

PATERNALISTIC LEADERSHIP AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT: EVIDENCE FROM THE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SECTOR

Muhammad Muzammil Ghayas^{*}, Malik Muhammad Sheheryar Khan^{**},
Etinder Pal Singh^{***}, Sami Emadeddin Alajlani^{****}, Abdul Ghafar^{****}

^{*} Iqra University, Karachi, Pakistan

^{**} Corresponding author, Higher Colleges of Technology, Sharjah, UAE

Contact details: Higher Colleges of Technology, University City, P. O. Box 7947, Sharjah, UAE

^{***} Apeejay School of Management, Dwarka, New Delhi, India

^{****} Higher Colleges of Technology, Sharjah, UAE



Abstract

How to cite this paper: Ghayas, M. M., Khan, M. M. S., Singh, E. P., Alajlani, S. E., & Ghafar, A. (2023). Paternalistic leadership and organizational commitment: Evidence from the information technology sector. *Corporate & Business Strategy Review*, 4(3), 159–166.

<https://doi.org/10.22495/cbsrv4i3art16>

Copyright © 2023 The Authors

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0).
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

ISSN Online: 2708-4965

ISSN Print: 2708-9924

Received: 08.11.2022

Accepted: 22.08.2023

JEL Classification: M10, M12, M15

DOI: 10.22495/cbsrv4i3art16

This research aims to test the relationship between dimensions of paternalistic leadership and dimensions of organizational commitment in the information technology (IT) sector of Istanbul. Two separate questionnaires were adapted for measuring dimensions of paternalistic leadership (Erben & Güneşer, 2008) and organizational commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Data were collected at two different points in time from such employees of the IT sector of Istanbul who have been working with the same manager for at least six months. In all, 350 pairs of questionnaires were distributed and only 248 pairs of questionnaires were received. Three separate multiple regression analyses were used as the statistical technique. Results indicated that two of the dimensions of paternalistic leadership, namely benevolent leadership and moral leadership, have a significant relationship with the three dimensions of organizational commitment, namely affective, normative, and continuance commitment. However, authoritarian leadership is found to be negatively associated with affective commitment, whereas, it does not have any significant association with normative and continuance commitment. Therefore, it is concluded that benevolent leadership and moral leadership can be instrumental in enhancing the level of organizational commitment among the employees, whereas, authoritarianism can be counterproductive in nature. Hence, the study provides the framework to the managers in the IT sector of Istanbul for enhancing the organizational commitment among the employees.

Keywords: Paternalistic Leadership, Organizational Commitment, Affective Commitment, Normative Commitment, Continuance Commitment

Authors' individual contribution: Conceptualization — M.M.G. and M.M.S.K.; Methodology — M.M.G., S.E.A., and A.G.; Investigation — E.P.S., S.E.A., and A.G.; Resources — M.M.G., E.P.S., S.E.A., and A.G.; Writing — Original Draft — M.M.G., M.M.S.K., E.P.S., S.E.A., and A.G.; Writing — Review & Editing — M.M.G., M.M.S.K., E.P.S., S.E.A., and A.G.; Supervision — M.M.S.K.

Declaration of conflicting interests: The Authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

1. INTRODUCTION

Ever since people have understood the consequences of globalization and the resulting competition in the business world, leadership has become the talk of the town. This is because of the fact people assume leaders to be instrumental in fighting the threats that are coming in due to globalization. It is further believed that leaders cannot only help the firms in countering the threats that are coming in because of globalization but can also play a pivotal role in creating a sustainable competitive edge. Hence, the presence of good leadership is important for any business organization and leaders have become the center of attention in the business world. This is because of that firms are under constant pressure to find a sustainable competitive edge.

Furthermore, the very fact that the business world has not remained as it was a decade or two ago has contributed to the acknowledgement of the importance of leadership. This is because the role of leadership becomes more and more important when the environment in which a business organization is operating turns into a complex and dynamic business environment. In this regard, one can argue that in the past few decades, businesses of all spectrums have witnessed the environment in which they are operating increasingly turning to be a complex and dynamic business environment. Hence, there has been a renewed interest in the topic of leadership among researchers and practitioners in the past few decades.

This is especially true when one talks about the IT sector. This is because the IT sector operates in a complex and dynamic business environment. Furthermore, the dynamic nature of the IT sector has made it extremely important for businesses to make timely decisions. Hence, there is always urgency in the IT sector to make quick decisions. In this regard, one can argue that under these circumstances, there exists a need to have a strong leader that can serve as an anchor for the firms in the IT sector and can be entrusted with quick decision-making. Hence, the importance of leadership cannot be ignored in the IT sector.

