

Examining Paternalistic Leadership Behaviours of Primary School Principals Based on the Teachers Perceptions in Turkey ¹

Bünyamin AĞALDAY², Abidin DAĞLI³

Atıf/©: Ağalday, Bünyamin; Abidin Dağlı, Examining Paternalistic Leadership Behaviours of Primary School Principals Based on the Teachers Perceptions in Turkey, Artuklu Human and Social Science Journal 2019/4 (2), 1-22.

Özet

The aim of this research is to examine the paternalistic leadership behaviours of the headmasters of public primary schools through perceptions of the teachers working in those schools. The sample of the research done in the descriptive survey method consists of 1059 teachers in primary schools selected by methods of stratified sampling and simple random sampling in Mardin city center and 8 districts of Mardin during the 2016-2017 academic year. The data of the research were obtained by using the “Headmasters’ Paternalistic Leadership Behaviours Scale”. The following findings were acquired after the analysis of the data: The overall average of teachers’ perceptions toward their headmasters’ paternalistic leadership behaviors was found at a “strongly agree” level. A significant difference was observed between the teachers’ perceptions toward their principals regarding the sub-dimension of benevolent leadership with respect to two variables, namely education level, and marital status and the sub-dimension of exploitative leadership with respect to gender. Based on the findings, suggestions were developed for both the practitioners and researchers.

Keywords: Leadership, paternalistic leadership, primary school, primary school administrators.

1

Türkiye’de İlkokul Müdürlerinin Paternalist Liderlik Davranışlarının Öğretmen Algılarına Dayalı Olarak İncelenmesi

Atıf/©: Ağalday, Bünyamin; Abidin Dağlı, Türkiye’de İlkokul Müdürlerinin Paternalist Liderlik Davranışlarının Öğretmen Algılarına Dayalı Olarak İncelenmesi, Artuklu İnsan ve Toplum Bilim Dergisi 2019/4 (2), 1-22.

Abstract

Bu araştırmanın amacı, ilkokullarda görevli öğretmenlerin kendi okul müdürlerinin paternalist liderlik davranışlarına ilişkin algılarını incelemektir. Betimsel tarama modelinde yapılmış araştırmanın örneklemini, 2016-2017 eğitim-öğretim yılında Mardin (merkez) Artuklu ilçesi ve bağlı 8 ilçe merkezindeki kamu ilkokullarından tabakalı ve basit seçkisiz örnekleme yöntemleriyle seçilen 1059 öğretmenden oluşmaktadır. Araştırmanın verileri, “Okul Müdürlerinin Paternalist Liderlik Davranışları Ölçeği” kullanılarak elde edilmiştir. Verilerin analizi sonucunda ulaşılan bazı önemli bulgular şunlardır: Öğretmenlerin ilkokul müdürlerinin paternalist liderlik davranışları ile ilgili algıları “çok katılıyorum” düzeyinde saptanmıştır. Öğretmenlerin ilkokul müdürlerinin paternalist liderlik davranışları ile ilgili algıları arasında; “öğrenim durumu” ve “medeni durum”

¹ This study was presented as an oral paper at the “13th International Congress on Educational Administration” and developed in part. The study was produced from Bünyamin AĞALDAY’s doctoral thesis titled “The relationship between primary school principals’ paternalistic leadership behaviours and teachers’ organizational creativity and organizational dissent levels” under the supervision of Abidin DAĞLI.

² Dr., Mardin Artuklu University, Department of Educational Sciences, Mardin-Turkey, bunyaminagalday@artuklu.edu.tr. ORCID: orcid.org/0000-0003-0128-5055.

³ Dr., Dicle University, Department of Educational Sciences, Diyarbakır-Turkey, dagli@dicle.edu.tr. ORCID: orcid.org/0000-0002-3072-8997.

Geliş/Received: 17.11.2019, **Kabul/Accepted:** 20.12.2019

değişkenlerine göre *yardımsaver liderlik* alt boyutunda ve “cinsiyet” değişkenine göre ise *çıkarıcı liderlik* alt boyutunda anlamlı bir fark saptanmıştır. Araştırmanın sonucunda uygulayıcılara ve araştırmacılara yönelik öneriler sunulmuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Liderlik, paternalist liderlik, ilkokul, ilkokul müdürleri.

INTRODUCTION

In today's world where a rapid transformation process is experienced due to the globalization, it is inconceivable to think of educational organizations as not affected by this change. There is a need for leadership in the fulfillment of the required functions in this transformation process (Higgs, 2002). Paternalistic leadership (PL) is deemed significant in the fulfillment of the required functions in the transformation process. Studies regarding the identification of the leadership model of the Eastern culture have started with Silin (1976) and continued with the studies by Redding (1990), Westwood and Chan (1992), Cheng (1995a, 1995b, 1995c), Westwood (1997), and Farh and Cheng (2000). These studies which lay the groundwork for the conceptual basis of PL have demonstrated that the leadership perception of Eastern societies differs from those of Western societies. Farh and Cheng (2000:85) state that random application of Western leadership models to the East has damaged the core image of Eastern leadership models. According to Liang, Ling and Hsieh (2007:127), this understanding of leadership presented as the basis for cultural differences between societies is called PL.

Rooted in “Confucianism”, a philosophy with approximately 2000-year-old influence on the Chinese governance, PL (Zhao, 1994) stands out as a concept appearing in the governance literature, especially in the last twenty years (Pellegrini and Scandura, 2008:567). PL is identified in various ways in the literature. According to Westwood and Chan (1992), PL is described as a “type of leadership in which it resembles a paternalistic relationship where a strong authority is combined with concern and thoughtfulness” while Redding, Norman and Schlander (1994) describe paternalistic leadership as an “authoritarian leadership in which an infinite guidance, concern and protection is provided to the followers”; Aycan and Fikret-Paşa (2003) describe it as “the type of leadership in which a strong discipline and authority is merged with a paternalistic benevolence within a moral integrity in a personal setting”, and Cheng et al. (2004) as a “three dimensional leadership approach, which include benevolence, moral values and authoritarianism comprised of a strong discipline and authority”. Having the literature examined, it is seen that most widely accepted leadership description about PL has been put into words by Farh and Cheng (2000). Accordingly, PL is described as a “style in which strong discipline and authority is merged with a paternalistic benevolence and moral integrity in a personal setting”. When the descriptions for PL have been examined, it is seen that this particular type of leadership resembles a parent's and child's relationship in many aspects. Parents look after the child, govern, feed, nurture, clean while at the same time, warn and punish. The child should follow the words and guidance of his or her parents firmly in order to avoid punishment. The relationship between the employee and employer shares a similar feature with this image (Aksoy, 2008). Saher, Naz, Tasleem, Naz and Kausar (2013) too indicate that the notion of PL is based upon a father-child relationship where the father establishes authority over the child. Having looked after the needs and well-being of his child and held sway over them, the father takes morally important decisions on behalf of the child's life. Nonetheless, fathers who are inclined to establish authority over their children should be acting in good faith at heart. According to Sinha (1990), values that are accepted by the traditional societies in which protective father figure is perceived as reliable, authoritarian, strict and demanding constitute the basis of the relationship between benevolence and authority, of which PL includes. There are inferences regarding children accepting the father figure as an

authority.

