Rescue Workers Prosocial Behavior And Their Relationship With Counterproductive Work Behavior: Moderating Role Of Social And Emotional Competence

Alam Zeb Khattak[1], Dr. Mazhar Iqbal Bhati[2] , Kashmala Zaman[3*], Muhammad Imran[4] , Ansa Talib[5*], Sumrish Malik[6*]

[1]*Department of Psychology, Islamic International University, Islamabad, Pakistan*
[2]*Department of Psychology, Islamic International University, Islamabad, Pakistan*
[3]*Department of Applied Psychology, National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad, Pakistan*
[4]*Department of Psychology, Islamic International University, Islamabad, Pakistan*
[5]*Government Graduate College for Women Peoples Colony No2, Faisalabad, Pakistan*
[6]*Clinical Psychologist, PAF Hospital, PAF Base Mushaf, Sargodha, Pakistan*
Corresponding Authors
[*]*Ansa Talib(ansatalib5@gmail.com)*
[*]*Sumrish Malik (sumrishmalik@yahoo.com)*
[*] *Kashmala Zaman (kashmalazaman@numl.edu.pk)*

Abstract

The current research examined the effects of prosocial behavior on counterproductive behavior of rescue workers moderated by social and emotional competence. A sample comprises of 385 operational rescue workers from four adjacent districts of Peshawar, Kohat, Hangu and Karak. Descriptive, quantitative and correlational procedures were used for analysis. Data was collected through reliable and valid questionnaires. For the measurement of rescue workers prosocial behavior, a newly self-developed and validated scale was used while the other two variables were measured through valid and structured questionnaires (permitted by the authors). Data was collected in personal visits from all the participants. Different statistical tools were used to find out Descriptive, regression and ANOVA etc. findings of the study explored that there is negative correlation (β= -.048, sig 0.000, p <0.05) between rescue workers prosocial behavior and their counterproductive work behavior while no moderating effect (β=.001, t=.788 & p=.431) was found on the association of prosocial behavior and counterproductive work behavior. The study suggests some other variables may be examined with prosocial behavior and sample may be taken from other organizations working in emergency situations.

Keywords: Prosocial behavior, Rescue workers, Counterproductive behavior, Social and Emotional Competence,

Introduction

Emergency Rescue Service Rescue 1122, the international standard pre-hospital care playing a vital role in saving people in Pakistan. This service is not only limited to save human beings, but they are also responding to the emergencies where animals need safety. Rescue 1122 responds to emergencies including medical, fire, history of fall, violence, road traffic accidents, drowning, deep well and disasters. In Pakistan, Pak Army, police, Rescue 1122 and Civil Defense are some government organizations mobilized in case of emergencies. Some non-governmental organizations like Edhi, Red

Crescents, Khidmat-e-Khalq foundation, Cheapa and Alkhidmat Foundation are also taking part to handle emergencies (Khattak, Bhati & Ullah, 2022: Amin, Khattak & Khan, 2018). Workers of the mentioned organizations are working in emotionally loaded situations. Working in these situations on regular basis effects them both physically and emotionally (Halpern et al.,2009; Amin et al., 2022).

Every human being is confronted with situations where their emotions are triggered and the individual is working beyond their mood status. These situations include emergencies where someone is crying for help. Emotional triggering either negative or positive sometimes leads to psychological disorders like acute stress disorders and post-traumatic stress disorders. Emotional management is necessary in the mentioned state of emotional triggering. Healthcare workers or those working in emergency situations either doctors or paramedics are reported intrinsically motivated and they are found involved in activities directly related to prosocial behavior like professionalism, esteem, sharing and caring (Brock et al., 2016). Number of researchers reported the association between high level of prosocial motivation and high quality of care of care among healthcare professionals (Noshili et al., 2022; Almutairi et al., 2022; Delfgaauw, 2007; Kolstad, 2013; Serra et al., 2011).