In this regard, researchers Fernandez and Shaw (2020) have tried to find various types of leadership that can be helpful in not only making the leader able to make quick decisions but also able to gain the creative cooperation of the employees. This is important because the acceptability of the decisions made by the leader is of key importance in the quick implementation of the decisions made by the leader. Moreover, these researchers have not limited themselves to trying to find various leadership styles but have also studied the antecedents and consequences of these types of leadership (Khan & Ghayas, 2022). This is done so because it is a popular belief that leadership results in positive work outcomes. In this regard, Hakimian et al. (2014) have found a significant relationship between the two variables but their study was limited to a one-dimensional construct of organizational commitment. However, Allen and Meyer (1990) previously established it to be a three-dimensional construct. In this regard, it is suggested that affective, normative, and continuance commitment are the three dimensions of organizational

commitment. Hence, the topic concerning the relationship between the dimensions of paternalistic leadership and the dimensions of organizational commitment is under-researched. Therefore, for trying to fill this gap, this research study seeks to answer the following research questions:

RQ1: What is the impact of dimensions of paternalistic leadership on affective commitment?

RQ2: What is the impact of dimensions of paternalistic leadership on normative commitment?

RQ3: What is the impact of dimensions of paternalistic leadership on continuance commitment?

Hence, this research study is important in a manner that it fills the gap in the literature on the relationship between the dimensions of paternalistic leadership and the dimensions of organizational commitment. This makes it a significant research study for leaders to understand how they can use the concept of paternalistic leadership for increasing the level of organizational commitment.

This paper is structured as follows. Section 1 provides the overview, problem statement, and research questions. Section 2 provides information about the theoretical underpinnings, the literature review, and the hypotheses. Section 3 presents the methodology used in this research which will be followed by results in Section 4, discussions in Section 5, and conclusions in Section 6.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Theoretical background

As far as theoretical underpinnings are concerned, the study is based on the concepts of social exchange theory. The theory suggests the presence of two types of relationships at work: social exchange relationships and economic exchange relationships. In this regard, one can argue that economic exchange relations are basically transactional in nature. In these relations, we are primarily concerned about the completion of tasks. The reasons for having this sort of relationship are purely economic. Furthermore, in these types of relations, we are not even concerned about taking the relationship to the next level (Carnevale et al., 2019). Although, this sort of relationship can help accomplish the tasks, however, this type of relationship cannot help in gaining the creative cooperation of employees. Therefore, there has to be something that can help the organizational leaders in gaining the creative cooperation of employees, these are the social exchange relations (Deluga, 1998). Hence, leaders must focus on building social exchange relations with employees (Khan & Ghayas, 2022). Social exchange relations are the relations that are more concerned about trustworthiness and the sense of affiliation with the other person. These relations are built on trust, care, and respect and help gain the creative cooperation of employees. Since, this study discusses paternalistic leadership and organizational commitment where paternalistic leadership suggests that the leader should take more of the role of an expert or a father-like figure (Soylu, 2011). Hence, the idea of paternalistic leadership is based on building social exchange relations. Therefore, one can argue that this study is based on the social exchange theory.

2.2. Leadership and paternalistic leadership

The term “leadership” can be defined in terms of the action of leading a group of people. This is usually done to attain specific goals. Leadership is important in any business setting (Ciulla, 2020). This is because it helps give direction toward success. This is done by the ability of effective leaders of providing the vision, making quick decisions, and gaining the creative cooperation of the employees. Therefore, there has been a renewed interest in the topics concerning leadership. Consequently, a large number of researchers (Batırlık et al., 2022; Fu et al., 2022) have studied leadership. In this regard, it should be noted that leadership is neither a one-dimensional construct nor a simple multi-dimensional construct but is rather a collection of various multi-dimensional constructs. In this regard, it can be suggested that there are several types of leadership and researchers have used separate multi-dimensional constructs for defining and measuring these types of leadership styles. Some examples of these leadership constructs are authentic leadership (Ghayas et al., 2023), servant leadership (Turner, 2022), and transformational leadership (Mach et al., 2022). Paternalistic leadership is also one of such leadership constructs (Chaudhary et al., 2023).

