Creating a Family or Loyalty–Based Framework: The Effects of Paternalistic Leadership on Workplace Bullying

Soydan Soylu

ABSTRACT. Prior research has demonstrated that issues in leadership problems can lead to both negative organisational outcomes and unethical practices at work, such as bullying and counterproductive behaviours. This study investigates the association of bullying with paternalistic leadership dimensions (i.e. creating family atmosphere at work, maintaining individualised relationships, non-work involvement, loyalty seeking and maintaining authority). Seven hundred and fifteen questionnaires were collected from employees in Turkish workplaces. Confirmatory factor analyses were used to examine the bullying phenomenon and paternalistic leadership with respect to their dimensions. Hierarchical regression analyses revealed that 'expecting loyalty in exchange for nurture at work' relates positively with the experience of bullying. In contrast, findings indicated a negative association between leadership involving 'behaving like a senior family member at work' and bullying. Plausible explanations of the findings were discussed by referring to relevant ethical climate literature.

KEY WORDS: benevolence, ethical climate, loyalty expectation, paternalistic leadership, workplace bullying

Introduction

One of the key issues in the field of organisational ethics is that of workplace bullying. Within the last decade, both the professional and academic communities have paid increasing attention to the phenomenon (Einarsen et al., 2003), and the study of the antecedents of workplace bullying is gaining ground in both scientific literature and popular media (Zapf and Einarsen, 2003). Emerging findings indicate problems in leadership as being among the major causes of greater incidence of levels of

bullying at work. While leadership issues have classically been implicated in negative organisational outcomes such as absenteeism and decline in productivity, it is also emerging as a key factor in the incidence of unethical practices, of which bullying is just one example. In the case of bullying, it has even been shown that perpetrators are often identified as individuals who have formal power (Hoel and Salin, 2003), again highlighting the need to investigate directly the link between leadership styles and workplace bullying.

Initial studies of this association have focused on the use of aggressive and exploitative leadership styles (Ishmael and Alemoru, 1999). It was shown that destructive leaders are inclined to aggressively criticise subordinates in public (Ashforth, 1994) and belittle others as a result of destructive narcissism (Harvey et al., 2007). The literature also suggested that dysfunctional leaders who are corporate psychopaths or Machiavellians will use any means necessary to achieve their objectives, use their organisational status to exert power or bully their subordinates (Babiak and Hare, 2006; Boddy, 2006; Clarke, 2005). In line with these arguments, scholars indicated that dictatorial and autocratic styles of leadership are positively associated with employees' experience of workplace bullying (Hoel and Cooper, 2000; Hoel et al., 2010; Vartia, 1996). Einarsen et al. (1994) reported that laissez-faire leadership style is also positively related to experiencing bullying at work, suggesting that the link extends beyond one leadership style. Despite substantial research on the relation between bullying at work and leadership styles, there is a paucity of studies examining the link between experiences of workplace bullying and paternalistic leadership; 'a

leadership style that combines strong discipline and authority with fatherly benevolence and moral integrity couched in a personalistic atmosphere' (Farh and Cheng, 2000, p. 94). This study aims to fill this gap in the business ethics literature by exploring distinct aspects of bullying at work and their relation to the paternalistic leadership style. This leadership style is broken down into key dimensions, each of which is considered as a predictor of the various facets of bullying at work.

Bullying at work: Defining the problem

Studies indicate that there is no single definition of bullying at work. Instead, different definitions of workplace bullying are used by different people, depending on their perspective or their professional interest in the issue (Rayner and Cooper, 2006). In addition, different expressions such as 'mobbing' (Martin, 2000; Zapf, 1999) and 'psychological harassment' (Salin, 2009) are used to explain the same phenomenon; 'the systematic mistreatment of a subordinate, a colleague, or a superior, which, if continued, may cause severe social, psychological, and psychosomatic problems on the victim' (Einarsen et al., 2003, p. 3). Being the pioneer of workplace bullying research, Leymann operationally defined the phenomenon:

> Psychological terror or mobbing [bullying] in working life involves hostile and unethical communication, which is directed in a systematic way by one or a few individuals mainly towards one individual who, due to mobbing, is pushed into a helpless and defenceless position, being held there by means of continuing mobbing activities. These actions occur on a very frequent basis (statistical definition: at least once a week) and over a long period of time (statistical definition: at least six months of duration)…The definition excludes temporary conflicts and focuses on a point in time where the psychosocial situation begins to result in psychiatrically or psychosomatically pathologic conditions. In other words, the distinction between 'conflict' and 'mobbing' does not focus on *what* is done or *how* it is done, but on the *frequency* and *duration* of what is done. (Leymann, 1996, p. 168)

Others argue that bullying could take the form of verbal, physical and subtle acts like isolation and undermining professional skills to terrorise or deter the victim (Zapf and Einarsen, 2001). Scholars differ about the definitions of bullying at work particularly regarding contextual issues related to the 'experience' of the bullying incidents (Keashly and Jagatic, 2003). Building on the line of arguments by Leymann, key researchers proposed a further elaboration by including the role of imbalance of power between the parties:

> Bullying at work means harassing, offending, socially excluding someone or negatively affecting someone's work task. In order for the label bullying (or mobbing) to be applied to a particular activity, interaction or process it has to occur repeatedly and regularly (e.g. weekly) and over a period of time (e.g. about six months)… A conflict cannot be called bullying if the incident is an isolated event or if two parties of approximately equal 'strength' are in conflict. (Einarsen et al., 2003, p. 15)

Rayner and Cooper (2006) stated that there is no definite list of behaviours that are considered to be bullying at work, and definitions will normally include several types of bullying incidents. Bullying may either take an explicit form, like verbal abuse, or be implicit, like task pressures. A distinction can also be made between 'work-related' and 'person-related actions', such as spreading slanders, belittling opinions or ostracism at work (Einarsen, 1999). Zapf (1999) suggested a categorisation of bullying at work including five dimensions which are (1) work-related bullying, (2) social isolation, (3) personal attacks, (4) verbal threats and (5) spreading rumours.

