PATERNALISTIC LEADERSHIP in TURKEY: ITS RELATIONSHIP with ORGANIZATIONAL IDENTIFICATION, WORK-GROUP IDENTIFICATION, SUPERVISOR IDENTIFICATION and ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIORS

The Graduate School of Economics and Social Sciences of
İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University

by

MERVE ALABAK

In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS IN PSYCHOLOGY

THE DEPARTMENT OF
PSYCHOLOGY
İHSAN DOĞRAMACI BİLKENT UNIVERSITY ANKARA

May 2016

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in Psychology.

Asst. Prof. Dr. David M. G. Lewis

Supervisor

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in Psychology.

Asst. Prof. Dr. Gül Günaydın

Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in Psychology.

Asst. Prof. Dr. Yonca Toker

Examining Committee Member

Approval of the Graduate School of Economics and Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Halime Demirkan

Director

ABSTRACT

PATERNALISTIC LEADERSHIP in TURKEY: ITS RELATIONSHIP with ORGANIZATIONAL IDENTIFICATION, WORK-GROUP IDENTIFICATION, SUPERVISOR IDENTIFICATION and ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIORS

Alabak, Merve

M.A., Department of Psychology

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. David M. G. Lewis

May 2016

The present study investigates paternalistic leadership from the dyadic leader-subordinate perspective and explores whether paternalistic leadership is associated with subordinates' identification with the organization, work-group and supervisor, as well as subordinates' organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), and organizational citizenship behavior directed toward supervisor (OCB-S). The data was obtained from 81 supervisors and 132 employees. Supervisors evaluated their own paternalistic leadership style and also employees' OCB and OCB-S. Employees evaluated their supervisors' paternalistic leadership style, their own organizational identification, work-group identification, supervisor identification, OCB and OCB-S. The findings showed that paternalistic leadership ratings of supervisors and employees was borderline significant. Supervisor-perceived paternalistic leadership was related to both employees and supervisor ratings of OCB and OCB-S. Employee-perceived paternalistic leadership was related to employees' identification with the organization and supervisor, and employee-rated OCB-S. There was a congruence between supervisor and employee ratings on employees' OCB and OCB-S. Practical implications, limitations and possible future research of these findings were mentioned.

Keywords: Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Organizational Identification, Paternalistic Leadership, Supervisor Identification, Work-group Identification.

ÖZET

TÜRKİYE'DE BABACAN LİDERLİK: BABACAN LİDERLİĞİN ÖRGÜTSEL ÖZDEŞİM, ÇALIŞMA GRUBU ile ÖZDEŞİM, YÖNETİCİ ile ÖZDEŞİM VE ÖRGÜTSEL YURTTAŞLIK DAVRANIŞLARIYLA İLİŞKİSİ

Alabak, Merve

Yüksek Lisans, Psikoloji

Tez Yöneticisi: Yard.Doç. Dr. David M. G. Lewis

Mayıs 2016

Bu çalışmada, babacan liderlik yönetici ve çalışan bakış açılarıyla incelenmekte, babacan liderliğin çalışanların örgütle, çalışma grubuyla ve yöneticileriyle özdeşimiyle ilişkisi ve babacan liderliğin çalışanların örgütsel yurttaşlık davranışı (ÖYD) ve yöneticiye yönelik örgütsel yurttaşlık davranışıyla (ÖYD-Y) ilişkisi araştırılmaktadır. Çalışmaya 132 çalışan ve bu çalışanların 81 birincil yöneticisi katılmıştır. Yöneticiler kendilerinin babacan liderlik stilini, çalışanlarının ÖYD ve ÖYD-Y' lerini değerlendirdiler. Çalışanlar, yöneticilerinin babacan liderlik stilini ve kendilerinin örgütsel özdeşimlerini, çalışma grubuyla özdeşimlerini, yöneticiyle özdeşimlerini, ÖYD ve ÖYD-Y'lerini değerlendirdiler. Sonuçlar yöneticilerin ve çalışanların babacan liderlik değerlendirmelerinin marjinal derecede anlamlı olduğunu göstermiştir. Yönetici tarafından algılanan babacan liderlik çalışanların hem kendileri hem de yöneticileri tarafından değerlendirilen ÖYD ve ÖYD-Y ile ilişkili bulunmuştur. Çalışan tarafından algılanan babacan liderlik çalışanların örgütle ve yöneticiyle özdeşleşmesiyle ve çalışan tarafından değerlendirilen ÖYD-Y ile ilişkili çıkmıştır. Yöneticilerin ve çalışanların, çalışanların ÖYD ve ÖYD-Y ile ilgili değerlendirmeleri arasında anlamlı ilişkiler bulunmuştur. Bulgular ilgili alan yazın temelinde tartışılmış ve uygulamaya yönelik öneriler sunulmuştur.

Anahtar kelimeler: Babacan Liderlik, Çalışma Grubu ile Özdeşim, Örgütsel Özdeşim, Örgütsel Yurttaşlık Davranışı, Yönetici ile Özdeşim.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT ……..iii

ÖZET……..v

TABLE OF CONTENTS……..vii

LIST OF TABLES……ix

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION……1

1.1.Overview……1

1.2.Paternalistic Leadership……..2

1.3.Paternalistic Leadership and Employee Outcomes……4

1.4.Cross-cultural Differences in Leadership Perception……5

1.5.Supervisor-perceived Paternalistic Leadership and Subordinate-perceived Paternalistic Leadership……7

1.6.Paternalistic Leadership and Identification……15

1.7.Paternalistic Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior…..18

1.8.Paternalistic Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior towards Supervisor……...20

CHAPTER II: METHOD……..20

2.1.Participants……..20

2.2.Procedure……20

2.3.Measures……..21

CHAPTER III: RESULTS……...24

3.1.Sample……..24

3.2.Descriptive Statistics and Correlations among Variables……24

3.3.Research Questions Analyses……..26

CHAPTER IV: DISCUSSION……30

4.1.Main Findings……..30

4.2.Other Results……35

4.3.Limitations……...35

4.4.Future Studies……..36

4.5.Implications…….37
4.6.Conclusion……...38

REFERENCES……39
APPENDICES…….46
A. PATERNALISTIC LEADERSHIP SCALE…….46
B. ORGANIZATIONAL IDENTIFICATION SCALE…….....47
C. WORK-GROUP IDENTIFICATION SCALE …….....48
D. SUPERVISOR IDENTIFICATION SCALE…….....49
E. ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR SCALE……50
F. ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIPBEHAVIOR TOWARDS SUPERVISOR SCALE…….52

LIST OF TABLES

1. Scales used in the study…….22

2. Demographic Information of Participants…….25

3. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations between Study Variables…….29

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Overview

The purpose of this study was first to investigate paternalistic leadership (PL) from both the perspective of employees and supervisors and then to investigate the relationship between supervisor-perceived PL, employee-perceived PL, employees' organizational identification, work-group identification, supervisor identification, organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), and organizational citizenship behavior toward supervisor (OCB-S) in Turkish organizations. The current study is the first empirical investigation of PL from multi-source data (employees and their direct supervisor). Additionally, this study makes contribution to employee identification (with organization, work-group and supervisor), and organizational citizenship behaviors literature by showing their association with PL. The introduction will be presented into three parts: (1) theoretical and empirical literature related to PL and its effectiveness in Turkey, (2) social identification (i.e., organizational identification, work-group identification) and relational identification (i.e., supervisor identification) within the organization as well as how they are related to PL, and (3) the relationship between PL, OCB and OCB-S.

1.2. Paternalistic Leadership

Paternalistic leadership (PL) has been studied over the past 20 year (Pellegrini & Scandura, 2008). In contrast to the Western literature, non-Western literature has focused on the benevolent intention of paternalistic leadership (Aycan, 2006; Pellegrini & Scandura, 2008). For example, Aycan's (2006) PL theory argued that the main concern of a paternalistic leader is subordinates' welfare and s/he genuinely guides subordinates' work and non-work lives. This benevolence brings trust, loyalty and gratitude toward the paternalistic leader.

PL can be viewed as a fatherly leadership style employed by supervisors (Aycan, 2006). In return subordinates are expected to accept the supervisor's authority (Aycan, 2006). Supervisors with a PL style combine authority with nurturing manners (Aycan, 2006). For instance, they are very interested in their subordinates' both personal and work life, but on the other hand they demand unquestioning loyalty.

Aycan (2006) listed five dimensions of PL. The first dimension is creating a family atmosphere at the workplace. Paternalistic leaders pursue a family-like environment at work by acting similar to a senior family member. For instance, they provide guidance to their employees like a parent about professional and non-work lives. The second dimension is establishing close and individualized relationships with subordinates. Paternalistic leaders are personally interested in their subordinates' welfare and know them personally (e.g., subordinates' family lives). Getting involved in the non-work domain, the third dimension, indicates that paternalistic leaders are present at employees' and their family members' personal events (e.g.,

wedding, graduations). These leaders also provide social and financial support if their employees need help for personal problems.

The last two dimensions are related to expectations from employees. Expecting loyalty, the fourth dimension, means that paternalistic leaders look for subordinates' commitment and loyalty in exchange for their kind and protecting manner. The final one, maintaining authority/status, indicates that, although paternalistic leaders are caring, they value hierarchical status differences. In a paternalistic relationship, subordinates are expected to respect the superiority of their leaders and behave accordingly.

