

The Impact of Paternalistic Leadership Approach on Employees' Performance and Organizational Identification - the Case of Antalya

Mahsum Calan ^{A*}, Akin Aksu ^B

Received: March 2023 | Accepted: January 2024

DOI: 10.5937/turizam27-43623

Abstract

The research objective aims to investigate the effect of paternalistic leadership on employees' performance and organizational identification. The research has adopted the quantitative approach and data collected from a population comprised of employees in five-star accommodation establishments located in Antalya. To represent the research population, the convenience sampling method was used to determine the sample, and in the 2021 summer season, 380 questionnaires obtained from the sample were analyzed. Pearson correlation analysis was used to determine the relationship between the scale variables. According to the results, a positive and significant relationship was found between paternalistic leadership perception, and employee performance and organizational identification. Paternalistic leadership perception explained 6% of the change in employee performance. In addition, paternalistic leadership behavior explained 11.1% of the variance of organizational identification. Significant and positive relationships were found between the subdimension of paternalist leadership (creating a family environment ($t=3.073$, $p\leq.01$), expectation of loyalty and deference ($t=2.061$, $p\leq.05$)), and organizational identification. Moreover, another positive relation was found between the subdimension of paternalist leadership (creating a family environment at the workplace ($t=2.328$, $p\leq.05$)) and performance. This research will be the first study in the tourism sector in Turkey in terms of paternalistic leadership, employee performance, and organizational identification. Since there is no other study in the literature in which these three variables are investigated together in tourism studies, it will fill the gap in the field.

Keywords: Paternalistic Leadership, Employee Performance, Organizational Identification, Tourism Sector, Accommodation Organizations, Antalya

^A Akdeniz University, Social Sciences Institute, Antalya, Turkey

^B Akdeniz University, Faculty of Tourism, Antalya, Turkey; aaksu@akdeniz.edu.tr

* Corresponding author: mahsumcln7@gmail.com

Introduction

In today's management world, it is getting harder for businesses to survive, increase their productivity, increase profit, and distinguish themselves from rival companies. In addition to having technological developments that will make a difference, the human capital factor, which is another component that will enable businesses to get ahead of their competitors, is increasing its place day by day in the world of management. Manager behaviors that motivate employees to work and improve their performance have increased importance in promoting employee productivity. New ways have been searched to increase the commitment and identification of the qualified workforce to the enterprises they work for. The answers to these questions have been examined within the framework of leadership theories in general and in the context of different leadership approaches. Leadership styles have been affected by various geographical, socio-economic and cultural differences. From the leadership standpoint, culture is closely linked with enhanced firm performance (Combs et al., 2019). Unfortunately, sociological study has failed to evaluate variables that affect organizational performance, such as cultural factors, while evaluating organizational results (Arun et al., 2020). One of the management types is the paternalistic leadership approach that emerged in societies with paternalistic characteristics. Hofstede's cultural model provides extensive information about societies with paternalistic characteristics (Hofstede, 2001). More research is needed to understand paternalistic leadership's results on structural outcomes, especially on abstract variables such as performance (Lau, 2012). Both well-grounded methodological and conceptual studies are needed to establish a credible research flow on paternalist leadership (Pellegrini, Scandura, 2008).

Concerning social identity theory, staff members intend to identify themselves with groups that meet their needs regarding self-esteem, belonging, control, and purpose in life (Hogg, 2006). Suppose hotel managers can meet their employees' needs for self-esteem, belonging, and their meaning in life. In that case, they can strengthen their employees' sense of identity (Zhuang et al., 2021). It has been observed that managers who show a friendly and amicable behavior style use a fatherly leadership style that affects employees positively (Redmond, Sharafizad, 2020). According to Chen's (2013) research, the paternalistic leadership approach demonstrated in the hospitality industry has found that employees effectively develop internal service behaviour. However, Tuan (2018) stated that the authoritarian leadership aspect of paternalistic leadership may hinder the improvement of the social exchange relationship between workers and the management, leading to low employee commitment to the business. As can be seen that it is worth investigating, the relationship between paternal leadership and the identification of organization has been identified as one of the topics of this research.

Researchers looking for a solution to improve employee performance have conducted numerous studies in different sectors to determine the effects of identification on performance (Agustina et al., 2024; Ly, 2024). It is suggested that employees who identify with their organization and see themselves as part of the organization put in more effort to do the job, see themselves as representatives of the organization both inside and outside the organization, and benefits of the organization in all their decisions; and one of the most critical outcomes of organisational identification is performance (Bacaksız et al., 2017).

Accordingly, the aim of this research, which was carried out on employees performing their jobs at five-star accommodation establishments located in Antalya, is to investigate how paternal leadership affects the performance and organizational identification of employees. Although research has been done in various sectors within the context of paternal leadership and organization identification, this study will be the first study in the tourism sector in Tur-

key in terms of paternalistic leadership, employee performance and organizational identification. Since there is no other study in the literature in which these three variables are investigated together in tourism studies, it will fill gap in the field. The outcomes of the research can help as a directing information for hotel managers within the tourism industry, with increasing effectiveness and efficiency of employees as a performance indicator and managing to hold employees in the same organization for the long term while increasing their organizational identification levels.

Conceptual Framework

Paternalistic Leadership

Many studies have been carried out on which management style is effective in increasing the productivity and performance of employees (Myers, Rushbrook, 2024; Garengo, Betto, 2024; Lopez Cabarcos, 2024; Al Malki, Juan, 2018; Babalola, 2016). Paternalistic leadership approach is one of the topics researched in this direction (Aycan, 2006; Farh et al., 2006; Köksal, 2011; Pellegrini, Scandura, 2008).

The concept of paternal leadership appears as a management kind shaped by the synthesis of cultural, geographical, and socio economic characteristics (Silin, 1976). When the studies on paternalistic leadership are reviewed, it is seen that Cheng et al. (2000) define paternal leadership as a benevolent leadership style that takes place within moral rules in an atmosphere in which personal authority and discipline are dominant. Bing (2004) argues that the employer is a transformed limitation of the person's genuine parental authority figure. Maccoby (2004) maintains that today's few pioneers are good at controlling and manipulating their followers' transference of paternal attitudes. Padavic and Earnest (1994) stated paternalism continues in the present era and explain it as an asymmetrical power relationship in which employees meet their remarkable materialistic and psychological needs. They also argue that managers are supposed to see paternalism as a viable option to implement their strategies.

Aycan et al. (2000) assert that in a paternalistic relationship, the higher ranked employee's role is to channel, protect and nourish the junior employee. The junior employee's role is to be loyal and respectful to the higher ranked employee. Within a cultural context, businesses run by managers with paternalistic leadership style can be likened to the relationship between the head of the family and its members in male dominated cultures where there is high hierarchical authority. The head of the family stands out as a high authority who knows everything better than anyone else and as a nonnegotiable senior authority or decision maker whose decisions are important for the family's safety, continuity, and wellbeing. The duty of the household, on the other hand, is to be aware of the fact that the decisions made by the head of the family are for their good and to fulfil their duties under the leadership of the head of the family with no interruptions.