Paternalistic leadership is one of the styles of leadership (Zheng et al., 2020). The concept of paternalistic leadership suggests that the leader should take more of the role of an expert or a father-like figure (Soylu, 2011). This sort of leadership style is prevalent in Eastern societies (Wren, 2005). It is primarily because Eastern cultures and socio-economic factors foster an environment where there is a need of having someone who can play the role of a father-like figure. Hence, subordinates in Eastern societies often find themselves to be comfortable while remaining obedient to their leader (Chaudhary et al., 2023). In return, they expect the leaders to treat them fairly and play the role of an elder brother or father. This is the reason why paternalistic leadership is more prevalent in Eastern societies in comparison to Western societies (Farh & Cheng, 2000). Furthermore, it is suggested that there are basically three dimensions of paternalistic leadership, these are authoritarian leadership, benevolent leadership, and moral leadership (Chen et al., 2014).

Authoritarian leadership is about the behavior of a leader in which the leader tries to assert control over the subordinates (Abbas et al., 2020). Hence, authoritarian leaders are more concerned about giving strict guidelines and instructions to the subordinates which in turn may limit the perceived autonomy of the subordinates. This may negatively affect organizational performance (Ghayas et al., 2023; Khan et al., 2020).

On the other hand, Karakas and Sarigollu (2012) defined benevolent leadership as a process of creating a virtuous cycle for encouraging and initiating positive change in firms using ethical decision-making, logical meaning, and trying to leave a positive impact on the community. Hence, leaders with a benevolent leadership style demonstrate tolerance and kindness toward their followers (Cheng et al., 2004). Furthermore, they express

personalized concern for the employees which in turn makes the employees feel obligated and indebted in reciprocation (Pellegrini et al., 2010). Benevolent leaders assume the parental role and act with care for the work of employees and their problems, which may motivate the employees (Kao et al., 2020). Hence, benevolent leadership has a positive relationship with organizational performance (Farh & Cheng, 2000).

While in moral leadership, the leaders set moral standards. This is all about demonstrating self-discipline and remaining unselfish, hence, serving as a role model for others. This increases the level of confidence the employees have in their leaders (Hou et al., 2019). Therefore, moral leadership is supposed to enhance organizational commitment.

Furthermore, it is argued that paternalistic leadership is prevalent in Eastern culture (Farh & Cheng, 2000). In this regard, one can argue that although Turkey is situated on the cross-road of Asia and Europe, Istanbul city is specifically divided into the Asian and European sides. However, Turkish culture has always been Eastern (Malcolm, 2019). In this regard, one can argue that even in the time of the Roman Empire, there was a distinction between the Eastern and the Western Roman Empire, and Anatolia had always been considered as a part of the eastern half of the empire. On the other hand, although the Ottomans had been able to rule a vast piece of European land as well, however, they had always been considered as an Eastern empire especially when it comes to classifying it in terms of culture. Similarly, there has been an immense effort to westernize the remaining part of Turkey. However, observers have a firm belief that much of its cultural core has remained Eastern. Furthermore, the political history of Turkey also suggests the fact that Turks had always been a nation that wants to see their political leadership as a fatherly figure. Therefore, people working in Turkish organizations may also be willing to work with leaders with a paternalistic leadership style. Hence, organizational leaders in Turkish businesses may also use paternalistic leadership styles as well.

2.3. Organizational commitment

Organizational commitment is the extent to which an employee feels committed to the organization. It is a broader term and can be further subdivided into three different types of organizational commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Affective commitment talks about the positive feeling or sense of association towards the organization. On the other hand, normative commitment is about the perception of employees that they ought to stay with the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Lastly, the continuance commitment is about the need to stay with the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990). In this regard, one can argue that since the firms are facing extreme challenges from the environment and are looking for creating a sustainable competitive edge, therefore, they find it important to have more and more committed employees. Having committed employees increases the overall morale of the workforce which in turn may result in an improved level of productivity.

2.4. Paternalistic leadership and organizational commitment

There have been instances when researchers have studied the impact of paternalistic leadership on various work outcomes such as job satisfaction (Ekmen & Okçu, 2021), employee engagement (Shafi et al., 2021), employee retention (Lin et al., 2020), and turnover intention (Abbas et al., 2020). However, there is a scarcity of research if one talks about the relationship between paternalistic leadership and organizational commitment. In this regard, although Hakimian et al. (2014) have found a significant relationship between the two variables but their study was limited to a one-dimensional construct of organizational commitment. However, Allen and Meyer (1990) previously established it to be a three-dimensional construct. In this regard, it is suggested that affective, normative, and continuance commitment are the three dimensions of organizational commitment. This is a popular concept and a fairly large number of researchers (Mustafa et al., 2020; Massoud et al., 2020; Nguyen et al., 2020) agree with the fact that there are three types of organizational commitment. Hence, the study aims to test the relationship between dimensions of paternalistic leadership and dimensions of organizational commitment. In this regard, since Allen and Meyer (1990) suggested that affective commitment is one of the dimensions of organizational commitment and Hakimian et al. (2014) have already established that paternalistic leadership is related to organizational commitment, therefore, we propose the following hypotheses:

H1: Authoritarian leadership has a significant relationship with affective commitment.

