Investigation Relational Levels of Intensity Between Paternalistic and Servant Leadership Styles and National Culture, Organizational Commitment and Subordinate Responses or Reactions to The Leaders Style

Seyfi TOP[a*], Ercan ÖGE[b**] Özlem ATAN[c***] Sefer GÜMÜŞ[d****]

[a,b]İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi, Florya Yerleşkesi
[c]İstanbul HaliçÜniversitesi, Haliç Yerleşkesi
[d] BeykenÜniversitesi, Ayazağa Yerleşkesi

Abstract

Leadership is a kind of behavior style that shows priority related to task and duty or people and human realize the objective The aim of this study is to examine how the level of relations among the paternalistic and servant leadership styles over traditional national culture (TNC), organizational commitment (OC) and subordinate response (SR) and how strong the level of relations between these two leadership style in terms of the reactions of SR, the impact of the TNC and OC in Turkey or visa versa. We will seek to explore the ongoing discussion on servant and paternalistic leadership that affect differently on the dimension of TNC, OC and SR. There are important relations between them. To be more meaningful we can rank these relations in itself from the strongest or intensive to the weakest relations. The strongest relations are between the subordinate response and the servant leadership; between the traditional national cultural reflection on the leadership and organizational commitment; between the organizational commitment and the subordinate response; between the servant leadership style and the paternalistic leadership style. The weakest relations are between the traditionsl national culture and paternalistic leadership, servant leadership and subordinate response; between the servant leadership and the organizatioanal commitment.

Keywords: *Paternalistic, Servant Leadership Style, Traditional National Culture, Organizational Commitment Subordinate response*

1.Introduction.

Since 1990, development of leadership theories turned to cultural influences due to the differences in the cultures of leadership and their social environment. At the global level, researches can show different aspects of leadership based

---

*Corresponding Author: Tel: 0090 535 4303423

E-mail Adres:seyfitop @gmail.com

** Corresponding Author: Tel: 0090 542 8953299

E-mail Adres:eoge@aydin.edu.tr

***Corresponding Author: Tel: 0090 532 4223101

E-mail Adres:oatan@hotmail.com

****Corresponding Author: Tel: 0090 212 8726432

on the separation of East and West world in particular. This research movement from the perspective of a leader's and leadership behavior turned from west to the East (Kutanis and Alpaslan, 2007). Sociality specific to the East have mysticism, group motivation, followers reliability, dedication and social value-centered and satisfying (the philosophy of hedonism) motivation prominent features of the efficacy and centrality of work (Koopman et al, 1999). Whereas servant leadership shows altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship. In the past, most research on leadership styles have focused on the Western context, and have paid less attention to leadership styles developed in the Eastern context. The research of paternalistic and servant leadership have been become one of the important and central part of the literature on management and organizational behavior for several decades (Schwandt and Marquardt, 2000).

2.Literature Review

2.1. Leadership and Leader

Leadership is rooted by ethical and moral teaching, leading, motivating the people to achieve the target successfully. Burns (1978) characterized leadership inducing followers to act for certain goals that represent the values and the motivations for their wants and needs. Nicholls (1987) describes leadership, as vitally concerned with what people are thinking and feeling and how they are linked to the environment, entity and to the job. More recently, Kent (2005) attempted to revisit the definition of the processes of leading and managing in a way that enables both the separation and distinction of the concepts for study as well as the integration of the concepts for practical application. Leadership in this dimesion is an art of directing enthusiasm and confidence to make subordinates tasks (Erdoğan, 1997), as an ability to guide followers toward shared goals (Bryman, 1992), as a form of influence (Hersey, 1984), as a simply something does (Fleishman, 1973), as an instrument of goal achievement (Berson et al, 2006), as a relationship to pursue common purpose (Burns 1978), as a follower interaction (Krishnan, 2002). Therefore leadership is called strategic factor for sustainable competition (Townsend and Busenitz, 2008). Leadership also represents the purposeful process of influencing follower toward goal attainment (Northouse, 2004). Therefore, leadership is very core and involves intentional influence (Hesselbein and Goldsmith, 2006). The other important theme in leadership is relationships between the leader and followers. Relationship building is the basic nature of leadership. Building relationship is fundamental characteristic of leadership that is suitable for monitoring their relation (Fairholm, 2001). Bennis (2007) also argued, "leadership is grounded in a relationship.

On the other hand leaders engage in a variety of activities and exhibit a variety of behaviors in an effort to motivate followers and coordinate their activities in a manner facilitating accomplishment of goals and objectives. The Ohio State and Michigan studies were strong representatives of the styles approach. The Ohio State studies (Hemphill and Coons, 1957) identified two types of behaviors explaining what leaders do: Leaders provide structure and nurture subordinates. At nearly the same time, the Michigan studies (Cartwrite and Zander, 1960; Likert, 1961, 1967) identified the behaviors of effective leaders to contain employee-oriented behaviors and production-oriented behaviours. Leaders, as the key decision-makers, determine the acquisition, development, and deployment of organizational resources (Zhu, et al, 2005). Zaleznik(1977) views the influence of leaders as altering moods, evoking images and expectations, and in establishing specific desires and objectives. Leader is defined as a person bringing together members of the group and directs them to the objectives of the group (Erdoğan, 1997). The leader decides the objectives, provides tools, establishes communication through the implementation phase (Grint, 2001) and motivator (Britt, et al, 2001) and people who do the right thing (Bennis and Nanus (1985).