On the basis of PL, which became symbolized by the “father” in the family, the organization is seen as a family. The leader is positioned as a family man who needs to be strong and he is expected to act like the head of the household. Besides that, the paternalistic leader is expected to create a family environment at the work place, to approach his followers like a father and to make all the effort to care about the private lives of his followers outside of work (Erkuş, Tabak and Yaman, 2010). In other words, the basis of the paternalistic leadership lies with the employer treating the employee as a father, close friend and even a brother when appropriate. In this kind of relationship, the employees believe that the rules laid down by the employers are for their own good and follow the decisions made by the employers voluntarily (Aycan, 2001; 2006). Loyalty, respect and obedience to the leader is expected in return of the paternal concern and protection in the paternalistic relationship.

When studies regarding the PL dimensions in the literature are examined, it is seen that two basic classifications are discussed at most. These classifications include the study by Farh and Cheng (2000) which analyzes paternalistic leadership in the dimensions of “benevolent leadership”, “moral leadership” and “authoritarian leadership” and the study by Kim (1994) which analyzes paternalistic leadership in the dimensions of “benevolent” and “exploitative”. The roots of the *benevolent leadership* dimension as an effective and significant cultural variable in the process of trust building of the follower towards his leader (Wasti, Tan, Brower and Önder, 2007:486) lie with the “generous and thoughtful superior” principle of Confucian ideology (Farh et al., 2006). *Benevolent leadership* consists of behaviors such as the leader taking an interest in the personal and family issues of his followers, protecting and forgiving them, along with an individualized, long-term and holistic concern to his followers for their good and well-being (Aycan and Fikret-Paşa, 2003; Erben and Güneşer, 2008:958). *Moral leadership* is generally described as “the overall behaviors indicating eminent personal values, self-discipline and generosity of a leader” (Cheng et al., 2004). In the *authoritarian leadership* in which the leader has absolute power and control over his followers, the followers are expected to have an unconditional obedience to the leader (Cheng, 1995b). In *exploitative leadership*, the ultimate goal of the leader is to get the obedience of his employees in return of the attention given and the priority of the leader is the organizational assets (Hayek, Novicevic, Humphreys and Jones, 2010:373). In *exploitative leadership*, subordinates show respect and loyalty to the superior in order to avoid penalty or obtain reward (Kim, 1994; Pellegrini and Scandura, 2006).

Whilst discourses on paternalistic leaders having an impact on the behaviors of the individuals in collectivist cultures with a high power range (Gelfand et al., 2007) are expressed, it is also stated that PL too is an acknowledged style in similar cultures (Pellegrini and Scandura, 2006:265). In this respect, the most comprehensive study is carried out by Aycan et al. (2000). When the results of this research conducted in ten countries are examined, “India, Pakistan, China and Turkey” ranked at the top in terms of paternalistic values while “Romania, Russia, Canada and the USA” took place in the middle, and “Israel and Germany” at the bottom. Furthermore, the research confirms that “collectivism” and “power range” are common cultural characteristics of countries with high paternalistic values. Collectivist cultures emphasize the continuity of the relationships, and value loyalty and sense of mission by reflecting the relationship dynamics based on the paternalistic approach. Consequently, it is natural and logical to expect high levels of paternalism in the organizations in Turkey.

The paternalistic leadership style has lately begun to be discussed in non-educational organizations while it is subjected to very little research in Turkey for educational organizations

(Arslan, 2016; Asyalı and Cerit, 2014; Aydınlan, 2016; Cerit, 2012; 2013; Dađlı and Ađalday, 2018; Mamatođlu, 2010; Mete and Serin, 2015; Tuncer, 2005). When mentioned studies are examined, it is seen that those researches are predominantly carried out in education levels besides primary schools or relationships between paternalistic leadership and various organizational variables are investigated in the studies. However, a research focusing on the paternalistic leadership manifestation levels of the headmasters in primary schools based on the perceptions of teachers and whether these perceptions change meaningfully according to various demographic variables has not been encountered. From this aspect, appearance of how the paternalistic leadership style, which is acknowledged as the source of cultural differences (Liang, Ling and Hsieh, 2007:127) is manifested by headmasters based on the perceptions of the teachers who are the focus points of the educational organizations is of great significance for the educational organizations. Hence, this research is conducted to determine perceptions of the teachers working in primary schools on the paternalistic leadership behaviours of their headmasters and whether those perceptions generate a meaningful difference with regard to the variables of *education level, gender, marital status, trade union membership and seniority*. Answers are sought for the questions below in line with this purpose:

1. How are the perceptions of teachers working in primary schools on the paternalistic leadership behaviours of their headmasters dispersed?

2. Is there a meaningful difference between the perceptions of teachers working in primary schools on the paternalistic leadership behaviours of their headmasters with regard to;

- A. Education level,
- B. Gender,
- C. Marital status,
- D. Trade union membership,
- E. Seniority variables?

Method

Research Model

This research has been conducted through the use of descriptive survey model. This model consists of survey arrangements carried out on the whole of population or on a sample of it in a population made up of many components, in order to reach a general conclusion about the population (Karasar, 2005:79).

Population and Sample

The population of the research consists of central Artuklu district of the province of Mardin in 2016-2017 school year and 2597 teachers working in public primary schools in affiliated 8 district centers. Data collection tools were applied to 1100 teachers selected from the population by stratified and simple random sampling methods, yet 1059 of them are evaluated. In this case, the rate of sample representation of the population is 40,77%. Each district was sampled as strata. There are 602 teachers in the central district. This number constitutes 23.19% of the number of teachers in the population. In order to determine the number of samples, 23.19% of the 1100 number was calculated and 255 number was obtained. Sampling method in other districts was calculated and applied in the same way. The schools and teachers who were sampled in the lower levels were determined by "simple random sampling" method.