H2: Benevolent leadership has a significant relationship with affective commitment.

H3: Moral leadership has a significant relationship with affective commitment.

Similarly, the second dimension of organizational commitment that Allen and Meyer (1990) proposed was normative commitment. Moreover, since paternalistic leadership is related to organizational commitment (Hakimian et al., 2014), we propose the following hypotheses:

H4: Authoritarian leadership has a significant relationship with normative commitment.

H5: Benevolent leadership has a significant relationship with normative commitment.

H6: Moral leadership has a significant relationship with normative commitment.

Lastly, continuance commitment is the third dimension of organizational commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Furthermore, since paternalistic leadership is related to organizational commitment, according to Hakimian et al. (2014), we propose the following hypotheses:

H7: Authoritarian leadership has a significant relationship with continuance commitment.

H8: Benevolent leadership has a significant relationship with continuance commitment.

H9: Moral leadership has a significant relationship with continuance commitment.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

To conduct this research study, two separate questionnaires were adopted. In this regard, the first questionnaire consists of twenty-eight items and was adapted from Cheng et al. (2004) for measuring dimensions of paternalistic leadership. It is a popular questionnaire for measuring dimensions of paternalistic leadership and has been used by other researchers such as Erben and Güneşer (2008). Out of these twenty-eight items, nine items were used for measuring authoritarian leadership, eleven items were used for measuring benevolent leadership, whereas, eight items were used for measuring the moral leadership dimension of paternalistic leadership.

The second questionnaire consisted of twenty-four items and was adapted from Allen and Meyer (1990). Out of these twenty-four items, eight items were used for measuring each of the dimensions of organizational commitment, namely affective, normative, and continuance commitment. For avoiding the common method bias, the data were collected at two different times. At time one, a total of 350 such questionnaires that seek to inquire about the dimensions of paternalistic leadership were divided among such employees of the IT sector of Istanbul who have been working with the same manager for at least six months. Out of these 350 questionnaires, 287 respondents returned the filled questionnaires. One month after receiving the first set of questionnaire, the second questionnaire that seeks to inquire about the dimensions of organizational commitment were distributed among those 287 respondents who have already filled out the first questionnaire. This time, 248 respondents filled out and returned the second questionnaire. Hence, these 248 sets of questionnaires were used as the sample for this research study. In this regard, it should be noted that the study was conducted in the IT sector of Istanbul. The prime reason for selecting the IT sector of Istanbul is that the IT sector is a sector where the tasks are usually non-repetitive and employees are required to perform new tasks every now and then. The very fact that the tasks in the IT sector are non-repetitive makes it extremely important for IT sector organizations to have committed employees. Furthermore, Istanbul is a big city, and Turkish people somehow like the paternalistic leadership style. This makes the IT sector of Istanbul a perfect choice for this research.

Furthermore, since there are three dependent variables, therefore, three regression analyses were applied. This is done so because multiple regression analysis is only fit to test the relationship with only one dependent variable. For analysis, the following regression equations were developed:

$$\text{Affective commitment} = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{ Authoritarian leadership} + \beta_2 \text{ Benevolent leadership} + \beta_3 \text{ Moral leadership} + \varepsilon_t \quad (1)$$

$$\text{Normative commitment} = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{ Authoritarian leadership} + \beta_2 \text{ Benevolent leadership} + \beta_3 \text{ Moral leadership} + \varepsilon_t \quad (2)$$

$$\text{Continuance commitment} = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{Authoritarian leadership} + \beta_2 \text{Benevolent leadership} + \beta_3 \text{Moral leadership} + \varepsilon_t \quad (3)$$

where, α is constant, β is the regression coefficient and ε_t is the error term.

Since this research study is based on the quantitative research technique, this corresponds to the deductive research approach. This indicates that the study primarily aims at testing the theory, hence, the study is based on the positivist epistemological position (Ghayas & Jabeen, 2020).

4. RESULTS

4.1. Reliability analysis

To examine the internal reliability, the Cronbach's alpha test was applied. Table 1 indicates the Cronbach's alpha values:

Table 1. Cronbach's alpha test

Variables	No. of items	Cronbach's alpha
Authoritarian leadership	9	0.788
Benevolent leadership	11	0.709
Moral leadership	8	0.702
Affective commitment	8	0.814
Normative commitment	8	0.775
Continuance commitment	8	0.791

Since Cronbach's alpha of all variables is 0.7 or greater, therefore, it is concluded that the instruments are reliable.