This leadership style is accepted in Turkey due to its highly collectivistic and power distant Turkish culture (Aycan, 2006; Pellegrini, & Scandura, 2008). Hofstede in his study (1980) defined individualism (vs. collectivism) as the degree to which members of a society give priority to individual rights and achievements over group achievements. In collectivistic cultures like Turkish culture, group needs and goals are more important than personal needs and goals (Hofstede, 1980). Strong connections among group members are strongly encouraged (Hofstede, 1980). Paternalism also involves conformity and dependency to the leader (Aycan, 2006). For example, supervisors' involvement and guidance in subordinates' both work and non-work life is perceived positively in collectivistic cultures (Aycan, 2006).

Power distance also has important implications for paternalistic leadership. Power distance deals with how people perceive power differences (Hofstede, 1980). Cultures with high power distance believe that large power differences between a leader and a subordinate are normal (Hofstede, 1980). In line with this, in a paternalistic relationship, a paternalistic leader is believed to be superior in terms of

experience, expertise and competence, and subordinates accept their own inferiority (Aycan, 2006).

PL is also more likely to be endorsed in cultures with high uncertainty avoidance. Individuals in high uncertainty avoidant cultures are less tolerant of uncertain or unstructured situations and less likely to deviate from group norms (Hofstede, 1980). Given that paternalistic leaders control employees' behaviors and provide stability in employees' lives, employees with high uncertainty avoidance may feel comfortable with the dependency to a paternalistic leader. Consistent with this, Aycan, Kanungo, Sinha (1999) found a high positive relationship between uncertainty avoidance and paternalistic leadership in India. Turkish culture is also characterized by strong uncertainty avoidance (Hofstede, 1980, 2001), so paternalistic leadership practices can emerge to decrease uncertainty.

On the other hand, Western cultures where individualism, low power distance and low uncertainty avoidance are prevalent view PL as malevolently authoritative and suppressing (Aycan, 2006).

1.2. Paternalistic Leadership and Employee Outcomes

As discussed above, PL is common in Turkey (Aycan, 2001; Aycan, et. al, 2000). However, empirical studies on PL are still sparse (Pellegrini & Scandura, 2008). The relationship between PL and work outcomes in Turkish organizations has been investigated in a limited number of studies (e.g., Goncu, Aycan, & Johnson, 2014; Erben & Guneser, 2007).

Recently, Goncu et al. (2014) found that paternalistic leadership style perceived by employees leads to more trust towards a leader, and in turn leads to more organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) (i.e., extra-role work behaviors) in

Turkey. Similarly, in Schroeder's (2011) study, subordinate-perceived PL was associated with more OCB and more job satisfaction in Turkish-based multi-national companies. Erben and Guneser (2007) tested the effect of subordinate-perceived PL on subordinates' organizational commitment. As expected, PL was related to increased organizational commitment among Turkish employees.

Building on this previous research, the current research aims to extend our understanding about PL and its outcomes in Turkey. To the best knowledge of author, there is no research that has tested PL from both the point of view of the supervisor and the subordinates. This present research is the first research investigating whether paternalistic behaviors of supervisors are perceived as paternalistic by subordinates.

1.3. Cross-cultural Differences in Leadership Perception

According to Lord and Maher (2002, p. 9), leadership is "the process of being perceived by others as a leader". Lord et al.'s (1984) leadership categorization theory suggested that followers have their own leadership prototypes which they rely on while perceiving and judging leaders' traits and behaviors (Cronshaw & Lord, 1987). The leader prototype was defined as one's implicit theory or abstraction about who is a leader (Maurer & Lord, 1991). A leader must fit with a subordinate leadership prototype to be viewed and accepted as a leader (Maurer & Lord, 1991).

At this point, it is important to note that leadership prototypes are affected by culture (Brodbeck et al., 2000; Hofstede, 1993; House, Hanges, Javidan, & Dorfman, 2004). A substantial body of research has demonstrated that cultures vary in their leadership preferences. For instance, Shafer, Vieregge and Choi (2005) tested the preferred leadership qualities of people from Hong Kong, India, China, Taiwan and the U.S..

Different leadership preferences were emphasized by members of those five groups. Specifically, Americans more than the other groups placed importance on honesty and courage. Significant differences also existed in preferences for interpersonal skills for all groups. While Americans look for a direct contact with a leader, personal contact was the least preferred by Indians. Similarly, Humphreys, Jiao and Sadler (2008) found that Americans compared to Chinese, prefer transformational leaders who show individualized consideration and encourage open communication.

More comprehensive cross-cultural research on how culture shapes leadership prototypes was initiated by House et al. (1999). The project called GLOBE (Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness) aimed to reveal culturally endorsed leadership prototypes across 61 countries, including Turkey. Six leadership dimensions which universally perceived as prototypical were identified (Den Hartog et al., 1999): “Charismatic/value based”, inspiring and motivating people for a vision or a goal; “team-oriented”, effective group cohesiveness and encouraging a common goal; “self-protective”, emphasizing the safety of the individual and the team by supporting face saving behaviors; “participative”, allowing others to be involved in decisions making; “humane-oriented”, showing consideration, patience and generosity; “autonomous”, being independent.

In Turkey, charismatic/value based, team-oriented, participative and humane-orientations have been more strongly associated with effective leadership. Brodbeck et al. (2000) replicated the GLOBE’s findings in their investigation of leadership prototypes in twenty one European countries and Turkey. Their results demonstrated that Turkish subordinates appreciate team-integrator, decisive, visionary, inspirational, administrative, diplomatic, collaborative and performance oriented leaders while they do not view self-centered and malevolent leaders as effective.

Similarly, Kabasakal and Bodur (2002) mentioned that in the GLOBE's Arabic cluster (Turkey, Egypt, Morocco, Kuwait, and Qatar) outstanding leadership is characterized with being team-oriented and charismatic. Team-oriented leaders focus on followers' welfare and needs by sacrificing their own interests, which is consistent with collectivistic values of these countries. Charismatic leaders are able to motivate and inspire their followers for better performance and future goals. Therefore, outstanding leaders are expected to encourage a group spirit while emphasizing strong performance within a collectivistic atmosphere in Turkey (Kabasakal & Bodur, 2002).

The most recent cross-cultural research on leadership prototypes (Aycan, Schysn, Sun, Felfe, & Saher, 2013) focused on paternalistic, transformational , authoritarian, and nurturant-task leadership prototypes in Turkey, China, and Pakistan, high power distance and collectivistic cultures, and the United States, Germany, and the Netherlands, low power distance and individualistic cultures. In line with the GLOBE project, Aycan et al., (2013) showed that culture has a great impact on leadership prototypes. The results demonstrated that paternalistic leadership prototypes are highly preferred by employees from high power distance and collectivistic cultures. In these cultures, the ideal leader is characterized by showing personal interest and guidance to subordinates, having power as well as being performance oriented. In contrast, employees in low power distance and individualistic cultures, value individualized consideration of a leader but do not tolerate authoritarianism in a leader.

1.4. Supervisor-perceived Paternalistic Leadership and Subordinate-perceived Paternalistic Leadership

Research findings above showing that leaders who are group-oriented, supportive, humane-oriented, and nurturing are perceived as the ideal by Turkish employees imply that a high quality relationship between a leader and a subordinate is important. Turkish culture is considered as a high-context culture, meaning that communication is indirect and depends on interpersonal relationships (Rosenbloom & Larsen, 2003). This relationship-oriented cultural environment may create a gap in the PL perceptions of subordinates and supervisors. In the nature of paternalism, each subordinate desires to have the most intimate relationship with the leader (Sinha, 1990). Similarly, Aktas and Sargut (2011) argued that people with collectivistic and high power distance values have need for relationship-oriented leaders because collectivists are emotionally attached to their in-group members, and power distance values encourage the need for supervisors' guidance and direction. Moreover, supervisors' protective and loving behaviors may not meet their subordinates' relatively high close relationship needs. Empirical evidence for this assumption comes from Ozmen's (2005) research. She found that employees perceived their supervisors as less relationship-oriented than did the supervisors perceive themselves in Turkish organizations.

Evidence from leader-member exchange (LMX) research also indicates different perceptions about the quality of supervisor-subordinate relationship between supervisors and their subordinates. LMX views leadership as a process concerning with the unique and dyadic relationship between leaders and subordinates (Gerstner & Day, 1997; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Illies, Nahrgang, & Morgeson, 2007). The core idea is that leaders develop specific exchange relationships or interactions with each employee they supervise (Liden & Maslyn, 1998). These relationships can have different qualities ranging from high quality (e.g., stronger mutual trust,

consideration and liking) to low quality (weaker mutual trust, consideration and liking) (Liden & Maslyn, 1998). Gersnter and Day's (1997) meta-analysis found little agreement in LMX perceptions of supervisors and subordinate. More recently, Hwa, Jantani, Ansari, & Canada (2009) and Xin (2004) also showed that supervisors and subordinates do not agree with their mutual LMX.

Until now, to the best knowledge of the author, there is no empirical investigation comparing leaders' own perception about their paternalism with their employees' perception in the Turkish organizational context. With the exception of Aycan et al.'s (2000) study, PL research has always focused on employees. Aycan et al. (2000) asked managers from ten countries including Turkey to what extent they perceive PL in their socio-cultural environment. Turkish managers characterized their environment as high paternalistic. It is not to say that Turkish managers believe they show total paternalism, and their employees perceive such paternalism. It remains unclear whether a supervisor's paternalism is perceived as such by a subordinate. Due to the lack of previous research and theoretical reasoning, we will address this issue as an exploratory question.

Research Question 1: Are paternalistic behaviors of the supervisors perceived as such by their subordinates?

As mentioned above, one possibility is that employees compared to their supervisors, perceive their supervisors as less paternalistic because of employees' strong preferences for a warm relationship with and close attention from the leader.