2.2.Paternalistic Leadership Style

PL is originated from Eastern context and is a positive value which is highly accepted by Japanese (Liu, 2013) and Chinese employees (Chen et al, 2011). PL also is the prevalent leadership style in the soughtestern countries business organizations. Especially Chinese society trust should play a critical role in explaining how paternalistic leaders can motivate followers to meet high performance standards (Chen et al, 2011). PL marks the Chinese style of leadership, combining strong discipline and authority with fatherly benevolence and moral integrity. Affective trust signifies a strong personal bond and felt positive emotions toward the trustee (McAllister, 1995). This is a special relationship based on and considers the relationship partner's genuine care and concern for one's well-being. (Chen et al, 2011).

There are some studies in this area that belong to Silin (1976) and Redding (1990). Westwood (1997) also proposed a model of paternalistic leadership that is manifest in a context characterized by centralization, low formalization, harmony building, and personalism via the following nine stylistic elements of paternalistic headship (Cheng, 1995a, 1995b) : (1) didactic leadership; (2) non-specific intentions; (3) reputation building; (4) protection of dominance ; (5) political manipulation; (6) patronage and nepotism; (7) conflict diffusion; (8) aloofness and social distance; and (9) dialogue ideal. Farh and Cheng (2000) reviewed all the research conducted since Silin's (1976). PL as a style that combines strong discipline and authority with fatherly benevolence and moral integrity couched in a personalistic atmosphere. Authoritarianism refers to a leader's behavior that asserts absolute authority and control over subordinates and demands unquestionable obedience from subordinates. Specifically, authoritarian leadership behaviors, referred to as li-wei (awe- and fear-inspiring), would induce employee compliance because authoritarianism is part of the Confucian value system that "higher ups govern, lower ranks obey" (Beamer, 1998).

2.3. Servant Leadership Style

Servant leadership is an emerging approach to leadership and service (Spears, 1996). Also SL is attracting audience throughout a wide variety of organizations today. This growing interest is fueled by changes taking place in the workplace and in the society at large. Though SL has been written and practiced by several in the past few years that it has not been studied in a systematic manner (Laub, 1999). SL promotes the valuing and development of people, the building of community, the practice of authenticity, the providing of leadership. SL also share power and status for the common good of each individual and the total organization which those served by the organization. Greenleaf (1977) originally simply defined servant leadership as where the great leader is seen as servant first. Refining Greenleaf's vision, Spears (1996:33) characterized servant leadership as one which is based on teamwork and community; one which seeks to involve others in decision making; one which is strongly based in ethical and caring behavior; and one which is enhancing the growth of people. However Laub (1999) defined servant leadership as an understanding and practice of leadership that places the good of those led over the self-interest of the leader. Servant leaders also have been described as having an ability to invoke organizational wisdom, fold experience and knowledge into decision-making to make pro-social choices and also possessing many of the characteristics of transformational leaders but moving beyond those behaviors by aligning motives and values with followers (Barbuto and Gifford, 2010). Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) clarified the servant leadership construct with a comprehensive critique of the literature and developed a measure for a revised construct and identified five dimensions of servant leadership: altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship.

Altruistic Calling: Bass (2000) suggested that one of the key differences between transformational leaders and servant leaders was the intent of the leader. Servant leaders are likely to exhibit more altruistic motives. Greenleaf's (1970) original conception of servant leaders argued that a conscious choice is made to serve others, which was contrary to the notion that leaders pursue such positions with the intention of leading others. Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) operationally defined altruistic calling as having both desire and willingness to put aside self-interest in order to benefit followers. Emotional Healing: Primarily due to the tremendous influence of transformational leadership theory, meta-analysis by Yukl, Taber and Gordon (2002). Kotter (1990) stated, "leadership by contrast is about coping with change".

2.4. Subordinate Response

SR is the behavior of subordinate that showing their leaders how they are affected from them. Subordinates percept fairly trust about their leaders during interpersonal enactments of formal procedures. It also includes interpersonal justice in terms of interpersonal treatment. Perceived interactional justice reflects subordinates' feelings of whether their superiors treat them with truthfulness, justification, respect, and propriety. Subordinate response has three strict dimension provided by Farh and Cheng (2000), identification and imitation, compliance without dissent and gratitude and repayment. Identification and Imitation: Identification and imitation refers to respecting and identifying with the supervisor's behaviors and values, and being willing to imitate them. Seven items were used, and the Compliance without dissent is concerned with whether or not subordinates obey and follow the supervisor's command completely. Gratitude and repayment is concerned with whether or not the subordinate is influenced by the supervisor's benevolence and is willing to strive to repay it, even if it requires self-sacrifice.