Data Collection Tool

Research data are obtained by the use of “Scale of the Paternalistic Leadership Behaviours of Headmasters”, which was developed by Dađlı and Ađalday (2017). The scale consists of two sections. There are five items in the *I. section* about personal details while there are 22 items in the *II. Section* about the paternalistic leadership behaviours manifested by the headmasters. A structure comprised of 22 items and four factors (benevolent leadership, moral leadership, authoritarian leadership, exploitative leadership) is obtained through exploratory factor analysis carried out in order to determine the construct validity of the scale. Items with numbers 10, 12, 15 and 16 in the scale are coded reverse. The variance rate each factor explains is determined to be 38,568% in the first factor, 4,800% in the second factor, 6,730% in the third and 9,842% in the fourth factor, respectively. The total variance each four variants explain is specified as 59,939%. It is seen that the scale possesses sufficient values of fit index through confirmatory factor analysis. Cronbach Alpha reliability co-efficient, which was calculated to identify the reliability of the scale, is .926 for the first factor while it is .872 for the second factor, .610 for the third, .619 for the fourth and .898 for the whole scale.

Data Analysis

Unpaired t-test and one-way analysis of variance test, among the parametric statistics methods, are benefited for the analysis of the data. Significance level of $\alpha = .05$ is predicated on for testing the difference between group averages. Scheffe test is applied for the identification for the source of meaningful difference according to the results of one-way analysis of variance. Effect size is examined too, along with the statistical significance of the difference between compared averages. Effect size is calculated in the t-test through the difference between group averages divided by the combined standard deviation, while in one-way analysis of variance through intergroup variance divided by total variance. Effect value is interpreted as immense effect for over 1, big effect for 0,8, medium for 0,5 and little effect for less than 0,2 in t-test, while it is interpreted as large effect for over 0,14, medium for 0,06 and little effect for less than 0,01 in one-way analysis of variance (Green and Salkind, 2005:169). Estimates in Table 1 are predicated upon when averages for items in the scale are interpreted. Arithmetic means of those points are used for interpretation of the views of teachers. Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient for the reliability of the data collection tool in this research is identified as 0,95 for the “benevolent leadership” dimension, 0,82 for the “moral leadership” dimension, 0,72 for the “authoritarian leadership” dimension, 0,71 for the “exploitative leadership” dimension, and 0,92 for the whole scale. Assessment criteria used for the interpretation of the item averages in the scale are illustrated in Table 1 below. Estimates with a reliability coefficient equal to and over 0,70 are acknowledged as reliable (Tezbařaran, 1997). Accordingly, it can be said that Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficients with reference to the obtained estimates are within the acceptable borders.

Table 1. Assessment Criteria Used For The Interpretation Of The Item Averages In The Scale

Average	Criteria
1,00-1,79	Completely Disagree
1,80-2,59	Less Agree
2,60-3,39	Averagely Agree
3,40-4,19	Strongly Agree
4,20-5,00	Completely Agree

Findings

This section consists of findings, respectfully, on the *paternalistic leadership behaviours* manifested by the headmasters and whether those paternalistic leadership behaviours create a meaningful difference according to *education level, gender, marital status, trade union membership and seniority*, based on the perceptions of the teachers working in primary schools.

Paternalistic Leadership Behaviours of the Headmasters Based on the Perceptions of Teachers

Average and standard deviation estimates concerning the “*benevolent leadership*”, “*moral leadership*”, “*authoritarian leadership*” and “*exploitative leadership*” sub-dimensions of paternalistic leadership behaviours manifested by the headmasters according to the perceptions of teachers are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Means And Standard Deviation Values Of Teachers' Perceptions Toward Paternalistic Leadership Sub-Dimensions

Dimension	Items	\bar{X}	Sd	Criteria
Benevolent Leadership	<u>My headmaster:</u>			
	1. approaches teachers like a parent and guards them.	3,45	1,29	Strongly Agree
	2. takes care of teachers’ private problems.	2,90	1,32	Averagely Agree
	3.endeavours to create a family milieu in school.	3,61	1,26	Strongly Agree
	4.works in harmony with teachers.	3,81	1,18	Strongly Agree
	5.cares about friendship.	3,86	1,19	Strongly Agree

	6.is tolerant of teachers.	3,96	1,11	Strongly Agree
	7.shares teachers' joy.	3,81	1,18	Strongly Agree
	8.takes care of teachers in one-to-one relationship.	3,63	1,21	Strongly Agree
	9.supports teachers to take the initiative.	3,50	1,24	Strongly Agree
	Factor average	3,61	1,04	Strongly Agree
Moral Leadership	10.does not care about teachers' health.	1,82	1,22	Less Agree
	11.treats justly when awarding.	3,49	1,34	Strongly Agree
	12.does not attach importance to vocational development.	1,88	1,24	Less Agree
	13.protects teachers from outside and unfair criticisms.	3,69	1,32	Strongly Agree
	14. maintains harmonious relationship with teachers who disagree with him/her.	3,63	1,26	Strongly Agree
	15.uses his/her authority for his/her personal benefit.	1,75	1,18	Completely Disagree
	16.arrogates to himself/herself teachers' achievements.	1,93	1,25	Less Agree
	Factor average	3,91	,87	Strongly Agree
Authoritarian Leadership	17.wants to keep all school matters under his/her control.	2,91	1,41	Averagely Agree
	18.keeps teachers at arm's length in his/her communication with them.	3,18	1,27	Averagely Agree
	19.wants teachers to obey his/her decisions unconditionally.	3,54	1,39	Strongly Agree
	Factor average	3,21	1,09	Averagely Agree
Exploitative Leadership	20.expects loyalty from teachers as a result of his/her close communication with them.	3,25	1,29	Averagely Agree
	21.expects endorsement from teachers whom s/he trusts.	2,79	1,32	Averagely Agree
	22.utilizes specific strategies to neutralize dissent.	3,72	1,30	Strongly Agree
	Factor average	3,25	1,04	Averagely Agree

Scale Average	3,60	,79	Strongly Agree
---------------	------	-----	----------------

As seen in Table 2, general average of the perceptions of teachers on the paternalistic leadership behaviours of their headmasters is determined to be in the level of “strongly agree ($\bar{X} = 3,60$)”. Averages for the teacher perceptions are specified as ranging between 2,90 and 3,96 in the “benevolent leadership” dimension, between 1,75 and 3,69 in the “moral leadership” dimension, 2,91 and 3,54 in the “authoritarian leadership” dimension, and between 2,79 and 3,72 in the “exploitative leadership” dimension of the paternalistic leadership. Teachers have stated their opinions the most in “strongly agree” level to the statement of “my headmaster is tolerant of teachers” ($\bar{X} = 3,96$) while the least in “averagely agree” level to “my headmaster takes care of teachers’ private problems” ($\bar{X} = 2,90$) in the “benevolent leadership” sub-dimension of the paternalistic leadership.