Another important addition of this research to the PL literature is to explore the relationship between PL perception and employee outcomes: organizational identification (OI), work-group identification (WGI), supervisor identification (SI),

organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), and organizational citizenship behavior directed supervisor (OCB-S).

Different from previous studies, the present study investigates whether supervisors' report on PL is related to employees' identification and behaviors. Supervisors' own perception regarding their PL style might be related to their subordinates' identification with organization, work-group and supervisor, and subordinates' helping behaviors because paternalistic leaders expect their employees to show self-sacrifice for the sake of the group and organization (Aycan, 2006). In other words, supervisors with PL may reflect their expectations to their employees.

1.5. Paternalistic Leadership and Identification

Identification refers to the degree to which a person describes him/herself in relation to another person or group (Pratt, 1998). The literature identifies two types of identification: relational identification and collective identification. Identification with supervisors or coworkers are examples of relational identification (Sluss & Ashforth, 2007), and identification with organizations or work-groups are examples of collective identification (van Knippenberg & van Schie, 2000). In the case of employee identification, recent research has mainly focused on multiple foci of identification, namely, organizational identification, work-group identification and supervisor identification (Cooper & Thatcher, 2010).

While there is a growing literature on the relationship between employee relational or collective identification and leadership styles (e.g., Cicero & Pierro, 2007; Zhang & Chen, 2013), the link between PL and employee identification with the organization, work-group or supervisor has been less examined. More importantly, no studies have investigated all foci of identification in a single study. We recognize

that paternalistic behaviors of the leader may influence subordinates' sense of identity with the organization, work-group and supervisor in Turkish organizations where PL is valued. Therefore, it is worthwhile to examine how PL affect employees' OI, WGI and SI which all potentially foster employees' voluntary extra-role behavior directed to the organization and supervisor.

Ashforth, Harrison and Corley (2008) defined OI as the extent to which employees characterize or define themselves as members of the organization. For instance, if an employee highly identifies with an organization, this employee refers to other employees in the organization as "we" (Mael & Ashforth, 1992). Recent research on OI has largely derived from social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) and self-categorization theory (Turner, 1985).

Social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner 1979) was initially proposed to explain why people see their own group superior or better than other groups (Hogg, Terry, & White, 1995). Tajfel in his a series of studies (e.g., Tajfel, Billig, Bundy, & Flament, 1971) found that people tend to favor their in-group members more and also if they have the opportunity, increase dissimilarities between in-group and out-group. This theory's main ideas are that group membership provides description and evaluation of who I am by (1) referring the features of the group, which is social identity of an individual, (2) people desire a positive self-esteem which partly originated from their social identity, and (3) to achieve a positive self-esteem by comparing themselves with relevant out-groups, people make a positive distinction between in-group and out-group (van Dick, Wagner, Stellmacher, & Christ 2004). Put differently, group memberships are considered as social identities which determine how people should think, feel and behave as a group member (Hogg et al. 1995). More comprehensive definition of social identity is that "part of an individual's self-concept which derives

from his knowledge of his or her membership of a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership" (Tajfel, 1978, p. 63).

Self-categorization theory focuses on cognitive dimension of social identity, that is, social categorization of self (Hogg & Terry, 2000; Turner, 1985). The core idea is that self-categorization occurs when one adopts in-group prototypes (cognitive representations about the group and group members) (Hogg & Terry, 2000). After this transformation of self, people think themselves as the embodiment of the in-group and think others as the embodiment of the out-group (Hogg & Hains, 1996).

Briefly, people tend to classify themselves based on group membership, and organizational identification occurs through self-categorization where people value organizational membership. Organizational membership provides an important and influential group affiliation since people are involved in organizational groups more than other groups in the modern era (Bergami & Bagozzi, 2000).

Leadership is important for OI for three reasons. First, leaders can be the most influential organizational connection for employees because they are the most powerful and generally single information source for the organizational disposition (Martin & Epitropaki, 2001). Second, employees spend time with their leaders on a daily basis in formal or informal activities in the organization (Chen, Tsui, & Farh, 2002). Finally, leaders are usually prototypical members of the group, so they show the preferred and approved features of the organizational group (Hogg, 2001).

Returning to the aim of this study, in Turkish organizational groups, PL can play a vital role in employees' OI. Aycan (2006) argued that PL's fatherly caring and protective behaviors create a big family atmosphere in the organization, and

subordinates feel a sense of identification with this family. In general, employees tend to evaluate their leaders' treatment as organizational treatment (Zhang & Chen, 2013). In line with this, Bell and Menguc (2002) claim that when employees work with supportive supervisors, they accept organizations' achievements and failures as their own, which is an indicator of OI. Also if employees feel well treated, they are more likely to adopt organizational goals as their personal goals, which also reflect strong OI (Bell & Menguc, 2002). Moreover, in a paternalistic environment, employees by considering their organization as a family, and by connecting their self with the organizations' goals and values can feel high OI. Goncu et al. (2014) demonstrated that employee-perceived PL has a positive impact on employees' OI in Turkey. We anticipate to find more evidence for the positive effect of PL on subordinates' OI. Our new contribution will be testing the link between PL perceived by supervisors and employees' OI. Thus,

Research Question 2: Is supervisor-perceived PL related to employees' OI?

While OI continues to attract increasing attention from researchers, another line of research suggests that people are more likely to show stronger identification with small groups like work-groups than with large organizations (e.g., Ashforth et al., 2008; Riketta & van Dick 2005; van Knippenberg & van Schie, 2000). For instance, Riketta and van Dick's (2005) meta-analysis demonstrated that employees have higher identification with their work-groups compared to organizations. Employees generally expend more meaningful time in their work-group (Millward, Haslam, & 2007), and they share more common goals with their work-group members (van Knippenberg & van Schie, 2000), so it is not surprising that the strength of work-group identification is greater than strength of organizational identification.

Brewer's (1991) optimal distinctiveness theory also supports the same logic. Individuals tend to join smaller groups that have specific characteristics and commonalities to create a balance between feeling unique and belonging a social group.

Similar to OI, WGI can be enhanced by supportive and benevolent behaviors of supervisors. Although there is no research on the link between PL and WGI, it is possible to expect that employee-perceived PL is positively related to WGI. However, our investigation will be exploratory.

Research Question 3: Are supervisor-perceived PL and employee-perceived PL related to subordinates' WGI?

Since close attachment between a supervisor and a subordinate is encouraged in a paternalistic relationship, investigating relational identification with the supervisor makes important contributions to the PL literature. Turkish employees probably perceive paternalistic leaders' protective and nurturing behaviors as signals for a committed relationship. Consequently, employees are more likely to integrate their supervisor's values, perspectives and goals to their self-concept. Additionally, loyalty to the supervisor is one of the core features of paternalism. In the paternalistic and relationship-oriented Turkish culture, being loyal to the supervisor has special significance. In such a culture, it is not difficult for employees to internalize their supervisor's values.

Interestingly, despite the great influence of supervisors on subordinates in Turkish organizational context, supervisor identification has not been examined in Turkey. Cheng, Chou, Wu, Huang and Farh (2004) found that employee-perceived PL is positively associated with supervisor identification in Taiwan where PL is common.

Although the positive link between PL and supervisor identification is evident in Taiwan, differences in leadership outcomes can be expected in different cultures.

Research Question 4: Are supervisor-perceived PL and employee-perceived PL associated with supervisor identification?

In summary, one of the unique contributions of this research is to close the gap regarding PL and its relations with employee identification with the whole organization, work-group and supervisor in the literature by providing both employee-perceived and supervisor-perceived PL data.

1.6. Paternalistic Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

The relationship between leadership styles and OCB has been extensively examined (e.g., Ehrhart, 2004; Lian & Tui, 2012; Piccolo & Colquitt, 2006). However, there are only two studies (Ersoy, Born, Derous, & van der Molen, 2012; Goncu et al., 2014) which explored PL as predictor of OCB in Turkey. This study expands this issue by using different sources (supervisor and subordinate) for OCB as well as different sources (supervisor and subordinate) for PL. To our knowledge, no empirical studies have been investigated the link between PL and OCB from different sources.

The term “organizational citizenship behavior” initially used by Bateman and Organ (1983) to define extra-role behaviors that are beneficial for the organization. Examples of these behaviors are assisting co-workers for job-related tasks, preventing or reducing problems in work-setting and supporting positive interactions among colleagues, which all are not job requirements (Bateman & Organ, 1983).

Later work has focused on dimensionality of OCB. Organ (1988) identified five sub-dimensions of OCB: altruism, civic virtue, conscientiousness, courtesy, and

sportsmanship. In his model, altruism refers to voluntary helping behaviors towards individuals while civic virtue refers to supporting behaviors towards the organization like active involvement in non-obligatory meetings. Conscientiousness as OCB dimension means voluntarily engaging in duties that are not required by formal job description. Courtesy consists of behaviors that prevent inter-personal conflict at work. Finally, sportsmanship refers to warmly enduring unavoidable and problematic characteristics of the job.

From the earliest research on OCB (Smith, Organ & Near, 1983), the effects of leadership behaviors on employees' OCB has drawn attention. For instance, Smith et al. (1983) demonstrated that leader supportive behaviors were related to employees' OCB. Authors explained the relationship by drawing on social exchange theory. Employees' OCB can be result of exchange for their leaders' supportiveness which can be viewed as discretionary behaviors. They also argued that leaders' devotion for their subordinates can be seen as OCB (e.g., helping employees), and leaders are kind of role models. Therefore, subordinates can be affected by their role models.

Other research also showed that high LMX, supervisor trust, transformational leadership behaviors (i.e., individualized consideration, being concerned for the needs of subordinates) are linked with employees' OCB (Deluga, 1994; Ilies et al., 2007; Piccolo & Colquitt, 2006).

