# Paternalistic Leadership: A Preliminary Study on Maritime Students

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ender ASYALI*      Prof. Dr. A. Guldem CERIT

Dokuz Eylul University, Maritime Faculty, Tınaztepe Campus,
35160, Buca, Izmir, Turkey. Tel: 00 90 232 301 88 01
*Visiting professor at Maine Maritime Academy
ender.asyali@deu.edu.tr      gcerit@deu.edu.tr

**Abstract:**

The Manila amendments to the STCW Convention and Code were adopted on 25 June 2010, marking a major revision of the STCW Convention and Code. With the introduction of the 2010 amendments, leadership training becomes a compulsory and essential part of Maritime Education and Training (MET). Appropriate leadership style will not only improve job satisfaction, well being, and motivation of seafarers but also will improve safety onboard of vessels and foster safety culture.

In this study, a preliminary study has been performed in order to determine the perceptions of maritime students about paternalistic leadership determinants. A survey tool developed by Aycan (2006) was applied to deck and engine cadets of Dokuz Eylul University, Maritime Faculty. This study will contribute to the literature by analyzing the impact of paternalistic leadership as an effective management tool in maritime domain.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Paternalism is defined as 'the interference with a person's liberty of action justified by reasons referring exclusively to the welfare, good, happiness, needs, interests or values of the person being coerced' (Dworkin, 1972). The meaning of paternalism is explained as 'to substitute the judgment of a third party or the government for that of a person on the ground that to do so is in that person's best interests' (Radin, 1987).

### 1.1. Paternalism: Approaches

There has been an ongoing debate among the scientists and academia regarding the sociological effects of paternalistic approaches. It has been argued that the system of class, gender and racial hierarchy has an important impact on these approaches and paternalism involves "false consciousness" (Kennedy, 1982). The other standpoint focuses on the autonomy and liberty of the individuals and it has been proposed that to understand the paternalistic justifications it is also needed to explore the constraints on the

decision making abilities of the individuals, since people are all subject to bounded rationality (Webb, 2005). In terms of risk management the discussions concentrate on under what kind of constraints paternalism is acceptable and it is argued that in respect of arguments about harms to others a post-proceduralist conception should have been drawn together (6, 2000).

The impacts of paternalism on business ethics are subject to numerous studies and it is observed that paternalistic priorities clash with the moral responsibility of businesses and corporations (Crossley, 1999). Warren's evaluation of the paternalistic model of human resources management (1999) reveals that "the model's conception of the employment relationship is deeply flawed and does not provide a morally acceptable approach towards responsible citizens in a democratic society".

Paternalist approaches concentrating on various aspects of the area have been subject to studies in different disciplines and several industries. Legal discussions (Kennedy, 1982; Radin, 1987; Elger and Harding, 2004), research in the education and education management areas (Whitehead, 1999; Witte and Mero, 2008; Smeyers, 2010); medical practice (Elger and Harding, 2004), occupational safety (Spurgin, 2006), railway industry (Revill, 1999) and other related industries (Weed, 2005) have produced arguments about the impacts of paternalistic approaches.

## 1.2. Paternalistic Leadership

Leadership training has become an important and essential part of MET after the introduction of STCW 2010 Manila amendments. Maritime training institutions have the responsibility to prepare cadets, equipped with relevant leadership skills required for a multi cultural and complex working environment.

Paternalistic leadership has become an important area of research in the leadership literature and received growing interest from organizational researchers around the world in the past two decades (Chen et al., 2011; Pellegrini and Scandura, 2008; Aycan, 2006)

Paternalistic leadership is a fatherlike leadership style (Westwood and Chan, 1992) and combines strong discipline and authority with fatherly benevolence (Farh and Cheng, 2000). Authoritarianism refers to leader behaviors that assert authority and control, whereas benevolence refers to an individualized concern for subordinates' personal well-being (Pellegrini and Scandura, 2008). In return, of this paternal care and protection, employees are expected to show loyalty, respect, and compliance to the leader (Aycan, 2006).

Although Paternalistic Leadership originated from traditional Chinese culture and (Hsieh and Chen, 2011) and also it is a prevalent cultural characteristic of traditional eastern societies such as China, Japan, India, and Korea (Cheng, et al., 2004; Aycan, 2001), recent results suggest paternalistic leadership may generalize across cultures (Pellegrini et al., 2010).