2.5. Reflection of Traditional National Culture on The Leadership

The culture in any organization is influenced by TNC. Thus, national cultural values will be mirror to the leadership style. The people who follow the leader show behavior under the national cultural habit and interaction leadership style in terms of relation. Considering that the interaction with the culture of the organization on leadership behaviors, culture is one of the important factor about the leadership behavior. (leaders use the values of the society that they are a part of) Shane (1992) makes an important observation about this phenomenon. Each people and leader represents a different social culture (Elenkov, et al, 2005). In traditional Chinese societies, rights were unequal between superiors and subordinates, and superiors demanded compliance, respect, and trust in authority from subordinates. They accept the traditional values that help them adapt to modern life, but discard traditional values that are unsuitable.

Cheng and Farh's (2001) research shows the points to a similar conclusion. They surveyed employees of Taiwanese and Chinese business organizations and found that despite relatively lower scores in authoritarianism, employees both in Taiwan and China had high scores in granting favors and face, instrumental relationships, and familism. (Cheng et al, 2004). Social culture is an important step in understanding its importance for leadership behaviors and innovation, organizational commitment processes. They focus on socio-cultural clusters that transcend national boundaries to better capture the role of socio-cultural similarities and differences (Ronen and Shenkar, 1985; Schneider and Barsoux, 2003).

2.6. Organizational Commitment

One important characteristic of the social live is to move together and behave in team effort. To accomplish this there is a need for leadership. Leaders need to know societies cultural value better than others. This feature affects organizational commitment. In general, OC is considered as a useful measure of organizational effectiveness (Steers, 1975). In particular, "organizational commitment is a multidimensional construct that has the potential to predict organizational outcomes such as performance, turnover, absenteeism, tenure, and organizational goals (Meyer and Allen, 1997). Loui (1995). OC focuses on employees' commitment in the organization. In explaining the significance of OC, Meyer and Allen (1997) refer to Morrow and McElroy's (1993) statement that organizational commitment is the most maturely developed of all the work commitment constructs. As part of their research, Meyer and Allen (1990;1991;1997) developed a framework that was designed to measure three different types of organizational commitment: (a) Affective commitment refers to employees' emotional attachment, identification with, and involvement in the organization. Employees with a strong affective commitment stay with the organization because they want to do employee might feel both a strong attachment to an organization and a sense of obligation to remain. (b) Continuance commitment refers to employees' assessment of whether the costs of leaving the organization are greater than the costs of staying. Employees who perceive that the costs of leaving the organization are greater than the costs of staying because they need to and a second employee might enjoy working for the organization but also recognize that leaving would be very difficult from an economic standpoint. (c) Normative commitment refers to employees' feelings of obligation to the organization. Employees with high levels of normative commitment stay with the organization because they feel they ought to and fnally, a third employee might experience a considerable degree ofdesire, need, and obligation to remain with the current employe.

3. Analysis and Methodology

3.1. Sample and Data Collection

This study will seek to explore the ongoing discussion on servant and paternalistic leadership that affect dimension of TNC, OC and SR. Therefore the aim of this study is to examine how the level of relations among the paternalistic and servant leadership styles over the TNC, OC and SR. Data was collected by convenience sampling that were educated the master degree from the five Universities and at the some time working in a business. Questionnaires distributed and collected within four weeks. Respondents' confidentiality were ensured to be kept strictly and were encouraged to complete the questionnaire sincerely and voluntarily and enough time was allocated to complete the survey. In this study 500 questionnaires were distributed to the responded and 271 questionnaires were returned.

Response rate is 54 % . The study was conducted with 271 employees from different sectors including service, public, trade, industry and agriculture sectors. Results of the study were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS 17.0). About 46,9 % of the respondents were male and 53.1% were female. About 45,4% of the participants were from service sector, 36,2% from public sector, 7% from trade, 6,3% from industry and 5,2 from agriculture sector. About 21,0% of the respondents were between ages 20-25, 30,6% were between 26-30, 19,6% were between 31-35, 13,3% were between 36-40 and rest (15,5%) were at age 41 and older. Tenure of the participants was 6-10 years for 64,2%, 1-5 years for 33,6 %, 11-15 years for 1,5% and more than 16 years for 0,8%. 67,2% of the participants had a master degree and 25,5% of them were university graduates. 5,2%had a doctoral degree and 1,5% had high school degree. 0.7 of them graduated from vocational schools.

