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Abstract

Newly conceptualized Project Citizenship Behavior (PCB) concept has not been examined through the classical gender literature and there has been little theoretical work seeking to articulate the mechanism between PCB and gender concepts. Therefore, the objective of this review study is to establish the theoretical connection between these two concepts by using their structures and interactions to provide insights into the impact of gender on PCBs. With a dialectical approach, the multiplicity of theoretical connections between PCB and Network Capital (NC) also raises the question of whether employees exhibit PCB for NC development. This potential relationship is the main reason to include NC in the study.

1. Introduction

The term gender *(masculine, feminine)* was built on perception and socializing from the very first organized human communities to the present day. The observed tendencies of certain logic systems underlying the behaviors of men and women over time has resulted in the terms masculine and feminine. These masculine or feminine forms of action may shape the basis of social activity in the entire organizational setting, including project citizenship behavior (PCB) which is newly conceptualised by a qualitative study (Braun, Seitz & Sydow, 2012). PCB probably comes out in different levels considering the chemistry of gender *(male/female)*. In this context, a wide differentiation between biological sex (woman/man) and socialized perspective (feminine/ masculine) is asserted (Bird & Brush, 2002) in relevant literature and these differences will theoretically be examined on the basis of PCB and NC.

Project work is seen as an ongoing construction of patterns of femininity and masculinity in society (Lindgren & Packendorff, 2006) and these persistent gender stereotypes also influence the assignment and determination of social roles (Kim et al., 2016; Park et al., 2017). Research indicates that men and women socialize differently (Mohindra & Azhar, 2012) and social role theory provides a conceptual basis for explaining gender differences in social relationships. According to this theory, different social expectations for women and men establish social norms that emphasise control and competition for men vs. cooperation, friendship, and intimacy for women in social interactions (Abukhait, Bani-Melhem & Zeffane, 2019) and ultimately this leads to gender differences in decision-making behavior (Horak, 2016). Consistent with this tendency, we may say that these social interaction differences based on gender may differ individuals PCBs.

Some theories form a basis for Project Citizenship Behavior (PCB) e.g., Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) and Network Citizenship Behavior (NCB). These citizenship behaviors are commonly observed and empirically verified behaviors in work environments. From a theoretical point of view, PCB is based on the concept of OCB (Braun et al., 2012). On the other side, Network Capital (NC) is a concept derived from social capital and social capital is the value of a network’s form and content (Burt, 1997). NC conveys resources, confirms identity and influences behavior (Wellman & Frank, 2001) but the exact definition of NC is still not clear. As NC has the capability to influence the behavior, it is expected that there may be a
relationship with the PCB. Considering that most variables related in social sciences, it can be stated that this inference has a rational base.

“Ethical relativism” is the problem of measuring human relations with the same scale (Fiske, 1990) and this reality makes it difficult to reach valid findings from organizations (e.g., projects, temporary, virtual) that are seen as a repository for empirical research. Thus, a theoretical study of gender on PCB and NC may provide a perspective and insight for interested researchers. It is within this background that we propose:

PCB of individuals depends on the quality of their relationship within the networked parties. The question that should be asked at this point is, does the network capital of individuals have a theoretical connection with gender and exhibit PCB and it’s dimensions?

In this direction, the research seeks to address the importance of gender in the formation of NC and PCB display of network employees. The study is structured as follows: How PCB concept is evolved. Secondly, we employed a literature review to compare our readings (e.g., empirical findings, literary analysis technique known as deconstruction11Deconstruction suspends the “taken for grantedness” of language (Ibid.), examining the language used to see what underlying assumptions are embodied within the text.) sorted and connected the gender characteristics and finally, we present our conclusions and future research directions.

2. Evolution of the Theory of Project Citizenship Behavior (PCB)

OCB research investigates noncontractual behaviors such as the social psychology of groups (Thibaut & Harold, 1959), psychological contract (Levinson,1963; Rousseau, 1990), extrarole behavior (Van Dyne et al., 1994) and OCB (Bateman & Organ, 1983). In order to capture an individual’s work behavior that contributes to organizational effectiveness, OCB was initially proposed (Guo, Wang, Fu & Liu, 2019) and growing research and theory signal the prominence of within-individual dynamics in OCB (Methot, Lepak, Shipp & Boswell, 2017). Empirical evidence suggests that citizenship behaviors are present in interorganizational contexts (Autry et al., 2008). Over time, studies on the OCB have increased in depth to a variety of domains, including network citizenship behavior (Braun et al., 2012), and inter-organizational citizenship behavior (Skinner, Autry, Lamb, 2009). Table 2.1 below shows the concepts and it’s sub-dimensions related to the PCB.