Prosocial Behavior

Prosocial, helping and altruistic behaviors are some interrelated terms used frequently and interchangeably in social science. Helping is not considered by some social scientists as prosocial behaviour (Khattak, Bhati & Ullah, 2022). Helping behaviors refers to those actions intended to improve situation of help recipient. Prosociality is narrower as compare to helping behaviour. It refers to "an individual voluntary behavior intended to help and benefit others and minimize aggression and antisocial behavior. It is the act of benefiting others not the self (Martí-Vilar et al., 2019; Penner et al., 2005). Prosociality is a planned or sometimes conducted actions or behaviors to help other people without concerning with the helper's motives (Afolabi, 2014). It is due to altruistic motives, motivated by an individual's self-interest. Prosociality is taking place without expecting something in return, but it need the involvement of assistance and attention towards other people (Afolabi, 2013; Sajithkumar & Prakash, 2016). Activation of prosocial motives and helping in some undesirable and unexpectable circumstances have both characteristics of individual and situational features. High self-esteem is a type of individual aspect while number of bystanders on the emergency spot is a situational aspect (Milovanovic, et al., 2020).

Prosociality in organizational settings need attention of the social scientists. This is less researched by organizational psychologists and it is also used interchangeably with organizational citizenship behavior. Good citizenship behaviors and extra role behaviors are also the terms used in the workplace for the said phenomenon (Mitonga-Monga and Cilliers, 2016). According to (Clarkson, 2014) prosociality in the organization develops and encourages collectivism. Collectivism on other ways promotes some more prosocial behaviors. Collectivistic approach within the organization generates altruistic leaders which in turns have the ability to practice prosocial behaviors in the organizations. Organizational long term sustainability is possible through the mentioned practices by the managers and leaders (Vieweg, 2018). Researchers found some important consequences of prosocial behaviour in the workplace. High prosociality leads to improved communication, high job satisfaction and improved client satisfaction.

Counterproductive Work Behavior

Counterproductive behavior has become an issue for most organizations either private or public. Some personality traits and human character strength generates positive energy which make an individual capable of practicing good and positive, which is helpful for both employees and organizations. This positivity reflects our cognition and actions (Peterson & Seligman, 2012). It is not only limited to positive emotions but it also make an individual emotionally and socially competent, enhance working and functioning in challenging situations (Miglianico et al., 2020). During literature search no research study with direct link between prosociality and counterproductive work behavior was found. According to (Bolino & Grant, 2016) the individual costs of prosocial behavior, which includes risks of increased burnout, job or role overload, imbalance in work family relationship. These all, individual costs are directly associated with decreased productivity and profitability. The workers consider it obligatory to help others and sacrifice for the benefits of others. Sometimes they sacrifice their personal resources including physical and psychological properties like well-being, strength, vigor and vitality etc.

Social and Emotional Competence

Individuals especially employees with a high level of social and emotional competence are known to be the assets of the firm/ organization. According to (Sadri, 2012), individuals with a high level of social and emotional competence were found effective leaders. Leaders with high level of emotional intelligence have the profound ability to identify, foresee and manage emotions of their self and their employees and they also motivate all team members. Another study by (Prati et al., 2003) reported that emotional intelligence is a positive predictor of active and effective team contact and coordination. This coordination is also necessary for organizational productivity. According to (Oberst et al., 2009) emotional intelligence provides a base to emotional competencies while (Emmerling & Goleman, 2005) reported that emotional competencies are not the characteristics and talents found innate but these competencies are learned by an individual to get outstanding performance towards the target. On the other hand, social intelligence is used parallel to social competence. It is the capability of an individual to understand someone, manage someone and act accordingly in the social situations (Seal et al., 2011).

Objectives of the Study

Objective of this research study is to find out the moderating role of social and emotional competencies on prosocial behavior and counterproductive work behavior of rescue workers. The current study will pave way to future researchers to spend some energy and conduct researches with some more variables. This study will also provide precious information about the internal workplace, issues and shortcoming of emergency rescue services.

Population and Sample

All operational employees of Emergency Rescue Service, Rescue 1122 Khyber Pakhtunkhwa is the population. Sample of the current research comprised of 385 rescue workers from rescue 1122 Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. Minimum age limit of the participants was from 25 years (minimum age for recruitment), qualification of the participants ranges from intermediate to MPhil and professional diploma like an associate engineer, health technology, and diploma in information technology. Participants for the present study were selected from the adjacent districts of Peshawar, Hangu, Kohat, Karak, Bannu, etc until we reached 385.