3.2. Methodology

Paternalistic leadership was measured using the PL Scale, developed by Cheng and his colleagues. The theoretical basis of paternalistic leadership began a comparison of research by Silin (1976), Redding (1990), and Westwood (1992) shows that the views and arguments of the three authors are not very contrary. However, the model of paternalistic headship introduced by Westwood is more complete and includes deeper and more extensive discussion, making it the primary basis for research throughout the following 5 years (King-Ching Hsieh, 2002, 2003a, 2003b, 2004). The scale was taken from Cheng et al. (2004). PL has three distinct dimensions named authoritarian leadership, benevolent leadership and moral leadership. However Cheng improved a number of scales for paternalistic leadership. We also revised this sub-scales each of contains five items. The scale consisted of 15 items and a five point Likert scale ranging from ''strongly disagree'' (1) to ''strongly agree'' (5) was used. Servant leadership was measured using the SL Questionnaire (SLQ). This survey instrument designed by Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) first creating a testable definition of SL ; then developing subscale items to measure 11 potential dimensions of servant leadership such as: calling, listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, growth, and community building. Servant leadership has five distinct dimensions named a altruistic calling, emotional healing, persuasive mapping, wisdom, and organizational stewardship (Trivers, 2009).The SL Questionnaire is a 20 question item and a five point Likert scale ranging from ''strongly disagree'' (1) to ''strongly agree'' (5) was used.

Subordinate response scale was developed by Cheng (2004) and we modified Cheng's (1995b) and Cheng et al.'s (1999) SR items. This scale obtains three types of SR (Cheng et al,2004). Subordinate response scale (SRS) has three strict dimension provided by Farh and Cheng (2000), identification and imitation, compliance without dissent and gratitude and repayment. SR scales revised by Cheng (2004). All the items in these scales were based on five points, in Likert scales. The moderating variable was authority orientation, which was adopted from the respect authority subscale of the traditionality sca (Cheng, 2004). The subordinate response questionnaire is 16 item and a five-point Likert scale. Traditional national cultural authority orientation was adopted from the respect authority sub scale of the traditionality scale (Yang et al,1989) and Cheng at al. (2004) revised and used his research. Scale includes 11 items. We also revised 10 item as a perception of national cultural authority orientation and behavral of national cultural authority orientation. The questionnaire is 16 item and a five-point Likert scale. Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) was considered as a measure of OC and constructed to measure employees' satisfaction and level of involvement in the organization by Porter, Steers, Mowday, and Boulian (1974). An examination of the psychometric properties of the OCQ by Mowday, Steers and Porter (1979) revealed internal consistency among the items, test-retest reliability, and evidence for the predictive validity of the instrument. Later, Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993) revised the normative commitment scale to clarify the distinction between affective commitment and normative commitment. While the earlier versions (Meyer & Allen, 1984, 1991; Allen and Meyer, 1990) of the OCQ contained 24 items (8 items for each scale), the later version by Meyer, Allen and Smith (1993) and Meyer and Allen (1997) only contained 18 items (6 items for each scale). Finally, Meyer et al. (in press) performed a meta-analysis of studies using both the 6-item and 8-item OCQ. Responses to each of the 8 items are rated using a 5-point Likert scale with anchors labeled: 1= strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree.

3.3. Reliability Analysis

Confidence tests is to be executed since confidence is assessing study's coherency and efficiency. The most common used confidence tests are "Cronbach's Alpha", "Split Test Method", "Parallel" and "Absolute Precision Parallel (Strict). Internal reliability was measured by using Cronbach's alpha coefficient resulting in 97%, split resulting in %96,0, Parallel resulting in 97,9%, Srict resulting in 97,7. Having Cronbach's Alpha value bigger than

60% is an indicator of scale and survey's success. Some researchers accept Cronbach's Alpha value bigger than %75 while some others accept it is bigger than 70%. These results present the survey has internal consistency and arguments are dependable. Furthermore; Split, Parallel and Strict tests' results are also acceptable values in each confidence interval. Sample results are consistent and reliable.

Table:1.Confidence Test Results of the Survey

Criterion	Confidence Test Results
Cronbach's Alpha	0.979
Split Test	0.960. 0.966
Parallel	0.979
Strict	0.977

3.4. Relation Analysis

The One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test procedure compares the observed cumulative distribution function for a variable with a specified theoretical distribution, which may be normal, uniform, Poisson, or exponential.Many parametric tests require normally distributed variables. The one-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test can be used to test that a variable is normally distributed. In this study explatory factor analysis applied and related factors were obtained using varimax rotation. Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test were made to the acquired factors. Factors derived from $p > 0.05$ indicating that the normality of data and than hypothesis H0 is accepted and also hypothesis H1 isn't rejected. Thus Pearson's correlation coefficient was calculated that is used the normal distribution of the sample. One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test Results is shown in table: 2.

Table 2: One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test Results

		Suberdianate Response	Traditioanal National Culture	Organizations Commitment	Paternalistic Leadership	Servant Leadership
N		271	271	271	271	271
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.067	.053	.030	.050	.058
	Positive	.038	.034	.021	.043	.051
	Negative	-.067	-.053	-.030	-.050	-.058
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		1.102	.865	.487	.831	.951
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.176	.443	.972	.495	.326

3.5. The Findings

The data obtained by this study is shown parametric dispersion of features. Parametric pearson correlation analysis which is more suitable for relation analysis was utilized to this study. In table 3: shows relational analysis result. According to result there is linear relation among all the factors which influence each other. We interpret the results as

follows: Subordinate response (SR) his or her to the managers or leaders reflects three perception about identification of their leaders or they imitate, obedience without opposition their leaders and carry a sense of gratitude and repayment. When the (SR) positively increase one unit, the (TNC) increases by 53%, organizational commitment (OC) increases by 70,9%, servant leadership (SL) style also increase by 71,7%, paternalistic leadership (PL) style increases by 63.9%. There is a positeve and quite strong and intensive relations between the subordinate response and all these factors.There is also quite strong relations between the subordinate response and paternalistic leadership. Responded perceptions shows strong relations for servant leadership than paternalistic leadership. At the same time it is seen that there are strong relations between the SR and OC.