Table 2.1. Concepts Related to PCB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCB concept</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alturizm</td>
<td>Helping behavior in the interorganizational project context; it captures the voluntary behavior to help the current project members who need such help to solve problems (Braun et al., 2013). However, OCB begins at low levels because they do not immediately know how to, or have the opportunity to, engage in OCB (Methot et al., 2017). Therefore, the same can be said for the citizenship behaviors that will be displayed in projects where different specialties come together in limited time span. Empirical research suggests both that females areperceived as more altruistic by observers (Seymour &amp; Busherhof, 1991) and females are more likely to report performing OCB-altruism than males (Kidder, 2002). Additionally, gender-consistent role of females as being supportive would lead to the prediction that females engage in more OCB (Ng et al. 2016). Social psychologists, too, have long observed that females display more helping behavior than males do (e.g., Eagly &amp; Crowley, 1986; Mesch, Brown, Moore &amp; Hayat, 2011). In conclusion, meta-analyzes of gender differences in helping behavior (Karau &amp; Williams, 1993) show that masculine and feminine characteristics may have an effect on employees’ showing PCB.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2
Sportsmanship behaviors are important to acquire a follow-up contract (Braun et al., 2012) such as helping behavior or willingness to tolerate inevitable inconveniences (Podsakoff et al., 2000). Project members work together very closely because their work is highly interdependent, and interdependency frequently requires assistance. Team members may actively assist other team members who are under time pressure, which may help to improve the project performance (Guo et al., 2019). According to Zhu and Mu (2016) knowledge sharing also supports and enhances innovative work behavior which is a desired feature especially in projects competing with time. Therefore, we may say sportsmanship behaviors is particularly valuable in projects.

Organizational loyalty or commitment is demonstrated by previous studies as a major attitudinal antecedent of citizenship behavior, especially when there is little expectation of formal rewards for such behavior (Podsakoff et al., 2000). Project commitment is defined as the acceptance of project goals, the willingness to invest considerable effort in the project, and the desire to maintain the membership in the project (Hoegl, Weinlauf & Gemuenden, 2004). Compliance and loyalty effort-related behaviors were positively related to project goal achievement (Ferreira et al., 2013). On the other hand, project deadlines can increase “a common spirit of comradeship” and a sense of loyalty because sharing the same fate (project outcome) often leads to loyalty (e.g., commitment, strong cohesion, compliance) behavior. These highly relevant concepts may lead to project loyalty and the notion of isomorphism11Isomorphism is the process whereby individuals in widely varying corporate environments tend to think and behave in highly similar ways (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983)), which implicitly endorses certain cognitive and external behaviors while discouraging others (Bucke & Thomas, 2003).

Organizational compliance is a dimension that involves any type of behavior that is related to the following rules, processes, and guidelines (Ferreira et al., 2013), whereas, project compliance is an extension of organizational compliance in the project context (Guo et al., 2019). A “good citizen” obeys rules and regulations even when nobody is watching (Podsakoff et al., 2000). Therefore, this dimension is especially important for PCB because nowadays many projects run “virtual”. Some objects of compliance are, for instance, communication procedures, information sharing policies, deadlines, and punctuality (Braun et al., 2012).

Individual initiative means task-related behavior beyond minimal expected requirements, which involves innovative acts leading to the improvement of process, products and services (Podsakoff et al., 2000). Individual initiative refers to behaviors aimed at ensuring the fulfillment of the project’s objectives (Guo et al., 2019). In this context, it is a fact that innovative approaches are necessary beyond demonstrating PCB in solving the problem of complex projects (Qureshi & Kang, 2015). Thus, uncovering the antecedents of (or what may nurture) employee innovative behaviours remains a pertinent research topic in several domains of social sciences (Abukhait et al., 2019). Organ (1988) admits that there is a difficulty in distinguishing in-role behavior from citizenship behavior for at least some types of actions (e.g., taking initiatives). Initiative and assertiveness are related notions. In relation to this discourse, strong empirical evidence suggests that males are perceived as more assertive and task-oriented (e.g., Carless, 1998; Eagly et al., 1995). Theoretically we may say that male characteristics may become prominent in this dimension.