Paternalistic leadership as an antecedent of bullying at work

Paternalistic leaders aim to promote followers' personal as well as professional welfare (Wasti et al., 2007). In doing so, they get involved in followers' non-work lives (Pasa et al., 2001) and refine the emotional aspects of social interactions by treating followers as in need of protection (Kerfoot and Knights, 1993). Although paternalistic and autocratic leaderships are very similar, in paternalistic leadership, the leader emphasises providing protection and support for the followers like a senior family member (Erben and Guneser, 2008). In paternalistic relation-

ship, providing guidance on the professional and the personal lives of the subordinates and creation of an atmosphere to provide protection and care in work and non-work related areas of employees' lives are the essentials (Aycan, 2006; Gelfand et al., 2007). Cheng et al. (2004) defined the basic dimensions of paternalistic leadership as authoritarianism, benevolence, and moral leadership. 'Authoritarianism refers to a leader's behaviour that asserts absolute authority and control over subordinates and demands unquestionable obedience from subordinates. Benevolence means that the leader's behaviour demonstrates individualised, holistic concern for subordinates' personal or familial wellbeing. Moral leadership can be broadly depicted as a leader's behaviour that demonstrates superior personal virtues, self-discipline, and unselfishness' (Cheng et al., 2004, p. 91). Building on the classification of Cheng et al. (2004), Aycan (2006) further operationalised the construct, arriving at five dimensions of paternalistic leadership: 'creating a family atmosphere in the workplace', 'establishing close and individualised relationships with subordinates', 'getting involved in non-work domain', 'loyalty expectation' and 'maintaining authority and status'.

A comparative study conducted by Aycan et al. (2000) revealed that among 10 countries, paternalistic characteristics are mostly observed in Eastern countries such as Pakistan, China and Turkey. Paternalism is a prevalent cultural characteristic of hierarchical and high power distant and collectivist cultures such as Turkey in which the levels of affectivity and particularism promote the acceptance of paternalism as an appropriate leadership style (Aycan, 2006; Wasti et al., 2007). Despite the fact that paternalistic leadership has been studied thoroughly over the past 15 years, more research is needed on the consequences of paternalistic leadership (Pellegrini and Scandura, 2008). In addition, although paternalistic leadership is one of the most significant cultural characteristics of Eastern societies, it has rarely been explored by researchers (Erben and Guneser, 2008).

Paternalistic leadership is perceived as exploitative and manipulative by Western scholars mainly because of the presence of an unquestioned power inequality in the paternalistic relationship (Pellegrini and Scandura, 2008). The literature makes a distinction between 'benevolent' and 'exploitative'

paternalism (see Table I). In exploitative paternalism, the leader cares for the followers and their families in exchange for unquestioned obedience and loyalty on the part of the followers and has the right to expect personal favours from them, and employees show conformity and dependence in order to avoid punishment (Aycan, 2006). In the exploitatively paternalistic relationship, employees would be expected to be totally committed and loyal to their leaders, and may be reprimanded by the leader if they take independent action (Erben and Guneser, 2008). On the other hand, in benevolent paternalism, followers show loyalty towards their leader in exchange for the leader's care and sincere generosity (Aycan, 2006).

It can be claimed that bullying and abusive behaviours at work might be triggered by exploitatively paternalistic managers who seek loyalty in exchange for care or aim to sustain authority at work since bullying can be considered as one of the major punishment tools for managers of this kind to deter subordinates from behaving against their will. That is to say, employees' disobedience can easily trigger immediate frustration on the part of exploitatively paternalistic leaders who perceive the care and support they exhibit to followers as 'investments'. This frustration, in turn, can easily turn into bullying as a way of seeking payoff. Furthermore, employees who have exploitative or abusive managers are more likely to learn bullying behaviours from their managers via social learning, and in turn, bully their peers or subordinates. In addition, clientelism and favouritism at work are fostered by a style of leadership that emphasises loyalty over job performance. Favouritism or clientelism at the workplace can lead to the acceptance of low moral standards. This issue,

TABLE I

Motivations of benevolent and exploitative paternalism

	Benevolent paternalism	Exploitative paternalism
Superior	Benevolence	Exploitation
Subordinate	Respect	Expectation of rewards/ avoidance of punishment

Partially adapted from Aycan (2006, p. 456).

in turn, can increase the development of bullying at work. Researchers examining the relationship between organisational factors and bullying indicate that organisational cultures which reward low moral standards demonstrate more workplace bullying (Zapf and Einarsen, 2003). In line with these arguments, the following hypothesis was postulated in the current study:

Hypothesis 1: Paternalistic leadership focusing on 'maintaining status and authority', and 'expecting loyalty in exchange for care' will be positively associated with experience of bullying at work.

While exploitatively paternalistic leaders promote abusive behaviours at work, supportively paternalistic leaders show particular concern for the followers' welfare without expecting unquestioned obedience and loyalty from them. By doing so, such leaders would create a positive climate that sustains an ethic of care in their organisations and would not use abusive behaviours towards their followers. In workplaces that promote a caring climate, employees have a particular concern for the wellbeing of their co-workers (Martin and Cullen, 2006; Vardi, 2001). Based on the nature of supportive leadership, the following hypothesis was proposed in this study:

Hypothesis 2: Paternalistic leadership focusing on 'creating family atmosphere at work', 'maintaining individualised relationships', and 'getting involved in non-work domain' will be negatively associated with experience of workplace bullying.

Methods

Sampling and procedure

A survey consisting of Turkish adaptations of workplace bullying and paternalistic leadership scales was administered to white- and blue-collar employees who have been working under an immediate supervisor for at least 6 months.

A total of 715 responses were collected. Of these, seven were eliminated due to either missing data or extensive response sets. That is to say, cases with one or more missing responses and cases in which at least

90% of the responses were identical in any sub-scale were excluded from the analysis. The analyses were conducted with the remaining 708 questionnaires. The sample consisted of 60.7% ($n = 430$) females and 39.3% ($n = 278$) males, of whom 49.9% ($n = 353$) worked in the public sector. Over half (55.3%) of the respondents were less than 35 years old and 56% of the respondents had a university degree. Two-third of the respondents had non-managerial positions and the remaining one-third had managerial positions. The sample comprised employees who worked in different sectors such as banking, municipality, health, pharmacy, consulting, the airline industry, education and manufacturing.