When TNC reflection over the leadership increase one unit, (OC) increases by 59,9 %, the SL style also increase by 33%, the (PL) style increases by 32.7% and subordinate response increases by 53%. There is a positeve and quite strong relations between the traditional national cultural reflection on the leadership and subordinate response and organization commitment. There are also quite weak relations between traditional national cultural reflection on the leadership style the subordinate response and paternalistic leadership. We can evaluate this results traditional national cultural don't effects leadership style very well. There is weak relation between the traditional national cultural reflection and the two kind of leadership style (servant and paternalistic) according to subordinate response and organization commitment. Traditional national culture doesn't influence both of SL and PL style very well.

Table: 3.Pearson Correlation Analysis of The Relationship Results

Correlations

		SR	TNC	OC	SL	PL
SR	Pearson Correlation	1	.530 **	.709 **	.717 **	.639 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	270	270	269	270	270
TNC	Pearson Correlation	.530 **	1	.599 **	.330 **	.327 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000	.000	.000
	N	270	271	270	271	271
OC	Pearson Correlation	.709 **	.599 **	1	.576 **	.588 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.	.000	.000
	N	269	270	270	270	270
SL	Pearson Correlation	.717 **	.330 **	.576 **	1	.731 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.	.000
	N	270	271	270	271	271
PL	Pearson Correlation	.639 **	.327 **	.588 **	.731 **	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.
	N	270	271	270	271	271

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

When (OC) increase one units, the (SR) increases by 70,9%, the (TNC) reflection on the leadership increase by 59,9%, the(SL) increase by 56,7%, and (PL) style increases by %58.8. There is a positeve and quite strong and intensive relations between the (OC) and (TNC). We can say that traditional national culture affect organizational commitment on the leadership. PL style is less preferred than SL style. There is also strong relation between (OC) and the (PL), (SL) and the (TNC). The strongest relation is between organizational commiments and subordinate

responses. When the (SL) style increase one unit the (TNC) reflection on the leadership increase by 33,3% the (OC) increases by 57,6%, the (SR) increases by 71.7% and the (PL) style increases by 73.1%. SL is associated with PL , both two kind of leaderhip close to each other and relation is very intensive. This means both of leadership style percept the more or less similarly by the responded. There is a positeve and quite weak relations between the (TNC) and servant leadership. There is also good relation between the (SL) and (OC). There is also very strong relation between servant leadership and paternalistic leadership.

When (PL) style of relations increases one unit the (SR) increases by 63,9%, the (OC) increases by 58,8%, the (TNC) reflection on the leadership increase by 32,7%, and (SL) style increase by 73.1%. There is quite strong relationship between the paternalistic leadership and the OC and SR. The strongest relationship is between the paternalistic leadership style and the servant leadership style. According to the responders there is no difference between the PL and SL. Leadership is equal PL and SL. There is a positeve and weak relations between (PL), style and the (TNC) reflection on the leadership. The weakest relationship is between the paternalistic leadership style the traditional national culture. These are very interesting findings. Because there is strong relationship between the PL and TNC. National culture reflect over the PL

Conclusion

This study sought to explore the ongoing discussion on servant and paternalistic leadership that affect relations between the TNC, OC and SR. According to these results, there are positive relations all among factors that affect each other. When we can rank these relations in it self from the strongest to the weakest relations levels. The strong correlation factors can be grouped as follows: In term of this study, there are the strongest relations between the SR and SL; between the traditional national cultural reflection on the leadership and organizational commitment; between the organizational commitment and the subordinate response; between the servant leadership style and the paternalistic leadership style. On the otherhand the factors showing relatively weak correlation can be grouped as follows: There are the weakest relations between the traditionsl national culture and paternalistic leadership, servant leadership and subordinate response; between the servant leadership and the organizatioanal commitment. These results assessing as belows:

1.In term of this study, one of the strongest relation is between the SR and the SL. We assess SL style reflect behavior altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship to their subordinate and subordinates also may be willing to imitate their leaders, the compliance without dissent, gratitude and repayment. SL perceptions by the subordinate both relational and task-oriented behaviors of leaders or managers are increase when SR increase positively. SL promotes the valuing and development of people, the practice of authenticity, the providing of leadership for the good of those led and the sharing of power and status for the common good of each individual. Subordinate shows positive relational response for servant leader's behaviors**.**

2. The another strongest relationship is between the TNC reflection on the leadership and the (OC). These strongest relations may be result TNC of outstanding features of cultural values are high power range, authority kept on top of the organizations and centralized decision-making and cultural values are favor humane helpful, friendly, tolerant an affectionate. Perception of these features by the subordinate positively change the relation of OC levels. We can say that Turkish leaders are influenced by national cultural and OC also is influenced by leaders and natioanal culture.The other side of TNC includes protective authority with leading features, leaders who can control and at the same time there is a serious discipline leads to the expectation. In this case we can say that TNC creating a sense of belonging that influence the organizational commitment. When one of these factor change positively the other factor also change positively too.