As a socio-cultural dimension paternalism implies a dyadic and hierarchical relationship between a superior and his or her subordinate and a role differentiation in this relationship. In a paternalistic relationship, the role of the superior is to provide guidance, protection, nurturance and care to the subordinate, and the role of the subordinate, in

return, is to be loyal and deferent to the superior (Aycan et al., 2000). The paternalistic leader takes care of his/her employees like a parent. S/he is involved in every aspect of employees' lives and provides guidance and counseling in professional as well as personal matters (Aycan and Pasa, 2003). There is a family metaphor about paternalism where manager is like a father and treats his/her employees as a father treats his children. Father protects and provide resources to his children. Paternalism is developed to humanize and remoralize the workplace as well as establish more flexible management system instead of rigid and contractual relationships between employers and workers (Aycan, 2006; Erben.and Guneser 2008).

The study performed by Aycan and Pasa (2003), explored the factors that influenced Turkish university students' career choices, job selection criteria, and leadership preferences. Findings revealed that Charismatic Leadership was most preferred style followed by participative, paternalistic, and bureaucratic styles. (Aycan and Pasa, 2003).

The results of the study performed among Turkish employees by Otken and Cenkci (2012) showed the importance of PL on employees in following company rules and procedures and showing a sense of responsibility and care to customers, community, and others in the organization (Otken and Cenkci, 2012).

Paternalism is a cultural characteristic, more than just being a type of leadership behavior. There are some cultural assumptions that are compatible with paternalism. These are collectivism, high-power distance, high uncertainty avoidance, masculinity, assertiveness, and diffuse culture (Erben and Guneser, 2008).

Borekcı evaluated the usage of paternalistic leadership styles in e-culture. With abilities like being catalyst, performance raising, communicating, helping, guiding, caring, influencing, resource organizing, organizations representing and team loyalty developing; paternalism may survive in e-culture where there are diverse groups of individuals operating on joint tasks for limited periods of time (Borekci, 2009).

Chen et al. (2011) revealed that while the benevolence and morality dimensions of paternalistic leadership are positively associated with both in-role and extra-role performance, the authoritarian paternalistic leadership dimension is negatively related to subordinate performance.

Cerit (2013) aimed to explore the relationship between bullying behaviours towards class-room teachers and paternalistic leadership. The results indicated that paternalistic leadership significantly negative correlated with work-related criticism, social isolation, non-work-related criticism, attacks on attitudes and ethnicity, whereas there was no significant correlation between paternalistic leadership and task pressures

Cerit's results suggest that paternalist leadership behaviors may enhance the classroom teachers' satisfaction from work, and supervisor. The results show that paternalistic leadership has significantly positive correlation with satisfaction from supervisor, and work (Cerit, 2012).

## 2. OBJECTIVE

In this study, a preliminary study has been performed in order to determine the perceptions of Turkish maritime students about paternalistic leadership determinants. A survey tool developed by Aycan (2006) was applied to deck and engine cadets of Dokuz Eylul University, Maritime Faculty. Turkey is geographically and culturally located between East and West in many respects. The Turkish workplace is ranked very high on within group collectivism practices (5th), and high on power distance (10th), according to the GLOBE study of 62 societies (House et al., 2004).

The main objective of this study is to analyze the paternalistic leadership determinants among groups of cadets. To assist internationally applicable results, it is proposed to carry out the study in two different populations, and to end with comparative results in the mentioned paternalistic leadership determinants. The analysis is accomplished in two different samples of students: 1, 2 and 4th year students of Marine Transportation Engineering and Marine Engineering Department of DEU Maritime Faculty.

The objectives of the study are included in the following statements:
1. To test each sample with differing departments with respect to the paternalistic leadership determinants.
2. To test each sample with differing classes with respect to the paternalistic leadership determinants.
3. To measure the level of importance of each specific variable to the student.

## 3. HYPOTHESES

Two main hypotheses are developed to test the objectives built on the comparative analysis of the populations:

$H_1$ : Paternalistic Leadership determinants are perceived different by students of different departments of the same institute.

$H_2$ : Paternalistic Leadership determinants are perceived different by students of different classes in the same undergraduate institute.

For each of the hypothesis 21 sub-hypotheses are formulated to analyze the determinants comparatively (**Table 3 and 4**).