Hypothesis

H1: There will be a negative correlation between rescue workers prosocial behavior and counterproductive work behavior.

H2: Social and emotional competencies will work as a moderator between rescue workers prosocial behavior and counterproductive work behavior.

Instruments

Prosocial Behavior Scale for Rescue Workers

Prosocial behavior scale for rescue workers was developed in the initial step or study I. the scale is comprised of 23 items with no reverse scoring item. Response categories of the scale ranges from 1-5. 1 for never true, 2 for occasionally true, 3 for sometimes true, 4 for often true and 5 for always true. 1 is for lowest response and 5 for highest response. Reliability coefficient of the scale (overall) is 0.86 while reliability coefficient for sub scale emotional is 0.92, Social is 0.88, Empathetic is 0.88, Helping is 0.91, caring and sharing is 0.77. High scores on the scale denotes high prosociality/prosocial behavior in rescue workers while low score on scale denotes low level of prosociality/prosocial behavior in rescue workers.

Social and Emotional Competencies Questionnaire (SEC-Q)

The social and emotional competencies questionnaire (SEC-Q) was developed by Zych, et al (2018). The scale is composed of 16 items with a five-point Likert Scale ranging from 1 "strongly disagree" to 5 "strongly agree", 2 for somewhat disagree, 3 for neither agree nor disagree and 4 for somewhat agree. The reliability coefficient of young adults was 0.87 and for adolescents was 0.80 (Zych et al., 2018)

Counterproductive Work behavior Checklist

The counterproductive work behavior checklist was developed by Spector and their colleagues in 2006. The checklist has several versions like 45, 32, and 10 items covering five domains of abuse, production deviance, sabotage, theft, and withdrawal. In the current study, we used short form of the checklist composed of 10 items. Responses on the scale are from never (1) to every day (5) 2 for once or twice, 3 for once or twice in a month, 4 for once or twice in a week. The alpha coefficient of the whole checklist is 0.90 (Spector et al., 2010).

Results

Table 1: Details of population and sample of the main study
N=385

All Operational Rescue Workers (EMT and FR)				
Districts	Population		Sample	
	EMT	FR	EMT	FR
Peshawar	193	109	130	59
Kohat	50	38	41	32
Hangu	48	30	33	25
Karak	55	32	38	27

EMT: Emergency Medical Technician, FR: Fire Rescuer

The above table contains information regarding population and sample of this research study.

Sample for the current research study was taken from the above mentioned four districts.

Table 2: Descriptive of Participants Demographic Characteristics
N=385

	N	Range	Mean	SD	Variance	Sleekness Sleekness	SE	Kurtosis Kurtosis	SE
Age	385	2.00	1.7870	.73693	.543	.360	.124	-1.093	.248
Designation	385	1.00	1.3896	.48830	.238	.455	.124	-1.803	.248
District	385	3.00	1.9844	1.10857	1.229	.688	.124	-.961	.248
Shift	385	2.00	1.8468	.73944	.547	.252	.124	-1.138	.248
SES	385	2.00	1.1870	.46919	.220	2.536	.124	5.761	.248
Qualification	385	2.00	1.0909	.80009	.640	-.165	.124	-1.419	.248
Marital status	385	2.00	1.6000	.50104	.251	-.285	.124	-1.609	.248

Table 02 is composed of the descriptive statistics of age (M=1.78, SD=0.736, Variance=0.543), designation (M=1.38, SD=0.488, Variance=0.238), duty district (M=1.98, SD=1.108, Variance=1.229), duty shift (M=1.84, SD=0.739, Variance=0.547), Socioeconomic status (M=1.18, SD=0.469, Variance=0.220), qualification (M=1.09, SD=0.800, Variance=0.64) and marital status (M=1.60, SD=0.501, Variance=0.251).

Table 03: Result of Linear Regression Analysis of Prosocial Behavior of Rescue Workers and Counterproductive Work behavior

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.228ᵃ	.052	.050	2.7900	.052	21.020	1	383	.000

   a. Predictors: (Constant), PBSRW
   b. Dependent Variable: CWBs

The above table 03 shows model summary of linear regression analysis of prosocial behavior of rescue workers and counterproductive work behavior. In this table the most important value is R^2, which is .052. It shows .052% variance in the dependent variable, which is counterproductive work behavior. F value is 21.020 which is significant at 0.000 level.