4.2. Results of regression analyses

Since three regression analyses were applied, therefore, the result of each regression analysis are presented separately. Below are the results.

4.2.1. Results of the first regression analysis

In the first regression analysis, the dimensions of paternalistic leadership are regressed against the affective commitment. The results of this regression analysis are given in Table 2:

Table 2. Results of affective commitment regression model

Variables	β -value	p-value	VIF
Constant	0.041	0.114	
Authoritarian leadership	-0.089	0.021	1.784
Benevolent leadership	0.171	0.041	1.919
Moral leadership	0.284	0.021	1.845
R-square		0.241	
Adjusted R-square		0.201	
F-statistics		21.715	
Sig.		0.000	

In this model, the dimensions of paternalistic leadership are regressed against the affective commitment dimension of organizational commitment. The R-square for the model is 0.241, whereas the Adjusted R-square value of this model is 0.201, indicating that a 20.1% variance in affective commitment can be explained through these three dimensions of paternalistic leadership. Furthermore, the F-statistics value is 21.715 with a significance value of 0.000 indicating that the model is statistically fit. Moreover, variance inflation factor (VIF) values are less than 2, indicating that there is no issue with multi-collinearity. Furthermore, the p-value of all the dimensions of paternalistic leadership is less than 0.05, indicating that all the dimensions are significantly associated with

affective commitment. Hence, the first three hypotheses of the study, i.e., *H1*, *H2*, and *H3* are supported. However, it should be noted that the β -value of authoritarian leadership is negative, therefore, suggesting that authoritarian leadership has a negative relationship with affective commitment.

4.2.2. Results of the second regression analysis

In the second regression analysis, the dimensions of paternalistic leadership are regressed against normative commitment. The results of this regression analysis are given in Table 3:

Table 3. Results of normative commitment regression model

Variables	β -value	p-value	VIF
Constant	0.024	0.084	
Authoritarian leadership	0.067	0.057	1.784
Benevolent leadership	0.124	0.037	1.919
Moral leadership	0.181	0.027	1.845
R-square		0.213	
Adjusted R-square		0.191	
F-statistics		20.324	
Sig.		0.000	

In this model, the dimensions of paternalistic leadership are regressed against the normative commitment dimension of organizational commitment. The R-square for the model is 0.213, whereas, adjusted R-square value of this model is 0.191. The F-Statistics value is 20.324 with the significance value of 0.000 indicating that the model is statistically fit. On the other hand, VIF values are less than 2, indicating that there is no issue with multi-collinearity. Furthermore, since the p-value of authoritarian leadership is greater than 0.05, therefore, it is suggested that authoritarian leadership does not have a significant relationship with normative commitment. This

suggests that *H4* of the present research study is not supported. Moreover, p-values of benevolent and moral leadership are less than 0.05, indicating that these dimensions are significantly associated with normative commitment. This suggests that *H5* and *H6* of the present research study are supported.

4.2.3. Results of the third regressions analysis

In the third regression analysis, the dimensions of paternalistic leadership are regressed against the continuance commitment. The results of this regression analysis are given in Table 4:

Table 4. Results of continuance commitment regression model

Variables	β -value	p-value	VIF
Constant	0.021	0.071	
Authoritarian leadership	0.088	0.061	1.784
Benevolent leadership	0.181	0.024	1.919
Moral leadership	0.246	0.004	1.845
R-square		0.291	
Adjusted R-square		0.271	
F-statistics		26.416	
Sig.		0.000	

In this model, the dimensions of paternalistic leadership are regressed against the continuance commitment dimension of organizational commitment. The R-square for the model is 0.291, whereas, the Adjusted R-square value of this model is 0.271. The F-statistics value is 26.416 with the significance value of 0.000 indicating that the model is statistically fit. On the other hand, VIF values are less than 2, indicating that there is no issue with multi-collinearity. Furthermore, since the p-value of authoritarian leadership is greater than 0.05, therefore, it is suggested that authoritarian leadership does not have a significant relationship with the continuance commitment. This suggests that *H7* of the present research study is not supported. On the other hand, the p-values of benevolent and moral leadership are less than 0.05, indicating that these dimensions are significantly associated with continuance commitment. This suggests that *H8* and *H9* of the present research study are supported.