Civic virtue is the willingness to perform cooperative behaviors. Braun and friends (2013), conceptualize the dimension as “relationship maintenance” beyond the termination of the project. Graham and her colleagues (e.g., Graham, 1991; Van Dyne et al., 1994) helped expand and evolve the concept of civic virtue towards “voice” behavior. Voice represents speaking out and challenging the status quo (Krefting & Powers, 1998; LePine & Van Dyne, 1998). At the point of gender, males are more likely to report performing OCB-civic virtue behaviors than females. This suggests that they are more likely to view voicing their opinions and being active in organizational life (i.e., civic virtue behaviors) as part of their occupational identity. This feature is also increases their self-reported performance of civic virtue behaviors. (Kidder, 2002). According to these findings exhibiting degree of civic virtue behaviors may vary within genders.

2.1. Revision of PCB related concepts

ICB occurs when coworkers stand by one another beyond their job requirements in such a way that results, either directly or indirectly, in enhancing individual job performance and ultimately contributes to organi-
zational functioning (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Settoon & Mossholder, 2002). The structure of interpersonal relationships in social systems (Burt, 1997) may lead socially asymmetric relationships that are characterized by the dependent individual liking the other without receiving reciprocation (Carley & Krackhardt, 1991), in other words, no need to impress the dependent other so, the relationships demonstrating unbalanced reciprocation (e.g. program director of a company A vs technician of a company B) between them. Considering this fact, Interpersonal Citizenship Behavior (ICB) can effect in a roundabout way the social interorganizational functioning. On the other side, social dependence was negatively related to the performance of ICB which predicted a negative relationship between positions of social dependence and receipt of ICB (Bowler & Brass, 2006). A number of studies have demonstrated that women trust less and their trust levels are more context-sensitive than men (Croson & Gneeze, 2009) and highly developed feminine behaviors tend to enhance “sensitivity in emotional contexts” (Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Jordan, 1997; Fletcher, 1998). Thus, this emotional contexts can affect their ICB.

NCB is an extra-role behavior exhibited by employees for creating positive psychological environment in multi-organizational network (Provan, Sydow & Podsakoff, 2017). Network Citizen Behavior (NCB) reflects an exchange between employees and organization and leaves behind individual relationships between employees (Bowler & Brass, 2006). In this context, OCB research is extensive (Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006), and has a positive correlation with a variety of measures of unit-level effectiveness, such as quality, profitability, sales, etc. (see Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, & Blume, 2009 for a review) but failing to address other important levels of analysis such as projects and networks. Networks generate commitment and loyalty between employees and back longevity in companies (Timberlake, 2005). Thus, these unique features of networks are important antecedents of possible PCB demonstration, such as “loyalty” and “compliance”. Besides, the inter-organizational collaboration that offers distinctive resources (Provan et al., 2017) affects the quality, quantity, and availability of resources (Popielarz, 2000), which are also important opportunities for project workers.

It is difficult to assess the situational context of citizenship behavior demonstrated during the operation of projects (Sydow et al., 2004). A social network perspective assumes that an individual’s behavior is not driven solely by his or her personal disposition or attitudes. Instead, the characteristics of relationships and the networks of relationships affect the attitudes and behavior of individual network actors (Scott, 2000). Thus, decisions and actions will have an impact on other network participants (Provan et al., 2017). The maintenance of relationships and loyalty towards project members helps to keep relationships in a condition of latency over a longer period of time and to reactivate these relationships when new projects are launched (Braun et al., 2012). Moreover, Henderson (2014) found that creating opportunities and networking strategies predicted more career satisfaction for women compared to men. In conclusion, NCB is the level of relationships that hold across several projects (Provan et al., 2017), and the maintenance of commitment and good relationships between project members could foster possible future NCB behaviors.