Table 04 ANOVA (Prosocial Behavior of Rescue Workers and Counterproductive Work behavior)

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig
1	Regression	163.635	1	163.635	21.020	.000ᵇ
	Residual	2981.507	383	7.785		
	Total	3145.143	384			

a. Dependent Variable: CWBs
b. Predictors: (Constant), PBSRW

In the above table 04 ANOVA statistics of prosocial behavior of rescue workers and counterproductive work behavior were elaborated. Here we will check value of F, which is of importance so it needs proper explanation. Value of F in the table is 21.020, which shows model fitness of regression model. The F value is significant at 0.000 level (p<0.05).

Table 05 Coefficients (Prosocial Behavior of Rescue Workers and Counterproductive Work behavior)

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	Constant	17.321	.922		18.780	.000
	PBSRS	-.048	.010	-.228	-4.585	.000

a. Dependent Variable: CWBs

The above table 05 elaborates the result of regression coefficients for the independent variable prosocial behavior of rescue workers and counterproductive work behavior as dependent variable. In the above table value t is -4.585 which is above the standard value of t (+-1.96). value of unstandardized coefficient of prosocial behavior of rescue workers is -.048 which indicates that a unit change in our independent variable prosocial behavior scale for rescue workers (PBSRS) will bring .048 units negative change in the dependent variable counterproductive work behavior (CWBs). The association is negative which means that increase in PBSRS will also decrease level of CWBs. The value of p is 0.000 which is less the .05 (p < .05). from the above table it is clear that prosocial behavior of rescue workers (PBSRS) is significantly negative correlated with Counterproductive work behavior (CWBs), (β= -.048, sig 0.000, p <0.05). So our hypothesis 2 (H2: There will be a negative correlation between rescue workers prosocial behavior and counterproductive work behavior) is accepted at 95% of confidence level. It is pointed out that there was significantly negative correlation between rescue workers prosocial behavior and counterproductive work behavior among rescue workers.

Moderating Effects of Social and Emotional Competence on the Association of Prosocial Behavior of Rescue Workers and Counterproductive Work behavior

Table 06 Model Summary (Moderator: SECQ, IV: PBSRW, DV: CWBs)

R	R-Sq	MSE	F	df 1	df 2	p
.231	.053	7.81	7.20	3.00	381.00	.0001

Outcome: CWBs

Table 06 explains summary of the model of moderation analysis. The table is composed of R, R^2, F, df and p values. Value of R^2 denoted in table is .053. It means that the independent variable prosocial behavior of rescue workers has .053% variation in the dependent variable counterproductive work behavior. F value in the table is 7.20 and p value is .0001 (less than 0.05). Value of F and p are important to tells us about model fitness. Results shows that our model is significant.

Table 07 Coefficients (Moderator: SECQ, IV: PBSRW, DV: CWBs)

Model	Coeff	se	R-sq	R-sq change	t	p
Constant	22.45	6.99	.053	.0015	3.20	.0014
PBSRW	-.109	.078			-1.38	.166
SECQ	-.083	.112			-.740	.459
Int_1	.001	.001			.788	.431

Table 07 contains results of prosocial behavior in rescue workers and counterproductive work behavior with moderating effect of social and emotional competencies. The table shows insignificant value of p for interaction effect. Results show that association of prosocial behavior of rescue workers with counterproductive work behavior of rescue workers is insignificantly moderated by social and emotional competencies. Result of the moderating variable (Social and Emotional competencies) is explained in the last row. Value of p is important in this table. (β=.001, t=.788 & p=.431). Value of p is .431 higher than the standard value, which indicates that social and emotional competence (moderating variable) has no significant effect at 95% of confidence level, upon the association of independent (PBSRW) and dependent (CWBs) variable. Comparing the above tabulated results our hypothesis 2 (H2: Social and emotional competencies will work as a moderator between prosocial behavior of rescue workers and counterproductive work behavior among rescue workers) has been rejected. R2=.053, R2 change=.0015, which indicates that social and emotional competence explaining .0015% of variance between prosocial behavior and counterproductive work behavior of rescue workers. So, it is reported that level of social and emotional competencies has no significant effect on the relationship of prosocial behavior of rescue workers and counterproductive work behavior among rescue workers.