3. The other result of strongest relationship is between OC and SR. The value of affective and normative commitment of OC is an emotional feeling that reflects subordinate respecting and identifying with the supervisor's behaviors and values and the supervisor's benevolence and is willing to strive to repay. There is emotional perception between the OC and SR and employees are most satisfied when they perceive their supervisors as exhibiting both relational and task-oriented behaviors.

4. The other result of strongest relationship is between SL and PL. Servant leaders bring a service-oriented approach to leadership that is manifested by enabling followers to grow and develop. We can evaluate both of these type of leadership is similiar to from the point of responded views. According to responded perceptions there isn't any difference bettween these two kinds of leadership styles. These two kinds of leadership styles influence each other at the same level of relational power. Servant and paternalistic leadership styles influence the subordinate's perception about management practice at the same.

5. On the otherhand, we evaluate the weakest relations between the TNC and SR, PL and SL. One of the interesting findings of the study is the relation of TNC and SR. This is a very interesting finding because there is strong relationship between the PL and TNC theoretically. In terms of employee response, TNC didn't help to take a model that apply to or at least pretend that successful business leaders as a model. Therefore it can be said that the part of PL obedience without opposition and express gratitude are the weakest sense of cultural values.We evaluated that these relations isn't more influenced by TNC values. Another interesting result is both paternalistic and as well as the style of servant leadership with TNC didn't affect no more each other. Although there is a positive correlation between them it didn't reflect TNC very well as in eastern culture. It can be said that TNC values and behavirol heritage is no position to make a difference of leadership perceptions and influence their behavior.

We can say, the leaders shows both of PLand SL style to investigate their subordinates' trust orientation, respect their personality and capability, and avoid unfavorable leadership behaviors to them. Second, in order to maintain leader employee relationships positively, based on their own relations instead of the actual interest. Third, the importance of characters entails the leaders to be righteous and unselfish to set an example of morality, which can induce subordinates' identification and imitation. Lastly, the leaders who employ an integrated leadership style about the PL and SL.

References

Barbuto, J. E., & Wheeler, D. W. (2006). Scale development and construct clarification of servant leadership. *Group & Organization Management, 31*(3), 300-326.
Barbuto, J. E., & Gifford, G. T. (2010). Examining gender differences of servant leadership: An analysis of the agentic and communal properties of the Servant Leadership Questionnaire. *Journal of Leadership Education, 9*(2),4-21.
Bass, B. (2000). The future of leadership in learning organizations. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 7,* 18-40.
Beamer, L. (1998). Bridging business cultures. *China Business Review,* May-June: 54-58.
Bennis, Warren and Burt Nanus (1985). *Leaders, The Strategies for Taking Charge*. New York: Harper and Rowe.
Bennis, W. G., & Nanus, B. (2007). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.
Berson, Yair, Nemanich,Louise A., Waldman, David A. Galvin, Benjamin M. and Keller, Robert T. (2006). Leadership and Organizational Learning: A Multiple Levels Perspective , *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol:17 (577–594).
Britt, T. W., Adler, A. B., & Bartone, P. T. (2001). Deriving benefits from stressful events: The role of engagement in meaningful work and ardiness. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 6,*53–63.
Bryman, A. (1992). *Charisma and leadership in organizations*. London: Sage.
Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership.* New York: Harper & Row.
Cartwrite, D. & Zander, A. (1960). *Group dynamics—research and theory*. Evanston, IL: Row Peterson.
Castaneda, M., Nahavandi, A. (1991). Link of manager behavior to supervisor performance rating and subordinate satisfaction. *Group & Organization Management*, *16*, 357-366.
Chen Xiao-Ping, Marion B. Eberly, Ting-Ju Chiang, Jiing-Lih Farh and Bor-Shiuan Cheng (2011) Affective Trust in Chinese Leaders: Linking Paternalistic Leadership to Employee Performance" *Journal of Management* Vol. XX No. X,(1-25).
Cheng, B.-S. (1995a). Difference structure and Chinese organizational behavior. *Indigenous Psychological Research in Chinese Societies, 3*, 142-219.
Cheng, B.-S. (1995b). The relationship between paternalistic authority and leadership: A case of a private enterprises owner in Taiwan. *Bulletin of the Institute of Ethnology Academia Sinica, 79*(12), 119-173.
Cheng, B. S. & Farh, J. L. (2001). Social orientation in Chinese societies: a comparison of employees from Taiwan and Chinese Mainland. Chinese Journal of Psychology, 43, 207–221 (in Chinese).