PCB helps accomplish tasks and solve problems which are not addressed in contractual arrangements (Braun et al., 2012). The PMII1The Project Management Institute, predominant professional association for Project managers in North America. spread of understanding and appreciation for skills and behaviors collectively termed project management. Nowadays, many projects are “virtual” and exceed their budgets, run late or inadequate in achieving the goals (White & Fortune, 2002) due to its complex nature. In order to achieving goals in complex environment project managers need to be communicative (Ekrot et al., 2016; Rezvani et al., 2016). Communication between manager and employee can also increase the quality of relationships and affect motivation and performance. (Fiša et al. 2015; Chromjaková, 2016), and this relationship may eventually leads or accelerate PCB. Display of PCB is also beneficial to cohesiveness in and across groups in the project (Braun et al., 2013). It can also be said that the concept of cohesiveness is a precondition for a quality relationship. Research of gender-related motivational differences is based on the idea of fundamental differences between men and women, i.e. on the existence of gender stereotypes (Hitka, Kozubikova & Potkany, 2018). Male and female project managers need to understand the differences inherent in masculine and feminine ways of managing projects and claim the strengths of both approaches (Buckle & Thomas, 2003) to maintain a positive psychosocial network environments. Finally, patterns of
behavior knitted by positions (e.g., project leader) should be considered when evaluating the OCB. Some of these seven dimensions, like helping behavior, sportsmanship and loyalty, can be found in the vast majority of OCB studies, while others, like self-development, are used less frequently. In addition, it should be noted that the dimensions have been reconceptualized several times in the historic development of the concept (e.g., Van Dyne et al., 1994). dimensions through the gender perspective.

3. Revision the dimensions of project citizenship behavior based on gender

The theoretical link between PCB and gender is underdeveloped and PCB is a comprehensive construct, with several dimensions consisting of several specific behaviors (Guo et al., 2019). Braun and his colleagues (2012), reconceptualized OCB as PCB on the basis of “Project Unique Characteristics”, i.e., temporariness, team, task, and context-embeddedness. PCB is a latent multidimensional construct which consists of five different related behaviors, i.e., helping behavior, project loyalty, project compliance, individual initiative, and relationship maintenance (Braun et al., 2013). The dimensions of PCBs summarized in Table 3.1 and discussed on the basis of gender. These dimensions are gathered from German chapter of the International Project Management Association (IPMA) the qualitative study of Braun et al., (2012). They also applied a broad range of industries to ensure the generalizability of their findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PCB Dimensions</th>
<th>Project-Specific Helping Behavior</th>
<th>Project Loyalty</th>
<th>Project Compliance</th>
<th>Project-Specific Proactive / Initiative Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dimension</td>
<td>- Bridging contractual gaps</td>
<td>- Cooperative behavior / pursuing joint project goals</td>
<td>- Orientation toward the rules, policies and processes of the temporary organization - In projects obey rules fosters reliability</td>
<td>- Performing tasks of the temporary organization with creative and innovative efforts that go beyond contractual arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitions</td>
<td>- Behavior directed towards helping coworkers in a temporary organization when solving problems</td>
<td>- Allegiance to the temporary organization as a whole, sometimes but not necessarily sacrificing the interests of one’s own or the employer organization for the common good - Willingness to help in the form of voluntarily sharing</td>
<td>- Fulfilling expectations (no need to continuous control)</td>
<td>- Direct the attention to project leader towards opportunities for improvements. - Introducing own experiences and ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coping with unforeseeable situations</td>
<td>- Orientation toward the rules, policies and processes of the temporary organization - In projects obey rules fosters reliability</td>
<td>- Fulfilling expectations (no need to continuous control)</td>
<td>- Direct the attention to project leader towards opportunities for improvements. - Introducing own experiences and ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Pragmatic solutions to problems</td>
<td>- Reciprocal support</td>
<td>- Following rules of engagement/ cooperation</td>
<td>- Offering tasks of the temporary organization with creative and innovative efforts that go beyond contractual arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Reciprocal support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1. Abstracted Structure of PCB
**PCB Dimensions**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Project-Specific Helping Behavior</th>
<th>Project Loyalty</th>
<th>Project Compliance</th>
<th>Project-Specific Proactive / Initiative Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Helping a coworker to fix a problem even though it is not part of any contract</td>
<td>-Defending the temporary organization when it is criticized from the outside</td>
<td>-Adhering to the quality standards of the temporary organization and to the rules that were set up at kick-off</td>
<td>-Making suggestions for improvements in processes, services, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Adopted from (Braun et al., 2012; 2013).