Measures

Bullying at work
A Turkish adaptation (Soylu, 2009) of the Revised Negative Acts Questionnaire (Einarsen and Hoel, 2006) was utilised to measure the experience of bullying at work. The scale consisted of 28 items. Respondents were asked to indicate how often they had been subjected to bullying behaviours listed in the scale. Sample items are 'I am required to work below my level' and 'I feel I am ignored at work'. Items were rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = 'not at all' to 5 = 'daily'. Internal consistency of the scale was found to be 0.89 (Soylu, 2009). In this study, Cronbach's α for the total inventory was found to be 0.93.

As a validity check, following the Negative Acts Questionnaire, a revised version of the formal definition of bullying at work established by Einarsen and Skogstad (1996) was introduced, and respondents were asked to indicate whether they considered themselves as targets of bullying at work according to this definition:

> Bullying is when a person feels they have systematically and repeatedly been subjected to negative treatment from one or more persons and they have difficulty defending against this treatment because the perpetrator has more power than they have.

The response categories were 'not at all', 'a little', 'a lot' and 'a great deal'. The bivariate correlation

between the total Negative Acts Questionnaire score and the participants' rated experience of bullying as specified by the formal definition was found to be 0.74 ($p < 0.01$). This high correlation indicates that the Negative Acts Questionnaire has convergent validity.

Paternalistic leadership
Paternalistic leadership was measured by the 21-item Paternalistic Leadership Scale of Aycan (2006). Sample items are 'My manager behaves like a family member (father/mother or elder brother/sister) towards his/her employees' and 'My manager places importance on establishing a one-to-one relationship with every employee'. Items were rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = 'strongly disagree' to 5 = 'strongly agree'. The scale had a Cronbach's α of 0.87 (Aycan, 2006). Cronbach's α for the total inventory was found to be 0.93 in this study.

Demographic variables
The questionnaire included questions on the demographic characteristics of the respondents such as age, sex, position at work (i.e. managerial vs. non-managerial role) and sector (i.e. public vs. private organisation). These variables were used as control variables in regression analyses. Sex was controlled since previous research (Bjorkqvist et al., 1994; Zapf et al., 2003) has demonstrated that women report bullying at work more frequently than men. Similarly, age was considered as a control variable because prior studies have indicated a negative association between age and exposure to bullying (Einarsen and Raknes, 1997; Hoel, 2000; Quine, 1999). Position at work (i.e. non-managerial vs. managerial status) was also used as a control variable as past research has shown that Turkish public sector employees report bullying more than private sector employees do, and employees in managerial positions report less bullying than employees in non-managerial positions (Soylu, 2009).

Data analysis

Few studies have examined workplace bullying as a multivariate construct, and a survey of the literature (e.g. Pellegrini and Scandura, 2008) indicated a need

for research on the possible differences among paternalistic leadership styles. As such, confirmatory factor analyses were performed to examine the bullying phenomenon and paternalistic leadership in depth with respect to their components. Maximum likelihood was utilised as the estimation method. Regression coefficients of the error terms over the endogenous variables were fixed to 1 to achieve model identification. In the analyses of both scales, multiple models were examined varying in the number of observed variables and latent factors to show that a certain factor solution was a better representation of the data than were the other factor solutions. In all models, every item was linked to its own factor only.

In addition, correlation analyses were used to explore the associations among variables. Finally, hierarchical regression analyses were conducted to examine the simultaneous effects of the dimensions of paternalistic leadership on bullying at work. In all regression analyses, control variables were included in the regression computation in the first step. In the second step, the five paternalistic leadership dimensions derived from the confirmatory factor analysis were added as predictors of bullying factors. Bullying dimensions were used as dependent variables, whereas paternalistic leadership dimensions were used as independent variables. Specifically, bullying dimensions (i.e. experiences of task pressures, work-related criticism, social isolation and non-work related criticism) were regressed on paternalistic leadership aspects (i.e. creating family atmosphere at work, maintaining individualised relationships, non-work involvement, loyalty seeking and maintaining authority).

AMOS v.16 was used for the confirmatory factor analyses. All other statistical analyses were conducted using SPSS v.16.

Results

Confirmatory factor analysis for the negative acts questionnaire

The factor structure found in the exploratory factor analysis of the Negative Acts Questionnaire in a Turkish sample (Soylu, 2009) was used as the theoretical foundation for model development. The

rationale for choosing this factor structure is that, apart from this research, studies conducted in Turkey considering bullying as a multivariate construct merely used Turkish translations of the Negative Acts Questionnaire, instead of using a Turkish adaptation of the scale.

Three models were constructed. Model 1 was a one-factor solution model which considered bullying at work as a single construct. The range of models included a three-factor model distinguishing between 'task pressures', 'work and non-work related criticism' and 'social isolation and attacks on attitudes/ethnicity'; and finally the five-factor solution found by Soylu (2009).

Fit indices of the three hypothesised models evaluated were illustrated in Table II. Summary of fit indices showed that both Models 1 and 2 fit the sample data poorly. Values of fit indices for the one-factor solution supported the argument that workplace bullying was not unidimensional. The results for Model 3 indicated acceptable levels of fit as the indices (χ^2/df, CFI and RMSEA) were within the recommended tolerances. Therefore, the five-factor solution (Model 3) was selected as the model which best fitted the data.

Regression coefficients, their corresponding errors, factor loadings (standardised regression coefficients) and corresponding Cronbach's α scores for each dimension for the five-factor model (Model 3) were illustrated in Table III. All items had significant loadings ($p < 0.01$), ranging from 0.58 to 0.88, which indicated high construct validity. In addition, α scores revealed that the internal consistencies of the constructs were high. Summary variables were computed for each factor and these summated subscales were used in the further parametric analyses in this research.