The number of studies conducted on paternalistic leadership has increased in recent years, but the conceptualization of paternalism as a legitimate form of authority as a managerial notion lane to work of Max Weber (Pellegrini, Scandura, 2008). Weber (1978) described three management styles: traditional, charismatic and bureaucratic. In the traditional management style, the stress is located on the administration of workers by an elder or paternal authority. Paternalistic leadership is grounded on individual commitment and unconditional defer-

ence of employees towards supervisor. Weber (1978) suggests that traditional paternal authority emerged from the relationship within the patriarchal household.

An expected situation that people grow up in a paternalistic culture show paternalistic leadership characteristics. Hofstede's cultural model, which provides a better understanding of the concept of paternalistic leadership, gives extensive information about societies with paternalistic characteristics (Hofstede, 2001). Paternalist societies are collectivist, avoid uncertainty, and have high level of hierarchical power (Köksal, 2011). These characteristics are important characteristic features of societies like as India, Pakistan, China, Korea and Turkey (Aycan et al., 2000). Researchers who have worked in the field of paternalistic leadership have put forward that paternal leadership is more effective management kind due to family structure in Eastern and Asian societies because of socio economic and cultural characteristics (Silin, 1976; Aycan et al., 2000; Kim, 1994). Kim (1994) underlines the importance of patriarchal relations in the family unit within the traditional values in Asian cultures and emphasizes that the boundaries of this relationship within the family reach workplaces over time.

Cheng et al. (2000) divide paternalism into three sections, which are authoritarianism, benevolence, and morality. Authoritarianism states the behaviour of superiors who assert authority and control and awaits unconditional deference from their subordinates. In authoritarian leadership, subordinates obey the leaders' wishes without opposition. The dimension of benevolence indicates individualized, holistic leader behaviours for the social and economic wellbeing of lower ranked workers. In exchange for leaders feel gratitude and the obligation to pay back after subordinates allow. The morality dimension describes the behaviours of a leader who exhibits superior individual ethics (e.g., one who does not manipulate authority for his own benefit, become a role model in private and professional life), that helps juniors workers to follow and identify with superiors (Pellegrini & Scandura, 2008). Based on these dimensions, Cheng et al. (2000) define paternalist leadership as "a management approach that contains intense discipline and authority with paternal benevolent and ethical honesty".

Aycan (2001) argued that paternalism is an important cultural extent that can expose intercultural diversities and a culture specific leadership model. In line with this approach, she developed the paternalistic leadership model. She created four dimensions based on behaviour and motivation and made them as a 2x2 matrix. These dimensions are benevolent, exploitative, authoritative, and authoritarian. It is seen that five scales used to measure paternalistic leadership have been developed so far (Aycan, 2006; Pellegrini, Scandura, 2008; Cheng et al., 2000; Aycan et al., 2000; Mathur et al., 1996). The scale developed by Aycan is one of the most up to date scales used and has been analyzed in Turkish culture (Schroeder, 2011). In this study, the short version of the paternalistic leadership scale developed by Aycan et al. (2013) was used.

Employee Performance

In today's technological world, human capital, which will make a difference for businesses to continue their competition, increase their profitability, and survive, is becoming more and more important. Staff performance in workplaces is a significant issue for businesses, so it is useful to address the concept of performance before discussing employee performance. Performance can be described as the level of utilization of a capacity, or the level of output obtained from a specific action (Uludağ, 2018). It also provides information about how much the attained level has achieved the intended goal (Uludağ, 2018). In this case, it would not be wrong to say, based on the concept of performance, that the employee's performance gives information about how much of the desired goals have been achieved as a result of the employ-

ee's effort while performing a certain job or service. Despite the technical differences between job performance, productivity, and efficiency, they are often used interchangeably (David Pin-cus, 2006).

The performances of individuals are important for both individuals and businesses. High performance of their employees can be considered as achieving quantitative and qualitative objectives such as producing more products or high quality services for businesses, gaining the majority of the market by having the edge over their competitors, and as a result, making profits (Ugurluoglu et al., 2018). For employees, alternatively, high performance helps reveal moral feelings such as self-confidence, self-efficacy, success, job satisfaction, and honour, as well as reward oriented financial opportunities such as promotion or additional income (Usta, 2012; Taşdemir, 2017). High performing individuals have better career opportunities in their jobs than those with medium and low performance showers (Sonnentag et al., 2008).

In their study on performance, Borman and Motowidlo (1997) examine performance in two dimensions: task performance and contextual performance. Task performance can be well defined as the direct contribution of the employees to the main technological process or as the indirect activities that benefit the technical process of the enterprise by providing the materials or services used for the process's continuity. Task performance is divided into two and examined as administrative task performance and leadership task performance (Karakoç, 2018). In general, the duties or services which are not taken in the work descriptions of the administrative personnel and which are included in the job descriptions of the lower level personnel are within the scope of technical task performance. Activities such as evaluating the employees and guiding them by their motivation and organizational objectives are considered within the scope of leadership task performance. Contextual performance is complementary elements of task performance that form the organization's social and psychological circumstances. In a way, it includes employee behaviours such as volunteering for additional jobs for the organization to be successful, helping other colleagues in the organization to complete the work, cooperating, taking initiative in work related decisions while doing their work (Borman, Motowidlo, 1997).

Organizational Identification

The concept of organizational identification is defined as the perception of unity in which employees in the organization see themselves as a part of the organization, that is, they see the goals of the organization as their personal goals and the accomplishment of the organization as their individual achievement and which is formed as a result of the congruence and consolidation of individual and organizational values (Kerse, Karabey, 2017). In studies on the subject, organizational identification is defined by Edgards and Peccei (2007) as "a psychological relationship between the employee and the organization, in which the individual feels a deep, self defining emotional and cognitive bond with the organization as a social entity", by Dutton et al. (1994) as the extent to which the member defines himself based on the same characteristics that he believes represent the organization; and by Mael and Ashforth (1992) as "the perception of oneness with or belongingness to an organization, in which the individual defines himself or herself in terms of the organization of which he or she is a member".

When employees introduce themselves to the external world, introducing the organization they work for as part of their identity, that is, introducing themselves as a member of the organization, is proof of how far the bond between the employee and the business can go (Dutton et al., 1994). An employee's provision of information about the bond with the organization

as a part of their identity reveals the relationship between organizational identity and social identity theory (Sökmen, Bıyık, 2016). Social Identity Theory shows that personal identity arising from group membership is necessary for their self concept, which affects their emotions, cognitions, and behaviors (Karanika Murray et al., 2015). At the same time, it is argued a personal self-concept belongs to a social group (or groups), and social identity is defined as the aspect arising from the value added and emotional meaning of participation. Suppose a person's organizational membership is central to their self-concept. In that case, that is, if the employer sets the institution he or she works for apart from other social group memberships, they are highly identified with the organization (Karabey, İşcan, 2007).

A high level of organizational identification in employees is very beneficial for organizations. Individuals who identify with their organization act as a representative of the organization when they come into contact with people outside the environment they work for, protect the interests of the workplace, and prevent harm to the workplace. They show high performance because they are loyal to their organizations, which helps organizations achieve their goals and objectives quickly (Karanika Murray et al., 2015). Organizational identification increases the level of work related satisfaction and decreases the turnover rate of employees. It enhances the sense of organizational citizenship by increasing the motivation level of the human resources that enable today's organizations to be successful by making a difference (Çetinkaya, Çimenci, 2014).