Braun and his colleagues (2012) originally re-conceptualized OCB as PCB based on their qualitative exploratory study and determined some conceptual dimensions of PCBs. The research paid attention to two principles: first, the interpreted the data with respect to the context of the interview, and secondly, the entire coding process was performed by two coders to ensure reliability. PCB behaviors depend on temporary organization. The dimensions of PCB above are normative expectations about behaviors of workers to be competent in specific and time-limited projects.

Project environment offers an opportunity to analyze the importance and nature of gender relations. Several studies showed differences in variables related with self-esteem, proactive behaviors, initiative, motivation and leadership among men and women. (Pons et al., 2016). Thus, the communal nature of women and the agentic nature of men lead us to believe that display of PCB differs according to gender.

Project-specific helping behavior is essential in temporary organizations (Braun et al., 2013), and has positive effects on project quality, project time, and relationship sustainability (Guo et al., 2019). Research on gender stereotypes differentiates between categories of helping behavior (Kidder, 2002). If projects requirements influences on collaborative relations we might expect to see collaborative profiles between men and women (Whittington, 2018). However, the persistence of gender inequalities in project-based labor markets still exists (Luther, 2015). The culture of project-based industries is inherently “masculine” in orientation already (Gale & Cartwright, 1995a) and gender bias reducing women potential contribution for networks (Mc Adam, Harrison & Leitch, 2019) whereas women care about working relationships and make compromises in order to maintain good relationships (Hitka et al., 2018).

In projects, there is generally less tolerance for time delays or human errors than in-line organizations (Braun et al., 2012). Time and more particularly the built-in termination of projects (Lundin & Söderholm, 1995; Müller-Seitz & Sydow, 2011) force staff to collaborate closely to complete the project according to the schedule. Therefore, rapid adjustment to changing requirements (Gustavsson, 2016), mutuality (Jordan, 1997; Westkott, 1997), and cooperative behaviors (Van Emmerik, 2006) are essential in projects. Otherwise, conflict would occur, and the increasing complexity and uncertainty in projects (Rezvani et al., 2016) leads to chaos. In this context, PCB may help to deal with uncertainties (Braun et al., 2012). On the other side, women seem to have a greater need to receive support, possess a sense of empowerment and feel a high level of self-confidence in their capabilities and results (Pons et al., 2016). In addition, when network managers (or other network members) have a motivating and empowering characteristics, they would exhibit higher levels of NCBs (Provan et al., 2017) These aforementioned variables that will contribute to the development of women can also be strengthened by the PCBs that will be shown to them during the project.

Project loyalty includes helpful, cooperative, and altruistic behavior (Braun et al., 2012; 2013). However, quite interestingly, females were less inclined to engage in knowledge sharing (Abukhait et al., 2019). Individuals high in project commitment are inclined to blur the organizational boundaries and cooperate with project members from other organizations (Hoegl et al., 2004). On the other side, there are parts of project management thinking that could imply an increased importance of traditional femininities (Lindgren
& Packendorff, 2006). Feminine cognition can be viewed as ‘field dependent,’ focusing on the conceiving of tasks and plans through consideration of the particular idiosyncratic demands of the moment (Buckle & Thomas, 2003). On the other side, the masculine gender role puts a premium on strength and individuality (Van Emmerik, 2006). Therefore, individuals with strong masculine styles hold a value system focusing on mastery over their environment (Eagly and Johnson, 1990; Hughes, 2000) that may prevent the engagement and cooperation of project coworkers within a specific types of projects (e.g., software) where collaborative behavior is not at the forefront. Furthermore, the cooperative climate, indeed showed significant gender differences (Van Emmerik, 2006). Women are expected to place more value on interpersonal relationships and to seek social support (e.g., instrumental, expressive) to a greater extent than does the masculine gender role for men (Greenglass, 2002).

Project compliance is especially important for project-oriented organizations because compliance notion can be taken as one of an explanatory variable to trust. Trust can shape or broaden the organization’s social network and thus increase future project opportunities (Ferreira et al., 2013; Huemann et al., 2007). In addition, a higher level of project-based compliance leads to team members better obeying the operation procedures and regulations (Guo et al., 2019). Individuals with strong masculine managerial skills tend to be highly task-oriented, excel at initiating structure through the development of roles and procedures, make leader and subordinate roles explicit, and ensure team members effectively follow prescribed structures to maintain high performance standards (Buckle & Thomas, 2003). Thus, it’s conceivable that this dominant feature of masculinity may stimulate orientation toward the rules, policies, and processes of the temporary organization and direct the attention of project workers (Braun et al., 2012). Men are natural providers, they are task-oriented and like to get the job done (Mohindra & Azhar, 2012). By nature, each project will have its own unique demands, thus, it can be argued that masculine behavior constitutes a special importance for this dimension due to its strong adaptability.