Cheng, Bor Shiuan, Chou, Li Fang, Yu Wu, Huan, Tsung Ming Ping and Lih Farh, Jiing (2004). Paternalictic Leadership and Subordinate Responses: Establishing A Leadership Model in Chinese Organizations. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol:7 (89-117).

Chua, R. Y. J., Ingram, P., & Morris, M. (2008). From the head and the heart: Locating cognition and affect-based trust in managers' professional networks. *Academy of Management Journal, 51*(3), 436–452.

Elenkov, Detelın S., Judge, Wıılliam and Wright,Peter (2005). *Strategıc Leadershıp And Executıve Innovatıon Influence: An Internatıonal Multı-Cluster Comparatıve Study Strategic Management Journal,* Vol:26: 665–682.

Erdoğan,İ. (1997). *İşletmelerde Davranış*, Dönence Basın ve Yayın, İstanbul.

Fairholm, Matthew R. (2001). The Themes and Theory of Leadership James MacGregor Burns and the Philosophy of Leadership. Working Paper CR01-01 The George Washington University Center for Excellence in Municipal Management, http://www.unc.edu/~mmb/cemm%20web/pdf_Files/ Burnsand. pdf_01082008

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. 85–127).London: Macmillan.

Fleishman, E. A. (1973). *Twenty years of considerationand structure. In E. A. Fleishman & J. G. Hunt (Eds.),Current developments in the study of leadership (pp. 1-40).Carbondale,* IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1970). *The Servant as Leader*. Indianapolis, IN: Greenleaf Center.

Greenleaf, R.K. (1977). *Servant Leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness.* Mahway, NJ: Paulist Press.

Grint, K. (2001). *Leadership: Classical, Contemporary and Critical Approaches*, Oxford University Press, New York.

Hemphill, J. K., Coons, A. E. (1957). Development of the leader behavior description questionnaire. In R. M. Stogdill & A. E. Coons (Eds.), *Leader behavior: Its description and measurement* (pp. 6-38). Columbus: The Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research.

Hersey,Paul (1984). *The Situational Leader,* Escondido, CA: Center for Leadership Studies.

Hesselbein, Frances and Goldsmith, Marshall (2006). The Leader of the Future 2: Visions, Strategies, And Practices for the New Era, Jossey-Bass Inc Pub.

Hsieh, K.-C. (2000). Paternalistic leadership in Chinese organization: Research prospects. *Indigenous Psychological Research in Chinese Societies, 13*, 181-186.

Hsieh, K.-C. (2002). *An analysis and comprehension on leader type paternalistic style in elementary scho* (NSC 91-2413-H-134-003). Taipei, Taiwan: National Science Council.

Hsieh, K.-C. (2003a). Analysis of the connotation of paternalistic style (pp. 73-94). *Proceedings of the Second academic symposium of educational leadership and development*. Taipei, Taiwan: The Graduate School of Educational Leadership & Development at Fu-Jen Catholic University.

Hsieh, K.-C. (2003b). *Analysis of the connotation of paternalistic style and the establishment of its adaptation patterns ( )* (NSC 93-2413-H-134-006). Taipei, Taiwan: National Science Council.

Hsieh, K.-C. (2004). *Analysis of the connotation of paternalistic style and the establishment of its adaptation patterns (II)* (NSC 93-2413-H-134-007). Taipei, Taiwan: National Science Council.

Kent, T.W. (2005). Leading and managing: It takes two to tango. *Management Decision,* Vol 43, Iss (7/8), pp. 1010-1017.

Koopman, P. L., Hartog D. N., Konrad, E. And et al. (1999). National Culture and Leadership Profiles in Europe: Some Results From the Globe Study, *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8(4).

Kotter, J. P. (2001). *Matsushita Liderliği*, Çev. Tevfik Ertan, Sistem Yayıncılık.

Krishnan, Venkat R. (2002). Transformational Leadership and Value System Congruence. *International Journal of Value-Based Management.* Vol: 15 (19-33).

Kutanis, Rana Özen ve Alpaslan, Sümeyra (2007). Bir Doğu Liderliğinin Metaforik Analizi: Konosuke Matsushita.*15. Ulusal Yönetim Ve Organizasyon Kongresi Bildiriler Kitabı.*Sakarya Üniversitesi. Sakarya (25-33).

Laub, James Alan (1999). Development of The Organızational Leadership Assessment (OLA) Instrument . *Ed.D. A Brief Synopsis of a Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of The College of Education in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education Florida Atlantic University.* Boca Raton, Florida.

Laub, J. (2004). Defining Servant Leadership: A Recommended Typology for Servant Leadership Studies. *Proceedings of the 2004 Servant Leadership ResearchRoundtable*.

Likert, R. (1961). *New patterns of management*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Likert, R. (1967). *The human organization: Its management and value*. New York:McGraw-Hill.