Paternalistic Leadership and Employee Performance

Many factors affect the high employee's performance in the workplace. In addition to personal factors such as the employee's sense of accomplishment, competence, and skill at work, some reasons affect the employee performance and are offered by the workplace such as working conditions, management style, business culture, climate and economic and social opportunities (Hatipoğlu et al., 2019). In this context, the relation between paternalistic leadership and employee performance effects examples have been given from international research area. For example, in the meta analysis and meta analytic criterion profile analysis which is conducted on 139 studies by Doudou et al. (2021) shows that benevolent leadership and the moral leadership dimension of paternalistic leadership have strong positive correlations with task performance.

Chan et al. (2013) conducted an investigation analysing the impact of two components of paternalistic leadership, namely authoritarian and benevolent leadership, on job performance through organizational based self-esteem. According to their findings, organizational self-esteem plays a detrimental mediating role in the connections between authoritarian leadership and the performance of employee tasks, as well as in the relationship between autocratic leadership and demonstrated organizational citizenship behaviour. Moreover, it was observed that a greater exhibition of benevolent leadership characteristics by supervisors significantly reduced the adverse effects of authoritarian leadership on organizational based self-esteem, subordinates' task performance, and organizational citizenship behaviour.

Chen et al. (2014) found that there was a positive correlation between the benevolent and moral dimensions of paternalistic leadership and both in role and extra role performance, whereas the authoritarian aspect of paternalistic leadership exhibited a negative association with subordinate performance.

Paternalistic Leadership and Organizational Identification

The behaviour of the leader in the organization is the leader's ability to perform their duties and fulfil their obligations; the leader's ability to communicate with their subordinates to establish good relations and ensure the loyalty of the members of the organization to their institutions increases the level of empowerment. In this context, the relation between paternalistic leadership and organizational identification effects examples have been given from international research area. For example, in a study carried out on 300 master's degree students in business administration in South Korea, Wang et al. (2017) concluded that the autocratic extent of paternalistic leadership did not influence organizational commitment. In contrast, benevolence and ethical extent had a positive relationship with organizational commitment. In addition, they found that while organizational identification was negatively related to the autocratic extent of paternalistic leadership, it had a positive relationship with the morality and benevolence dimensions.

In their research on various SMEs workers of Pakistan, Rehman et al. (2012) paternalistic leadership was found to have a positive effect on improving citizenship behaviour and increasing employee loyalty.

According to Tuan's (2018) research conducted in accommodation businesses in Vietnam, it has been seen that paternalistic leadership affects employees' commitment and takes on an extra role for customer satisfaction. The secondary purpose of the research was to examine the moderator part of optional HR practices to reveal the effects of paternalistic leadership components on work engagement. From this point of view, it has been proven that optional HR practices have a moderator role in the relationship between the three dimensions of paternalistic leadership and employee engagement. Optional HR practices strengthened the favourable relationship between the benevolent and ethical sides of paternalist leadership and work engagement. They moderated the unfavourable relationship between the authoritarian side of paternalist leadership and work engagement.

Zhuang et al. (2021) explored the effect of dimension and sub dimensions of paternalistic leadership on the voice behaviours of hotel employees and the role of organizational identification as a mediator in their study on 359 employees staffed in Taiwan hotels. The results showed that managers' authoritarian and moral leadership behaviours affected the workers' voice behaviours negatively. In contrast, managers' benevolent leadership affected the workers' voice behaviours positively. They also found that the link between moral authority and voice behaviour, the relationship between benevolent leadership and verbal action, and the relations between authoritarian management and nonverbal acts are mediated by organizational identification.

Paternalistic Leadership effects on employee performance and organisational identification in the Business Environment of Turkey

Paternalist societies, including Turkey, generally exhibit cultural characteristics such as being collectivist, having avoidance of uncertainty, and having a high hierarchical authority distance. Workers who follow managers with a paternalistic leadership style expect their managers to guide them, protect them, take care of them, treat them just like a father treats his own children; in return, the manager expects his/her subordinates to be loyal, respectful, and devoted to him/her and to show superior performance (Aycan, 2006). In this section, we will spate in two part and dive deeper to show more scientific results of paternalistic leadership effects on

employee performance and organisational identification from business environment of Turkey. In the first part, we will formulate our hypotheses by giving examples from scientific studies conducted in Turkey on the effect of paternalistic leadership on employee performance. In the second part, formulation of hypotheses by giving examples from scientific studies conducted in Turkey on effect of paternalist leadership on organizational identification.

As an example of the first part, in his study conducted in Turkey, Tekin (2019) stated paternalistic leadership positively and significantly affected employees' job satisfaction and performance. He furthermore stated the sub dimensions of paternalistic leadership, the family environment, loyalty, and satisfaction expectations and internal job satisfaction were positively and significantly correlated. The family environment, loyalty, and satisfaction expectations had a significant and positive relationship with performance, but there was no evidence of a significant connection between concern for the employees' wellbeing and performance.

In their study, Uğurluoğlu et al. (2018) observed paternalistic leadership behaviours directly affected employees' job performance and intention to leave. In their study, the researchers suggest that leaders within healthcare organizations have the potential to positively impact the job performance of their subordinates by emphasizing the value of benevolence. Furthermore, in order to mitigate the desire to depart, leaders at hospitals may prioritize the influence of benevolence and morality over specific behaviours.

The findings of the analysis done by Saygılı et al. (2020) indicated a noteworthy and affirmative correlation between paternalistic leadership and the various dimensions of ethical climate, namely egoistic, benevolent, and moral climate. Moreover, a relevant association has been established between ethical climate dimensions and performance, as well as between paternalistic leadership and performance.

Katı et al. (2021) conducted a study on 306 tourism employees in Antalya, Balıkesir and Çanakkale cities of Turkey and investigated the impact of X, Y and Z generations on the relationship between paternalist leadership and job performance. Based on the analysis outcomes, a noteworthy and affirmative correlation was identified linking paternalistic leadership with both job performance and its sub dimensions of contextual and task performance. The study established a significant discrepancy between the X and Y generations concerning the correlation between paternalistic leadership and job performance.

Through the investigation of various studies, it has been posited that a correlation exists between paternalistic leadership and employee performance. The following hypotheses are proposed on the basis of these studies;

- H_{1a}: There is a significant and positive relationship between creating a family environment at workplace, a dimension of paternalistic leadership, and employee performance.
- H_{1b}: There is a significant and positive relationship between involvement in non-work domain of employees' lives, a dimension of paternalistic leadership, and employee performance.
- H_{1c}: There is a significant and positive relationship between expectation of loyalty and deference, a dimension of paternalistic leadership, and employee performance.

As mentioned previously, the leadership's styles affect employees' organisational commitments. In the second section, we will provide more scientific examples from the Turkish private sector and create our hypothesis.