Project-specific proactive behavior can be described as a different kind of “psychological contract” definition because proactivity can be a source of additional motivation for an employee to behave beyond contractual arrangements. Individuals with a proactive personality show initiative, make constructive contributions, identify new opportunities, and generate new ideas (Villar, 2005). Abstraction of introducing own experiences and idea means project members may discover potential project opportunities, or propose suggestions proactively based on their own experience, aiming to optimize the implementation of the project (Xia, Zhong, Wang, & Tiong, 2017). Therefore, the project worker proactively directed the attention of the project leader towards opportunities for improvement (Braun et al., 2012). On the other side, proactive behavior has a negative effect on relationship sustainability due to cause competition and lead to an unequal status among the team members (Guo, 2019).

Gender differences in risk aversion are particularly important (Friedl, et al., 2020). Women in Western societies are typically more risk averse than men in individual risk taking decisions (Friedl, Pondorfer, & Schmidt, 2020) which is also associated with proactive behavior by it’s nature. For example, one project staff may discover a potential risks and then directly exhibit proactive behavior to reduce it, however these actions may be somewhat offensive to his colleagues (Guo et al., 2019). In this context, gender differences in risk perceptions and risk-taking behavior, suggesting that the negative outcomes (including psychological perceptions and behavior intentions) of such perceptions would be stronger for women than for men (Lin et al., 2017). In support of these propositions, organizations are more likely to encourage women to develop their interpersonal skills, adopt a more assertive attitude, or change their managerial style to enable them to overcome organizational constraints (Gale & Cartwright, 1995a). In these gender differential context, theoretical constructs of masculine and feminine behavior differences and it’s associated terms in projects can be seen below.

### Table 3.2. Work Language Associated With Gender Constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical constructs</th>
<th>Associated terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Field independent Avoid, Categories, Closure, Conflict, Constrain, Control, Correct, Efficiency, Efficient, Separation from environment, others Execute, Expectation, Formalize, Get, Getting, Hierarchical, Hierarchy, Impose, Performance orientation Influence, Initiate, Logic, Manage, Measure, Organize, Outside, Perform, Plan, Risk Active (+Uncertain/Threat/Unknown), Sequential, Structure, Technique, Template, Linear-sequential Terminate, Tool, Uniform Hierarchical authority Control over Analytical/impersonal problem solving Impersonal task focus Feminine Field dependent/Context sensitivity Affect, Care, Connect, Consider, Coordinate, Devote, Discover, Disseminate, Emerge, Connection to environment, others Estimate, Feedback, Generate, Informal, Lead, Link, Receive, Relate, Relationship, Improvisational Respond, Response, Share, Unexpected, Unplanned Receptive/responsive Non-linear Lateral-democratic authority Shared power/Control with focus on Situational and emotional gestalts Interpersonal relationships


Social roles are the key causes of gender differences in people’s behaviors within an environment (Lin, Featherman & Sarker, 2017). All individuals tend to vary along two dimensions in project, masculinity and femininity. Although these roles are distributed differently in projects, every man and woman has access to both views of femininities and masculinity through ongoing interaction with other people at work (Holmqvist & Lindgren, 2002; Lindgren & Packendorff, 2006) to form NC in projects (Provan et al., 2017). Societal expectations of gender appropriateness can highlight that women are expected to display communal (interpersonally, nurturing, sensitive) and that men are expected to display dominant (assertive, independent, ambitious) attitudes and behaviors (Wood & Lindorff, 2001). These major distinctions can be seen in the masculine and feminine theoretical constructs in Table 3.1. Considering the sub-dimensions of feminine and masculine structures from a holistic perspective, men hold more instrumental attitudes, whereas women hold more emotional responsive attitudes (Van Emmerik, 2006). Therefore, women employees should engage in masculine strategies (Pons et al., 2016) to access instrumental networks.