Discussion

Different analysis were carried out to get empirical evidences regarding the mentioned relationship. Prosocial behavior of rescue workers was found negatively correlated with counterproductive work behavior of rescue workers. Rescue workers who scored high on prosocial behavior scale for rescue workers, scored low on counterproductive work behavior. High prosocial rescue workers were found less or uninvolved in those actions to harm the organization. Results of the study proved this hypothesis, which was accepted. Before empirical analysis it was presumed that there will be negative association between prosocial behavior of rescue workers and counterproductive work behavior. Results of the research were in line with research study conducted by (Dalal, 2005). The research reported modestly negative association between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior, results of this study were verified on 16721 research participants. According to (Judge et al., 2006), it was reported that association between employee deviant behavior and perceptions of workplace environment and highly engaged employees are said to be more positive and less counterproductive (Ariani, 2013; Den Hartog & Belschak, 2012). OCB and CWBs are known to be different constructs and an individual may be engaged in either OCB or CWBs. Results of our current research are found parallel with studies of (Dalal, 2005) and (Kelloway et al., 2010), they reported negative association between the two constructs. Highly prosocial or those rescue workers involved in organizational citizen behavior will score less on counterproductive behavior scale and they will be less harmful to the organization. Such type of rescue workers can benefit and develop and emergency service.

It was hypothesized (Hypothesis 2), that social and emotional competencies can change the association between prosocial behavior and counterproductive work behavior of the rescue workers. After carrying different analysis no moderating effect of social and emotional competence was found on the relationship of prosocial behavior and counterproductive work behavior of rescue workers. Results of the current study shows that the association of prosocial behavior and counterproductive work behavior of rescue workers is insignificantly moderated by social and emotional competencies. Value of p for hypothesis 5 is .43 which is higher than the standard value, which indicates that social and emotional competence (moderating variable) has no significant effect upon the association of independent variable (prosocial behavior) and dependent variable (counterproductive work behavior). No earlier research study was found with all the mentioned variables however a research on the moderating influence of emotional intelligence on organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior by (Dixit & Singh, 2019) was consulted.

Results of our current study are in contrast with the study conducted by (Dixit & Singh, 2019). According to them, emotional intelligence has a significant influence on the association of OCB and counterproductive work behavior. Work of rescue workers is totally under the influence of emotions. It effects both OCB and all job outcomes. Emotionally intelligent employees will be more involved in OCB practices (Jung & Yoon, 2012). Several research studies reported positive impact of emotional intelligence OCB and negative association with counterproductive behavior of the employees in the workplace. Another research study by (Dixit & Singh, 2019) reported the importance of emotional intelligence in the workplace. Increase in emotional intelligence produces organizational citizenship behavior among employees which is more

profitable for the organization and its also necessary for the development of the organizations. Development and success of the organization is dependent upon the extra roles of the employees they are playing in the organizations. Employees emotionally intelligent and engaged in organizational citizenship behaviors are found more committed and less involved in counterproductive work behaviors (Cohen, 2016; Dixit & Singh, 2019). Employees who have the ability to understand the emotions of self and others are found helping and empathic towards others and they are found less involved while taking revenge and blame others for their own unacceptable actions. According to (Khalid et al., 2009) employees with the good quality of self-management have also the capability to easily control their feelings which keeps them away misbehaving or abusing other employees.

Limitations of the Current Research

Primary data for the current research was collected through self-administered questionnaires from a single source and convenient sampling was used. Cross-sectional research designs was used which lack to investigate cause and effect relationship among variables. Data for the current research was taken from emergency rescue service rescue 1122 Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, however there are some other departments also working to tackle emergency situations like all Armed forces, police, Fire Brigade and Civil Defense etc.

Suggestions and Future Directions

In future the researchers may extend to collect data by using alternate sources of data collection from rescue officers and they are also requested to attempt other research designs to explore cause and effect relationship between these variables.