Teachers have stated their opinions the most in “strongly agree” level to the statement of “my headmaster protects teachers from outside and unfair criticisms.” ($\bar{X} = 3,69$) while the least in “completely disagree” level to “my headmaster uses his/her authority for his/her personal benefit.” ($\bar{X} = 1,75$) in the “moral leadership”⁴ sub-dimension of the paternalistic leadership.

Participants have stated their opinions the most in “strongly agree” level to the statement of “my headmaster wants teachers to obey his/her decisions unconditionally.” ($\bar{X} = 3,54$) while the least in “averagely agree” level to “my headmaster wants to keep all school matters under his/her control.” ($\bar{X} = 2,91$) in the “authoritarian leadership” sub-dimension.

Teachers have stated their opinions the most in “strongly agree” level to the statement of “my headmaster utilizes specific strategies to neutralize dissent.” ($\bar{X} = 3,72$) while the least in “averagely agree” level to “my headmaster expects endorsement from teachers whom s/he trusts.” ($\bar{X} = 2,79$) in the “exploitative leadership” sub-dimension of the paternalist leadership.

Paternalistic Leadership Behaviours of the Headmasters Based on the Personal Variables of Teachers

Information on whether there is a meaningful difference between perceptions of the teachers on the paternalistic leadership behaviours their headmasters manifest according to the variables “education level”, “gender”, “marital status”, “trade union membership” and “seniority” of the teachers is given below, respectively.

Paternalistic leadership behaviours of the headmasters according to the education level variable of the teachers

Average and standard deviation estimates concerning the perceptions of the teachers on the PL behaviours of their headmasters according to the education level variable are shown in Table 3.

⁴ Items with numbers 10, 12, 15 and 16 in the moral leadership sub-dimension are coded reverse in the descriptions based on the dimensions, as in the case for descriptions based on items.

Table 3. Average And Standard Deviation Estimates Concerning The Perceptions Of The Teachers According To The Education Level Variable

Dimension	Education Level	N	X	Sd
Benevolent Leadership	1. Two-year degree	34	4,02	,80
	2. Bachelor's degree	987	3,61	1,04
	3. Master's degree	38	3,44	1,08
	Total	1059	3,61	1,04
Moral Leadership	1. Two-year degree	34	4,02	,78
	2. Bachelor's degree	987	3,92	,87
	3. Master's degree	38	3,73	,87
	Total	1059	3,91	,87
Authoritarian Leadership	1. Two-year degree	34	3,12	1,14
	2. Bachelor's degree	987	3,22	1,09
	3. Master's degree	38	3,12	1,00
	Total	1059	3,21	1,09
Exploitative Leadership	1. Two-year degree	34	3,34	1,07
	2. Bachelor's degree	987	3,25	1,04
	3. Master's degree	38	3,28	1,06
	Total	1059	3,25	1,04
Scale	1. Two-year degree	34	3,81	,11
	2. Bachelor's degree	987	3,60	,02
	3. Master's degree	38	3,47	,12
	Total	1059	3,60	,02

When Table 3 is examined, it is seen that average teacher perceptions range between 3,44 and 4,02 in the “*benevolent leadership*” dimension of PL, between 3,73 and 4,02 in the “*moral leadership*” dimension, between 3,12 and 3,22 in the “*authoritarian leadership*” dimension, between 3,25 and 3,34 in the “*exploitative leadership*” dimension, and between 3,47 and 3,81 in the total score of PL. One-way analysis of variance (Anova) is used to determine whether the differences between averages are meaningful or not. The results of the analysis are presented in

Table 4.

Table 4. Anova Results Regarding The Education Level Variable

Dimension	Source	SS	df	MS	F	p	Difference (Scheffe)
Benevolent Leadership	Between groups	6,900	2	3,450			
	Within groups	1151,510	1056	1,090	3,164	,043*	1-2
		1158,410	1058				1-3
	Total						
Moral Leadership	Between groups	1,703	2	,851			
	Within groups	810,646	1056	,768	1,109	,330	-
		812,349	1058				
	Total						
Authoritari an Leadership	Between groups	,675	2	,337			
	Within groups	1264,791	1056	1,198	,282	,755	-
		1265,466	1058				
	Total						
Exploitativ e Leadership	Between groups	,285	2	,142			
	Within groups	1150,177	1056	1,089	,131	,878	-
		1150,462	1058				
	Total						
Scale	Between groups	2,113	2	1,057			
	Within groups	662,807	1056	,628	1,683	,186	-
		664,920	1058				
	Total						

*: $p < ,05$

As seen in Table 4, a meaningful difference between the teacher perception averages has been identified in the "benevolent leadership" ($F(2,1056)= 3,164$, $p < .05$) sub-dimension of PL, according to the education level variable. The calculated effect size ($\eta^2=0,005$) shows that this

difference is in small scale. A meaningful difference between the teacher perceptions has been identified in the “*benevolent leadership*” dimension of PL, between teachers with a two-year degree and bachelor’s degree, and between teachers with a two-year degree and master’s degree. Accordingly, the perceptions of teachers with a two-year degree on the benevolent leadership behaviours of their headmasters ($\bar{X} = 4,02$) are meaningfully higher than those with a bachelor’s degree ($\bar{X} = 3,61$) and those with master’s degree ($\bar{X} = 3,44$).

Whereas, a meaningful difference between perceptions of the teachers is not identified in the “*moral leadership*” ($F(2,1056)= 1,109, p> .05$), “*authoritarian leadership*” ($F(2,1056)= ,282, p> .05$) and “*exploitative leadership*” ($F(2,1056)= ,131, p> .05$) sub-dimensions. There is also no meaningful difference encountered between the perceptions of the teachers for the total score of PL($F(2,1056)= 1,683, p> .05$).

Paternalistic leadership behaviours of the headmasters according to the gender variable of the teachers

T-test results regarding whether there is a meaningful difference between perceptions of the teachers on the PL behaviours of their headmasters in relation to the gender variable are shown in Table 5.