Xia and friends (2017) found a significant differences on the dimensions of PCBs helping behavior, individual initiative (proactive behavior) and project commitment according to the gender variable. Women tend to exhibit facilitative and friendly behaviors, which can be termed communal, indicating that their behaviors tend to focus on social- and people-oriented factors. In contrast, men favor a pattern of assertive and
independent behaviors (Lin et al., 2017) which indicates that their behaviors tend to focus on mastery in social interactions. In the light of these theoretical discussions, we may say network capital and PCB in the projects had some specific connection with gender constructs.

5.1. Revision of network capital based on PCB and gender

Gendered dispositions may also act as capital (Mc Adam et al., 2019) and gender affects social capital accumulation (Palgi & Moore, 2004). Exchange of emotional aid, tangible support, companionship, and information between network members is frequently underlined in the network research. Resource possession and availability, reciprocity, similarity (facilitate each other’s delivery of resources), and social control (facilitate or constrain the provision of resources) are some dimensions of NC (Wellman & Frank, 2001) and these dimensions are in close interaction with gender by nature. In addition, social capital may promote citizenship behaviors (e.g., Bolino, Turnley, Bloodgood, 2002) and critical to success for both men and women (Timberlake, 2005). Also considering the differences in “work language” of gender, it can be thought that masculine and feminine behaviors exhibited in the project operation may affect NC.

Network factors are important in understanding gender differentials (Whittington, 2018). The concepts that underpin to PCB dimensions (e.g., help, reciprocal, cooperative) are closely related and interacted to the concepts that form the network capital (e.g., mutual understanding, commitment, trust, knowledge sharing). For example, Kang and Lee (2017) found that external knowledge can provide employees with new insights and, thus, contribute to innovative behaviour. External information can be obtained from the individual’s network capital and on the other side innovative behavior can be seen as an antecedent variable of proactive behavior dimension of PCB due to its ability to require innovative efforts. In addition, Groysberg (2010) argues that women profit from external ties because they are much more selective, cautious, and strategic than men when making choices on future projects.

There is a similar mapping between network characteristics (e.g., provision of social support, tie strength) and gender (Wellman & Frank, 2001). Men tend to have predominantly male networks, while women tend to have female or mixed networks (McKinsey & LeanIn.Org, 2015). Therefore, in addition of women weakness of network resources (Santos, Roomi & Linan, 2016) social networks may allocate resources differently (Haines & Hurlbert, 1992) based on the prevailing perceptions of gender differences as they relate to workplace hierarchies and access to resources (Abukhait et al., 2019). In addition, Chun (2013) found differences in the approaches of men and women to using social networks, contacts, and alliances of colleagues to access knowledge which can also be a civic virtue behavior in projects.

Women have less social capital than men and face problems in accumulating it, due to credibility issues in networks (Mc Adam, 2019). The underrepresentation of women is a function of the gendering of the project management discipline, which is such that some men may not find that women “fit in”. (Gale & Cartwright, 1995b). In this aspect, gender research suggests different reasons for expecting women to need more social support (Pons, Ramos, & Ramos, 2016). For example, men use networks in a goal-directed way for gaining personal advantages, to use them for enhancing career and economic, whereas women are more interested to getting their needs met, for gaining social and emotional support (Söker-Petersen & Thorssell, 2008). Supporting this finding, either Bolino et al., (2002) propose that OCB influences social capital on a relational dimension by improving mutual liking, trust, and identification which may encouraged PCB for expanding network contacts. By this way, the relational dimension of social capital, which concerns affective relationships may also facilitate PCB and linked to the interpersonal relationships and emotional gestalts of feminine behavior (see. Table 3.2).

Women are potentially disadvantaged in projects (Lutter, 2015). Women’s gender-homophilous networks (i.e., their identity networks to other women) tend to be negatively associated with positional power, whereas men’s homophilous networks are positively associated to power and authority and are larger in absolute numbers (Ibarra, 1993). If we interpret this reality from PCB perspective, it is more difficult for women to maintain their networks in projects and they have less network capital to exhibit PCB. As a result of these findings, it can be thought that individuals accessing the level of expressive benefits such as friendship and
social support. Soft social capital develops from expressive ties, and instrumental ties involve the information, expertise, professional advice, political access, and material resources (see Tichy, 1981, for a review). Hard social capital develops from instrumental ties (Ibarra, 1993). Networks can be differed according to their gender. However, gender capital is a capital that is available to men and women (Huppatz & Goodwin 2013), women must reach out to a variety of different network contacts to form sufficient network capital.