Given the importance of positive and reliable relationship between supervisors and subordinates for predicting subordinates' OCB, it is not surprising that PL which is relationship-oriented style is associated with OCB. Goncu et al. (2014) suggested that Turkish employees may willing to engage in OCB to maintain warm relationships with their supervisors and not be deprived of close interest of their

supervisors. In line with this, they found that PL was linked to subordinates' OCB activated by impression management motives in the Turkish organizational context. That means employees wish to create a good image in the eyes of their supervisors by displaying OCB.

Paine and Organ (2000) claim that higher power distance which fosters PL might be related to employees' OCB perception and engagement. For example, employees in high power distance cultures compared to employees in low power distance cultures may be more likely to engage in sportsmanship dimension of OCB. They may easily accept the negative or intolerable parts of their job and organization. However, their supervisors may not see their extra efforts for the organization as OCB. Lam, Hui and Law (1999) investigated OCB perception of supervisors and subordinates from four countries; Hong Kong, Japan, Australia, and the USA. Participants were asked to respond whether each OCB is in employees' job roles or extra duties. Supervisors were more likely to perceive OCB as subordinates' job requirements. More specifically, supervisors from high power distant cultures (Hong Kong and Japan) compared to supervisors from low power distant cultures (Australia and the USA) had more expectations about their subordinates' formal job roles. Lam et al. (1999) reasoned that authority figures in higher power distant cultures have more control and power over subordinates, so they want to see more subordinate work and effort.

In the light of previous studies, we examined PL and OCB link by using different sources (supervisor and subordinate). Since these studies did not include actual supervisor ratings regarding subordinate OCB, it is not clear whether supervisors notice their subordinates' voluntary beneficial behaviors for the organization. Allen, Barnard, Rush and Russell (2000) found that supervisor and employee ratings of employees' OCB were not correlated in the US sample. Their explanation was that

observers like supervisors may not see whole supportive and productive voluntary behaviors for the organization. The picture can be different in Turkey where subordinates try to create the most favorable view in the eyes of their superior. Acting beyond formal responsibilities in front of supervisors can be a good way of looking like a perfect employee.

Additionally, the source of OCB is important to consider because Organ and Ryan's (1995) meta-analysis indicated that self-rating OCB show higher correlations with self-report variables than other-rating of OCB. Moreover, collecting only one particular rating might cause overpredicting the relationships between OCB and its predictors. For this reason, we believe that different rating sources (supervisor and subordinate) may give us more reliable view about the PL and OCB link. Specifically, the following questions will be addressed in the Turkish organizational context.

Research Question 5: Is there a correlation between supervisor-rated OCB and subordinate-rated OCB?

Research Question 6: Does the rating source matter for PL and OCB relationship?

1.7. Paternalistic Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior towards Supervisor

We also go beyond previous studies on OCB and PL by examining whether PL is related to more OCB directed toward the supervisor. Following the same rational about the link between OCB and PL, we proposed that PL will increase Turkish employees OCB directed their immediate supervisors. They may use OCB-S as a way of displaying their loyalty to their supervisor, being perceived as a hardworking employee as well as reciprocating their supervisors' protection and care.

Additionally, whether supervisors observe their employees' discretionary helpful behavior toward them will be explored.

Research Question 7: Does rating source create a difference in the relationship between PL and OCB-S?

Research Question 8: Is there a correlation between supervisor-rated OCB-S and subordinate-rated OCB-S?

In conclusion, we aim to provide more sophisticated understanding about PL and its link with employee outcomes in Turkey by using multi-source data.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

2.1. Participants

Thirteen companies belonging to a major holding company in Ankara were informed about the thesis. Companies are from construction, furniture, press, property management, tourism, and security sectors. A total of 390 questionnaires (130 supervisors and 260 subordinates) by matching subordinates with their direct supervisors were distributed. 98 matched supervisors-subordinate questionnaires were received. The final sample consists of 81 matched pairs after excluding missing data. 30 supervisors matched with 1 subordinate, and 51 supervisors matched with 2 subordinates.

2.2. Procedure

Data were collected with the assistance of human resources (HR) managers in the companies. HR managers sent an e-mail about the current research to supervisors and employees noting that participation is voluntary. Then, HR managers distributed the questionnaires with two empty envelopes; one for consent form, one for questionnaire. Participants put the signed consent form into one envelope, and put the questionnaire

into another envelope. They delivered envelopes HR managers within two weeks. We used numbers to match supervisor and employee questionnaires.

2.3. Measures

Two different questionnaires were used for data collection: one for supervisors and one for employees (see Table 1). Supervisors' questionnaire consisted of PL scale to assess themselves, OCB and OCB-S scales to evaluate their subordinates, and demographic information (i.e., gender, age, education level, tenure as a supervisor). Employees' questionnaire included PL scale to assess their immediate supervisors' PL style, OI, WGI, SI, OCB, OCB-S scales and demographic questions (i.e., gender, age, education level, tenure with supervisor and organization).

We used translation-back-translation method for Turkish questionnaires.

Paternalistic Leadership

A 10-item version of Paternalistic Leadership Style developed by Aycan (2006) (Aycan et al., 2013) was used to assess PL (Appendix A). Supervisors rated their own PL style. A sample item was "I behave like a family member (father/mother or elder brother/sister) towards my employees." Subordinates used the same scale to evaluate their direct supervisors' PL style. A sample item was "He/she behaves like a family member (father/mother or elder brother/sister) towards his/her employees." The ratings were collected using a 5-point likert scale (1= Never to 5= Always). In the present study, the coefficient alphas were .85 and .91 for supervisor ratings and subordinate ratings respectively.

Organizational Identification

Organizational identification was assessed with Johnson, Frederick and Hekman's (2012) scale (Appendix B). The scale has two subscales: affective identification (4 items) and cognitive identification (4 items). A sample item for affective identification was "I feel happy to be an employee in this organization." and a sample item for cognitive identification was "My self-identity is based in part on my membership in the organization." Employees rated their OI on a 7-point likert scale (1= Strongly disagree to 7=Strongly agree). The coefficient alpha of whole scale was found .90.

Table 1. Scales used in the study

Supervisor Questionnaire	*Employee Questionnaire*
Paternalistic Leadership	Paternalistic Leadership
Organizational Citizenship Behavior	Organizational Identification
Organizational Citizenship Behavior directed Supervisor	Work-group Identification
Gender	Organizational Citizenship Behavior directed Supervisor
Age	Gender
Organizational Citizenship Behavior	Age
Education Level	Education Level
Tenure as a Supervisor	Tenure with Supervisor
	Tenure with Organization

Work-group Identification

Work-group identification was measured by the organizational identification scale developed by Mael and Ashforth (1992) (Appendix C). The word "organization" changed as "work-group". An example item was "I am very interested in what others think about this work-group." The scale consisted of 6

items, and responses were gathered on a 5-point likert scale (1= Strongly disagree to 5=Strongly agree). The internal consistency was .79.

Supervisor Identification

We used 10 items from Walumbwa and Hartnell (2011) to assess subordinates' supervisor identification (Appendix D). For example, "When someone criticizes my supervisor, it feels like an insult to me." Items were rated using a 7-point likert scale (1= Strongly disagree to 7=Strongly agree). The internal consistency was .79.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

OCB was measured using the 10-item version of a behavioral frequency checklist (Spector, Bauer and Fox, 2010) (Appendix E). Employees reported how frequently they show organizational citizenship behaviors in their current job on a five-point scale: never, once or twice, once or twice a month, once or twice a week, and every day. The internal consistency for employee-reported OCB was .82 and for supervisor-rated OCB was .92. The scale was adopted to Turkish by Schroder (2011).

Organizational Citizenship Behavior towards Supervisor

5 items were adopted from Rupp and Cropanzano (2002) to measure employees' OCB directed their immediate supervisors (Appendix F). For example, "I accept added responsibility when my supervisor is absent.". Responses ranged from 1 (never) to 5 (always). The internal consistency for self-report and supervisor-rated OCB-S was .76 and 91 respectively.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

First, demographic information of participants are given to clarify sample characteristics. Next, descriptive statistics and correlations among the variable of interest are provided. Finally, analyses for the research questions are presented.

3.1. Sample

Supervisors and employees' demographic characteristics are shown in Table 2. The majority of supervisors were male (70.2%) while the majority of subordinates were female (65.6%). Supervisors' average age was 32.26 (*SD* = 7.71) and employees' average age was 39.50 (*SD* = 8.03). All participants were university graduates. The percent with Master's degrees is relatively higher for supervisors (13.7%) than employees (8.6%).

A small percentage of supervisors (16.8%) had less than 2 years work experience as a supervisor. All employees had at least six months tenure with their current supervisors.

3.2. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations among Variables

Since we used multi-source data for PL and 51 supervisors rated by 2 employees, we used the averaged of two employees PL in the analyses. 30 supervisors were rated by only one employee. The sample size for the relationships between supervisor perceived variables and the relationships between supervisor perceived and employee-perceived variables, was 81. The sample size for the relationships between employee-perceived variables was 132.