Table 5. T-test Results Regarding The Gender Variable

Dimension	Gender	N	\bar{X}	Sd	df	t	p
Benevolent Leadership	1. Female	539	3,59	1,02	1057	-,636	,525
	2. Male	520	3,64	1,06			
Moral Leadership	1. Female	539	3,93	,86	1057	,581	,562
	2. Male	520	3,90	,88			
Authoritarian Leadership	1. Female	539	3,25	1,05	1057	1,176	,240
	2. Male	520	3,17	1,13			
Exploitative Leadership	1. Female	539	3,32	1,01	1057	2,297	,022*
	2. Male	520	3,18	1,07			
Scale	1. Female	539	3,62	,76	1057	,492	,623
	2. Male	520	3,59	,82			

*: $p < ,05$

As seen in Table 5, a meaningful difference between the teacher perceptions is identified in the “*exploitative leadership*” ($t(1057)= 2297, p < .05$) sub-dimension of PL, in relation to the gender variable. The calculated effect size ($\eta^2=0,14$) shows that this difference is in small scale. Accordingly, perceptions of female teachers on the PL behaviours of their headmasters ($\bar{X} =3,32$) are meaningfully higher than perceptions of male teachers ($\bar{X} =3,18$) in the exploitative leadership dimension. On the other hand, no meaningful difference of teacher perceptions is identified in the

“benevolent leadership”(t(1057)= -,636, p> .05), “moral leadership”(t(1057)= ,581, p> .05), “authoritarian leadership” (t(1057)= 1,176, p> .05) sub-dimensions as well as in the total score of PL (t(1057)= ,492, p> .05). Even though there are no meaningful differences identified in the abovementioned sub-dimensions, it can be said that the perceptions of female teachers are relatively more positive, compared to male teachers.

Paternalistic leadership behaviours of the headmasters according to the marital status variable of the teachers

T-test results regarding whether there is a meaningful difference between perceptions of the teachers on the PL behaviours of their headmasters in relation to the marital status variable are shown in Table 6.

Table 6. T-test Results Regarding The Marital Status Variable

Dimension	Marital Status	N	\bar{X}	Sd	df	t	p
Benevolent Leadership	1. Married	684	3,66	1,03	1057	2,081	,038*
	2. Single	375	3,52	1,05			
Moral Leadership	1. Married	684	3,94	,860	1057	1,164	,245
	2. Single	375	3,87	,903			
Authoritarian Leadership	1. Married	684	3,23	1,11	1057	,524	,601
	2. Single	375	3,19	1,05			
Exploitative Leadership	1. Married	684	3,29	1,06	1057	1,741	,082
	2. Single	375	3,18	,992			
Scale	1. Married	684	3,64	,796	1057	1,944	,052
	2. Single	375	3,54	,782			

*: p< ,05

As seen in Table 6, a meaningful difference between the teacher perceptions is identified in the “benevolent leadership”(t(1057)= 2,081, p< .05) sub-dimension, in relation to the marital status variable. The calculated effect size (d=0,13) shows that this difference is in small scale. Accordingly, perceptions of married teachers on the benevolent leadership behaviours (\bar{X} =3,66) are meaningfully higher than those of single teachers(\bar{X} =3,52). On the other hand, no meaningful difference of teacher perceptions is found in the “moral leadership”(t(1057)= 1,164, p> .05), “authoritarian leadership” (t(1057)= ,524, p> .05), “exploitative leadership” (t(1057)= 1,741, p> .05) sub-dimensions as well as in the total score of PL (t(1057)= 1,944, p> .05). Even though there are no meaningful differences identified in the abovementioned sub-dimensions, it can be said that the perceptions of married teachers are relatively more positive, compared to single teachers.

Paternalistic leadership behaviours of the headmasters according to the union membership variable of the teachers

T-test results regarding whether there is a meaningful difference between perceptions of the teachers on the PL behaviours of their headmasters in relation to the trade union membership variable are shown in Table 7.

Table 7. T-test Results Regarding The Trade Union Membership Variable

Dimension	Trade union membership		N	\bar{X}	Sd	df	t	p*
	1. Yes	2. No						
Benevolent Leadership	1. Yes		716	3,60	1,07	1057	-,785	,433
	2. No		343	3,65	,994			
Moral Leadership	1. Yes		716	3,91	,873	1057	-,424	,672
	2. No		343	3,93	,883			
Authoritarian Leadership	1. Yes		716	3,20	1,09	1057	-,785	,433
	2. No		343	3,25	1,08			
Exploitative Leadership	1. Yes		716	3,24	1,05	1057	-,673	,501
	2. No		343	3,28	1,02			
Scale	1. Yes		716	3,59	,804	1057	-,830	,406
	2. No		343	3,63	,768			

*: p < ,05

As seen in Table 7, no meaningful difference between the perceptions of the teachers is identified in the “benevolent leadership” ($t(1057) = -,785, p > .05$), “moral leadership” ($t(1057) = -,424, p > .05$), “authoritarian leadership” ($t(1057) = -,785, p > .05$) and “exploitative leadership” ($t(1057) = -,673, p > .05$) sub-dimensions, in relation to the trade union membership variable. There is no meaningful difference in the total score of PL ($t(1057) = 1,944, p > .05$), as well.

Paternalistic leadership behaviours of the headmasters according to the seniority variable of the teachers

Average and standard deviation estimates concerning the perceptions of the teachers on the PL behaviours of their headmasters in relation to the seniority variable are shown in Table 8.

Table 8. Average And Standard Deviation Estimates Concerning The Perceptions of The Teachers According To The Seniority Variable

Dimension	Seniority	N	\bar{X}	Sd
Benevolent Leadership	1. 1-5 years	453	3,63	1,01
	2. 6-10 years	301	3,51	1,10
	3. 11-15 years	163	3,68	1,08
	4. 16-20 years	73	3,62	1,04
	5.21 years and above	69	3,81	,85
	Total	1059	3,61	1,04
Moral Leadership	1. 1-5 years	453	3,92	,89
	2. 6-10 years	301	3,93	,84
	3. 11-15 years	163	3,92	,89
	4. 16-20 years	73	3,78	,86
	5.21 years and above	69	3,92	,80
	Total	1059	3,91	,87
Authoritarian Leadership	1. 1-5 years	453	3,25	1,06
	2. 6-10 years	301	3,19	1,09
	3. 11-15 years	163	3,23	1,16
	4. 16-20 years	73	3,01	1,14
	5.21 years and above	69	3,24	1,01
	Total	1059	3,21	1,09
Exploitative Leadership	1. 1-5 years	453	3,22	1,02
	2. 6-10 years	301	3,27	1,05
	3. 11-15 years	163	3,32	1,11
	4. 16-20 years	73	3,15	1,02
	5.21 years and			

	above	69	3,31	,99
	Total	1059	3,25	1,04
Scale	1. 1-5 years	453	3,62	,76
	2. 6-10 years	301	3,57	,83
	3. 11-15 years	163	3,65	,82
	4. 16-20 years	73	3,52	,83
	5. 21 years and above	69	3,70	,69
	Total	1059	3,60	,79

When Table 8 is examined, it is seen that teacher perceptions range between 3,51 and 3,81 in the “*benevolent leadership*” dimension of PL, between 3,78 and 3,93 in the “*moral leadership*” dimension, between 3,01 and 3,25 in the “*authoritarian leadership*” dimension, between 3,15 and 3,32 in the “*exploitative leadership*” dimension, and between 3,52 and 3,70 in the total score of PL, according to the seniority variable. Analysis of variance (one-way) is used to determine whether the differences between averages are meaningful or not. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 9.