6. Discussion and managerial implications

This theoretical investigation may present important implications for professionals and researchers of project-based organizing. The main objective of this study was to expand the understanding of the PCB concept by approaching theoretically on a gender basis to fill the current research gap. The PCB concept which evolved from OCB is also increasing it’s importance day by day due to increasing numbers of outsourcing and joint projects. Prior to this study, a great deal of knowledge existed about project networks and OCB, but review of the PCB from gender perspective will contribute to the development of knowledge about organizational behavior.

Building effective networks within teams as well as organizations will enhance the performance of those teams and organizations (Reagans, Zuckerman & McEvily, 2004), but how teams are socially composed and structured should not be ignored. However, access to organizational and social networks is not always equitable. Much of the literature strongly suggests that women do not have equal access to social capital (Timberlake, 2005). The feminine features that stand out in terms of interaction with the environment provide some advantages, especially in international projects that require many actors to work in harmony within a network. In addition, gender constructs (masculine and feminine ways of knowing and being in workplaces) are also undoubtedly valuable for project management (Buckle & Thomas, 2003) for how to foster PCBs in projects. Men and women differ in terms of motivation (Hitka et al., 2018). Considering that extrinsic motivation is higher in men, and intrinsic motivation is higher in women (Pons et al., 2016). In this context, expressive ties which women need to access in workplace may enhance their intrinsic motivation to exhibit more PCB.

In conclusion, theoretically, we may say that “proactive behavior” is related to masculine type while “helping behavior” is more related to feminine type individuals. In addition, under masculine hierarchical authority, male domination on instrumental networks and less emotional responsive attitudes of masculinity could effect the level of PCB of employees. Furthermore the differentiation between men and women in accessing social capital will also differ between their network creation capabilities but the compositional (e.g., frequency of contact, network size, network heterogeneity) and structural (e.g., density of links among alters) characteristics of network must be taken into account (Wellman & Gulia, 1999) when making such evaluations.

7. Limitations and future research directions

Project organisations differ substantially from permanent, functionally organised, and traditional, organisations (Turner, 1997). Without discriminating between the traditional (e.g., construction; heavy engineering; defence) and non-traditional (e.g., finance; IT; training) industries associated with project management techniques, we have discussed projects as being usually embedded into more permanent contexts such as organizations and/or interorganizational networks in this study. The PCB concept should also be considered “not culture free” (e.g., masculinity vs feminity, individualism, long-short-term orientation). Gender role theory also suggests that individuals internalize cultural expectations about their gender (Eagly, Karau & Makajhani, 1995). However, culture is beyond the analytic scope of this review study. Ultimately, when evaluating individuals network capital, the macro variable culture should always be considered. Because, network functioning is also not culture free (Brodbeck, Frese & Javidan, 2002).

Most effects of PCB on project performance were positive (Guo et al., 2019), and we may say it has a strategic impact on network based working. Therefore, identifying antecedents for PCB may another future research motivation. The dimensions of PCB should be validated and refined through measurable items and scales to fulfill conceptual clarity and potential differences should be taken into account according to
project context. Because the co-existence of different organizing principles and working conditions of project partners can affect employee experience and thus they may have exhibited different types of PCBs. A mix of both quantitative and especially qualitative methodologies (e.g., structured questionnaires, in-depth interviews) are appropriate for a comprehensive understanding of the impact of gender on PCBs and under what circumstances do people act PCBs. The Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK) also can be used as a prominent source of masculine and feminine logic systems to integrate new concepts into the dimensions of PCB. Future studies may also apply surveys to check the dimensions of PCB and the causality of possible network and gender effects on PCB. Additionally, personality (for example, big five personality traits) helps us understand who (for example, extroversion) can perform more PCB in projects within a limited time frame.

Proposals of this study are theoretically significant but would not provide definitive answers to the question of causality due to it’s structural nature. Additional empirical evidence and theoretical development are needed to acquire insights and clarify which masculine and feminine features effects or facilitate the PCB. Only behavioral notions of masculinity and femininity in the literature are discussed as an explanatory variable in this study. Otherwise, it would go beyond the scope of this study. Further studies in different perspectives such as culture or organizational structures will provide deeper understanding of gender differences and fills the research gap in PCB.
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