## 4. METHODOLOGY

### 4.1. Questionnaire Development

To test the hypothesis of the research, a questionnaire consisting of 2 different parts is developed. The first part covers 3 questions on the information about department, class and gender of the student for the purpose of profile establishment. The second part covers totally 21 statements on paternalistic leadership which were developed by Aycan (2006).

Sample items included "The ideal leader behaves like a family member (father/mother or elder brother/sister) towards his/her employees", "The ideal leader creates a family environment in the workplace". Respondents were asked to rate the extent which they agreed with the stated characteristics of ideal leadership on a 5-point Likert scale (5='strongly agree'; 1='strongly disagree').

### 4.2. Sample

Dokuz Eylul University (DEU) Maritime Faculty was founded in 1988 and provides undergraduate education in three departments; Maritime Business Administration, Marine Transportation Engineering and Marine Engineering. The aim of later two departments are to educate oceangoing masters and oceangoing marine engineers.

All of the students in the freshman, sophomore and senior classes of the Marine Transportation Engineering and Marine Engineering departments, namely a total of 265 students have constituted the sample of the study. As junior classes were at the open sea training during the study, they were not included to the study.

The research was carried out during the final assessments in February 2014. Although all of the students were included in the population, due to the irregularities of some of the students a total of 205 (77% response rate) questionnaires were received. Valid 132 questionnaires from the Marine Transportation Engineering department and 62 questionnaires from the Marine Engineering Department with a total of 11 missing were received.

### 4.3. Data Analysis Procedures

The research covers a comparative analysis and the analysis procedures for the data are selected accordingly. Data processing is maintained by the SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) Program. Means for the sample sizes and the standard deviations are calculated and these are used as a basis for the comparative analysis. Hypotheses based on Likert-scale questions, ending in interval data, are comparatively analyzed using t-tests and ANOVA.

### 5. Evaluation and Results

*Student Profile*

The profiles of the students are summarized in Table 1. 205 students completed the questionnaire, 64,4%(n=132) of the whole population were from Marine Transportation Engineering Department and 30.2% ( n=62 ) are from Marine Engineering Department and 5,4% (n=11) are missing. With respect to their classes; 73 freshmen (37,6%), 73 sophomores (37,6%) and 48 senior (24,7%) students completed the survey. Male students account for 90.2 %(n=175)of the population.

**Table 1.** Profile of the Respondents

| | | | Department | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Marine Transportation Engineering | Marine Engineering | |
| Class | Freshmen | **Count** | **51** | **22** | **73** |
| | | % within class | 69,9% | 30,1% | 100,0% |
| | | % within dept. | 38,6% | 35,5% | 37,6% |
| | | % of Total | 26,3% | 11,3% | 37,6% |
| | Sophomores | **Count** | **43** | **30** | **73** |
| | | % within class | 58,9% | 41,1% | 100,0% |
| | | % within dept | 32,6% | 48,4% | 37,6% |
| | | % of Total | 22,2% | 15,5% | 37,6% |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Seniors | Count | **38** | **10** | **48** |
| | | % within class | 79,2% | 20,8% | 100,0% |
| | | % within department | 28,8% | 16,1% | 24,7% |
| | | % of Total | 19,6% | 5,2% | 24,7% |
| Total | | Count | **132** | **62** | **194** |
| | | % within class | 68,0% | 32,0% | 100,0% |
| | | % within department | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |
| | | % of Total | 68,0% | 32,0% | 100,0% |
| gender | female | Count | **16** | **3** | **19** |
| | | % within gender | 84,2% | 15,8% | 100,0% |
| | | % within department | 12,1% | 4,8% | 9,8% |
| | | % of Total | 8,2% | 1,5% | 9,8% |
| | male | Count | **116** | **59** | **175** |
| | | % within gender | 66,3% | 33,7% | 100,0% |
| | | % within department | 87,9% | 95,2% | 90,2% |
| | | % of Total | 59,8% | 30,4% | 90,2% |
| **total** | | Count | **132** | **62** | **194** |
| | | % within gender | 68,0% | 32,0% | 100,0% |
| | | % within department | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |
| | | % of Total | 68,0% | 32,0% | 100,0% |

*Reliability of the Construct*

The Cronbach Alpha coefficients of the construct has the value of 0,864 which indicates the reliability (high internal consistency) of the construct.