Table 2. Demographic Information of Participants

Variable	*Supervisor (N = 81)*	*Employee (N = 132)*
Gender (%)		
Male	70.2	34.4
Female	29.8	65.6
Age	M = 32.26 SD = 7.71	M = 39.50 SD = 8.03
Education (%)		
Less Than High School	-	-
High School	-	-
Bachelor's Degree	86.3	91.4
Master's Degree	13.7	8.6
Doctoral Degree	-	-
Tenure as a supervisor (%)		-
6 months-1 year	16.8	-
2-4 years	35.9	-
5-10 years	35.9	-
More than 10 years	11.5	
	M = 2.42 SD = 0.90	
Tenure with the supervisor		
6 months-1 year	-	46.0
2-4 years	-	42.1
5-10 years	-	10.3
More than 10 years	-	1.6

All variables mean scores and standard deviations were displayed in Table 2. In terms of PL ratings, a paired-sample t-test demonstrated that the mean of employee-perceived PL was different from the mean of supervisor-perceived PL (t = 4.57, p < .001). Employee-perceived PL (M = 3.95, SD = .68) had higher ratings than supervisor-perceived PL (M = 3.51, SD = .71). The mean of supervisor-rated OCB-S was different from the mean of subordinate-rated OCB-S (t = 2.78, p < .05). Employee-rated OCB (M = 3.62, SD =.72) and OCB-S (M = 4.15, SD = .74) were higher than their supervisors' ratings of employees' OCB (M = 3.39, SD = .81) and OCB-S (M = 3.52, SD = .97).

Intercorrelations among study variables, descriptive statistics and scales' reliabilities are provided in Table 3. Supervisor-perceived PL was not correlated with employees' OI, WGI and SI, but it was significantly positively correlated with both employee ratings of OCB (r = .26, p < .05), OCB-S (r = .21, p < .05) and supervisory ratings of OCB (r = .66, p < .001) and OCB-S (r = .49, p < .001). Employee-perceived PL was significantly positively correlated with OI (r = .23, p < .05), SI (r = .53, p < .001) and employee-rated OCB-S (r = .29, p < .01). Supervisors and employee tenures was also correlated with employee-perceived PL. Supervisors' tenure as a supervisor (r = -.37, p < .01), employees' tenure with their current supervisors (r = -.41, p < .001) and employees' organizational tenure (r = -.34, p < .01) were negatively correlated with employee-perceived PL.

The pattern of correlations among OI, WGI, SI, employee-rated OCB and employee-rated OCB-S are not surprising. For instance, SI and employee-rated OCB-S

correlation (r = .32, p < .001) were positively correlated. Supervisory- rating on OCB and OCB-S were not significantly correlated with employees OI, WGI and SI.

3.3 Research Questions Analyses

In the present research, supervisors themselves rated their own PL as well as their employees evaluated their supervisors' PL. Research question 1 focused on this PL perception. In other words, it was explored whether supervisors' PL perception regarding their leadership style is related to their subordinates' PL perception about them. The correlation between employee-perceived PL and supervisor-perceived was marginally significant (r = .20, p = .06).

Research question 2 was about whether supervisor-perceived PL was related to employees' OI. Supervisor-perceived PL was not associated with employees' OI. Subordinate-perceived PL was significantly related to subordinates' OI, r = .23, p < .05.

Research question 3 aimed to explore whether supervisor-perceived PL and employee-perceived PL were related to employees' WGI. Both supervisor-perceived PL and employee-perceived PL were not linked with employees' WGI.

Research question 4 was concerned with whether supervisor-perceived PL and employee-perceived PL were related to employees' SI. The results revealed that PL observed by employees significantly related to their SI (r = .53, p < .001) whereas PL observed by supervisors were not associated with employees' SI.

Research question 6 and 7 were related to the role of rating source in OCB (and OCB-S) and PL relationship. The correlation was significant for PL rated by supervisor and subordinate-rated OCB (r = .26, p < .01), but the correlation was not significant for PL rated by employee and subordinate-rated OCB. While supervisor-

perceived PL was associated with supervisory rating on OCB (r = .66, p < .001), subordinate-perceived PL was not associated with supervisor-rated OCB. Regarding to OCB-S and PL, it was found that both supervisor-perceived PL (r = 21, p < .05) and employee-perceived PL (r =.29, p < .01) were related to subordinate-rated OCB-S. However, employee-perceived PL was not related to OCB-S rated by supervisors although supervisor-perceived PL was related to OCB-S rated by supervisor (r = .49, p < .001).

Research question 5 was about the correlation between supervisor-rated OCB and subordinate-rated OCB. OCB ratings of supervisor and subordinate were significantly correlated (r = .44, p < .001). The mean of supervisor-rated OCB was different from the mean of subordinate-rated OCB (t = 2.78, p < .05). The mean of subordinate-rated OCB (M = 3.62, SD = .71) was higher than the mean of supervisor-rated OCB (M = 3.39, SD = .79) Research question 8 was about the correlation between supervisor-rated OCB-S and subordinate-rated OCB-S. OCB-S ratings of supervisor and subordinate were also correlated (r = .33, p < .001). The mean of supervisor-rated OCB-S was different from the mean of subordinate-rated OCB-S (t = 6.92, p < .001). The mean of subordinate-rated OCB-S (M = 4.15, SD = .74) was higher than the mean of supervisor-rated OCB-S (M = 3.52, SD = .96).

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations between Study Variables

	M	**SD**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**
1. Supervisor-perceived Paternalistic Leadership (S)	3.51	.70	(.85)	.20^{+}	-.07	-.01	.14	.26**	.21*	.66**	.49**	.07	.12	.10
2. Employee-perceived Paternalistic Leadership (E)	3.95	.68		(.91)	.23*	.13	.53**	.07	.29**	.16	.07	-.37**	-.41**	-.34**
3. Organizational Identification (E)	5.10	1.15			(.90)	.17*	.34**	.18*	.20*	-.09	-.01	-.03	-.06	.08
4. Work-group Identification (E)	4.09	.70				(.79)	.33**	.21*	.19*	-.00	.09	-.02	.13	-.08
5. Supervisor Identification (E)	5.61	1.12					(.79)	.29**	.32**	.13	.11	-.27**	-.22*	-.21*
6. Subordinate-rated Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) (E)	3.62	.71						(.82)	.44**	.35**	.36**	-.10	-.04	.11
7. Subordinate-rated Organizational Citizenship Behavior directed Supervisor (OCB-S) (E)	4.15	.74							(.76)	.31**	.33**	-.13	-.06	-.04
8. Supervisor-rated OCB (S)	3.39	.79								(.92)	.76**	-.13	-.18*	-.15
9. Supervisor-rated OCB-S (S)	3.52	.96									(.91)	.07	-.01	-.00
10. Tenure as Supervisor (S)	2.42	.90										-	.53**	.23**
11. Employee Tenure with Supervisor (E)	1.67	.72											-	.72**
12. Employee Tenure with Company (E)	1.94	.93												-

Note: Numbers in parenthesis represent internal consistency of the scale. *p <.05, **p <.001, +p = .06. E: Employee ratings, S: Supervisor ratings. N (the correlations between supervisor perceived variables and the relationships between supervisor perceived and employee-perceived variables) : 81. N (the correlations between employee-perceived variables): 132.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The present study investigated PL perception of supervisors and employees, and also investigated the relationship between supervisor-perceived PL, employee-perceived PL, employees' OI, WGI, SI as well as employees' supervisor-rated OCB, supervisor-rated OCB-S, employee-rated OCB and employee-rated OCB-S. In other words, this research combined PL shown by leader and PL seen by subordinate, and their link with subordinates' identification and behavior, which had not been examined before.

4.1 Main Findings

PL was assessed with two sources: supervisors themselves and their employees. We found a marginally significant relationship between supervisor-perceived PL and employee-perceived PL. This is an interesting finding as the LMX literature has demonstrated that a quality of relationship between supervisor and subordinate is perceived differently by them (e.g., Gersnter and Day, 1997). There might be two plausible reasons that explain the small (and marginal) relationship between supervisor-perceived-PL and employee-perceived PL. First, by being exposed to Turkish culture both managers and employees may believe that their leader-member relationship should be paternalistic.

Moreover, supervisors act paternalistically, and employees approve and enhance this paternalistic relationship by obeying leaders rules and showing high deference. Social exchange theory also argues that supervisor-employee relationship is mutual (Liden, Wayne, & Stilwell, 1993). Subordinates desire to have intimate relationships with their leaders, so they make efforts to satisfy their leaders' expectancy (Eisenberg, Cotterell, & Marvel, 1987 as cited in Liden et al., 1993; Liden et al., 1993). Second, again Turkish culture which is high power distant and collectivistic may cause employees to easily perceive and internalize supervisors' paternalistic behaviors (e.g., showing care, being authoritative), so report them.

Although we thought that employees compared to supervisors may report less PL about their supervisors due to their greater fatherly care expectation, employees' PL ratings were higher than supervisors' PL ratings. More interestingly, our results revealed that when employees' tenure with their supervisor increased, they interpreted their supervisors' behaviors as less paternalistic. We speculated two explanations. First, paternalistic leaders consider each employee as an extended family member (Aycan, 2006), so employees get used to close interest from a leader. Employees with longer supervisor tenure may normalize paternalistic consideration after working together in long years. Another explanation could be that supervisors with PL may pay more attention and consideration to newcomer employees so, they can know these employees, and provide smooth orientation.

The findings regarding PL and employees' OI was an important extension of Goncu et al.'s (2014) study. Employee-perceived PL was associated with more

identification with the organization, which is consistent with Goncu et al. (2014). Additionally, supervisor-perceived PL was not found as a predictor of employees' OI. Apparently, it is not sufficient that supervisors are paternalistic, employees should notice supervisors' behaviors as paternalistic. One may expect that employees who work with paternalistic leaders will identify themselves with their work-group goals and values because paternalistic leaders support a high quality family-like relationship within the group and they may foster collective identity. However, our result did not demonstrate the relationship between PL (both rated by supervisor and rated by subordinate) and WGI. Paternalistic leaders' subordinates try to get the most parental treatment, interest and support, so there is a competition among group members (Goncu et. al., 2014). The lack of relationship between PL and WGI may be result of this competition. When paternalistic behaviors increased, employees may care more about supervisor special consideration, so they may want closer relationship with supervisor rather than work-group. Employees may prefer to identify their self in terms of their organizational membership rather than work-group membership. They may see the whole organization as a big family but work-group members can be competitive siblings.