Erben et al. (2008) investigated the role of organizational commitment in the relationship between paternalistic leadership behaviors and ethical climate in a study conducted on various employee sectors in Istanbul. The results revealed that benevolent paternalistic leadership

had a moderate effect on affective commitment and a substantial effect on continuance commitment. Furthermore, paternalistic leadership was determined to affect the perception of ethical climate. The climate of ethics and affective commitment has been seen to have a strong relationship, with moderate relationships observed regarding ethics and continuance commitments. As a result, the researchers found that the ethics climate mediates the relationship between benevolent paternalistic leadership and affective commitment.

Çelen (2022), one of the recent studies in Turkey, investigated the impact of organizational climate perceptions and paternalistic leadership styles of 252 managers working in public institutions in Çanakkale on their organizational identification. As a result, there is a significant relationship between the benevolent leadership dimension of paternalistic leadership and organizational identification.

Yüzbaşıoğlu et al. (2018) researched 243 workers employed in hotels in Antalya to find the link between paternalist leadership and organizational commitment. They determined the link between paternalist leadership and organizational commitment. Moreover, mediating relationship has been observed between benevolent leadership and affective commitment, continuance commitment, normative commitment. Besides a low level, relationship between authoritarian leadership and continuance commitment is acknowledged too.

Yeşiltaş et al. (2022) examined the associated between paternalistic leadership, forgiveness climate, and organizational identification in a study conducted on 366 various echelon status executives and personnel staffed in five-star hotels in Bodrum, Turkey. The results indicated the morality and benevolent dimensions of paternalist leadership had a straight effect on forgiveness climate. In addition, benevolent leadership and forgiveness climate have affected organizational identification. The results showed that the forgiveness climate influenced both moral and benevolent dimensions of paternalistic leadership and organisational identification.

The following hypotheses are proposed based on these studies:

- H_{2a}: There is a significant and positive relationship between creating a family environment at workplace, a dimension of paternalistic leadership, and employees' perceptions of organizational identification.
- H_{2b}: There is a significant and positive relationship between involvement in non-work domain of employees' lives, a dimension of paternalistic leadership, and employees' perceptions of organizational identification.
- H_{2c}: There is a significant and positive relationship between expectation of loyalty and deference, a dimension of paternalistic leadership, and employees' perceptions of organizational identification.

Methodology

Purpose of the Research

The study's primary purpose is to investigate the effect of paternalistic leadership approach of managers working in the tourism sector on employees' performance and organizational identification.

Study Scope

The study population comprised the workforce in five star accommodation establishments in Antalya. The convenience sampling method has been applied to select a sample representing the research universe. In the summer of 2021, 406 people were contacted the population; however, 26 questionnaires were eliminated because they did not meet the required qualifications; as a result, 380 questionnaires were analysed. Bryman and Cramer (2012) stated that the sample size should be five times larger than the number of items listed on the questionnaire for analysis (cited in Delice, Ergene, 2015). There are 20 items in the questionnaire used in the research. Since the number of people reached was 3.8 above the specified level, the analysis was performed.

Research Method and Data Collection Tool

The research was carried out using a quantitative method. The survey methodology adopted for quantitative research was used as a data collection method. The survey was carried out in four parts. The first section deals with questions relating to participants' demographics, and the second section consists of the short version of the Paternalistic Leadership Scale, which was developed and translated into many languages by Aycan et al. (2013). Paternalistic leadership scale is comprised of three dimensions and ten items. The first four items are about creating a family environment at the workplace, the 5th, 6th, and 7th items are about involvement in the non-work domain of employees' lives, and the last three items address the dimension of expectation of loyalty and deference. The questionnaire had been measured with likert scale (1-Never, 5-Always). The high validity and reliability scores of this scale used in cross cultural studies (Cronbach alpha: 0.83) (Baysak, 2020) were effective in its employment in the present study. For this study, the Cronbach alpha scale coefficient has been calculated as 0.93.

The scale of employee performance, as defined by Kirkman and Rosen (2000) and used by Sigler and Pearson (2000), is included in the third part of the survey. The scale has one dimension with four items and is a five point Likert scale (1 Strongly Disagree, 5 Strongly Agree). The Cronbach Alpha coefficient was found to be above 0.70. The Cronbach Alpha coefficient of the scale was calculated as 0.83 by Çöl (2008) in a study in which the reliability and validity of the Turkish version of the scale were assessed. The Cronbach alpha coefficient is 0.73 in this study.

The organizational identification scale prepared by Mael and Ashforth (1992) with one dimension and six items was used for the 4th and last part, and the Cronbach Alpha coefficient was determined as 0.77. The scale developed by Mael and Ashforth (1992) was used in our study since it has been widely cited by the literature and Turkish validity and reliability tests have been conducted. In the study by Yarmacı (2012), in which the scale was adapted to Turkish, the Cronbach Alpha was calculated as 0.78, and a 5 point likert scale (1 Completely Disagree, 5 Completely Agree) was used. In this study, the Cronbach Alpha is calculated as 0.86.

Data Analysis

Data has analysed by using the SPSS 26. First of all, to determine the demographic characteristics of those participants, analysis of frequencies was carried out. Skewness and Kurtosis values have been checked to determine the usual distribution of data. According to the evaluation of Tabachnick and Fidell (2013), who are frequently cited regarding, if the skewness and kurtosis values lie between -1.5 and +1.5, it is considered that the data are typically distribut-

ed. Since values demonstrate that data is normally distributed, parametric tests were applied for the analyses. A frequency analysis was conducted to assess the degree of distribution of demographic characteristics between participants. In addition, an independent t test had been applied to reveal whether the scales significantly change according to gender. Furthermore, Pearson correlation analysis was used to identify the relationships between the variables. Also, regression analysis was applied to analyse the impact of paternalistic leadership, employee performance, and organizational identification. The confidence interval was determined to be 95% ($p < 0.05$) in the analyses.

Findings

The distribution of the demographic characteristics of the individuals participating in the research is presented in Table 1. The findings indicated that of the 380 participants participating in the study, 42% were female, and 58% were male. A total of 8% of the participants were under the age of 20 (18-20 Legal working age in Turkey), 39% were between the ages of 21-30, 32% were between the ages of 31-40, 16% were between the ages of 41-50, and 5% were at the age of 51 and over. When the participants' marital status was examined, it was found that 46% were single, 47% were married, 6% were divorced, and 1% were widowed. When the participants' work position was examined, it was found that 70,3% were employees, 5,3% were supervisors, 18,2% were chief, and 6,3% were managers. Looking at the data on time spent by the employees in their professions, it was observed that 17,9% of the employees spent 1 year or less, 29,7% of the employees spent 2-5 years, 18,2% of the employees spent 6-9 years, and 6,3% of the employees spent 10 years and over spend time in their professional life. When the data on time spent by the employees in their organization is analysed, it was observed that 41,6% of the employees spent 1 year or less, 42,6% of the employees spent 2-5 years, 9,5% of the employees spent 6-9 years, and 6,3% of the employees spent 10 years and over spend time in their professional life. In addition, 17% of the participants were primary school graduates, 39% graduated from high school, 19% had associate degrees, 23% had bachelor's degrees, and 2% had a postgraduate degree. Of the 380 participants participating in the study, 42% were female, and 58% were male.