Confirmatory factor analysis for the paternalistic leadership scale

For the paternalistic leadership construct, the factor solution found in the exploratory factor analysis conducted by Aycan (2006) was used as the theoretical foundation of model development since no other researchers have proposed another factor solution for this paternalistic leadership scale so far. Aycan (2006) derived five dimensions (i.e. family atmosphere at work, individualised relationships, involvement in employees' non-work lives, loyalty expectation, and status hierarchy and authority) in the study for scale development. This five-factor solution model was compared with a single factor solution model in which paternalistic leadership was considered as unidimensional. In addition, for model comparison, a two-factor solution model in which 'creating a family atmosphere at work', 'establishing close and individualised relationships' and 'getting involved in non-work domain' loaded in a single factor, whereas 'loyalty expectation', and 'maintaining authority and status' loaded in another, was tested.

Table IV depicted the fit indices of the models compared. Models 1 and 2 indicated poor fit of the data. Poor fit indices for the one-factor model supported the argument that paternalistic leadership should not be examined as a unidimensional construct (Pellegrini and Scandura, 2008). Although the CFI score fell within the recommended tolerances, normed chi-square (χ^2/df) and RMSEA values indicated poor fit of the proposed five dimension model (Model 3). Examination of the modification indices showed that the removal of two items (Item 14: 'My manager expects loyalty and deference in exchange for his or her care and nurturance', Item

TABLE II

Summary of fit indices for the negative acts questionnaire

Model	χ^2	df	χ^2/df	CFI	RMSEA	CAIC
One factor (Model 1)	3138.31★	275	11.41	0.72	0.12	3516.43
Three factors (Model 2)	1821.85★	227	8.03	0.83	0.10	2192.41
Five factors (Model 3)	1005.73★	220	4.57	0.92	0.06	1429.23

Note: N = 708, ★$p < 0.01$.

TABLE III

Confirmatory factor loadings, standard errors (SE), and Cronbach's α scores (α) for the five-factor model of the negative acts questionnaire

Item no.		Regr. Coeff.★	SE	Std. Regr. Coeffs.	α
	Factor 1: Task pressures				0.83
2	I am asked to attain irrelevant objectives	1.00	–	0.61	
3	I am required to work below my level	0.99	0.07	0.58	
4	My decisions are questioned	1.17	0.07	0.77	
5	I am deprived of some of my responsibilities	1.36	0.08	0.80	
6	I am required to do pointless tasks	1.30	0.08	0.77	
	Factor 2: Work-related criticism/abuse				0.90
8	I am always reminded of my mistakes	1.00	–	0.77	
9	I am criticised for working too little	1.01	0.04	0.78	
10	I am aggressively criticised for my work efforts	1.03	0.04	0.87	
11	When I make a mistake, I am aggressively told off	0.97	0.04	0.81	
12	I am threatened with dismissal	0.63	0.03	0.67	
13	I am exposed to belittling in front of my colleagues	0.94	0.04	0.83	
20	I receive offensive telephone calls or emails	0.53	0.03	0.60	
	Factor 3: Social isolation				0.84
17	I am often told to work on my own – away from my colleagues	1.00	–	0.78	
18	Some people do not respond to my telephone calls or emails	0.86	0.04	0.73	
19	I feel I am ignored at work	1.23	0.05	0.83	
21	I am frequently not told about social activities	1.15	0.06	0.71	
	Factor 4: Non-work-related criticism				0.75
7	There is malicious gossip about me	1.00	–	0.58	
14	My private life is criticised	0.94	0.06	0.75	
15	I am teased about some of my personality characteristics	1.10	0.07	0.77	
16	I am teased about my physical characteristics	0.66	0.04	0.65	
	Factor 5: Attacks on attitudes and ethnicity				0.86
23	I am criticised about my religious beliefs	1.00	–	0.88	
24	I am criticised for my political beliefs	1.03	0.04	0.84	
25	I am subjected to ethnic jokes	0.67	0.03	0.76	

Note: $N = 708$, ★$p < 0.01$ for all regression weights.

TABLE IV

Summary of fit indices for the paternalistic leadership scale

Model	χ^2	df	χ^2/df	CFI	RMSEA	CAIC
One factor (Model 1)	2069.40★	189	10.95	0.80	0.11	2387.02
Two factors (Model 2)	1569.53★	188	8.34	0.85	0.10	1894.72
Five factors (Model 3)	1023.91★	179	5.72	0.91	0.08	1417.16
Five factors (revised) (Model 4)	693.80★	142	4.89	0.94	0.07	1056.79

Note: $N = 708$, ★$p < 0.01$.

20: 'My manager wants to control or to be informed about every work-related activity') would improve the model significantly. Thus, a revised model (Model 4) was proposed after excluding these items from the analysis. The revised model had a reduced χ^2 and acceptable normed χ^2, CFI and RMSEA.

Furthermore, the CAIC value was lower than the initial five-factor solution. Therefore, the revised model indicated an acceptable level of fit and was selected as the best model for further analyses.

Table V displays the regression coefficients, their corresponding errors, factor loadings (standardised regression coefficients) and corresponding Cronbach's α scores for each dimension for the revised five-factor model (Model 4). The findings implied high construct validity since the lowest standardised factor loading was 0.50 ($p < 0.01$). Furthermore, α scores indicated that internal consistencies of the constructs were high. Summary variables were computed for each factor of paternalism and these summated subscales were considered in the further parametric analyses of the data.

The association between paternalistic leadership and bullying at work

Descriptive statistics and bivariate correlations among study variables were presented in Table VI. Findings showed that all of the bullying dimensions were significantly and negatively correlated with paternalistic leadership involving 'creating family atmosphere at work, building individualised relationships with followers and involvement in followers' non-work lives'. The magnitudes of these associations were moderate for the associations between benevolent paternalism factors and task pressures, work-related criticism and social isolation. On the other hand, weak associations were observed between benevolent paternalism factors and attacks on attitudes/ethnicity. The results implied that when employees were supervised by a manager who got involved in the non-work domain and who sustained a family framework at work with maintaining individualised relationships, there were less incidents of bullying in the organisation.