*Descriptive Statistics*

Frequencies of responses of the whole population of the DEU Maritime Faculty Marine Transportation Engineering and Marine Engineering students for the statements on PL are checked as means and standards deviations and the results are given in Table 2. In terms of the frequencies of the responses given to the Likert-type statements, Despite establishing close relationships with employees, keeps his or her distance ($\mu$=4,1134; SD=,89762) emerge as the most important attribute. The other most important attributes are: Wants to control or to be informed about every work-related activity ($\mu$=4,2435; SD=,85864); Asks opinions of employees about work-related issues, however, makes the last decision himself or herself ($\mu$=4,1134;SD=,89762); Closely monitors the development and progress of his or her employees ($\mu$=4,1596; SD=,81172); Places importance to establishing one-to-one relationship with every employee ($\mu$=4,0521; SD=,90802).

**Table 2.** Descriptive Statistics

| Statements | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Behaves like a family member (father/mother or elder brother/sister) towards his/her employees. | 194 | 3,8660 | 1,05427 |
| 2. Provides advice to employees like a senior family member. | 194 | 3,7629 | ,98983 |
| 3. Creates a family environment in the workplace. | 192 | 3,8802 | ,89865 |
| 4. Feels responsible for employees as if they are his or her own children. | 192 | 3,9219 | 1,04312 |
| 5. Protects employees from outside criticisms. | 192 | 3,8490 | ,93959 |
| 6. Places importance to establishing one-to-one relationship with every employee. | 192 | 4,0521 | ,90802 |
| 7. Places importance to knowing every employee in person (e.g., personal problems, family life, etc.). | 190 | 3,7105 | ,96795 |
| 8. Shows emotional reactions, such as joy, sorrow, or anger, in his or her relationships with employees. | 193 | 2,7565 | 1,15820 |
| 9. Closely monitors the development and progress of his or her employees. | 188 | 4,1596 | ,81172 |
| 10. Does not hesitate to take action in the name of his or her employees, whenever necessary. | 194 | 2,8299 | 1,18143 |
| 11. Is ready to help employees with their nonwork problems (e.g., housing, education of the children, health, etc.) whenever they need it. | 194 | 3,8814 | ,96109 |
| 12. Attends special events of employees (e.g., weddings and funeral ceremonies, graduations, etc.) | 192 | 3,8646 | ,97207 |
| 13. Is prepared to act as a mediator whenever an employee has problem in his or her private life (e.g., marital problems). | 192 | 3,0156 | 1,04594 |
| 14. Expects loyalty and deference in exchange for his or her care and nurturance. | 193 | 3,7565 | ,94526 |
| 15. Does not consider performance as the most important criterion while making a decision about employees (e.g., promotion, layoff). | 194 | 3,2010 | 1,16325 |
| 16. Places more importance to loyalty than performance in evaluating employees. | 192 | 3,3802 | 1,06649 |
| 17. Is disciplinarian and at the same time nurturant (tough and tender). | 193 | 3,9430 | ,85505 |
| 18. Believes that he or she knows what is best for his or her employees. | 189 | 3,7196 | 1,00567 |
| 19. Asks opinions of employees about work-related issues, however, makes the last decision himself or herself. | 194 | 4,1134 | ,89762 |
| 20. Wants to control or to be informed about every work-related activity. | 193 | 4,2435 | ,85864 |
| 21. Despite establishing close relationships with employees, keeps his or her distance. | 193 | 4,3679 | ,80649 |

## 5. 2. Results of the Hypotheses Tests

The two main hypotheses of the study aimed searching for the analysis of measures of paternalistic leadership determinants in two aspects; the departments and classes: The determinants, (1) being perceived different by students of different undergraduate

departments of the same institute, and (2) being perceived different by students of different classes in the same undergraduate institute.