5. DISCUSSIONS

This research study is certainly not the first study on the topic concerning leadership. In fact, it is one of the many studies that have been conducted on the topic concerning leadership (Ospina et al., 2020; Chai et al., 2020; McCauley & Palus, 2021). The study seeks to advance the literature on paternalistic leadership and organizational commitment by testing the association between the dimensions of the two variables. Hence, the study is crucial for understanding the concepts of leadership and organizational commitment. The results of the study suggest that moral leadership and benevolent leadership are related to organizational commitment. This is consistent with Prakasch and Ghayas (2019) that leadership styles that are not authoritarian in nature are related to positive work outcomes. On the other hand, authoritarian leadership is not found to be associated with organizational commitment. This is consistent with the previous researchers (Xu et al., 2021; Ghayas & Jabeen, 2020) that leaders should be careful about

their conduct while dealing with employees for harboring positive work outcomes. Furthermore, the results also suggest that the authoritarian leadership style is negatively associated with affective commitment, indicating that it is not only unable to enhance the chances of positive work outcomes but at times it also proves to be counter-productive. Hence, this research study advances the literature on the concept of leadership.

6. CONCLUSION

The results of this research point to the fact that only moral leadership and benevolent leadership have a significant relationship with organizational commitment, whereas, authoritarian leadership does not have a significant association with positive work outcomes such as normative commitment and continuance commitment. Furthermore, it is also found that authoritarian leadership style has a negative relationship with affective commitment. This indicates that people do not want to have someone who tries to lead them in an authoritarian manner. Hence, it is concluded that leaders should be careful while managing their subordinates. Furthermore, it is also concluded that although Turkey is situated on the cross-road of Asia and Europe and Istanbul city is specifically divided into the Asian and European sides, Turkish culture has always been eastern ever since the Roman Empire and the Ottoman era, however, the very fact that even the Turks are a bit reluctant in following the authoritarian leaders implies that there is some sort of misunderstanding in understanding the concept of paternalistic leadership. In this regard, from the results of this study, it can be concluded that although people in Eastern cultures like to have paternalistic leaders, yet, they do not prefer someone authoritarian.

This research study tests the relationship between the dimensions of paternalistic leadership and the dimensions of organizational commitment. It is basically the first study that seeks to explain the relationship between dimensions of paternalistic leadership and dimensions of organizational

commitment. Hence, it provides insights into the relationship between dimensions of paternalistic leadership and dimensions of organizational leadership. Therefore, this is an important study for the theoretical progression of the concept of paternalistic leadership and organizational commitment.

Since this study concludes that only moral leadership and benevolent leadership are positively associated with positive work outcomes, therefore, organizational leaders in the IT sector of Istanbul should remain vigilant about their own conduct and evaluate their actions in terms of morality and benevolence. This will help them in their quest of enhancing the level of organizational commitment of their sub-ordinates. Furthermore, since the study also concludes that the authoritarian style of leadership does not have a significant association with positive work outcomes such as organizational commitment, therefore, organizational leaders in the IT sector of Istanbul should remain extra careful while asserting their authority and they should work carefully on the impression management as well while trying to assert their managerial authority.

Although, it is a crucial study concerning paternalistic leadership and organizational commitment, however, the study does not test the role of psychological outcomes such as stress and emotional dissonance in the relationship between the dimensions of the two variables. Therefore, it is suggested that future researchers should study the role of psychological outcomes such as stress and emotional dissonance in the relationship between the dimensions of the two variables. Furthermore, it is also suggested that for

greater generalizability of results, similar studies should also be conducted in other Turkish cities such as Ankara, Izmir, and Iznik, etc. In this regard, it is also recommended that similar studies should also be replicated in the multi-national IT sector firms that are based in Turkey.

Furthermore, since it is also suggested that Turks who had always been proud of portraying their past leaders as fatherly figures which suggests that Turks must have inclination towards paternalistic leadership style are not happy with the authoritarian leaders. Hence, this can be used as proof that the construct of paternalistic leadership needs to be revisited. Therefore, future researchers should try to revisit the construct of abusive supervision and try to explore more factors of paternalistic leadership, and try to explain how authoritarian leadership facets of paternalistic leadership differ from the transactional leadership style. In addition to this, it should also be studied whether the employees consider paternalistic leadership as a new leadership style or they just think it is another form of abusive style of leadership.

Moreover, since the results suggest that people in Istanbul's IT sector do not prefer to have authoritarian leaders although Turkey has always been considered as more of an Eastern country than it has ever been a Western country, especially in terms of culture, therefore, there exists a need to revisit Hofstede's cultural dimensions as well. This is primarily because the advent of globalization has truly transformed the world and it has also affected the traditional cultural boundaries as well.