No significant positive associations were found between bullying factors and loyalty seeking and authoritative paternalism. However, contrary to expectations, there appeared to be mild negative correlations among authoritative paternalism and experiencing workplace bullying dimensions. This finding indicated that the more the manager maintains status and hierarchy, the lower the likelihood of experiencing bullying at work.

Contributions of paternalistic leadership to experience of bullying at work

After examining bivariate correlations, four hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted to examine further the associations between exposure to bullying and paternalistic leadership components (see Table VII). In the analyses, familial paternalism, maintaining individualised relationships, non-work involvement, loyalty seeking and authoritative paternalism were used as independent variables to predict bullying dimensions (i.e. experiences of task pressures, work-related criticism, social isolation and non-work related criticism). The main assumptions of the regression analysis (i.e. normality of residuals, linearity between dependent and independent variables, homoscedasticity, independence of residuals and the absence of multicollinearity) were checked, and all assumptions were met except for the regression analysis for 'attacks on attitudes and ethnicity' dimension of bullying. The regression model for this dimension failed to meet the assumption of independence of residuals (i.e. absence of autocorrelation). Thus, regression analysis results for 'attacks on attitudes and ethnicity' dimension were not presented.

Regression analyses showed that across the bullying dimensions, the amount of variance that could be accounted for by paternalistic leadership aspects and the control variables ranged from 14 to 25%. In addition, results indicated that, controlling for other variables, 'creating a family framework at work' negatively, whereas 'loyalty-seeking paternalism' positively contributed to the variance in each bullying factor. Furthermore, managers' involvement in the non-work domain was found to be negatively contributed to the variance in work-related criticism. These findings provided empirical support for the research hypotheses. Therefore, hypotheses 1 and 2 were partially supported. Overall, contributions of 'creating family atmosphere at work' were larger than those of authoritative and loyalty-seeking paternalism in all models. On the other hand, no significant contributions of paternalistic leadership involving 'maintaining individualised relationships with subordinates were found on the variance in any bullying factor. Contrary to expectations, authoritative paternalism was found to contribute negatively to employee experience of non-work related

TABLE V

Confirmatory factor loadings, standard errors, and Cronbach's α scores for the five-factor model of the paternalistic leadership scale

Item No.		Regr. Coeff.*	SE	Std. Regr. Coeffs.	Cronbach's α
	Factor 1: Family atmosphere at work				0.93
1	My manager behaves like a family member (father/mother or elder brother/sister) towards his/her employees	1.00	–	0.88	
2	My manager provides advice to employees like a senior family member	0.96	0.02	0.88	
3	My manager creates a family environment in the workplace	0.98	0.02	0.89	
4	My manager feels responsible from employees as if they are his or her own children	0.94	0.03	0.85	
5	My manager protects employees from outside criticisms	0.83	0.03	0.77	
	Factor 2: Individualised relationships				0.83
6	My manager places importance to establishing one-to-one relationship with every employee	1.00	–	0.87	
7	My manager places importance to knowing every employee in person (e.g. personal problems, family life, etc.)	0.95	0.03	0.83	
8	My manager shows emotional reactions, such as joy, sorrow, anger, in his or her relationships with employees	0.53	0.03	0.50	
9	My manager closely monitors the development and progress of his or her employees	0.86	0.03	0.79	
	Factor 3: Involvement in employees' non-work lives				0.76
10	My manager does not hesitate to take action in the name of his or her employees, whenever necessary	1.00	–	0.58	
11	My manager is ready to help employees with their non-work problems (e.g. housing, education of the children, health, etc.) whenever they need it	2.52	0.27	0.84	
12	My manager attends special events of employees (e.g. weddings and funeral ceremonies, graduations, etc.)	2.17	0.24	0.74	
13	My manager is prepared to act as a mediator whenever an employee has problem in his or her private life (e.g. marital problems)	2.14	0.23	0.75	
	Factor 4: Loyalty expectation				0.75
15	My manager does not consider performance as the most important criterion while making a decision about employees (e.g. promotion, lay-off)	1.00	–	0.67	
16	My manager places more importance to loyalty than performance in evaluating employees	1.26	0.12	0.89	
	Factor 5: Status hierarchy and authority				0.81
17	My manager is a disciplinarian and at the same time nurturant (bitter and sweet)	1.00	–	0.74	
18	My manager believes that s/he knows what is best for his or her employees	1.10	0.05	0.78	
19	My manager asks opinions of employees about work-related issues, however, makes the last decision himself/herself	0.86	0.05	0.61	
21	My manager keeps his or her distance, despite establishing close relationships with employees	1.02	0.05	0.72	

Note: $N = 708$, $\star p < 0.01$ for all regression weights.

TABLE VI
Means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations among variables

Measure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1 Task pressures	1									
2 Work-related criticism/abuse	0.63★★	1								
3 Social isolation	0.51★★	0.72★★	1							
4 Non-work related criticism	0.57★★	0.75★★	0.68★★	1						
5 Attacks on attitudes/ethnicity	0.22★★	0.39★★	0.49★★	0.42★★	1					
6 Family atmosphere at work	−0.45★★	−0.40★★	−0.34★★	−0.33★★	−0.14★★	1				
7 Individualised relationships	−0.39★★	−0.33★★	−0.30★★	−0.28★★	−0.15★★	0.79★★	1			
8 Non-work involvement	−0.35★★	−0.33★★	−0.28★★	−0.27★★	−0.11★★	0.73★★	0.76★★	1		
9 Loyalty expectation	−0.01	−0.05	−0.04	−0.01	−0.04	0.34★★	0.38★★	0.45★★	1	
10 Status hierarchy and authority	−0.24★★	−0.25★★	−0.27★★	−0.20★★	−0.07	0.58★★	0.56★★	0.56★★	0.49★★	1
Mean	2.48	1.65	1.49	1.80	1.36	3.08	3.13	3.03	3.29	3.42
Standard deviation	0.97	0.82	0.80	0.77	0.76	1.11	0.98	0.92	0.94	0.87

Notes: $N = 708$, ★★$p < 0.01$ (two-tailed).

criticism and social isolation. The effect of the control variable 'age' was significant in a negative direction for the experience of task pressures and non-work related criticism. That is to say, the older the employee, the less likely they are to experience task pressures or non-work related criticism. However, it should be noted that the effects of age on these bullying factors are weak. It was also found that public sector employees are more likely to experience social isolation and non-work related criticism than private sector employees.