References

1. Afolabi, O. A. (2013). Roles of personality types, emotional intelligence and gender

differences on prosocial behavior. Psychological thought, 6(1).

2. Afolabi, O. A. (2014). Psychosocial predictors of prosocial behaviour among a sample of Nigerian undergraduates. European Scientific Journal, 10(2).

3. Almutairi, A. M., Shahbal, S., Alzahrani, S. M., Aladah, R. A., Alfageih, I. Y., Alharthi, Y. A., & Ibraheem, M. (2022). ASSOCIATION BETWEEN LOCUS OF CONTROL OF HEALTH, RELIGIOUS ATTITUDE, AND SPIRITUALITY IN OLDER ADULTS IN PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITALS OF JEDDAH. Journal of Positive Psychology and Wellbeing, 161-171.

4. Amin, M., Khattak, A, Z & Khan M, Z. (2018). Effects of job stress on employee engagement and organizational commitment: a study on employees of emergency rescue service rescue 1122 district Peshawar. City University Research Journal, 08(02), 200-208.

5. Amin, Z., Shahbal, S., Noshili, A. I., Hamdi, A. M., Alrakad, H. H., Rajhi, M. A. A., ... & Ahmad, F. (2022). Jobs Stress and Prodromal Psychosis Among Healthcare Employees with Different Job Roles. International Journal of Clinical Skills, 16(4), 238.

6. Ariani, D. W. (2013). The relationship between employee engagement, organizational citizenship behavior, and counterproductive work behavior. International Journal of Business Administration, 4(2), 46.

7. Bolino, M. C., & Grant, A. M. (2016). The bright side of being prosocial at work, and the dark side, too: A review and agenda for research on other-oriented motives, behavior, and impact in organizations. Academy of Management Annals, 10(1), 599-670.

8. Brock, J. M., Lange, A., & Leonard, K. L. (2016). Generosity and prosocial behavior in healthcare provision evidence from the laboratory and field. Journal of Human Resources, 51(1), 133-162.

9. Clarkson, G. P. (2014). Twenty-first century employment relationships: The case for an altruistic model. Human Resource Management, 53(2), 253-269.

10. Cohen, A. (2016). Are they among us? A conceptual framework of the relationship between the dark triad personality and counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs). Human Resource Management Review, 26(1), 69-85.

11. Dalal, R. S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. Journal of applied psychology, 90(6), 1241.

12. Delfgaauw, J. (2007). Dedicated Doctors: Public and Private Provision of Health Care with Altruistic Physicians. Tinbergen Institute Discussion Paper No. 2007-010/1, 1-32.

13. Den Hartog, D. N., & Belschak, F. D. (2012). Work engagement and Machiavellianism in the ethical leadership process. Journal of Business Ethics, 107(1), 35-47.

14. Dixit, O., & Singh, S. (2019). Moderating influence of emotional intelligence on organisational citizenship behaviour and counterproductive work behaviour. Journal of Strategic Human Resource Management, 8(1), 26-31.

15. Emmerling, R., & Goleman, D. (2005). Leading with Emotion Emotional intelligence predicts success. Leadership Excellence, 22(7), 9.

16. Halpern, J., Gurevich, M., Schwartz, B., & Brazeau, P. (2009). What makes an incident critical for ambulance workers? Emotional

outcomes and implications for intervention. Work & Stress, 23(2), 173-189.

17. Judge, T. A., Scott, B. A., & Ilies, R. (2006). Hostility, job attitudes, and workplace deviance: test of a multilevel model. Journal of Applied psychology, 91(1), 126.

18. Jung, H. S., & Yoon, H. H. (2012). The effects of emotional intelligence on counterproductive work behaviors and organizational citizen behaviors among food and beverage employees in a deluxe hotel. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 31(2), 369-378.

19. Kelloway, E. K., Francis, L., Prosser, M., & Cameron, J. E. (2010). Counterproductive work behavior as protest. Human resource management review, 20(1), 18-25.

20. Khalid, S. A., Kassim, K. M., Ismail, M., Noor, A. N. M., Rahman, N. A., & Zain, R. S. (2009). Emotional intelligence and organizational citizenship behavior as antecedents of students' deviance. International Journal of Business and Management, 4(7), 117-125.