Liu,Yu,(2013). Exploring the Impact of Organizational Culture on Paternalistic Leadership in Chinese SMEs, *Proceedings of 3rd Asia-Pacific Business Research Conference 25 - 26 February, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, ISBN: 978-1-922069-19-1.*

Loui, K. (1995). Understanding employee commitment in the public organization: A study of the juvenile detention center. *International Journal of Public Administration. 18* (8), 1269-1295.

Madlock, P.E. (2008). The link between leadership style, communicator competetence, and employee satisfaction. *Journal of Business Communication,* 45 (1), 61-78.

McAllister, D. J. (1995). Affect- and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal,* 38.24-59.

Meyer, J. & Allen, N. (1984). Testing the 'side-bet theory' of organizational commitment: Some methodological considerations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 69*, 372-378.

Meyer, J., Allen, N., & Gellatly, I. (1990). Affective and continuance commitment to the organization: Evaluation of measures and analysis of concurrent and time-lagged relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*, 710-720.

Meyer, J. & Allen, N. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review, 1*(1), 61-89.

Meyer J P, Allen N J and Smith, C. (1993). Commitment to Organizations and Occupations: Extension and Test of a Three-component Conceptualization, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 78, pp. 538-551.

Meyer, J, & Allen, N. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Morrow, P. & McElroy, J. (1993). Introduction: Understanding and managing loyalty in a multicommitment world. *Journal of Business Research, 26*, 1-2.

Mowday, R.T., Steers, R.M. and Porter, L.W. (1979). The Measurement of Organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. Vol:14. 224-227.

Nicholls, John (1987). Leadership in Organizations: Meta, Macro and Micro. *European Management Journal*. Volume.6 No.1.

Northouse, P. (2004). *Leadership: Theory and practice,*(3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Özkan-Canbolat, Ela, Beraha,Aydın Çeliksoy, Emine ve Türker, Yücel (2010). Türk Liderlik Profili: Türk Siyasi Liderleri Üzerine Niteliksel Bir Çalışma. *Sosyal Ve Beşeri Bilimler Dergisi,* Cilt:2, Sayı:2, (37-45).

Porter, L.W., Steers,R.M., Mowday, R.T. and Boulian, P.V. (1974). Organizational Commitment, job satisfaction and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Vol.59,603-609.

Redding, S. G. (1990). *The spirit of Chinese capitalism*. New York: NY: Walter de Gruyter & Co.

Ronen, S., Shenkar, O. (1985). Clustering countries on attitudinal dimensions: a review and synthesis. *Academy of Management Review.* 10(3): 435–454.

Schneider, S.C., Barsoux, J.L.(2003). *Managing across Cultures*. Pearson Education: Harlow, UK.

Schwandt, D. & Marquardt, M. (2000). *Organizational learning from world-class theories to global best practices*. New York: St. Lucie Press.

Shane, S.A. (1992). Why do some societies invent more than others? *Journal of Business Venturing,* 7(1): 29–46.

Silin, R. H. (1976). *Leadership and value: The organization of large-scale Taiwan enterprises*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

Spears, L. (1996). Reflections on Robert K. Greenleaf and servant-leadership.*Leadership &Organization Development Journal, 17*(7), 33-35.

Steers, R. (1975). Problems in the measurement of organizational effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 20*, 546-558.

Townsend, David M. and Lowell, W. Busenitz (2008). Factor Payments, Resource-Based Bargaining and The Creation of Firm Wealth in Technology-Based Ventures, *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal,* Vol: 2 (339–355).

Trivers, G.A. (2009). Servant Leadership effects on trust and organizational citizenship behaviors, *A Dissertation Doctod of Business Administration*, Faculty of Argosy University Seattle.

Westwood, R. I. (1992). Culture, cultural differences, and organizational behavior. In R. I. Westwood (Ed.), *Organizational behavior - Southeast Asian perspectives* (pp. 27-62). Jurong, Singapore: Addison Wesley Longman Asia.

Westwood, R. I. (1997). *Harmony and patriarchy: The cultural basis for paternalistic headship among overseas Chinese.* Organization Studies, 18, 445–480.

Yang, K. S. Yu, A. B., & Yeh, M. H. (1989). Chinese individual modernity and traditionality: Construct definition and measurement. In K. S. Yang & A. B. Yu (Eds.), *Chinese psychology and behavior*: 241-306. Taipei, Taiwan: Laureat

Yukl, G. (1989). *Leadership in Organizations,* Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Yukl, G., Gordon, A., & Taber, T. (2002). A Hierarchical Taxonomy of Leadership Behavior: Integrating a Half Century of Behavior Research. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, Vol:9,* 15-32.

Zaleznik, A. (1977). "Managers and Leaders: Are They Different?", *Harvard Business Review*, May-June.1977.Vol:55 (67-78).

Zhu Weichun, Irene K.H. Chew and Spangler,William D. (2005). "CEO Transformational Leadership And Organizational Outcomes: The Mediating Role of Human–Capital-Enhancing Human Resource Management", *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol:16 (39–52).