Discussion

Confirmatory factor analysis for the Negative Acts Questionnaire indicated that the factor structure was compatible with the dimensions proposed in the literature (Soylu, 2009; Zapf, 1999). One of the major strengths of utilising factor analysis in this study was the opportunity of exploring the bullying phenomenon in depth with respect to its components. In addition, the correlation coefficient between participants' rated experience of bullying as specified by the formal definition and the total bullying inventory was very high ($r > 0.70$). Hence, the Negative Acts Questionnaire yielded high construct and convergent validities.

Likewise, the five-factor solution of the paternalistic leadership scale proposed by Aycan (2006) fit the data well in the corresponding confirmatory factor analysis. Only two items (Item 14: 'My manager expects loyalty and deference in exchange for his or her care and nurturance' and Item 20: 'My manager wants to control or to be informed about every work-related activity') did not work well in the analysis and so were removed in order to achieve a good fit. The issue with Item 14 might be due to the fact that it encloses the overarching operational definition of paternalistic leadership: 'expecting deference in exchange for care'. Examination of the modification indices supported this argument by implying that Item 14 loaded on almost every factor. Item 20, on the other hand, might not have yielded enough variance in responses to load to a single factor since managers usually want to supervise and to be informed about what their followers do. Likewise, frequency analysis of Item 20 indicated that Item 20 was negatively skewed and the majority

TABLE VII

Summary of hierarchical regression analyses for prediction of scores on experience of bullying dimensions

	Criterion variables (bullying dimensions)											
	Experience of task pressures			Experience of work-related criticism/abuse			Experience of social isolation			Experience of non-work related criticism		
	β	R^2	ΔR^2	β	R^2	ΔR^2	β	R^2	ΔR^2	β	R^2	ΔR^2
Step 1: Control variables												
Age	−0.13**	0.02*	0.02*	−0.03**	0.00	0.00	−0.02	0.02*	0.02*	−0.10*	0.02*	0.02*
Sex	−0.04			0.00			0.02			−0.04		
Position (non-managerial vs. managerial)	0.02			−0.04			−0.02			−0.06		
Sector (public vs. private)	−0.01			−0.00			−0.13**			−0.04**		
Step 2: Predictors												
Age	−0.12**	0.25**	0.21**	−0.21	0.18**	0.21**	−0.01	0.16**	0.14**	−0.09*	0.14**	0.12**
Sex	−0.02			0.02			0.00			0.02		
Position (non-managerial vs. managerial)	0.04			−0.03			−0.00			−0.05		
Sector (public vs. private)	−0.15			0.01			−0.12*			−0.02		
Family atmosphere at work	−0.34**			−0.33**			−0.24**			−0.24**		
Individualised relationships	0.11			0.01			−0.03			−0.05		
Non-work involvement	−0.09			−0.14*			−0.07			−0.09		
Loyalty expectation	0.21**			0.16**			0.15**			0.15**		
Status hierarchy and authority	−0.04			−0.07			−0.14*			−0.05*		

Notes: N = 708, *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01.

of the respondents (65.4%) agreed or strongly agreed that their managers would like to control or to be informed about every work-related activity.

Positive bivariate correlations observed between paternalistic leadership dimensions, and the poor fit of the two-factor solution distinguishing exploitative and benevolent paternalism implies that the latter are not two opposite forms of paternalistic leadership. Despite the theoretically meaningful distinction between exploitative and benevolent paternalism, it is extremely difficult to observe this distinction in empirical research. One reason for this problem may be that exploitative and benevolent paternalism are not mutually exclusive. For instance, a participative and supportive leader can be exploitative at the same time by expecting deference in exchange for his or her nurturance. Therefore, studies for scale development (cf. Aycan, 2006) mainly captured the behaviours of paternalistic leadership, in general, rather than aiming at distinguishing different types of paternalistic leadership (i.e. benevolent vs. exploitative).

In all regression models, creating a family atmosphere at work was found to be the strongest predictor, which negatively contributes to the bullying dimensions, as hypothesised. That is, managers who sustain a family framework at work would lead to fewer incidents of negative acts in their workplaces. These negative relations support the second research hypothesis and indicate that not all paternalistic leaders promote abusive behaviours or bullying at work. Moreover, these findings implied that managers who create a family atmosphere in the workplace might behave like a father to such an extent that they are unable to take action against subordinates, even when requests are disobeyed. Another explanation for this finding might be the possible positive effects of benevolent and supportive paternalism on the ethical climate in the organisation. An ethical climate of benevolence is sustained by organisational members who show concern for the welfare of their co-workers (Cullen et al., 2003). Leaders influence the perceptions of their subordinates regarding behaving in an ethical or unethical fashion (Dickson et al., 2001). Therefore, an unselfish manager who behaves like a family member towards subordinates might serve as a role model who exhibits ethically acceptable behaviours and shows how ethical problems and questions should be addressed. Thus, a positive ethical climate can be sustained in the organisation by the subordinates who accept the workplace as their own family and feel an emotional bonding with the organisation. When a caring atmosphere is sustained in the workplace, employees perceive that decisions should be based on an overarching concern for the well-being of others (Martin and Cullen, 2006). Consequently, one can expect that employees working in a positive ethical climate would be less inclined to bully or harass their co-workers. The significant negative association between underestimation of professional skills and caring climate at work found in the study of Bulutlar and Öz (2009) supports the argument that bullying and positive ethical climate at work are negatively correlated.