Table 9. Anova Results Regarding The Senirotiy Variable

Dimension	Source	SS	df	MS	F	p*
Benevolent Leadership	Between groups	7,092	4	1,773		
	Within groups	1151,318	1054	1,092	1,623	,166
	Total	1158,410	1058			
Moral Leadership	Between groups	1,482	4	,371		
	Within groups	810,866	1054	,769		
	Total	812,349	1058		,482	,749
Authoritarian Leadership	Between groups	3,768	4	,942		
	Within groups	1261,699	1054	1,197		
	Total	1265,466	1058		,787	,534
Exploitative Leadership	Between groups	2,311	4	,578		
	Within groups	1148,150	1054	1,089		
	Total	1150,462	1058		,530	,713

Examining Paternalistic Leadership Behaviours of Primary School Principals Based on the Teachers Perceptions in Turkey

	Between groups	1,947	4	,487		
Scale	Within groups	662,973	1054	,629	,774	,542
	Total	664,920	1058			

*: $p < .05$

As shown in Table 9, there is no meaningful difference between teacher perceptions identified in the “*benevolent leadership*” ($F(4, 1054) = 1,623, p > .05$), “*moral leadership*” ($F(4, 1054) = ,482, p > .05$), “*authoritarian leadership*” ($F(4, 1054) = ,787, p > .05$) and “*exploitative leadership*” ($F(4, 1054) = ,530, p > .05$) sub-dimensions of PL, in relation to the seniority variable. Besides, no meaningful difference between teacher perceptions is seen in the total score of PL ($F(4, 1054) = ,774, p > .05$).

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

The aim of the research is to determine the perceptions of the teachers working in public primary schools on the paternalistic leadership behaviours of their headmasters and whether these perceptions create a meaningful difference in relation to the *education level, gender, marital status, trade union membership and seniority* variables. Findings obtained in the study is discussed within the context of the related literature.

When the findings related to the first sub goal of the study are examined, perceptions of the teachers on the PL behaviours of the primary school headmasters are found to be at the level of “strongly agree”, on the basis of the scale. Averages of the teacher perceptions on the PL behaviours of the primary school headmasters in the sub-dimensions are identified as “strongly agree” for *benevolent leadership* and *moral leadership*, while they are identified as “agree in medium level” for *authoritarian leadership* and *exploitative leadership*. Those findings can be interpreted in the way that headmasters usually manifest high levels of PL behaviours, according to the teachers working in primary schools. Findings obtained from researches made (Arslan, 2016; Cerit, 2012; 2013; Dağlı and Ağalday, 2018; Mete and Serin, 2015) seem to be consistent with the findings obtained in the current research. In the relevant studies, as well, it is reported that the perceptions of teachers on the PL behaviours of headmasters are in a good level, while average of benevolent leadership and moral leadership dimensions of PL are determined to be higher than the authoritarian leadership dimension. Hence, it can be stated that primary school headmasters create a family environment in the school, work with the teachers in harmony, take an interest in the private issues of the teachers, support them to take initiative, care for the professional development of the teachers, treat fairly when giving awards, protect his teachers against the unjust criticisms coming from out of the school and maintain a harmonious relationship with teacher groups from different views.

When the findings related to the second sub goal of the study are examined, it is seen that there is a meaningful difference between the teacher perceptions on the PL behaviours of the primary school headmasters in the sub-dimension of the *benevolent leadership* in relation to the “education level” variable. Accordingly, perception level of teachers with a two-year degree on the benevolent leadership behaviours of primary school headmasters are meaningfully higher than those with bachelor’s and master’s degrees. Findings from the studies of Yaman (2011), Yardımcı (2010) and Aksoy (2008) support these findings. There might be many factors behind the appearance of this finding. Teachers with bachelor’s and master’s degrees being in a tendency to act more professionally and autonomously without the support of their headmasters behind them, due

to the perfectionism and self-confidence brought by an education received in a more modern system of education compared to teachers with a two-year degree, and less educated teachers with a two-year degree being in a tendency to demand support from their headmasters due to them considering themselves less adequate may have played a role in the obtaining of the current finding. On the other hand, given the fact that teachers with a two-year degree are older than teachers with bachelor's and master's degrees, higher perceptions of teachers with two-year degrees on the benevolent leadership are expected findings, based upon the idea of the benevolent leadership to form a family environment in the organization. This finding is also supported by the research Aycan (2001) conducted. In the relevant research, it is detected that younger participants less prefer paternalistic practices, compared to participants with older ages. On the other hand, it is also observed that the finding obtained from the current research is inconsistent with findings of some studies (Akdeniz, 2016; Cesur, 2015; Cheng et al., 2004; Pellegrini, Scandura and Jayaraman, 2010). In the relevant studies, it is identified that perceptions of the employees on the PL behaviours of their employer do not show a meaningful difference according to the education level. Generally, it can be stated that education level only has an impact on the benevolent leadership, among the sub-dimensions of PL.

There is a meaningful difference of the perception of teachers on the PL behaviours of the primary school headmasters in the *exploitative leadership* sub-dimension, in relation to the "gender" variable. Accordingly, perception level of female teachers regarding the exploitative leadership behaviour of their headmasters are meaningfully higher than male teachers. This finding bears a resemblance to the findings obtained in the studies of Çalışkan (2008) and Tuncer (2005). Even though there is a meaningful difference based on the gender variable ascertained in the studies of Dağlı and Ağalday (2018), Cesur (2015), Kaygısız (2015) and Yaman (2011), on the contrary to the findings obtained in the current research, it is found that perceptions of male employees on paternalistic leadership are more positive than those of female employees. Yet, mentioned difference in Yaman's (2011) research has only been identified in the moral leadership sub-dimension of PL. Whereas, in the studies of Akdeniz (2016), Türesin (2012), Macit (2010), Yardımcı (2010), Pellegrini and Scandura (2008), and Pellegrini et al. (2010), there has been no meaningful difference between employee perceptions on paternalistic leadership with reference to gender. According to the findings from the current research, female teachers can be said to have higher perceptions on the headmasters, related to teachers being faithful to the headmaster as a result of the close relationship he establishes with the teachers, having support of the teachers he trusts and warding off any possible opposition that may be formed against himself. Having male headmasters in general, the inability of male headmasters to empathize with female teachers, interrogator nature of female teachers, more demand of justice by the female teachers because of the predominant idea that women are of secondary importance sociologically are considered to be having an effect in the appearance of this finding in the current research. In the current research, although there is no meaningful difference detected between teacher perceptions in the benevolent, moral and authoritarian leadership sub-dimensions in relation to gender, it can be said that perceptions of female teachers are more positive compared to those of male teachers. In general, gender can be stated to have influence only on exploitative leadership.

