The Effects of Paternalist Leadership on Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Mediating Role of Distributive Justice

Murat YEŞİLTAŞ
Mehmet Akif Ersoy University,
School of Tourism Management and Hospitality,
Istiklal Campus, Burdur, Turkey
yesiltas.murat@gmail.com

Extensive Summary

Introduction

Although studies on paternalistic leadership have been carried out for the last twenty years, paternalistic management style was designed by Max Weber as a legal authority and it was shaped in his studies. In the economy and society designed by Weber (1968), three types of authorities are referred to as traditional, charismatic, and bureaucratic authority and traditional design of the rules is referred to as paternalistic authority (Pellegrini and Scandura, 2008). What does the leadership style which was expressed by Weber in 1968 and which has come to the fore as paternalism for the last twenty years mean? While there are different definitions in the literature, the most common definition has been made by Farh and Cheng (2000). Accordingly, paternalistic leadership refers to a style blending "strong discipline and authority, with a fatherly benevolence and moral integrity"(quoted by Kôksal, 2011b, p. 105 from Farh& Cheng, 2000, 94).

Based on this definition, Cheng et al (2004, p. 91) suggest that paternalism has three components. These are authoritarianism, utilitarianism and ethical leadership. Authoritarianism refers to a style in which the leader is an absolute authority in his behaviours; seniors have a control over subordinates; and subordinates obey their seniors without questioning. Utilitarianism means that there is a holistic benefit in the behaviour of the leader for the well-being of employees and families. Ethical leadership, on the other hand, means a high level of personal moral virtue, self-discipline and the exclusion of self-interest.

Ever since the paternalistic leadership began to take place in the literature, organizational and individual results have also begun to be explored in the literature.
For example, in the literature, there are studies which explore the impact of paternalistic leadership on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, innovative behaviour (Anwar, 2013), confidence in the manager (Saher, Naz, Tasleem, Naz and Kausar, 2013), and organizational justice (Köksal, 2011a). This study examines the mediating role of distributive justice in the impact of paternalistic leadership on organizational citizenship behaviour.

**Methodology**

The objective of the study is to examine the mediating role of distributive justice paternalistic leadership on organizational citizenship behaviour which are employed in four and five-star hotels in Istanbul. In this sense, the data have been collected from employees of five of four-star and ten of five star hotels which are run in Istanbul. 450 questionnaires have been distributed between April 2013 and June 2013, as a result, the analysis of the study has been completed based on returned 325 questionnaires.

Scales which are in the literature and tested in terms of their validity and reliability have been used while collecting the data. The questionnaire form of the study consists of four parts. The first section is composed of statements assessing the paternalistic leadership; the second part includes statements that measure the distributive justice; the third part consists of statements that evaluate organizational citizenship behaviour, and the last section consists of the demographic variables. In the first part, there is scale for Paternalist Leadership. The Paternalist Leadership Scale was developed by Cheng et al. (2004), and the study of Ökten and Cenkci (2012) has been used for Turkish translation of the scale. It consists of 26 items. In the second part, a distributive scale, which consists of 5 items and developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993) is given. We have benefited from Karaeminoğulları (2006) for Turkish translation of the scale. The third part of the questionnaire includes organizational citizenship behaviour scale. The OCB scale was developed by Bolat and Bolat in 2008 it consists of 20 items. All ratings are made on a five-point scale (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree). And in the last part of the questionnaire, there are questions about demographic characteristics of the participants.

**Findings and Discussions**

We have used structural equation modelling with LISREL 8.8 to test our hypotheses. Prior to hypothesis testing, we have conducted a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) of the predictor constructs (paternalist leadership, distributive justice and OCB). Results from this CFA have shown an adequate fit for all the scale. Also, we have tested to see if measurement model had good fit (Anderson and Gerbing, 1988). The measurement model has an acceptable fit ($X^2$: 1556.03; $df$: 783; $X^2/df$: 1.99; RMSEA: 0.055; IFI: 0.97; CFI: 0.97; NFI: 0.95; NNFI: 0.97) (Schermelleh-Engel, Moosbruggerve Müller, 2003, p.52; Şimşek, 2007). The study results show that the composite reliability ranges from 0.77 to 0.88, or greater than the standard of 0.7.

Having confirmed that the measurement model has adequate fit, we have tested our model. Results of the structural analysis of the proposed model provides an acceptable fit for the data ($X^2$: 1703.74; $df$: 805; $X^2/df$: 2.11; RMSEA: 0.059; IFI: 0.97;
In the study first hypothesis which is paternalist leadership (authoritarian and dimensions) significantly and positively affected distributive justice ($\gamma=0.50; \text{t-value}=2.70$) is validated. Nonetheless, results show that other two hypothesis, $H_2 (\gamma=-0.02; \text{t-value}=-0.10)$ and $H_3 (\gamma=0.09; \text{t-value}=1.24)$, are not supported. In paternalism, the authoritarian approach can be said to distribute both the award and the punishment in a fair way within the organization and, in the same way, the authoritarian approach makes a fair distribution for promotion opportunities within the organization. The authoritarian leader also has a dominant control over the resources of the organization. While controlling the resources, the leader has the control of the budget and equipment and information which are presented to him, moreover, he is the ultimate determiner of the awards to be given to subordinates (Niu et al, 2009, p.37).

Based on the relationship between the distributive justice and sportsmanship conduct the hypotheses ($H_4 \beta=0.91, \text{t-value}=11.23$), civic virtue ($H_5 \beta=0.76; \text{t-value}=10.50$), conscientiousness ($H_6 \beta=0.91, \text{t-value}=11.24$), courtesy ($H_7 \beta=0.88, \text{t-value}=11.73$), and altruism ($H_8 \beta=0.88, \text{t-value}=11.73$) are positive and statistically significant. There is a significant and positive relationship between distributive justice and PL. In this sense, the decisions directly related to employees such as fair promotion opportunities within the organization and fair distribution of wages can be effective in their conducting volunteer activities. When organizational citizenship behaviors are evaluated as an input to a job, paternalistic leadership may be seen and it may cause a decrease in that sense within an organization if the individual is paid with a lower wage and if that individual perceives inequality (Nieoff and Moorman, 1993, p.533). In this study we supported full mediating impact only authoritarian leadership dimensions. The other direct impacts (moral and benevolent dimensions) did not support.