The perception of supervisor as paternalistic was related to higher identification with the supervisor. From the PL perspective, this finding is in line with the several aspects of paternalistic leadership. For example, "individualized relationship" and "involvement in non-work life" aspects of PL can encourage employees to follow their supervisors' professional and personal views and goals, and this may activate the identification with supervisor. Similarly, social learning theory (Bandura, 1977)

argues that individuals learn by observing or modeling their role models' behaviors and perspectives. Identification can be seen as a way of modeling (Brown, Trevino, & Harrison, 2005). Employees are more likely to choose their supervisors as a role model to understand what is desirable and what is undesirable in the work-context (Brown et al., 2005). In our case, since paternalistic leaders are assumed to be more experienced (Aycan, 2006), Turkish subordinates tend to internalize their paternalistic supervisors' values. The positive association between employee-perceived PL and SI may also lie in the "loyalty expectation" feature of PL. Employees are aware that they should show commitment to their supervisors in a paternalistic relationship. Therefore, SI might readily arise out of this expected commitment. With regard to supervisor-perceived PL and SI link, PL evaluated by supervisors was not linked with employees' SI.

Although supervisor-perceived PL was not associated with subordinate-rated identifications (OI, WGI and SI), it was linked with subordinate-rated OCB and OCB-S (and also supervisor-rated OCB and OCB-S). Subordinate-perceived PL was associated with only subordinate-rated OCB-S. These results somewhat correspond to Goncu et al. (2014) finding that is employees' impression management motives play a role in employees' OCB. Specifically, they found that Turkish employees engage in OCB to be positively evaluated by their supervisors. Similarly, in our study, Turkish employees might use extra-role behaviors to protect and enhance close relationship with their paternalistic supervisors. This reasoning can also explain why supervisor-perceived PL was associated with supervisor-rated OCB and OCB-S. The focus of citizenship behaviors may be only to supervisors. For example,

subordinates may help their co-workers in front of their supervisors. As a result, since supervisors were able to more closely observe their paternalistic style and employees' voluntary extra behaviors, supervisor ratings on OCB, OCB-S and PL are expected to be correlated.

Indeed, the positive relationship between employee-perceived PL and employee-rated OCB-S can be better explained by the target similarity model (Lavelle, Rupp, & Brockner, 2007). According to this model, employees' attitudes are more predictive for behaviors that correspond to similar targets (Lavella et al., 2007). For instance, commitment to co-workers will automatically bring OCB directed towards co-workers (Morin et al., 2011). Rupp, Shao, Jones and Liao's (2014) meta-analysis demonstrated justice coming from the supervisor showed stronger relationships with outcomes directed toward the supervisor (e.g., supervisor trust, OCB-S), while justice coming from the organization were more associated with outcomes directed toward the organization (e.g., organizational identification). In the present study, since paternalistic consideration stems from the supervisor, Turkish employees may choose to show their OCB directed toward their supervisor.

Another additional contribution of the present study to the OCB literature was comparing supervisor and employee ratings on employees' OCB and OCB-S. Both OCB and OCB-S ratings obtained by supervisors and employees were moderately correlated. Although there is a consensus between ratings, subordinate ratings were higher than supervisor ratings. Allen et al. (2000) demonstrated that subordinates reported more OCB than their supervisors in the US sample. Therefore, as suggested

by Allen et al. (2000), supervisors might witness limited OCB of their employees. Also, as claimed by Lam et al. (1999), supervisors may have more expectations regarding their subordinates' job roles, and some OCBs may not be even considered as extra role behavior.

Addressing a gap in the Turkish PL literature, we aimed to discuss the association between leader-perceived PL, employee-perceived PL, employees' relational and social identification, discretionary beneficial behaviors directed toward the organization and supervisor. It was explored whether supervisor-perceived PL and subordinate-perceived PL might show different relationships with employee responses. Consistent with previous findings (Goncu et al., 2014; Pellegrini & Scandura, 2006) subordinate-perceived PL was associated with positive subordinate outcomes (i.e., identification with the organization and supervisor, OCB-S). Although employee perception of PL was highly relevant to relational identification with the supervisor, its link with social identification (i.e., WGI) was more limited. Similarly, if employees notice paternalistic style of their supervisor, they tend to engage in extra work behavior that might benefit the supervisor. Paternalistic leaders believed that their subordinates perform more than job requirements for the sake of both the organization and the supervisor. Based on the link between OCB and OCB-S ratings, it appears that supervisors are aware that their subordinates perform more than what is expected of them.

4.2. Other Results

The present research tends to focus on multi-source findings, but findings that come from only employee data should be noted. OI was related to WGI ($r = .17$, $p < .05$) and SI ($r = .34$, $p < .01$). WGI was associated with SI, $r = .33$, $p < .01$. All identifications were related to employee-rated OCB and OCB-S. Employees' OI was linked with employee-rated OCB ($r = .18$, $p < .05$) and OCB-S ($r = .20$, $p < .05$). Employees' WGI was associated with employee-rated OCB ($r = .21$, $p < .05$). Employees' SI was also linked with employee-rated OCB ($r = .29$, $p < .01$) and OCB-S ($r = .32$, $p < .01$). Seemingly, Turkish employees not only make extra efforts in their job because they share the values of the organization and the work-group but also they perform more than their duties require because they partially define their self with the values of their supervisor. Moreover, our study showed relational identification with the supervisor may have important employee outcomes.

4.3. Limitations

Some limitations of the present study should be mentioned. First, although we make effort to reach as much as more participants, our sample size can be considered small. Second, our sample consisted of highly educated employees working in companies under the one holding company in Ankara, so generalization of finding for Turkey may be problematical. Third, the majority of supervisors were male and the majority of subordinates were female, so it should be considered while evaluating the findings. Finally, our study was cross-sectional.

4.4. Future Studies

Given our sample size and characteristics, future research should apply longitudinal design with more participants who work in different cities in Turkey. Also, we encourage researchers to test our research questions with blue-collar workers because findings from white-collar may not be applied to blue-collar workers. Some findings can be extended in future studies. For example, the negative link between employee-perceived PL and tenure with supervisor raises the question whether PL is especially effective or attractive for new employees. It is possible that new employees view paternalistic leaders as a mentor. It would be interesting to examine whether paternalistic leaders are perceived as a mentor or a formal manager.

Future research should investigate possible mediators of relationship between supervisor-perceived PL and employees' outcomes. Supervisor trust can be one mediator.

Though we used different questionnaires to measure OI and WGI, our participants may not differentiate organization and work-group in their mind. We suspect that employees can somewhat reflect their thoughts about the work-group while completing OI scale or vice versa. WGI and OI can be measured in different times in future studies. Additionally, PL and WGI link might be significant for teams who require group work. Researchers can investigate PL in varied of work-groups. In practice, supervisors should consider how to maintain good relationships among work-group members. For example, when paternalistic supervisors show close treatments to their subordinates, they may encourage subordinates to support group members in their work and personal life.

We focused on employees' work-related identities. Personal identity which includes characteristic features like personality traits, physical skills or personal interests (Ashforth & Mael, 1989) can give us more comprehensive understanding about PL and employee outcomes. For example, the literature tends to heavily focus on the effect of national culture on PL perception but we still do not know the effect of personality or other individual differences on the perception of PL. Researchers should consider to investigate them in future research.

OCB can be assessed by differentiating OCB directed individuals and OCB directed organization in future research. For example, higher WGI can lead to OCB directed individuals. That means if employees identify themselves with their work-group, they may help or support their co-workers.

4.5. Implications

The present research showed that supervisor-perceived PL can be linked employees' identification with the organization and the supervisor. Therefore, we suggest supervisors to realize how important their leadership style for employees' organization and supervisor identification.

Supervisor-perceived PL was not only linked with employees' OI and SI but it was also linked with OCB-S. Employees perceiving father-like caring from the supervisor may assist their supervisors although this assistance is not formally required. This was another important finding for supervisors.

4.6. Conclusion

The current research was the first attempt to compare the PL perception of supervisors and employees in Turkey. We found marginally significant relationship between supervisor-perceived PL and employee-perceived PL. Employee-perceived PL was related to employees' OI, SI and OCB-S. Yet, supervisor-perceived PL was related to employees' OCB and OCB-S. OCB and OCB-S ratings coming from supervisors and employees were correlated. Considering a few empirical research on PL, the current research hopes to inspire future research to explore PL and its relationship with other employee outcomes in more generalizable samples.

REFERENCES

Aktas, M., & Sargut, A. S. (2011). İzleyicilerin Kültürel Değerlerine Göre Liderliğe Duyulan Gereksinme Nasıl Farklılaşır?: Kuramsal Bir Çerçeve. *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*, 44(4), 145-163.

Allen, T. D., Barnard, S., Rush, M. C., & Russell, J. E. (2000). Ratings of organizational citizenship behavior: Does the source make a difference? *Human Resource Management Review*, *10*(1), 97-114.

Ashforth, B. E., Harrison, S. H., & Corley, K. G. (2008). Identification in organizations: An examination of four fundamental questions. *Journal of Management*, *34*(3), 325-374.

Aycan, Z. (2001). Human resource management in Turkey-Current issues and future challenges. *International Journal of Manpower*, *22*(3), 252-260.

Aycan, Z. (2006). Paternalism. In U. Kim, K. S. Yang, & K. K. Hwang (Eds.), *Indigenous and Cultural Psychology: Understanding People in Context.* (pp. 445-466), New York: Springer.