Table 1. Distribution of the participants by demographic characteristics

Demographic variables	Groups	n	%
Gender	Female	160	42.1
	Male	220	57.9
Age	20 and below	32	8.4
	21-30	147	38.7
	31-40	122	32.1
	41-50	62	16.3
	51 and above	17	4.5
Marital Status	Single	175	46.1
	Married	180	47.4
	Divorced	23	6.1
	Widowed	2	0.5
Work Position	Employee	267	70.3

Demographic variables	Groups	n	%
	Supervisor	20	5.3
	Chief	69	18.2
	Manager	24	6.3
Duration of Employment In the Profession	1 year or less	68	17.9
	2-5	113	29.7
	6-9	69	18.2
	10 years and over	130	34.2
Duration of Employment In the Organisation	1 year or less	158	41.6
	2-5	162	42.6
	6-9	36	9.5
	10 years and over	24	6.3
Educational Level	Primary School	66	17.4
	High School	149	39.2
	Associate degree	71	18.7
	Bachelor's degree	87	22.9
	Postgraduate degree	7	1.8

The descriptive analysis of the scale variables is illustrated in Table 2. It was observed that the paternalistic leadership perception scores of the participants (4.03 ± 0.86) were at a “high” level. When the sub dimensions were examined, it was seen that creating a family environment at the workplace (4.15 ± 0.91) was at a “high” level, involvement in non-work domain of employees’ lives (3.76 ± 1.13) was at a “moderate” level, and expectation of loyalty and deference was (4.12 ± 0.87) was at a “high” level. In addition, organizational identification scores of the participants (4.03 ± 0.82) were determined to be “high”. Furthermore, employee performance scale had the highest average among the scales, and the perception scores (4.59 ± 0.48) were identified to be at a “high” level.

Table 2. Descriptive Analysis of The Variables

Variables and Sub-dimensions	N	X	SS	Skewness	Kurtosis
Paternalistic Leadership	380	4.0255	0.85507	-0.674	-0.196
Creating a family environment at workplace	380	4.1467	0.90942	-0.998	0.320
Involvement in non-work domain of employees' lives	380	3.7614	1.12822	-0.616	-0.654
Expectation of loyalty and deference	380	4.1184	0.86886	-0.960	0.506
Employee Performance	380	4.5877	0.47579	-1.048	0.635
Organizational Identification	380	4.0255	0.82058	-0.703	-0.187

Table 3 presents the Pearson correlation analysis of the scale variables. According to the results of the correlation analysis presented in Table 3, there was a low level, positive, and significant relationship between paternalistic leadership and employee performance ($r=.258$, $p<.01$) (Büyüköztürk, 2018). When the relationship between the sub-dimensions of paternalistic leadership and employee performance was examined, a low level, positive, and significant relationship was revealed between creating a family environment at workplace and employee performance ($r=.251$, $p<.01$), and a low level, positive, and significant relationship between

involvement in non-work domain of employees' lives and employee performance ($r=.213, p<.01$). In addition, a low level, positive relationship was identified between loyalty expectation and deference and employee performance ($r=.213, p<.01$).

Table 3. Correlation Analysis of The Variables

Variables and Sub-dimensions	1	1.1	1.2	1.3	2	3
1. Paternalistic Leadership	1	.906**	.893**	.865**	.258**	.334**
1.1 Creating a family environment at workplace		1	.693**	.683**	.251**	.330**
1.2 Involvement in non-work domain of employees' lives			1	.686**	.213**	.263**
1.3 Expectation of loyalty and deference				1	.213**	.306**
2. Employee Performance					1	.209**
3. Organizational Identification						1

** $p<.01$

According to the table, there was a moderate, positive and significant relationship between paternalistic leadership perception and organizational identification level ($r=.334, p<.01$). Concerning the relationship between the sub-dimensions of paternalistic leadership and the variable of organizational identification, a moderate, positive, and significant relationship was observed between creating a family environment at workplace and organizational identification ($r=.330, p<.01$) and a low level, positive and meaningful relationship was identified between involvement in nonwork domain of employees' lives and organizational identification ($r=.263, p<.01$). It can be seen that there was a moderate, positive relationship between expectation of loyalty and deference and organizational identification ($r=.306, p<.01$).

In addition, low level, positive and significant relationship was identified between employee performance and organizational identification ($r=.209, p<.01$).

Regarding the analysis of the hypotheses, the regression analysis tables (Tables 4 and 5) and their interpretations are given below;

Table 4. Regression Analysis Regarding the Relationship between The Sub-Dimensions of Paternalistic Leadership and Employee Performance

Variables	B	SH _B	β	T	P	Bilateral r	Partial R
Constant	3.996	0.124		32.297	0.000		
Creating a family environment at workplace	0.092	0.039	0.175	2.328	0.020	0.251	0.119
Involvement in non-work domain of employees' lives	0.022	0.032	0.053	0.703	0.482	0.213	0.036
Expectation of loyalty and deference	0.031	0.041	0.057	0.759	0.448	0.213	0.039
R=0.259 R ² Adjusted=.060							
F _(3,376) =9.041 p=.0000							

When the bilateral and partial correlations between the dependent and independent variables were examined, it was seen that there was a positive and low-level relationship between creating a family environment at the workplace and employee performance ($r=0.25$). When the relations between the other variables were controlled, the correlation between the two variables was calculated as $r=0.12$. It was seen that there was a positive and low-level relationship between involvement in the non-work domain of employees' lives and employee performance

($r=0.21$). However, when the relationship between the other two variables was controlled, the correlation was calculated as $r=0.04$. In addition, a positive and low-level relationship was identified between expectation of loyalty and deference and employee performance ($r=0.21$). When the relationship with the other two variables was controlled, the correlation was $r=0.04$.

There is a low level, significant relationship between the variables of creating a family environment at workplace, involvement in non-work domain of employees' lives, and expectation of loyalty and deference and employee performance scores, $R=0.259$, R^2 Adjusted= $.060$, $p<.01$. The three variables mentioned explained approximately 6% of the total variance of employee performance together. Considering the standardized regression coefficient (β), the relative importance of the predictor variables on employee performance can be ordered as involvement in non-work domain of employees' lives ($\beta=.05$), the expectation of loyalty and deference ($\beta=.06$), and creating a family environment at workplace ($\beta=.18$).

When the t-test results regarding the significance of the regression coefficients were examined, it was seen that only the variable of creating a family environment at the workplace ($t=2.328$, $p\leq.05$) is a significant predictor of employee performance. It is seen that the dimensions of involvement in the non-work domain of employees' lives and the expectations of loyalty and deference do not have a significant effect. In this context, the hypothesis H_{1a} "There is a significant and positive relationship between creating a family environment at workplace, a dimension of paternalistic leadership, and employee performance", which was aimed at the correlation between the sub-dimensions of paternalistic leadership and employee performance, was accepted in line with the regression analysis. However, according to the results of the analysis, the hypotheses H_{1b} and H_{1c} were rejected.