A meaningful difference is detected between the perceptions of teachers on PL behaviours of their headmasters in the *benevolent leadership* sub-dimension with respect to the "marital status" variable. Accordingly, perception levels of married teachers are meaningfully higher than those of single teachers on the benevolent leadership behaviours of their headmasters. The possibility that headmasters could be more benevolent to married teachers through empathy since many of the headmasters are by and large married could also be influential in the obtained

findings. Yet, according to the findings of some studies (Dağlı and Ağalday, 2018; Yaman, 2011; Yardımcı, 2010), no meaningful difference is found between the perceptions of employees on paternalistic leadership with regard to marital status. Even though there is no meaningful difference detected in the moral, authoritarian and exploitative leadership sub-dimensions in relation to the marital status, it can be stated that the perceptions of married teachers are more positive compared to the perceptions of single teachers. In general, marital status can be said to have an effect only on the benevolent leadership. On the other hand, no meaningful difference is reached between the perceptions of teachers on the paternalistic leadership behaviours of their headmasters in all of the dimensions, in relation to the trade union membership and seniority variables. In other words, perceptions of teachers are quite similar to one another in this regard.

Following suggestions can be put forward for executives and researchers based on the findings obtained as a result of this research:

1. Primary school headmasters should manifest relatively more benevolent and moral leadership behaviours towards teachers.
2. Primary school headmasters should meet with teachers one-to-one periodically, should attend to special occasions of teachers such as the wedding ceremony, funeral, birthday, graduation etc., and should support the teachers in their daily problems (personal issues, family life and so on.).
3. Primary school headmasters should not insist on approaching teachers with bachelor's and master's degrees, who have relatively lower perception levels on benevolent leadership, to support them, should give the impression that the support does not stem from the inadequacy of the said teachers, but rather from the family environment intended to be created in the school. On the other hand, they should also manifest benevolent behaviours towards single teachers as well, given that perception of single teachers on the benevolent leadership is lower than that of married teachers.
4. Primary school headmasters should not hinder female teachers from expressing their contradictory views and should not expect commitment as a result of the close contact they will be establishing with female teachers.
5. Similar researches can be conducted in district or districts level by the expansion of sample size.
6. Similar researches can be conducted by the use of qualitative methods and techniques.
7. In view of the fact that studies focusing on the paternalistic leadership behaviours of headmasters are very limited, relationship between the paternalistic leadership behaviours of headmasters and different organizational variables can be researched.

REFERENCES

- Akdeniz, M. Z. (2016). *Paternalistik Liderlik ve Örgütsel Adaletin Çalışanların Mutluluklarına Olan Etkisi: Sağlık sektöründe Bir Uygulama*. Unpublished master's thesis, Bahçeşehir University Institute of Social Sciences, İstanbul.
- Aksoy, B. (2008). *The Relationship between Paternalistic Leadership, Empowerment and Turnover Intention: An empirical study*. Unpublished master's thesis, Marmara University Institute of Social Sciences, İstanbul.
- Arslan, Ö. (2016). *Okul Yöneticilerinin Paternalist Liderlik Düzeyleri ile Öğretmenlerin Örgütsel Sınızm Algıları Arasındaki İlişki*. Unpublished master's thesis, Uşak University, Institute of Social Sciences, Uşak.

- Asyalı, E. and Cerit, A. G. (2014). Paternalistic Leadership: A Preliminary Study on Maritime Students. Maritime Education Summit.
- Aycan, Z. (2001). Human Resource Management in Turkey: Current Issues and Future Challenges. *International Journal of Manpower*, 22(3), 252-260.
- Aycan, Z. (2006). Paternalism: Towards Conceptual Refinement and Operationalization. In Yang, K.S., Hwang, K.K., ve Kim, U. (Eds.). *Scientific Advances in Indigenous Psychologies: Empirical, Philosophical, And Cultural Contributions* (pp. 445-466), London: Cambridge University Press.
- Aycan, Z. and Fikret-Paşa, S. (2003). Careerchoices, Job Selection Criteria, and Leadership Preferences in a Transitional Nation: The case of Turkey. *Journal of Career Development*, 30(2), 29-144.
- Aycan, Z., Kanungo, R. N., Mendonca, M. Yu, K., Deller, J. Stahl, G., et al. (2000). Impact of Culture on Human Resource Management Practices: A Ten Country Comparison. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 49(1), 192-220.
- Aydıntan, B. (2016). Relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Paternalistic Leadership: A Field Study on the Turkish University Students. *International Journal of Business and Management Invention*, 5(12), 98-102.
- Cerit, Y. (2012). Paternalistik Liderlik ile Yöneticiden ve İşin Doğasından Doyum Arasındaki İlişki. *Ondokuz Mayıs University Journal of Education Faculty*, 31(2), 35-56.
- Cerit, Y. (2013). Paternalist Liderlik ile Öğretmenlere Yönelik Yıldırma Davranışları Arasındaki İlişki. *Educational Sciences: Theory &Practice*, 13(2), 839-851.
- Cesur, D. K. (2015). *Paternalist Liderlik ve Örgüt Kültürü İlişkisi: Sakarya Üniversitesi Örneği*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Sakarya University, Institute of Social Sciences, Sakarya.
- Cheng, B. S. (1995a). *The Relationship between Parent's Authority and Leadership Behaviors: A Case Study of President of a Taiwanese Enterprise*. Report on Special Topics, National Science Committee.
- Cheng, B. S. (1995b). Choxuegeju and Chinese Organizational Behaviour. *Indigenous Psychological Research in Chinese Societies*, 3, 142-219.
- Cheng, B. S. (1995c). Paternalistic Authority and Leadership: A Case Study of a Taiwanese CEO. *Bulletin of the Institute of Ethnology Academic Sinica*, 79, 119-173.
- 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, 89-117.
- Çalışkan, S. C. (2008). *Yöneticilerin Bireysel Yetkinliklerinin Liderlik Tarzları ve Lider Üye Etkileşimine Verdikleri Önem Üzerindeki Etkileri ve Bu Etkileşimde Kültürel Varsayımların Rolü*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Marmara University, Institute of Social Sciences, İstanbul.
- Dağlı, A. and Ağalday, B. (2017). Developing A Headmasters' paternalistic Leadership Behaviours Scale in Turkey. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 8(30), 190-200.
- Dağlı, A. and Ağalday, B. (2018). Okul Müdürlerinin Paternalist Liderlik Davranışlarının İncelenmesi. *Electronic Journal of Social Sciences*, 17(66), 518-534.