Aycan, Z., Kanungo, R., Mendonca, M., Yu, K., Deller, 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., Kanungo, R. N., & Sinha, J. B. (1999). Organizational Culture and Human Resource Management Practices The Model of Culture Fit. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *30*(4), 501-526.

Aycan, Z., Schyns, B., Sun, J. M., Felfe, J., & Saher, N. (2013). Convergence and divergence of paternalistic leadership: A cross-cultural investigation of prototypes. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *44*(9), 962-969.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, *84*(2), 191.

Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee “citizenship”. *Academy of Management Journal*, *26*(4), 587-595.

Bell, S. J., & Menguc, B. (2002). The employee-organization relationship, organizational citizenship behaviors, and superior service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, *78*(2), 131-146.

Bergami, M., & Bagozzi, R. P. (2000). Self-categorization, affective commitment and group self-esteem as distinct aspects of social identity in the organization. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *39*(4), 555-577.

Brewer, M. B. (1991). The social self: On being the same and different at the same time. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *17*(5), 475-482.

Brodbeck, F. C., Frese, M., Akerblom, S., Audia, G., Bakacsi, G., Bendova, H., ... & Castel, P. (2000). Cultural variation of leadership prototypes across 22 European countries. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology,73*(1), 1-29.

Brown, M. E., Treviño, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 97*(2), 117-134.

Chen, Z. X., Tsui, A. S., & Farh, J. L. (2002). Loyalty to supervisor vs. organizational commitment: Relationships to employee performance in China. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 75*(3), 339-356.

Cheng, B. S., Chou, L. F., Wu, T. Y., Huang, M. P., & Farh, J. L. (2004). Paternalistic leadership and subordinate responses: Establishing a leadership model in Chinese organizations. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, *7*(1), 89-117.

Cicero, L., & Pierro, A. (2007). Charismatic leadership and organizational outcomes: The mediating role of employees' work-group identification. *International Journal of Psychology*, *42*(5), 297-306.

Cooper, D., & Thatcher, S. M. (2010). Identification in organizations: The role of self-concept orientations and identification motives. *Academy of Management Review*, *35*(4), 516-538.

Cronshaw, S. F., & Lord, R. G. (1987). Effects of categorization, attribution, and encoding processes on leadership perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *72*(1), 97.

Deluga, R. J. (1994). Supervisor trust building, leader-member exchange and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *67*(4), 315-326.

Den Hartog, D. N., House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A., & Dorfman, P. W. (1999). Culture specific and cross-culturally generalizable implicit leadership theories: Are attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership universally endorsed? *The Leadership Quarterly*, *10*(2), 219-256.

Erben, G. S., & Guneser, A. B. (2008). The relationship between paternalistic leadership and organizational commitment: Investigating the role of climate regarding ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *82*(4), 955-968.

Ehrhart, M. G. (2004). Leadership and procedural justice climate as antecedents of unit-level organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, *57*(1), 61-94.

Ersoy, N. C., Born, M. P., Derous, E., & Molen, H. T. (2012). The effect of cultural

orientation and leadership style on self-versus other-oriented organizational citizenship behaviour in Turkey and the Netherlands. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, *15*(4), 249-260.

Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. (1997). Meta-Analytic review of leader–member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *82*(6), 827.

Goncu, A., Aycan, Z., & Johnson, R. E. (2014). Effects of paternalistic and transformational leadership on follower outcomes. *International Journal of Management and Business*, *5*, 36-58.

Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *The leadership quarterly*, *6*(2), 219-247.

Hofstede, G. (1980). Motivation, leadership, and organization: do American theories apply abroad?. *Organizational Dynamics*, *9*(1), 42-63.

Hofstede, G. (1993). Cultural constraints in management theories. *The Academy of Management Executive*, *7*(1), 81-94.

Hofstede, G. (2001). Culture's Consequences. *Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks CA: Sage Publications.

Hogg, M. A. (2001). A social identity theory of leadership. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *5*(3), 184-200.

Hogg, M. A., & Hains, S. C. (1996). Intergroup relations and group solidarity: Effects of group identification and social beliefs on depersonalized attraction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *70*(2), 295.

Hogg, M. A., & Terry, D. I. (2000). Social identity and self-categorization processes in organizational contexts. *Academy of Management Review*, *25*(1), 121-140.

Hogg, M. A., Terry, D. J., & White, K. M. (1995). A tale of two theories: A critical comparison of identity theory with social identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 255-269.

House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A., Dorfman, P. W., Javidan, M., Dickson, M., & Gupta, V. (1999). Cultural influences on leadership and organizations: Project GLOBE. *Advances in global leadership*, *1*(2), 171-233.

Humphreys, J., Jiao, N., & Sadler, T. (2008). Emotional disposition and leadership

preferences of American and Chinese MBA students. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, *3*(2), 162-180.

Hwa, A. M. C., Jantani, M., & Ansari, M. A. (2009). Supervisor vs. subordinate perception on leader-member exchange quality: a Malaysian perspective. *International Journal of Business and Management*, *4*(7), 165.

Ilies R, Nahrgang JD, Morgeson FP. (2007). Leader-member exchange and citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 269–277.

Johnson, M. D., Morgeson, F. P., & Hekman, D. R. (2012). Cognitive and affective identification: Exploring the links between different forms of social identification and personality with work attitudes and behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *33*(8), 1142-1167.

Kabasakal, H., & Bodur, M. (2002). Arabic cluster: A bridge between East and West. *Journal of World Business*, *37*(1), 40-54.

Lam, S. S., Hui, C., & Law, K. S. (1999). Organizational citizenship behavior: Comparing perspectives of supervisors and subordinates across four international samples. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *84*(4), 594.

Lavelle, J. J., Rupp, D. E., & Brockner, J. (2007). Taking a Multifoci Approach to the Study of Justice, Social Exchange, and Citizenship Behavior: The Target Similarity Model. *Journal of Management*, *33*(6), 841-866.

Lian, L. K., & Tui, L. G. (2012). Leadership styles and organizational citizenship behavior: The mediating effect of subordinates' competence and downward influence tactics. *The Journal of Applied Business and Economics*,*13*(2), 59.

Liden, R. C., & Maslyn, J. M. (1998). Multidimensionafity of leader-member exchange: An empirical assessment through scale development. *Journal of management*, *24*(1), 43-72.

Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., & Stilwell, D. (1993). A longitudinal study on the early development of leader-member exchanges. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *78*(4), 662.

Lord, R. G., Foti, R. J., & De Vader, C. L. (1984). A test of leadership categorization theory: Internal structure, information processing, and leadership perceptions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *34*(3), 343-378.

Lord, R. G., & Maher, K. J. (2002). *Leadership and information processing: Linking perceptions and performance*. Routledge.

Mael, F., & Ashforth, B. E. (1992). Alumni and their alma mater: A partial test of the reformulated model of organizational identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *13*(2), 103-123.

Martin, R., & Epitropaki, O. (2001). Role of organizational identification on implicit leadership theories (ILTs), transformational leadership and work attitudes. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *4*(3), 247-262.

Maurer, T. J., & Lord, R. G. (1991). An exploration of cognitive demands in group interaction as a moderator of information processing variables in perceptions of leadership. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *21*(10), 821-839.

Millward, L. J., Haslam, S. A., & Postmes, T. (2007). Putting employees in their place: The impact of hot desking on organizational and team identification. *Organization Science*, *18*(4), 547-559.

Morin, A. J., Vandenberghe, C., Boudrias, J. S., Madore, I., Morizot, J., & Tremblay, M. (2011). Affective commitment and citizenship behaviors across multiple foci. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *26*(8), 716-738.

Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome*. Lexington Books/DC Heath and Com.

Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, *48*(4), 775-802.

Ozmen, N. I. (2005). *Leadership style of Turkish middle level managers in private sector and its relationship with subordinate performance, satisfaction, and commitment*. Unpublished master thesis. Middle East Technical University.

Paine, J. B., & Organ, D. W. (2000). The cultural matrix of organizational citizenship behavior: Some preliminary conceptual and empirical observations. *Human Resource Management Review*, *10*(1), 45-59.

Pellegrini, E. K., & Scandura, T. A. (2006). Leader-member exchange (LMX), paternalism, and delegation in the Turkish business culture: An empirical investigation. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 264-279.

Pellegrini, E. K., & Scandura, T. A. (2008). Paternalistic leadership: A review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Management*, *34*, 566-593.

Piccolo, R. F., & Colquitt, J. A. (2006). Transformational leadership and job behaviors: The mediating role of core job characteristics. *Academy of Management Journal*, *49*(2), 327-340.

Pratt, M. G. (1998). Central questions in organizational identification. *Identity in Organizations*, 171-207.

Riketta, M., & Van Dick, R. (2005). Foci of attachment in organizations: A meta-analytic comparison of the strength and correlates of workgroup versus organizational identification and commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *67*(3), 490-510.

Rosenbloom, B., & Larsen, T. (2003). Communication in international business-to-business marketing channels: Does culture matter?. *Industrial Marketing Management*, *32*(4), 309-315.

Rupp, D. E., & Cropanzano, R. (2002). The mediating effects of social exchange relationships in predicting workplace outcomes from multifoci organizational justice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *89*(1), 925-946.

Rupp, D. E., Shao, R., Jones, K. S., & Liao, H. (2014). The utility of a multifoci approach to the study of organizational justice: A meta-analytic investigation into the consideration of normative rules, moral accountability, bandwidth-fidelity, and social exchange. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *123*(2), 159-185.