The regression equation for the prediction of employee performance according to the results of the regression analysis is given below;

$$\text{employee performance} = 3.996 + 0.092 \text{ creating a family environment at workplace} + 0.022 \text{ involvement in non-work domain of employees' lives} + 0.031 \text{ expectation of loyalty and deference}$$

Table 5. Regression Analysis Regarding the Relationship Between the Sub-Dimensions of Paternalistic Leadership and Organizational Identification

Variables	B	SH _b	β	T	p	Bilateral r	Partial R
Constant	2.592	0.207		12.512	0.000		
Creating a family environment at workplace	0.203	0.066	0.225	3.073	0.002	0.330	0.157
Involvement in non-work domain of employees' lives	0.004	0.053	0.005	0.069	0.945	0.263	0.004
Expectation of loyalty and deference	0.141	0.068	0.149	2.061	0.040	0.306	0.106
R=348 R ² Adjusted=.114							
F _(3,376) =17.251 p=.0000							

When the binary and partial regressions between the predicted and predictor variables were examined, it was seen that there was a positive and moderate relationship between creating a family environment at the workplace and organizational identification ($r=0.33$). When the relationships between the other variables were controlled, the correlation between the two variables was calculated as $r=0.16$. In addition, a positive and low-level relationship was detected

ed between involvement in the non-work domain of employees' lives and organizational identification ($r=0.26$). However, when the relationship between the other two variables was controlled, the correlation was $r=0.004$. Moreover, it was determined that there was a positive and moderate relationship between the expectation of loyalty and deference and organizational identification ($r=0.31$). When the relationship with the other two variables was controlled, the correlation was calculated as $r=0.10$.

A moderate and significant relationship was identified between the variables of creating a family environment at workplace, involvement in non-work domain of employees' lives, and expectation of loyalty and deference and organizational identification scores, $R=0.348$, R^2 Adjusted=.114, $p<.01$. Together, these three variables explained approximately 11% of the total variance of organizational identification.

Considering the standardized regression coefficient (β), the relative importance of the predictor variables on organizational identification can be ordered as involvement in the non-work domain of employees' lives ($\beta=.005$), the expectation of loyalty and deference ($\beta=.15$), and creating a family environment at workplace ($\beta=.23$).

When the t-test results regarding the significance of the regression coefficients were examined, it was found that creating a family environment at the workplace ($t=3.073$, $p\leq .05$) and expectation of loyalty and deference ($t=2.061$, $p\leq .05$) variables are significant predictors of organizational identification. The dimension of involvement in non-work domain of employees' lives did not have a significant effect. In this context, the hypothesis H_{2a} "There is a significant and positive relationship between creating a family environment at workplace, a dimension of paternalistic leadership, and employees' perceptions of organizational identification" and H_{2c} "There is a significant and positive relationship between expectation of loyalty and deference, a dimension of paternalistic leadership, and employees' perceptions of organizational identification", which were aimed to find correlation between the sub dimensions of paternalistic leadership and employees' perceptions of organizational identification, were accepted in line with the regression analysis. However, according to the analysis results, the hypotheses H_{2b} was rejected.

The regression equation for the prediction of organizational identification according to the results of the regression analysis is given below;

organizational identification' = 2.592 + 0.203 *creating a family environment at workplace* + 0.004 *involvement in non-work domain of employees' lives* + 0.141 *expectation of loyalty and deference*.

Conclusion

Tourism is a human intensive industry. The enterprise's human capital has an important place such as the competition of enterprises with opponents, their separation in service and guest's preference, increasing guest satisfaction and the level of profit. The problem of finding and keeping qualified staff is becoming an essential issue in tourism sector day by day. In order to retain qualified personnel, enterprises pay more attention to management styles that will ensure the identification of the staff with the organization and more efficient performance, as

well as the improvement of salaries and working conditions. Based on this approach and our research's objective, the effect of paternalistic leadership on employee performance and organizational identification was investigated in five star accommodation enterprises in Antalya.

According to the research results, there is a positive and significant relationship between the perception of paternalistic leadership and organizational identification. Paternalistic leadership behavior predicts 11.1% of the variance of organizational identification. According to the results of the regression analysis, creating a family environment at the workplace ($t=3.073$, $p\leq.05$) and expectation of loyalty and deference ($t=2.061$, $p\leq.05$) variables are significant predictors of organizational identification. As a result of our study, it has been observed that the level of identification of the employees in the organization they work in increases due to the hotel managers creating a family atmosphere in the workplace and their behaviours, including loyalty expectation and deference. Knowing this essential information and using it by the tourism sector managers can reduce the turnover rate and increase the organizational identification level of employees.

Creating a family atmosphere and loyalty expectation and deference dimensions can be separated under the dimensions of benevolent paternalism and authoritarian paternalism, as Aycan (2006) revealed in her research. The result of our study, which found a positive relationship between benevolent leadership and organizational identification, is academic publications on tourism and different sectors (Wang, Kwan, 2017; Yeşiltaş et al., 2022; Zhuang et al., 2021).

As mentioned in the introduction part of the study, Tuan (2018) stated that the authoritarian dimension of paternalistic leadership may hinder the development of the social exchange relationship between employees and the organization, leading to low employee commitment to the business. Their study results show that a high perception of authoritarian leadership may negatively impact employees' commitment to the company. Also, as mentioned before, the study done by Wang, Kwan (2017) shows organizational identification was negatively related to the authoritarian dimension of paternalistic leadership. The study conducted in Turkey by Yüzbaşıoğlu (2018) partly supports Wang and Tuan's findings. The findings show a low-level relationship between authoritarian leadership and continuance commitment in Turkey's tourism sector. Although our study findings show a relationship between loyalty expectation and obedience (authoritarian leadership) sub-dimension of paternalist leadership and organizational identification, the low level of this relationship supports the mentioned findings.

It has been stated that Hofstede's cultural model shows paternalistic society cultural characteristics are collectivist (collectivist), avoid uncertainty, and have a high level of hierarchical power. Turkey is part of paternalist culture as in Eastern and Asian societies. Logically, the studies on paternalist leadership in similar societies are expected to have similar outputs. Although the same paternalistic leadership characteristics appear in these societies, existing cultural differences can affect slightly different leadership outcomes. One of the findings, which is a low positive relationship between loyalty expectation and obedience dimension and organizational identification, differs from Tuan's and Wang's findings may be the cultural differences between societies as mentioned.

According to the research results, there is a positive and significant relationship between the perception of paternalistic leadership and employee performance. The paternalistic leadership perception explained 6% of the change in employee performance, that is, 6% of the change in employee performance was presented by paternalistic leadership behaviour. The research finding aligns with the academic literature (Ugurluoğlu et al., 2018; Chen et al., 2014; Kati, Toptaş, 2021). When the t-test results regarding the significance of the regression coefficients are analysed, it is seen that only the variable of creating a family atmosphere in the workplace

($t=2.328, p \leq .05$) is a significant predictor of employee performance. It is expected that sincere managers of collectivist societies such as Turkish society, who establish close relations with their employees, have an impact on the performance of their employees. According to the research conducted by Tekin (2019), a positive and significant relationship was found between the variables of creating a family atmosphere in the workplace, loyalty and satisfaction expectations and performance, but it was concluded that the interest in the life of the employees outside of work did not affect the performance. The result that Tekin found is partially compatible with our research. In addition, the lack of a significant relationship between employees' involvement in non-work life and loyalty expectation and deference dimensions with performance is meaningful in terms of the high hierarchical power level that employees feel and a misunderstanding of participation in life outside of work (Tekin, 2019).

