time-end/>.
- Newton, I. (1846). *Principia*. (A. Motte, Çev.), New York: Daniel Adee.
- Ornstein, R.E. (1977). *The psychology of consciousness*. USA: W.H. Freeman and Company.
- Postman, L., Bruner, J. S., & McGinnies, E. (1948). Personal values as selective factors in perception. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 43(2), 142–154. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0059765>.
- Proshansky, H., & Murphy, G. (1942). The effects of reward and punishment on perception. *The Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied*, 13, 295–305. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.1942.9917097>.
- Rhoades, L., Eisenberger, R., & Armeli, S. (2001). Affective commitment to the organization: The contribution of perceived organizational support. *Journal of applied psychology*, 86(5), 825. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.5.825>.
- Ridley, M. (1998). *The origins of virtue*. USA: Penguin Books.
- Ross, E.A. (1930). *The principles of sociology*. New York: The Century Co.
- Russell, A. M., & Fiske, S.T. (2010). Power and Social Perception. In Guinote, A., & T. A. Vescio (Eds.), (p. 231-250), *The social psychology of Power*. USA: The Guilford Press.
- Sabir, A. (2017). Motivation: Outstanding way to promote Productivity in employees. *American Journal of Management Science and Engineering*, 2(3), 35-40. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajmse.20170203.11>
- Schein, V.E. (1977). Individual power and political behaviors in organizations: An inadequately explored reality. *The Academy of Management Review*, 2(1), 64-72. <https://doi.org/10.2307/257607>
- Schneider, B. (1987). The People make the place. *Personnel Psychology*, 40(3), 437–453. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1987.tb00609.x>
- Self, J.T. & Dewald B. (2011). Why do employees stay? A qualitative exploration of employee tenure. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, 12(1), 60-72, <https://doi.org/10.1080/15256480.2011.540982>
- Simon, H.A. (1990). A mechanism for social selection and successful altruism. *Science*, 250(4988),1665-8, doi: 10.1126/science.2270480.

- Shermer, M. (2022). *İnanan beyin*. (N. Elhüseyni, Translate). İstanbul: Alfa Yayınları.
- Shoemaker, S. (1969). Time without change. *The Journal of Philosophy*, 66(12), 363-380.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/2023892>
- Schwartz, B. (1993). Why altruism is impossible...And ubiquitous. *Social Service Review*, 67(3), 314-343. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/30012502>
- Smith, D.H. (1981). Altruism, volunteers and volunteerism. *Journal of Voluntary Action Research*, 10(21), 21–36. <https://doi.org/10.1177/089976408101000105>
- Smith, J.M. (1972). Time in the evolutionary process. In Fraser, J.T., Haber, F.C., & G.H. Müller (Eds.), *The study of time*. (p. 266-272). Springer Publications.
- Smith, J., & Price, G. (1973). The logic of animal conflict. *Nature*, 246 (5427), 15–18.
<https://doi:10.1038/246015a0>.
- Tawney, R. H. (1952). *Equality*, 4th ed., London: Allen and Unwin.
- Teichmann, R. (1993). Time and change. *The Philosophical Quarterly*, 43 (171), 158-177.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/2220367>
- Titchener, E.B. (1919). *A text-book of psychology*. New York: McMillan Company.
- Van Dyne, L., Graham, J. W., & Dienesch, R. M. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(4), 765–802. <https://doi:10.2307/256600>.
- Vroom, V. H. (1966). Organizational choice: A study of pre-and postdecision processes. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 1(2), 212-225.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073\(66\)90013-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(66)90013-4).
- Weinstein, E. A., & Deutschberger, P. (1963). Some dimensions of altercasting. *Sociometry*, 26(4), 454–466. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2786148>.
- Wilson, E. O. (1975). *Sociobiology: The new synthesis*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.