*Hypotheses Tests*

*Tests for $H_1$ :*

Results of the tests for $H_1$ regarding the perceptions of students of different departments (Marine Transportation Engineering and Marine Engineering Departments) of the same institute (DEU Maritime Faculty) are summarized in Table 3, Statistically significant differences between two groups are found for one statement after applying *t*-tests. The supported sub-hypotheses is "H18 Shows emotional reactions, such as joy, sorrow, or anger, in his or her relationships with employees"

**Table 3.** Analysis of PL Determinants among Maritime Students of Marine Transportation Engineering, and Marine Engineering: Results of the Hypotheses Tests for $H_1$

| Hypotheses | Support | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|---|---|---|
| | t | |
| H11 Behaves like a family member (father/mother or elder brother/sister) towards his/her employees. | Not supported t=-1,659 p>0,05 | ,099 |
| H12 Provides advice to employees like a senior family member. | Not supported t=-1,199 p>0,05 | ,232 |
| H13 Creates a family environment in the workplace. | Not supported t=-1,965 p>0,05 | ,051 |
| H14 Feels responsible for employees as if they are his or her own children | Not supported t=,035 p>0,05 | ,972 |
| H15 Protects employees from outside criticisms. | Not supported t=-,751 p>0,05 | ,454 |
| H16 Places importance to establishing one-to-one relationship with every employee. | Not supported t=-1,166 p>0,05 | ,245 |
| H17 Places importance to knowing every employee in person (e.g., personal problems, family life, etc.). | Not supported t=-,05 9 p>0,05 | ,953 |
| H18 Shows emotional reactions, such as joy, sorrow, or anger, in his or her relationships with employees. | supported t=-2,417 p=0.017 | ,017 |
| H19 Closely monitors the development and progress of his or her employees. | Not supported t=-1,118 p>0,05 | ,265 |
| H110 Does not hesitate to take action in the name of his or her employees, whenever necessary. | Not supported t=-1,510 p>0,05 | ,133 |
| H111 Is ready to help employees with their nonwork problems (e.g., housing, education of the children, health, etc.) whenever they need it. | Not supported t=-,857 p>0,05 | ,393 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| H112 Attends special events of employees (e.g., weddings and funeral ceremonies, graduations, etc.) | Not supported t=,595 p>0,05 | ,552 |
| H113 Is prepared to act as a mediator whenever an employee has problem in his or her private life (e.g., marital problems). | Not supported t=-,553 p>0,05 | ,582 |
| H114 Expects loyalty and deference in exchange for his or her care and nurturance. | Not supported t=-1,455 p>0,05 | ,147 |
| H115 Does not consider performance as the most important criterion while making a decision about employees (e.g., promotion, layoff). | Not supported t=-,467 p>0,05 | ,641 |
| H116 Places more importance to loyalty than performance in evaluating employees. | Not supported t=-,930 p>0,05 | ,354 |
| H117 Is disciplinarian and at the same time nurturant (tough and tender). | Not supported t=,084 p>0,05 | ,933 |
| H118 Believes that he or she knows what is best for his or her employees. | Not supported t=,585 p>0,05 | ,559 |
| H119 Asks opinions of employees about work-related issues, however, makes the last decision himself or herself. | Not supported t=1,905 p>0,05 | ,058 |
| H120 Wants to control or to be informed about every work-related activity. | Not supported t=1,276 p>0,05 | ,203 |
| H121 Despite establishing close relationships with employees, keeps his or her distance. | Not supported t=-0,227 p>0,05 | ,203 |

Method of analysis is t-test, p<0.05

*Tests for H₂* :

The second hypotheses of the conceptual model attempts to compare perceptions of the cadets regarding PL with respect to their classes. ANOVA was used in order to test the sub-hypotheses. Two statements have statistically significant differences (See Table 4).The statements that are perceived different by the sample are given below:"H218 Believes that he or she knows what is best for his or her employees" and "H219 Asks opinions of employees about work-related issues, however, makes the last decision himself or herself."

**Table 4.** Comparative Results for with Respect to classes. H₂ Sub Hypotheses

| Hypothesis | Support |
|---|---|
| H21 Behaves like a family member (father/mother or elder brother/sister) towards his/her employees. | Not supported F=0,007 p>0,05 |
| H22 Provides advice to employees like a senior family member. | Not supported F=0,318 p>0,05 |
| H23 Creates a family environment in the workplace. | Not supported F=0,471 p>0,05 |
| H34 Feels responsible for employees as if they are his or her own children. | Not supported F=2,201 p>0,05 |
| H25 Protects employees from outside criticisms. | Not supported F=,861 p>0,05 |
| H26 Places importance to establishing one-to-one relationship with every employee. | Not supported F=0,363 p>0,05 |