Limitations and Suggestions for Future Studies

Several limitations should be taken into account when considering the interpretations made based on the research analyses. Since the limited sample in the study is specific to Antalya, it should be taken into account that different results may be obtained in different destinations. Therefore, this study can be conducted in different destinations within the same country and the results can be compared. In addition, the study sample comprises employees in five star accommodation establishments. Conducting the same study on employees in four star or three star hotels with fewer employees, with a lower hierarchical power level, may reveal different results. In fact, conducting research considering hotel ownerships, which we can distinguish as corporate and family businesses, may show that paternalistic leadership may cause differences between these institutions.

Since the sample used in the study was obtained from Turkey, which reflects a collectivist culture, it can be argued a limited cultural analysis was made. Conducting the same research in a culture with individual community characteristics such as Europe may help us to look at the study from a broader perspective.

References

- Al-Malki, M., Juan, W. 2018. Leadership styles and job performance: A literature review. *Journal of International Business Research and Marketing* 3(3), 40-49.
- Arun, K., Şen, C., Okun, O. 2020. How does leadership effectiveness related to the context? Paternalistic leadership on non-financial performance within a cultural tightness-looseness model?. *JEEMS Journal of East European Management Studies* 25(3), 503-529.
- Agustina, R., Yusuf, M., Sutiyan, O.S.J., Ardianto, R., Norvadewi, N. 2024. Employee Performance Mediated Quality Of Work Life Relationship Satisfaction On The Job And Organizational Commitment. *Jurnal Darma Agung* 30(2), 589-605.
- Aycan, Z. 2001. Paternalizm: Yönetim ve Liderlik Anlayışına İlişkin Üç Görgül Çalışma. *Yönetim Araştırmaları Dergisi* 1(1), 1-19.
- Aycan, Z. 2006. Paternalism. In: Kim, U., Yang, K., Hwang, K., *Indigenous and Cultural Psychology: Understanding People in Context* (s. 445-466). Springer :New York.

- Aycan, Z., Kanungo, R., Mendonca, M., Yu, K., Dell, J., Stahl, G., Kurshid, A. 2000. Impact of culture on human resource management practices: A 10-country comparison. *Applied psychology*, 49(1), 192-221.
- Aycan, Z., Schyns, B., Sun, J.-M., Felfe, J., Saher, N. 2013. *Paternalistic Leadership Questionnaire—Short Form (PLQ)* [Database record]. APA PsycTests.
- Babalola, S. 2016. The effect of leadership style, job satisfaction and employee-supervisor relationship on job performance and organizational commitment. *Journal of Applied Business Research* 32(3), 935-946.
- Bacaksiz, F.E., Tuna, R., Seren, A.K.H. 2017. The relationships between organisational identification, job performance, and job crafting: A study among nurses. *International Journal of Caring Sciences* 10(1), 251-259.
- Baysak, B. 2020. *Liderliğin Firma Performansına Etkisinde Girişimcilik Eğiliminin Aracı Rolü ve Ulusal Kültürün Düzenleyici Etkisi: Teknopark Firmaları Üzerine Bir Araştırma*. İstanbul: Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İşletme Ana Bilim Dalı Doktora Tezi.
- Bing, S. 2004. *Sun Tzu was a sissy: Conquer your enemies, promote your friends, and wage the real art of war*. Harper Collins.
- Borman, W., Motowidlo, S. 1997. Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human performance* 10(2), 99-109.
- Bryman, A., Cramer, D. 2012. *Quantitative data analysis with IBM SPSS 17, 18 & 19: A guide for social scientists*. Routledge.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. 2018. *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı. Pegem Atıf İndeksi*. Pegem Akademi; Ankara.
- Chen, W.J. 2013. Factors influencing internal service quality at international tourist hotels. *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 35, 152-160.
- Chan, S., Huang, X., Snape, E., Lam, C. 2013. The Janus face of paternalistic leaders: Authoritarianism, benevolence, subordinates' organization-based self-esteem, and performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 34(1), s. 108-128.
- Chen, X., Eberly, M., Chiang, T., Farh, J. 2014. Affective trust in Chinese leaders: Linking paternalistic leadership to employee performance. *Journal of management* 40(3), s. 796-819.
- Cheng, B., Chou, L., Fang, J. 2000. Paternalistic Leadership scale: construction and measure of a triple model. *Indigenous Psychology Journal* 14, 3-64.
- Combs, J.G., Crook, T.R., Rauch, A. 2019. Meta-analytic research in management: Contemporary approaches, unresolved controversies, and rising standards. *Journal of Management Studies* 56(1), 1-18.
- Çelen, Y. 2022. *Kamu Kurumlarında Çalışan Yöneticilerin Örgüt İklimi Algılarının Ve Babacan Liderlik Tarzlarının Örgütsel Özdeşleşme Üzerindeki Etkisi: Çanakkale İlinde Bir Araştırma*. Çanakkale: Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü (Yüksek Lisans Tez).
- Çetinkaya, M., Çimenci, S. 2014. Örgütsel adalet algısının örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı üzerindeki etkisi ve örgütsel özdeşleşmenin aracılık rolü: Yapısal eşitlik modeli çalışması. *Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi* 12(23), 237-278.
- Çöl, G. 2008. Algılanan Güçlendirmenin İşgören Performansı Üzerine Etkileri. *Doğuş Üniversitesi Dergisi* 9(1), 35-46.
- David Pincus, J. 2006. Communication Satisfaction, Job Satisfaction, and Job Performance. *Human Communication Research* 12(3), 395-419.