Schroeder, J. (2011). *The impact of paternalism and organizational collectivism in multinational and family-owned firms in Turkey*. Unpublished master thesis. University of South Florida, Tampa.

Shafer, E. L., Vieregge, M., & Choi, Y. (2005). Cultural differences in perceived leadership styles. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*,*6*(3), 65-88.

Sluss, D. M., & Ashforth, B. E. (2007). Relational identity and identification: Defining ourselves through work relationships. *Academy of Management Review*, *32*(1), 9-32.

Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *68*(4), 653.

Spector, P. E., Bauer, J. A., & Fox, S. (2010). Measurement artifacts in the assessment of counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior: do we know what we think we know?. *Journal of Applied Psychology*,*95*(4), 781.

Tajfel, H. E. (1978). *Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations*. Academic Press.

Tajfel, H., Billig, M. G., Bundy, R. P., & Flament, C. (1971). Social categorization and intergroup behaviour. *European Journal of Social Psychology*,*1*(2), 149-178.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*, *33*(47), 74.

Turner, J. C. (1985). Social categorization and the self-concept: A social cognitive theory of group behavior. *Advances in Group Processes*, *2*, 77-122.

Van Dick, R., Wagner, U., Stellmacher, J., & Christ, O. (2004). The utility of a

broader conceptualization of organizational identification: Which aspects really matter?. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational psychology*, *77*(2), 171-191.

Van Knippenberg, D., & Van Schie, E. (2000). Foci and correlates of organizational identification. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *73*(2), 137-147.

Walumbwa, F. O., & Hartnell, C. A. (2011). Understanding transformational leadership–employee performance links: The role of relational identification and self-efficacy. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *84*(1), 153-172.

Xin, K. R. (2004). Asian American managers: An impression gap?: An investigation of impression management and supervisor-subordinate relationships. The *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 40*, 160-181.

Zhang, Y., & Chen, C. C. (2013). Developmental leadership and organizational citizenship behavior: Mediating effects of self-determination, supervisor identification, and organizational identification. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *24*(4), 534-543.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A- PATERNALISTIC LEADERSHIP SCALE

1 = Hiç bir zaman 2 = Nadiren3 = Zaman zaman 4 = Çoğunlukla 5 = Her zaman

ŞU ANKİ YÖNETİCİM,					
1. Çalışanlarına karşı bir aile büyüğü (baba/anne veya ağabey/abla) gibi davranır.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Çalışanlarına bir aile büyüğü gibi öğüt verir.	1	2	3	4	5
3. İş yerinde aile ortamı yaratmaya önem verir.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Bir ebeveynin çocuğundan sorumlu olması gibi, her çalışanından kendini sorumlu hisseder.	1	2	3	4	5
5. İhtiyaçları olduğu zaman, çalışanlarına iş dışı konularda (örn., ev kurma, çocuk okutma, sağlık vs.) yardım etmeye hazırdır.	1	2	3	4	5
6.Çalışanlarının özel günlerine (örn., nikah, cenaze, mezuniyet vs.) katılır.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Çalışanlardan birinin özel hayatında yaşadığı problemlerde (örn; eşler arası problemlerde) arabuluculuk yapmaya hazırdır.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Çalışanlarında sadakate, performansa verdiğinden daha fazla önem verir.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Çalışanlarına gösterdiği ilgi ve alakaya karşılık, onlardan bağlılık ve sadakat bekler.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Çalışanları için neyin en iyi olduğunu bildiğine inanır.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX B-ORGANIZATIONAL IDENTIFICATION SCALE

Aşağıdaki cümleler kişilerin çalıştıkları kurum hakkındaki duygu ve düşüncelerini yansıtmaktadır. Lütfen bu cümlelere şu anda çalıştığınız kurum açısından ne ölçüde katıldığınızı belirtiniz.

---

1 = Hiç katılmıyorum
2 = Katılmıyorum
3 = Kısmen katılmıyorum
4 = Ne katılıyorum ne katılmıyorum
5 = Kısmen katılıyorum
6= Katılıyorum
7= Tamamen katılıyorum

---

1. Bu kurumda bir çalışan olmaktan mutluyum.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Bu kurumun bir çalışanı olmaktan gurur duyuyorum.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Bu kurumda çalışan olmak bana iyi hissettiriyor.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. İşimden ayrılmak zorunda bırakılsam bu beni üzer.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Bu kuruma ait üyeliğim öz kimliğimin bir parçasını oluşturur.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Bu kurum içindeki üyeliğim kim olduğumu anlamamda çok önemlidir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Bu kurum içindeki kimliğimle kendi öz kimliğim birbirlerini kapsar.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Eğer kurumum eleştirilirse bu benim kendimle ilgili düşüncelerimi de etkiler.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

APPENDIX C-WORK-GROUP IDENTIFICATION SCALE

Lütfen aşağıdaki cümlelere şu anda çalıştığınız çalışma grubunuz (bölüm) açısından ne ölçüde katıldığınızı belirtiniz. Yer alan her bir tanımla ilgili görüşünüzü verilen ölçeği kullanarak belirtiniz.

---

1 = Hiç katılmıyorum2 = Katılmıyorum 3 = Kararsızım 4 = Katılıyorum

5 = Tamamen katılıyorum

---

1. Başkalarının çalışma grubum hakkında ne düşündüğü benim için çok önemlidir.	1	2	3	4	5
2.Birisi çalışma grubumu eleştirdiğinde bu bana kişisel bir hakaret gibi gelir.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Çalışma grubum hakkında konuşurken genellikle “onlar” yerine “biz” derim.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Çalışma grubumun başarıları benim başarılarımdır.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Birisi çalışma grubumu övdüğünde bu, bana kişisel bir iltifat gibi gelir.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Basına yansıyan bir olayda çalışma grubum eleştirilirse bundan çok rahatsız olurum.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX D-SUPERVISOR IDENTIFICATION SCALE

Lütfen bu bölümdeki sorulara doğrudan bağlı olduğunuz yöneticinizi/amirinizi düşünerek cevap veriniz. Yer alan her bir tanımla ilgili görüşünüzü verilen ölçeği kullanarak belirtiniz.

---

1 = Hiç katılmıyorum
2 = Katılmıyorum
3 = Kısmen katılmıyorum
4 = Ne katılıyorum ne katılmıyorum
5 = Kısmen katılıyorum
6= Katılıyorum
7= Tamamen katılıyorum

---

1. Biri şu anda bağlı bulunduğum yöneticimi eleştirse kendimi hakarete uğramış gibi hissederim.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Başkalarının şu anda bağlı bulunduğum yöneticim hakkındaki düşünceleriyle ilgilenirim.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Şu anda bağlı bulunduğum yöneticim hakkında konuşurken “o” yerine “biz “derim.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Şu anda bağlı bulunduğum yöneticimin başarısını paylaşırım.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Şu anda bağlı bulunduğum yöneticimle iş ortağıymışız gibi hissederim.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Başkalarına şu anda bağlı bulunduğum yöneticimle çalıştığımı söylemekten gurur duyarım.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Arkadaşlarımla konuşurken şu anda bağlı bulunduğum yöneticimi överim.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. Şu anda bağlı bulunduğum yöneticimle birbirimize yarar sağladığımız bir ilişkimiz var.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. Şu anda bağlı bulunduğum yöneticimin görüşlerine ve önerilerine saygı duyarım.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. Şu anda bağlı bulunduğum yöneticimin değerleri benim değerlerimle uyuşur.	1	2	3	4	5	6

APPENDIX E-ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR SCALE

Lütfen bu bölümde aşağıdaki ifadelerde geçenleri ne sıklıkla yaptığınızı belirtiniz.

---

1 = Hiçbir zaman **2** = Bir iki defa **3** = Bir ayda bir veya iki kez **4** = Bir haftada bir veya iki kez **5** = Her gün

---

1. Bir is arkadaşıma tavsiyede bulunmak, koçluk etmek ya da mentörlük yapmak için zaman ayırdım.

1 2 3 4 5

2. Bir iş arkadaşıma yeni yetenekler kazanmasında yardımcı oldum ya da işe yönelik bilgimi paylaştım.

1 2 3 4 5

3. Yeni çalışanlara işe ayak uydurmalarında yardımcı oldum.

1 2 3 4 5

4. Yapacak çok fazla işi olan bir iş arkadaşıma yardım ettim.

1 2 3 4 5

5. Birisinin iş ile ilgili bir problemini samimice dinledim.

1 2 3 4 5

6. İş ortamını geliştirmek için önerilerde bulundum.

1 2 3 4 5

7. Ekstra görevler için gönüllü oldum.

1 2 3 4 5

8. Bir proje ya da işi tamamlamak için hafta sonları ya da çalışma saatleri dışındaki başka günlerde çalıştım.

1 2 3 4 5

9. Kendime ait zamanlarda yapılacak toplantılara katılmak ya da iş ile ilgili komitelerde yer almak için gönüllü oldum.

1 2 3 4 5

10. İşimi tamamlamak için yemeğimden ya da diğer aralardan feragat ettim.

1 2 3 4 5

APPENDIX F-ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR TOWARDS SUPERVISOR SCALE

Lütfen aşağıdaki 5 ifadeyi ne sıklıkla yaptığınızı belirtiniz.

1 = Hiçbir zaman 2 = Nadiren 3 = Bazen 4 = Sık sık 5 = Her zaman

1. Yöneticim olmadığında fazladan sorumluluk almayı kabul ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Yöneticime iş yükü fazla olduğunda yardımcı olurum.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Yöneticimin yardım istemediği zamanlarda da ona yardım ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Yöneticimin işleriyle yakından ilgilenirim.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Yöneticime işle ilgili bilgileri iletirim.	1	2	3	4	5