| | |
|---|---|
| H27 Places importance to knowing every employee in person (e.g., personal problems, family life, etc.). | Not supported F=2,096 p>0,05 |
| H28 Shows emotional reactions, such as joy, sorrow, or anger, in his or her relationships with employees. | Not supported F=1,597 p>0,05 |
| H29 Closely monitors the development and progress of his or her employees. | Not supported F=0,030 p>0,05 |
| H210 Does not hesitate to take action in the name of his or her employees, whenever necessary. | Not supported F=0,990 p>0,05 |
| H211 Is ready to help employees with their nonwork problems (e.g., housing, education of the children, health, etc.) whenever they need it. | Not supported F=1,680 p>0,05 |
| H212 Attends special events of employees (e.g., weddings and funeral ceremonies, graduations, etc.) | Not supported F=1,145 p>0,05 |
| H213 Is prepared to act as a mediator whenever an employee has problem in his or her private life (e.g., marital problems). | Not supported F=0,289 p>0,05 |
| H214 Expects loyalty and deference in exchange for his or her care and nurturance. | Not supported F=0,084 p>0,05 |
| H215 Does not consider performance as the most important criterion while making a decision about employees (e.g., promotion, layoff). | Not supported F=0,255 p>0,05 |
| H216 Places more importance to loyalty than performance in evaluating employees. | Not supported F=1,363 p>0,05 |
| H217 Is disciplinarian and at the same time nurturant (tough and tender). | Not supported F=1,817 p>0,05 |
| H218 Believes that he or she knows what is best for his or her employees. | Supported F=7,231 p=,001 |
| H219 Asks opinions of employees about work-related issues, however, makes the last decision himself or herself. | Supported F=5,319 p=,006 |
| H220 Wants to control or to be informed about every work-related activity. | Not supported F=2,407 p>0,05 |
| H221 Despite establishing close relationships with employees, keeps his or her distance. | Not supported F=0,902 p>0,05 |

Method of analysis is Anova, p<0.05

# 6. CONCLUSION

Maritime education and training is serving an industry of which is totally international, highly regulated, the actors dealing with complex and integrated global problems in all disciplines. The graduates of maritime undergraduate programs need to be equipped with highly developed problem solving skills against integrated problems, self-confidence, teamwork and leadership skills, self-assessment and intrinsic motivation to learn.

This study conclude that paternalistic leadership is highly accepted and supported by Turkish Maritime Students. This study support traditional management style that can be observed onboard of Turkish vessels. Highly respected and relatively old masters are called "beybaba" among their crew. "Beybaba" means "mister father" in Turkish language and used as a respect for technical and non technical skills of the experienced captains.

*Limitations and Further Research*

The study has been applied to the students of only one school. The research may be repeated with students of different maritime schools in Turkey and also in other countries.

## REFERENCES

Aycan, Z. (2006). Paternalism: Towards conceptual refinement and operationalization. In K. S. Yang, K. K. Hwang, & U. Kim (Eds.), Indigenous and Cultural Psychology: Understanding People in Context. New York, NY: Springer. pp. 445–466.

Aycan, Z. (2000) Impact of Culture on Human Resources Management Practices: A 10 Country Comparision, *Applied Psychology: An International Review*,49 (1). pp.192-221.

Aycan, Z, Fikret-Pasa, Selda (2003) Career Choices, Job Selection Criteria, and Leadership Preferences in a Transitional Nation: The Case of Turkey, *Journal of Career Development, Vol. 30, No. 2, Winter 2003*

Börekci, Dilek Yılmaz (2009) Paternalistic Leadership Style's Evalution in e-Culture *Istanbul University Journal of the School of Business Administration*, Cilt/Vol:, 2009, 103-109 ISSN: 1303-1732 - www.ifdergisi.org

Cerit, Yusuf (2013) The Relationship between Paternalistic Leadership and Bullying Behaviours towards Classroom Teachers. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 13(2),Spring, 847-851

Cerit, Yusuf (2012) The Relationship Between Paternalistic Leadership And Satisfaction From Administrator And Work, Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 31(2), 35-56

Chen, Xiao-Ping,Marion B. Eberly, Ting-Ju Chiang,Jiing-Lih Farh, Bor-Shiuan Cheng, (2011) Affective Trust in Chinese Leaders: Linking Paternalistic Leadership to Employee Performance, *Journal of Management*, Vol. 40 No. 3, March 2014 796–819, DOI: 10.1177/0149206311410604

Cheng, Bor-Shiuan, Li-Fang Chou and Tsung-Yu Wu, Min-Ping Huang, Jiing-Lih Farh(2004) Paternalistic leadership and subordinate responses: Establishing a leadership model in Chinese organizations, *Asian Journal of Social Psychology,* Vol. **7** . pp. 89–117.