- Delice, A., Ergene, Ö. 2015. Ölçek geliştirme ve uyarlama çalışmalarının incelenmesi: Matematik eğitimi makaleleri örneği. *Karaelmas Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi* 3(1), 60-75.
- Dutton, J., Dukerich, J., Harquail, C. 1994. Organizational images and member identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 39, 239-263.
- Edwards, M., Pececi, R. 2007. Organizational identification: Development and testing of a conceptually grounded measure. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 16(1), 25-57.
- Erben, G., Güneşer, A. 2008. The relationship between paternalistic leadership and organizational commitment: Investigating the role of climate regarding ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics* 82(4), s. 955-968.
- Farh, J., Cheng, B., Chou, L., Chu, X. 2006. Authority and benevolence: Employees' responses to paternalistic leadership in China. In: A. Tsui, Y. Bian, & L. Cheng (Ed.) *China's domestic private firms: Multidisciplinary perspectives on management and performance*. (s. 230-260) Sharpe: New York.
- Garengo, P., Betto, F. 2024. The role of organisational culture and leadership style in performance measurement and management: a longitudinal case study. *Production planning & control* 35(2), 151-169.
- Hatipoğlu, Z., Akduman, G., Demir, B. 2019. Babacan liderlik tarzının çalışan görev performansı ve duygusal bağlılık üzerindeki etkisi. *İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi* 11(1), s. 279-292.
- Hofstede, G. 2001. *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations*. Sage, London
- Hogg, M. 2006. Social Identity Theory: Contemporary Social Psychology Theories. In: McKeown, S., Haji, R., Ferguson, N., (Ed), *Understanding Peace and Conflict Through Social Identity Theory*, California: Stanford University, 111-136.
- Karabey, C., İşcan, Ö. 2007. Örgütsel Özdeşleşme, Örgütsel İmaj ve Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı İlişkisi: Bir Uygulama. *Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi* 21(2), 231-241.
- Karakoç, A. 2018. İş Tatmininin Örgütsel Bağlılık ve İş Gören Performansı Üzerindeki Etkisi: Sigorta Acentesi Çalışanları Üzerine Bir Uygulama. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi* 23(4), 1371-1388.
- Karanika-Murray, M., Duncan, N., Pontes, H., Griffiths, M. 2015. Organizational identification, work engagement, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 30(8), 1019-1033.
- Katı, Y., Toptaş, A. 2021. Paternalist liderliğin iş performansı ve alt boyutlarına etkisi: X, Y ve Z kuşakları üzerine bir araştırma. *Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* 24(46), 1073-1092.
- Kerse, G., Karabey, C. 2017. Algılanan örgütsel desteğin örgütsel özdeşleşmeye etkisi: Örgütsel sinizmin aracı rolü. *Manas Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi* 6(4), s. 375-398.
- Kim, U. 1994. Significance of Paternalism and communalism in the occupational welfare system of Korean Firms: A national survey. In: H. Triandis, Ç. Kağıtçıbaşı, S. Choi, & G. Yoo, *Individualism and Collectivism: Theory, method and applications* (251-266). Sage: London
- Kirkman, B., Rosen, B. 2000. Powering up teams. *Organizational Dynamics* 28(3), s. 48-66.
- Köksal, O. 2011. Bir Kültürel Liderlik Paradoksu: Paternalizm. *Mustafa Kemal University Journal of Social Sciences Institute* 8(15), 101 - 122.
- Lau, E.W. 2012. *A study of effective leadership in the Chinese context*. Academy of Management 2012 Annual Meeting.

- López Cabarcos, M.Á., Vázquez Rodríguez, P., QuinoA Pineiro, L.M. 2022. An approach to employees' job performance through work environmental variables and leadership behaviours. *Journal of Business Research* 140, 361-369.
- Ly, B. 2024. Inclusion leadership and employee work engagement: The role of organizational commitment in Cambodian public organization. *Asia Pacific Management Review* 29(1), 44-52.
- Maccoby, M. 2004. Why people follow the leader: The power of transference. *Harvard Business Review* 82(9), 76-85.
- Mael, F., Ashforth, B. 1992. Alumni and their alma mater: A partial test of the reformulated model of organizational identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 13, 103-123.
- Mathur, P., Aycan, Z., Kanungo, R. 1996. Work cultures in Indian organisations: A comparison between public and private sector. *Psychology and Developing Societies* 8(2), s. 199-222.
- Myers, C., Rushbrook, E. 2024. Leadership. In: *Disaster Health Management* (pp. 335-346). Routledge.
- Padavic, I., Earnest, W. 1994. Paternalism as a component of managerial strategy. *Social Science Journal* 31(4), 389-405.
- Pellegrini, E., Scandura, T. 2008. Paternalistic leadership: A review and agenda for future research. *Journal of management* 34(3), 566-593.
- Redmond, J., Sharafizad, J. 2020. Discretionary effort of regional hospitality small business employees: Impact of non-monetary work factors. *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 86.
- Rehman, M., Afsar, B. 2012. The impact of paternalistic leadership on organization commitment and organization citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Business Management and Applied Economics* 5(5), 148-159.
- Saygili, M., Özer, Ö., Karakaya, P. 2020. Paternalistic leadership, ethical climate and performance in health staff. *Hospital topics* 98(1), 26-35.
- Schroeder, J.L. 2011. *The Impact of Paternalism and Organizational Collectivism in Multinational and Family-Owned Firms in Turkey*. A Thesis Submitted for thr Degree of Master of Arts to University of South Florida.
- Sigler, T., Pearson, C. 2000. Creating an empowering culture: examining the relationship between organizational culture and perceptions of empowerment. *Journal of Quality Management* 5, 27-52.
- Silin, R. 1976. *Leadership and values: The organization of large-scale Taiwanese enterprises* (62). Harvard Univ Asia Center.
- Sökmen, A., Büyük, Y. 2016. Örgütsel bağlılık, örgütsel özdeşleşme, kişi-örgüt uyumu ve iş tatmini ilişkisi: Bilişim uzmanlarına yönelik bir araştırma. *International Journal of Informatics Technologies* 9(2), 221.
- Sonnentag, S., Volmer, J., Spychala, A. 2008. *Job performance*. The Sage handbook of organizational behavior, 1, 427-447.
- Tabachnick, B., Fidell, L. 2013. *Using Multivariate Statistics* (6). Pearson:Boston.
- Taşdemir, F. *Performans değerlendirme yöntemleri nelerdir?* Kolayik.com: <https://kolayik.com/ikutuphane/performans-degerlendirme-yontemleri-nelerdir/> (24.10.2017).
- Tekin, E. 2019. Paternalist liderliğin iş tatmini ve çalışan performansına etkisi üzerine bir araştırma. *Third Sector Social Economic Review* 54(1), s. 178-204.
- Tuan, L. T. 2018. Driving employees to serve customers beyond their roles in the Vietnamese hospitality industry: The roles of paternalistic leadership and discretionary HR practices. *Tourism Management* 69, 132-144.

- Ugurluoglu, O., Aldogan, E., Turgut, M., Ozatkan, Y. 2018. The effect of paternalistic leadership on job performance and intention to leave the job. *Journal of Health Management* 20(1), s. 46-55.
- Uludağ, G. 2018. Örgütsel Bağlılık İle İşgören Performansı İlişkisini İncelemeye Yönelik Bir Alan Araştırması. *Bitlis Eren Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* 7(1), 171-193.
- Usta, I. 2012. Ödüllendirmenin örgütsel bağlılığa etkisi: İstanbul'daki beş yıldızlı otel işletmelerinde bir araştırma. Master's thesis, Trakya Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Wang, H., Kwan, K. 2017. A study on the influence of paternalistic leadership on organizational commitment: Focus on the mediating effect of organizational identification. *International Journal of Trade, Economics and Finance* 8(2), s. 109-116.
- Weber, M. 1978. *Economy and society: An outline of interpretive sociology* (Vol. 2). University of California press: California.
- Yarmacı, N. 2012. Psikolojik güçlendirmenin örgütsel özdeşleşmeye etkisi: Otel işletmelerinde bir araştırma. Master's thesis, Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Yeşiltaş, M., Gürlek, M., Tuna, M., Kanten, P., Çeken, H. 2022. Paternalistic leadership and organizational identification: The mediating role of forgiveness climate. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration* 23(3), s. 546-575.
- Yüzbaşıoğlu, N., Doğan, O. 2018. Relationship between paternalistic leadership and organizational commitment in hospitality industry: Case of Antalya, Turkey. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 7(1), s. 163-173.
- Zhuang, W., Lee, C., Ma, C. 2021. Hotel Employees' Voice Behavior: The Role of Paternalistic Leadership and Organizational Identification. *Sustainability* 14(1), s. 256.