21. Khattak, A, Z., Bhati, M, I & Ullah, S. (2022). Association between Prosocial Behavior and Work Engagement of Rescue Workers: Moderation Effect of Social and Emotional Competence. SHAJAR, 4(2), 36–45.

22. Kolstad, J. T. (2013). Information and quality when motivation is intrinsic: Evidence from surgeon report cards. American Economic Review, 103(7), 2875-2910.

23. Martí-Vilar, M., Corell-García, L., & Merino-Soto, C. (2019). Revisión sistemática de medidas de conducta prosocial. Revista de Psicología (PUCP), 37(1), 349-377.

24. Milovanović, I., Gentile, A., Gutović, T., Kezić, A., Matošić, D., Kreivytė, R., Valantine, I., Daidone, G., Bianco, A., & Radjo, D. (2020). Prosocial and aggressive behavior occurrence in young athletes: field research results in six European countries. Sustainability, 12(12), 5085.

25. Milovanović, I., Gentile, A., Gutović, T., Kezić, A., Matošić, D., Kreivytė, R., Valantine, I., Daidone, G., Bianco, A., & Radjo, D. (2020). Prosocial and aggressive behavior occurrence in young athletes: field research results in six European countries. Sustainability, 12(12), 5085.

26. Mitonga-Monga, J., & Cilliers, F. (2016). Perceived ethical leadership: Its moderating influence on employees' organisational commitment and organisational citizenship behaviours. Journal of Psychology in Africa, 26(1), 35-42.

27. Noshili, A. I., Batool, R., Najmi, A. A., Najmi, M. A., Abiri, H. M. A., Khubrani, F. Y. G., ... & Hamzi, J. M. (2022). Relationship Between Personality Trait, And Mental Health Well-Being, The Mediating Role Of Emotional Intelligence Among Healthcare Workers In Jizan, KSA. Journal of Positive School Psychology, 6(10), 1833-1851.

28. Oberst, U., Gallifa, J., Farriols, N., & Vilaregut, A. (2009). Training emotional and social competences in higher education: The seminar methodology. Higher Education in Europe, 34(3-4), 523-533.

29. Penner, L. A., Dovidio, J. F., Piliavin, J. A., & Schroeder, D. A. (2005). Prosocial behavior: Multilevel perspectives. Annu. Rev. Psychol., 56, 365-392.

30. Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. (2012). Character Strengths and Virtues: A Handbook and Classification (New York: American Psychological Association & Oxford University Press, 2004). Reflective Practice: Formation and Supervision in Ministry, 32.

31. Prati, L. M., Douglas, C., Ferris, G. R., Ammeter, A. P., & Buckley, M. R. (2003). Emotional intelligence, leadership effectiveness, and team outcomes. The international journal of organizational analysis.

32. Sadri, G. (2012). Emotional intelligence and leadership development. Public Personnel Management, 41(3), 535-548.

33. Sajithkumar, P., & Prakash, R. (2016). Prosocial Behaviour-A Major Determinant of Helping People in Health Emergency. The International Journal of Indian Psychology, 03(04), 53-56.

34. Seal, C. R., Naumann, S. E., Scott, A. N., & Royce-Davis, J. (2011). Social emotional development: A new model of student learning in higher education. Research in Higher Education Journal, 10, 1.

35. Serra, D., Serneels, P., & Barr, A. (2011). Intrinsic motivations and the non-profit health sector: Evidence from Ethiopia. Personality and Individual Differences, 51(3), 309-314.

36. Spector, P. E., Bauer, J. A., & Fox, S. (2010). Measurement artifacts in the assessment of counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior: Do we know what we think we know? Journal of Applied Psychology, 95(4), 781.

37. Vieweg, J. C. (2018). Prosocial behaviors: Their motivations and impacts on organizational culture. The Journal of Values-Based Leadership, 11(2), 12.

38. Zych, I., Ortega-Ruiz, R., Muñoz-Morales, R., & Llorent, V. J. (2018). Dimensions and psychometric properties of the Social and Emotional Competencies Questionnaire (SEC-Q) in youth and adolescents. Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología, 50(2), 98-106.