Crossley, D. (1999) Paternalism and Corporate Responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics*,Vol. 21.pp. 291-302

Dworkin, G. (1972) Paternalism, *The Monist, Philosophy and Public Policy*, Vol. 56, No. 1. pp. 64-8.

Elger ,B.S. and Harding, T.W. (2004) Compliance with the Wishes of Competent Patients Among Future Physicians and Lawyers: Is Paternalism a Predictable Individual or Group-Specific Trait? *Medical Teacher*, Vol. 26, No. 5. pp. 458–462.

Erben, G. S. and Guneser, A. B. (2008) The Relationship Between Paternalistic Leadership and Organizational Commitment: Investigating the Role of Climate Regarding Ethics, *Journal of Business Ethics* 82:955–968  DOI 10.1007/s10551-007-9605-z

Farh, J. L., & Cheng, B. S. (2000) A Cultural Analysis of Paternalistic Leadership in Chinese Organizations. In J. T. Li., A. S. Tsui, & E. Weldon (Eds.), *Management and Organizations in the Chinese Context*. London: Macmillan. pp.84-127.

House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. & Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hsieh, King-Ching and Chen, Yin-Che (2011) Development and Significance of Paternalistic Leadership Behavior Scale, *Asian Social Science* Vol. 7, No. 2; February. pp.45-55.

Kennedy, D. (1982) Distributive and Paternalist Motives in Contract and Tort Law, with Special Reference to Compulsory Terms and Unequal Bargaining Power. *Maryland Law Review*, Vol. 41, No.4. pp. 563-658.

Pellegrini, Ekin K., Terri A. Scandura and Vaidyanathan Jayaraman (2010) Cross-Cultural Generalizability of Paternalistic Leadership: An Expansion of Leader-Member Exchange Theory, *Group & Organization Management,* Vol. 35. pp. 391-420.

Pellegrini, E. K. and Scandura, T. A. (2008) Paternalistic Leadership: A Review and Agenda for Future Research, *Journal of Management*. Vol.34. pp. 566-593.

Radin, M.J.(1987) Market-inalienability. *Harvard Law Review*. Vol. 100, No.8, June. pp. 1849-1937.

Revill, G. 1999. Liberalism and Paternalism: Politics and Corporate Culture in 'Railway Derby', 1865-75. *Social History*. Vol. 24, No. 2, May. pp.196-212.

6, P. (2000) The Morality of Managing Risk: Paternalism, Prevention and Precaution, and the Limits of Proceduralism. *Journal of Risk Research*. Vol.3 No.2. pp.135–165.

Smeyers, P. (2010) Empathy, Paternalism and Practical Reason: Philosophy of Education and the Ethics of Care Revisited. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*. Vol. 44, No. 1. pp.171-181.

Spurgin, E. W. (2006) Occupational Safety and Paternalism: Machan Revisited. *Journal of Business Ethics*. Vol.63. pp. 155–173.

Otken, Ayse Begum and Cenkci Tuna (2012) The Impact of Paternalistic Leadership on Ethical Climate: The Moderating Role of Trust in Leader, *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 108 No. 4. pp.525–536.

Warren R. C. (1999) Against Paternalism in Human Resource Management. *Business Ethics: A European Review*. Vol. 8 No. 1, January. pp.50-59.

Webb, D. (2005) Autonomy, Paternalism, and Institutional Interest: Why Some Conflicts Can't be Waived. *International Journal of the Legal Profession*. Vol. 12, No. 2, July. pp.261-289.

Westwood, R. and Chan, A. (1992) Headship and Leadership. in R. Westwood (Ed.), *Organisational Behaviour: Southeast Asian Perspectives*. Hong Kong: Longman. pp.118-143.

Witte, D. E. and Mero, P. T. (2008) Removing Classrooms from the Battlefield: Liberty, Paternalism, and the Redemptive Promise of Educational Choice. *Brigham Young University Law Review*. Issue: 2. pp.377-414.

Whitehead, S. (1999) From Paternalism to Entrepreneuralism: The Experience of Men Managers in UK Postcompulsory Education. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*. Vol. 20, No. 1. pp. 57-71.