REFERENCES

1. Abbas, M., Habib, H., & Siddique, A. (2020). Impact of paternalistic leadership on turnover intention: Evidence from the Islamic banking industry of Karachi, Pakistan. *RADS Journal of Business Management*, 2(2), 167-176. <https://jbm.juw.edu.pk/index.php/jbm/article/view/38/31>
2. Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63(1), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1990.tb00506.x>
3. Batırlık, S. N., Gencer, Y. G., & Akkucuk, U. (2022). Global virtual team leadership scale (GVTLS) development in multinational companies. *Sustainability*, 14(2), Article 1038. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14021038>
4. Carnevale, J. B., Huang, L., & Paterson, T. (2019). LMX-differentiation strengthens the prosocial consequences of leader humility: An identification and social exchange perspective. *Journal of Business Research*, 96, 287-296. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.11.048>
5. Chai, D. S., Jeong, S., & Joo, B. K. (2020). The multi-level effects of developmental opportunities, pay equity, and paternalistic leadership on organizational commitment. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 44(4/5), 405-424. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJTD-09-2019-0163>
6. Chaudhary, A., Islam, T., Ali, H. F., & Jamil, S. (2023). Can paternalistic leaders enhance knowledge sharing? The roles of organizational commitment and Islamic work ethics. *Global Knowledge, Memory and Communication*, 72(1/2), 98-118. <https://doi.org/10.1108/GKMC-06-2021-0109>
7. Cheng, B.-S., Chou, L.-F., Wu, T.-Y., Huang, M.-P., & Farh, J.-L. (2004). Paternalistic leadership and subordinate responses: Establishing a leadership model in Chinese organizations. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 7(1), 89-117. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-839X.2004.00137.x>
8. Chen, X.-P., Eberly, M. B., Chiang, T.-J., Farh, J.-L., & Cheng, B.-S. (2014). Affective trust in Chinese leaders: Linking paternalistic leadership to employee performance. *Journal of Management*, 40(3), 796-819. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206311410604>
9. Ciulla, J. B. (2020). The importance of leadership in shaping business values. In J. B. Ciulla (Ed.), *The search for ethics in leadership, business, and beyond* (pp. 153-163). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-38463-0_10
10. Deluga, R. J. (1998). Leader-member exchange quality and effectiveness ratings: the role of subordinate-supervisor conscientiousness similarity. *Group & Organization Management*, 23(2), 189-216. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601198232006>
11. Ekmen, F., & Okçu, V. (2021). The relationship between paternalistic leadership behaviors of school administrators and pre-school teachers' job satisfaction. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 8(6), 142-164. <https://doi.org/10.46827/ejes.v8i6.3776>
12. Erben, G. S., & Güneşer, 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. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-007-9605-z>