Consistent with the research hypotheses, loyalty-seeking paternalism was found to be positively associated with all bullying dimensions. That is, employees whose managers expect deference in exchange for their care are more likely to be the victims of workplace bullying. This finding supported the argument that clientelism and favouritism, which are fostered by the inverse relation between expecting loyalty and performance, can lead to low moral standards at work. Low moral standards at work, in turn, can increase the number of bullying incidents at the workplace. In ethical climates, in which altruistic and caring behaviours are rarely acknowledged, abusive behaviours at work are more likely to occur (Bulutlar and Öz, 2009; Vardi, 2001).

Nevertheless, authoritative paternalism, the other exploitatively paternalistic leadership dimension, yielded no significant positive contributions to bullying factors in any regression model. Contrary to the relevant research hypothesis, it was found that authoritatively paternalistic leadership leads to less incidents of social isolation at work. This counterintuitive finding can be explained by the nature of maintaining status and hierarchy at work. As authoritative paternalism often involves a great amount of communication with followers to maintain authority and control, employees might experience social isolation less when they have such a manager.

Low values for R^2, ranging from 0.14 to 0.25 in the regression analyses, were not surprising as there are many other antecedents of bullying at work that were not considered in the research model. In fact, the overarching aim of this study was focusing on several possible relations that have not been studied before in

the literature rather than exploring all possible antecedents and outcomes of bullying at work.

Several limitations of this study should be noted. First, a positive self-selection bias might have occurred among victims who have experienced severe bullying (De Cuyper et al., 2009). Second, since convenience and snowball sampling methods were employed, findings of this study may not be truly representative of the entire working population. Moreover, it was not possible to draw conclusions regarding causal association between paternalistic leadership and workplace bullying since the study was cross-sectional. However, despite these limitations, this study has offered important insights into the relationship between bullying at work and paternalistic leadership.

Conclusion

The overarching aim of this study was to explore the association between the experience of bullying and paternalistic leadership. In order to capture the phenomenon as rigorously as possible, a large sample size was used. Overall, the findings supported the research hypotheses and indicated that bullying in Turkish workplaces is associated with different types of paternalistic leadership in the work context. Specifically, regression analyses showed that loyalty-seeking paternalism relates positively with bullying in Turkish workplaces, while familial paternalism displayed a negative association. Cross-cultural analyses should complement this study by exploring whether or not the associations between paternalism and bullying identified in this research are similar in other cultural contexts. Furthermore, future studies might investigate the possible association between paternalistic leadership styles and ethical climate types. Likewise, the possible mediating role of ethical climate on the relationship between paternalistic leadership styles and bullying at work would be an interesting avenue to explore in future research.

Acknowledgments

References

Ashforth, B.: 1994, 'Petty Tyranny in Organisations', *Human Relations* **47**(7), 755–778.

Aycan, Z.: 2006, 'Paternalism: Towards Conceptual Refinement and Operationalization', in U. Kim. K. Yang and K. Hwang (eds.), *Indigenous and Cultural Psychology* (Springer, New York), pp. 445–467.

Aycan, Z., R. N. Kanungo, M. Mendonca, K. Yu, J. Deller, G. Stahl and A. Khursid: 2000, 'Impact of Culture on Human Resource Management Practices: A Ten Country Comparison', *Applied Psychology: An International Review* **49**(1), 192–220.

Babiak, P. and R. D. Hare: 2006, *Snakes in Suits When Psychopaths Go to Work* (HarperCollins, New York).

Bjorkqvist, K., K. Osterman and M. Hjelt-Back: 1994, 'Aggression Among University Employees', *Aggressive Behaviour* **20**(3), 173–184.

Boddy, C. R.: 2006, 'The Dark Side of Management Decisions: Organisational Psychopaths', *Management Decision* **44**(10), 1461–1475.

Bulutlar, F. and E. Ü. Öz: 2009, 'The Effects of Ethical Climates on Bullying Behaviour in the Workplace', *Journal of Business Ethics* **86**(3), 273–295.

Cheng, B., L. F. Chou, T. Y. Wu, M. Huang and J. Farh: 2004, 'Paternalistic Leadership and Subordinate Responses: Establishing a Leadership Model in Chinese Organizations', *Asian Journal of Social Psychology* **7**(1), 89–117.

Clarke, J.: 2005, *Working with Monsters. How to Identify and Protect Yourself from the Workplace Psychopath* (Random House, Sydney).

Cullen, J. B., K. P. Parboteeah and B. Victor: 2003, 'The Effects of Ethical Climates on Organisational Commitment: A Two-Study Analysis', *Journal of Business Ethics* **46**(2), 127–141.

De Cuyper, N., E. Baillien and H. De Witte: 2009, 'Job Insecurity, Perceived Employability and Targets' and Perpetrators' Experiences of Workplace Bullying', *Work & Stress* **23**(3), 206–224.

Dickson, M. W., D. B. Smith, M. W. Grojean and M. Ehrhart: 2001, 'An Organizational Climate regarding Ethics: The Outcome of Leader Values and the Practices That Reflect Them', *Leadership Quarterly* **12**(2), 197–217.

Einarsen, S.: 1999, 'The Nature and Causes of Bullying at Work', *International Journal of Manpower* **20**(1/2), 16–27.

Einarsen, S. and H. Hoel: 2006, *Measuring Bullying and Harassment in the Workplace. Development and Validity of the Revised Negative Acts Questionnaire. A manual* (University of Bergen, Bergen).

Einarsen, S., H. Hoel, D. Zapf and C. L. Cooper: 2003, 'The Concept of Bullying at Work: The European Tradition', in S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf. C. L. Cooper (eds.), *Bullying and Emotional Abuse in the Workplace* (Taylor & Francis, London), pp. 3–31.

Einarsen, S. and B. I. Raknes: 1997, 'Harassment in the Workplace and the Victimization of Men', *Violence and Victims* **12**(3), 247–263.

Einarsen, S., B. I. Raknes and S. B. Matthiesen: 1994, 'Bullying and Harassment at Work and Their Relationships to Work Environment Quality: An Exploratory Study', *The European Work and Organizational Psychologist* **4**(4), 381–401.