- Erben, G. S. and 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.
- Erkuş, A., Tabak, A. ve Yaman, T. (2010). Paternalist (babacan) Liderlik Çalışanların Örgütsel Özdeşleşmelerini ve İşten Ayrılma Niyetlerini Etkiler Mi? Bir Özel Hastane Uygulaması. 9. *National Business Congress*, Karaelmas University, Zonguldak.
- Farh, J. L. and 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. 94-127). London: Macmillan.
- Farh, J. L., Cheng, B. S., Chou, L. F. and Chu, X. P. (2006). Authority and Benevolence: Employees' responses to Paternalistic Leadership in China. in: A.S. Tsui, Y. Bian ve L. Cheng (eds.). *China's Domestic Private Firms: Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Management and Performance*: 230-260. New York: Sharpe.
- Gelfand, M. J., Erez, M. and Aycan, Z. (2007). Cross-cultural Organizational Behavior. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58, 479-514.
- Green, S. B. and Salkind, N. J. (2005). *Using SPSS for Windows and Macintosh: Analyzing and Understanding data*(4th edition). New Jersey: Pearson.
- Hayek, M., Novicevic, M. M., Humphreys, J. and Jones, N. (2010). Ending the Denial of Slavery in Management History: Paternalistic Leadership of Joseph Emory Davis. *Journal of Management History*, 16(3), 367-379.
- Higgs, M. (2002). How Can We Make Sense of Leadership in the 21st Century. *The Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 24(5), 273-284.
- Karasar, N. (2005). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Kaygısız, E. (2015). *The Relationship between Paternalistic Leadership Leader-member Exchange (lmx) and Jobstress*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Yeditepe University, Institute of Social Sciences, İstanbul.
- Kim, U. M. (1994). *Significance of Paternalism and Communalism. In the occupational welfare System of Korean firms: A National Survey*. In U. Kim, H.C. Triandis, C.
- Liang, S., Ling, H. and Hsieh, S. (2007). The Mediating Effects of Leader-member Exchange Quality to Influence the Relationships between Paternalistic Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. *Journal of American Academy of Business*. 2(10), 127-137.
- Macit, G. (2010). *İletişim Tarzları Üzerinde Kültürel Değerlerin Etkisi: Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Öğrencileri Üzerine Bir Araştırma*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Süleyman Demirel University Institute of Social Sciences, Isparta.
- Mamatoğlu, N. (2010). Lider Davranışları Algıları ve Örgütsel Kimliklenme Boyutları Arasında Çalışanın Kişilik Özelliklerinin Düzenleyici Rolü. *Turkish Journal of Psychology*, 25(65), 82-97.
- Mete, Y. A. and Serin, H. (2015). Okul Yöneticilerinin Babacan Liderlik Davranışı ile Öğretmenlerin Örgütsel Vatandaşlık ve Örgütsel Sinizm Davranışları Arasındaki İlişki. *HAYEF Journal of Education*, 12(24), 147-159.

- Pellegrini E. K. and Scandura T. A. (2006). Leader-member Exchange (LMX), Paternalism and Delegation in the Turkish Business Culture: An Empirical Investigation. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37(2), 264-279.
- Pellegrini, E.K. and Scandura, T. A. (2008). Paternalistic Leadership: A Review and Agenda for Future Research. *Journal of Management*, 34, 566-593.
- Pellegrini, E. K., Scandura, T. A. and Jayaraman, V. (2010). Cross-Cultural Generalizability of Paternalistic Leadership: An Expansion of Leader-member Exchange Theory (LMX). *Group and Organization Management*, 35, 391-420.
- Redding, S. G. (1990). *The spirit of Chinese capitalism*. New York: NY: Walter de Gruyter & Co.
- Redding, S. G., Norman, A. and Schlander, A. (1994). The Nature of Individual Attachment to theory: A Review of East Asian Variations. Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology. Triandis, H. C., M. D. Dunnett and L. M. Hough. CA, USA, Consulting Psychology Press: 674-688. Saher, N., Naz, S., Tasleem.
- Saher, N., Naz, S., Tasleem, I., Naz, R. and Kausar, S. (2013). Does Paternalistic Leadership Lead to Commitment? Trust in Leader as Moderator in Pakistani context. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 5(1), 443-455.
- Silin, R. H. (1976). *Leadership and Value: The Organization of Large-scale Taiwan Enterprises*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- Sinha, J. P. (1990). *A Model of Effective Leadership Styles in India*, in: A. M. Jaeger and R. N. Kanungo (eds.), *Management in developing countries* (Routledge, New York, NY), 252-263.
- Tezbaşaran, A. (1997). *Likert Tipi Ölçek Hazırlama Kılavuzu*. Ankara: Türk Psikologlar Derneği.
- Tuncer, G. (2005). *The Self in Family Context and Traditional Family Values on Behaviours toward Paternalistic Leadership Style*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Koç University Institute of Social Sciences, İstanbul.
- Türesin, H. (2012). *Örgüt Çalışanlarının Paternalistik Liderlik Algıları, Öğrenilmiş Güçlülük Düzeyleri İş Tatmin Düzeyleri ve İşten Ayrılma Niyetleri Arasındaki İlişkilerin İncelenmesi*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Celal Bayar University, Institute of Social Sciences, Manisa.
- Wasti, S. A., Tan, H. H., Brower, H. H. and Önder, Ç. (2007). Cross-Cultural Measurement of supervisor trust worthiness: An Assessment of Measurement Invariance Across Three Cultures. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18, 477-489.
- Westwood, R. I. (1997). Harmony and Patriarchy: The Cultural Basis for Paternalistic Headship among the Overseas Chinese. *Organization Studies*, 18, 445-480.
- Westwood, R. I. and Chan, A. (1992). *Headship and Leadership*. in: R. I. Westwood (Ed.), *Organizational Behavior-Southeast Asian Perspectives* (pp. 118-143). Jurong, Singapore: Addison Wesley Longman Asia.
- Yaman, T. (2011). *Yöneticilerin Paternalist (babacan) Lider Davranışlarının Çalışanların Örgütsel Özdeşleşmelerine, İş Performanslarına ve İşten Ayrılma Niyetlerine Etkisi: Özel Sektörde Uygulama*. Unpublished Master's thesis, Military Academy, Ankara.

Examining Paternalistic Leadership Behaviours of Primary School Principals Based on the Teachers Perceptions in Turkey

- Yardımcı, C. (2010). *Paternalist Liderlik Davranışlarının İş Tatmini Üzerindeki Etkisi: Bankacılık Sektörü Üzerinde Bir Uygulama*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Hacettepe University, Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara.
- Zhao, S. (1994). Human resource management in China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 32(2), 3-12.