13. 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* (pp. 84-127). Palgrave Macmillan, London. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230511590_5
14. Fernandez, A. A., & Shaw, G. P. (2020). Academic leadership in a time of crisis: The Coronavirus and COVID-19. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 14(1), 39-45. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jls.21684>
15. Fu, Q., Cherian, J., Ahmad, N., Scholz, M., Samad, S., & Comite, U. (2022). An inclusive leadership framework to foster employee creativity in the healthcare sector: The role of psychological safety and polychronicity. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(8), Article 4519. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19084519>
16. Ghayas, M. M., & Jabeen, R. (2020). Abusive supervision: Dimensions & scale. *New Horizons*, 14(1), 107-130. <http://greenwichjournals.com/index.php/NH/article/view/259/48>
17. Ghayas, M. M., Akhtar, N., & Devi, A. (2023). Applying the Islamic principles in managing human resources: An investigation into authentic leadership and turnover intention. *Al-Manhal Research Journal*, 3(1), 1-8. <https://almanhal.org.pk/ojs3303/index.php/journal/article/view/30/63>
18. Ghayas, M. M., Khan, M. M. S., Kumar, S., & Mohyuddin, S. M. (2023). Reconstruction of trust and organizational commitment through servant leadership in the postpandemic era: Evidence from the IT sector of Pakistan. *Journal of Asia Business Studies*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JABS-03-2022-0094>
19. Hakimian, F., Farid, H., Ismail, M. N., & Ismail, I. A. (2014). Paternalistic leadership and organizational commitment. *International Journal of Management Excellence*, 3(1), 373-378. <http://surl.li/kbwvr>
20. Hou, B., Hong, J., Zhu, K., & Zhou, Y. (2019). Paternalistic leadership and innovation: the moderating effect of environmental dynamism. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 22(3), 562-582. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-07-2018-0141>
21. Kao, S.-F., Lien, Y.-H., Cheng, Y.-H., & Cheng, B.-S. (2020). Literature review of transformational leadership and paternalistic leadership in sport: Current status and future directions. *Chinese Journal of Psychology*, 62(2), 267-298. http://www.cjpsy.com/_i/assets/upload/files/pg047-24-32.pdf
22. Karakas, F., & Sarigollu, E. (2012). Benevolent leadership: Conceptualization and construct development. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 108, 537-553. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-1109-1>
23. Khan, M. M. S., & Ghayas, M. M. (2022). Impact of authentic leadership on employee engagement in the banking sector of Karachi. *International Journal of Business Performance Management*, 23(1/2), 90-98. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJBPM.2022.119567>
24. Khan, M. M. S., Ghayas, M. M., & Kashif, S. (2020). Servant leadership and organizational commitment. *New Horizons*, 14(2), 223-240. <http://greenwichjournals.com/index.php/NH/article/view/442>
25. Lin, C.-C., Su, C.-L., Lee, Y.-D., & Chang, C.-B. (2020). The impact of paternalistic leadership on the willingness of retention for the employees in real estate industry-organizational identity and job satisfaction as the mediating variables. *International Journal of Economics, Business and Management Research*, 4(1), 47-61. <http://surl.li/kbwyp>
26. Mach, M., Ferreira, A. I., & Abrantes, A. C. M. (2022). Transformational leadership and team performance in sports teams: A conditional indirect model. *Applied Psychology*, 71(2), 662-694. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12342>
27. Malcolm, N. (2019). *Useful enemies: Islam and the Ottoman Empire in Western political thought, 1450-1750*. Oxford University Press.
28. Massoud, A. H., Jameel, A. S., & Ahmad, A. R. (2020). Stimulating organizational citizenship behavior by applying organizational commitment and satisfaction. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Economic Review*, 2(2), 20-27. <https://doi.org/10.36923/ijsser.v2i2.58>
29. McCauley, C. D., & Palus, C. J. (2021). Developing the theory and practice of leadership development: A relational view. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 32(5), Article 101456. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2020.101456>
30. Mustafa, M. Z. B., Nordin, M. B., Razzaq, A. R. B. A., & Ibrahim, B. B. (2020). Organizational commitment of vocational college teachers in Malaysia. *PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology*, 17(9), 5023-5029. <https://www.archives.palarch.nl/index.php/jae/article/view/4737/4671>
31. Nguyen, H. N., Le, Q. H., Tran, Q. B., Tran, T. H. M., Nguyen, T. H. Y., & Nguyen, T. T. Q. (2020). The impact of organizational commitment on employee motivation: A study in Vietnamese enterprises. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 7(6), 439-447. <https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2020.vol7.no6.439>
32. Ospina, S. M., Foldy, E. G., Fairhurst, G. T., & Jackson, B. (2020). Collective dimensions of leadership: Connecting theory and method. *Human Relations*, 73(4), 441-463. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726719899714>
33. Pellegrini, E. K., Scandura, T. A., & Jayaraman, V. (2010). Cross-cultural generalizability of paternalistic leadership: An expansion of leader-member exchange theory. *Group and Organization Management*, 35(4), 391-420. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601110378456>
34. Prakasch, J. N., & Ghayas, M. M. (2019). Impact of servant leadership on turnover intentions in banking sector of Karachi. *RADS Journal of Business Management*, 1(1), 22-30. <http://surl.li/kbyka>
35. Shafi, M. Q., Raza, A., Haider, A., & Gul, N. (2021). Impact of paternalistic leadership on organizational readiness for change: Mediating role of employee engagement and moderating role of Islamic work ethics. *Journal of Islamic Business and Management*, 11(1), 126-143. <https://doi.org/10.26501/jibm/2021.1101-009>
36. Soyulu, S. (2011). Creating a family or loyalty-based framework: The effects of paternalistic leadership on workplace bullying. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 99(2), 217-231. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-010-0651-6>
37. Turner, K. (2022). Servant leadership to support wellbeing in higher education teaching. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 46(7), 947-958. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2021.2023733>
38. Wren, D. A. (2005). *The history of management thought*. John Wiley & Sons.
39. Xu, J., Wang, X., & Yan, L. (2021). The moderating effect of abusive supervision on information security policy compliance: Evidence from the hospitality industry. *Computers & Security*, 111, Article 102455. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cose.2021.102455>
40. Zheng, X., Shi, X., & Liu, Y. (2020). Leading teachers' emotions like parents: Relationships between paternalistic leadership, emotional labor and teacher commitment in China. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, Article 519. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00519>