Einarsen, S. and A. Skogstad: 1996, 'Bullying at Work: Epidemiological Findings in Public and Private Organizations', *European Work and Organizational Psychologist* **5**(2), 185–201.

Erben, G. S. and A. B. Guneser: 2008, 'The Relationship Between Paternalistic Leadership and Organizational Commitment: Investigating the Role of Climate Regarding Ethics', *Journal of Business Ethics* **82**(4), 955–968.

Farh, J. L. and B. S. Cheng: 2000, 'A Cultural Analysis of Paternalistic Leadership in Chinese Organisations', in J. T. Li, A. S. Tsuni and E. Weldon (eds.), *Management and Organisation in the Chinese Context* (Macmillian, London), pp. 84–130.

Gelfand, M. J., M. Erez and Z. Aycan: 2007, 'Cross-Cultural Approaches to Organisational Behaviour', *Annual Review of Psychology* **58**, 479–515.

Harvey, M. G., M. R. Buckley, J. T. Heames, R. Zinko, R. L. Brouer and G. R. Ferris: 2007, 'A Bully as an Archetypal Destructive Leader', *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies* **14**(2), 117–129.

Hoel, H. and C. L. Cooper: 2000, 'Destructive Conflict and Bullying at Work', http://bullyinginstitute.org/research/res/umist.pdf. Retrieved 19 March 2008.

Hoel, H., L. Glaso, J. Hetland, C. L. Cooper and S. Einarsen: 2010, 'Leadership Styles as Predictors of Self-reported and Observed Workplace Bullying', *British Journal of Management* **21**(2), 453–468.

Hoel, H. and D. Salin: 2003, 'Organisational Antecedents of Workplace Bullying', in S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf and C. L. Cooper (eds.), *Bullying and Emotional Abuse in the Workplace* (Taylor & Francis, London), pp. 203–219.

Ishmael, A. and B. Alemoru: 1999, *Harassment, Bullying and Violence at Work* (The Industrial Society, London).

Keashly, L. and K. Jagatic: 2003, 'By Any Other Name: American Perspectives on Workplace Bullying', in S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf and C. L. Cooper (eds.), *Bullying and Emotional Abuse in the Workplace* (Taylor & Francis, London), pp. 3–31.

Kerfoot, C. and D. Knights: 1993, 'Management, Masculinity and Manipulation: From Paternalism to Corporate Strategy in Financial Services in Britain', *Journal of Management Studies* **30**(4), 659–677.

Leymann, H.: 1996, 'The Content and Development of Mobbing at Work', *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* **5**(2), 165–184.

Martin, B.: 2000, 'Mobbing: Emotional Abuse in the American Workplace', *Journal of Organizational Change Management* **13**, 401–447.

Martin, K. D. and J. B. Cullen: 2006, 'Continuities and Extensions of Ethical Climate Theory: A Meta-Analytic Review', *Journal of Business Ethics* **69**(2), 175–194.

Pasa, S., H. Kabasakal and M. Bodur: 2001, 'Society, Organisations, and Leadership in Turkey', *Applied Psychology: An International Review* **50**(4), 559–589.

Pellegrini, E. K. and T. A. Scandura: 2008, 'Paternalistic Leadership: A Review and Agenda for Future Research', *Journal of Management* **34**(3), 566–593.

Quine, L.: 1999, 'Workplace Bullying in NHS Community Trust: Staff Questionnaire Survey', *British Medical Journal* **318**, 228–232.

Rayner, C. and C. L. Cooper: 2006, 'Workplace Bullying', in E. K. Kelloway, J. Barling, J. Barling and J. J. Hurrell (eds.), *Handbook of Workplace Violence* (Sage, London), pp. 121–147.

Salin, D.: 2009, 'Organisational Responses to Workplace Harassment: An Exploratory Study', *Personnel Review* **38**(1), 26–44.

Soylu, S.: 2009, 'The Dark Side of Expecting Deference in Exchange for Care: The Relationship Between Paternalistic Leadership and Bullying in Turkish Workplaces', in W. Scroggins, C. Gomez, P. G. Benson, R. L. Oliver and M. J. Turner (eds.), *Celebrate the Tapestry: Diversity in the Modern Global Organization. Proceedings of the 10th International Human Resource Management Conference* (Santa Fe, NM, USA), ISBN: 978-1-61584-212-4 (CD-ROM).

Vardi, Y.: 2001, 'The Effects of Organisational and Ethical Climates on Misconduct at Work', *Journal of Business Ethics* **29**(4), 325–337.

Vartia, M.: 1996, 'The Sources of Bullying – Psychological Work Environment and Organizational Climate', *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* **5**(2), 203–214.

Wasti, S., H. H. Tan, H. H. Brower and Ç. Önder: 2007, 'Cross-Cultural Measurement of Supervisor

Trustworthiness: An Assessment of Measurement Invariance Across Three Cultures', *Leadership Quarterly* **18**(5), 477–489.

Zapf, D.: 1999, 'Organisational, Work Group Related and Personal Causes of Mobbing/Bullying at Work', *International Journal of Manpower* **20**(1/2), 70–85.

Zapf, D. and S. Einarsen: 2001, 'Bullying in the Work-place: Recent Trends in Research and Practice: An Introduction', *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* **10**(4), 369–373.

Zapf, D. and S. Einarsen: 2003, 'Individual Antecedents of Bullying: Victims and Perpetrators', in S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf and C. L. Cooper (eds.), *Bullying and Emotional Abuse in the Workplace* (Taylor and Francis, London), pp. 165–185.

Zapf, D., S. Einarsen, H. Hoel and M. Vartia: 2003, 'Empirical Findings on Bullying in the Workplace', in S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf and C. L. Cooper (eds.), *Bullying and Emotional Abuse in the Workplace* (Taylor & Francis, London), pp. 103–127.

London School of Economics,
London, U.K.
E-mail: s.soylu@lse.ac.uk