

Journal of Management

<http://jom.sagepub.com>

Paternalistic Leadership: A Review and Agenda for Future Research

Ekin K. Pellegrini and Terri A. Scandura

Journal of Management 2008; 34; 566

DOI: 10.1177/0149206308316063

The online version of this article can be found at:
<http://jom.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/34/3/566>

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:



[Southern Management Association](#)

Additional services and information for *Journal of Management* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://jom.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://jom.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations <http://jom.sagepub.com/cgi/content/refs/34/3/566>

Paternalistic Leadership: A Review and Agenda for Future Research[†]

Ekin K. Pellegrini*

*University of Missouri–St. Louis, College of Business Administration, Department of Management,
St. Louis, MO 63121*

Terri A. Scandura

*University of Miami, School of Business Administration, Department of Management,
Coral Gables, FL 33124*

The growing interest in paternalistic leadership research has led to a recent proliferation of diverse definitions and perspectives, as well as a limited number of empirical studies. Consequently, the diversity of perspectives has resulted in conceptual ambiguities, as well as contradictory empirical findings. In this article, the authors review research on paternalistic leadership in an effort to assess the current state of the literature. They investigate the construct of paternalistic leadership and review the findings related to its outcomes and antecedents as well as the various measurement scales used in paternalistic leadership research. On the basis of this review, the article concludes with an agenda for future theoretical and empirical research on this emerging and intriguing new area for leadership research.

Keywords: *cross-cultural; leadership; paternalism; paternalistic leadership*

International leadership research is at a major crossroads (Graen, 2006). The quest to define effective leadership has long been an important topic of discussion (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004), but when these discussions drift into different cultural contexts, our current knowledge and insights appear rather limited (Drost & Von Glinow, 1998). One such area in leadership research is paternalistic leadership. Paternalistic leadership is a flourishing

[†]The authors would like to thank Russell Cropanzano and Tom Wright for their comments on earlier versions of this article.

*Corresponding author: Tel.: 314-516-4528; fax: 314-516-6420

E-mail address: pellegrinie@umsl.edu

Journal of Management, Vol. 34 No. 3, June 2008 566-593

DOI: 10.1177/0149206308316063

© 2008 Southern Management Association. All rights reserved.

research area in management literature, but there is still considerable disparity among authors with respect to the definition and effectiveness of paternalistic practices.

More than eight decades ago, the human relations movement suggested that if managers focused on employees rather than on mechanistic production, workers would be more satisfied and more productive. These early behavioral management theorists believed that managers should be paternalistic and nurturing to build work groups that are productive and satisfied (Follett, 1933; Munsterberg, 1913). On the other hand, at roughly the same time, Max Weber (1947) argued that paternalistic practices would become obsolete as organizations became more bureaucratic and relied on rules and the protection of individual rights. He suggested within a paternalistic system, obedience is owed to the leader only by virtue of his or her status, and he described paternalism as one of the most elementary types of traditional domination. He further argued that the rational-legal model of bureaucracy would replace traditional forms of control such as paternalism and that the shift from paternalism-based traditional organizations to rational-legal organizations would produce better performance (Weber, 1968).

Studies on paternalism emerging from Asia opposed Weber's purely authoritarian view and argued that paternalistic managers provide support, protection, and care to their subordinates (Redding, Norman, & Schlander, 1994). Westwood and Chan (1992) defined paternalism as a fatherlike leadership style in which strong authority is combined with concern and considerateness. More recent research from India, Turkey, China, and Pakistan also suggests that paternalism does not connote "authoritarianism" but rather a relationship in which subordinates willingly reciprocate the care and protection of paternal authority by showing conformity (Aycan et al., 2000; Pellegrini & Scandura, 2006). Recently, Pearce (2005) claimed that paternalism is never completely removed from even the most rational-legal organizations and that the benevolent aspect in paternalism may be underappreciated in the Western literature.

Despite diverse descriptions offered by different authors across time and cultures, more recent research typically defines paternalistic leadership as "a style that combines strong discipline and authority with fatherly benevolence" (Farh & Cheng, 2000: 91). *Authoritarianism* refers to leader behaviors that assert authority and control, whereas *benevolence* refers to an individualized concern for subordinates' personal well-being. This type of leadership is still prevalent and effective in many business cultures, such as in the Middle East, Pacific Asia, and Latin America (Farh, Cheng, Chou, & Chu, 2006; Martinez, 2003; Pellegrini & Scandura, 2006; Uhl-Bien, Tierney, Graen, & Wakabayashi, 1990). However, it has increasingly been perceived negatively in Western management literature, which is reflected in descriptions of paternalism such as "benevolent dictatorship" (Northouse, 1997: 39) and "a hidden and insidious form of discrimination" (Colella, Garcia, Reidel, & Triana, 2005: 26).

In this review, we attempt to integrate the diverse perspectives on paternalistic leadership in an effort to assess the current state of the literature. An integrative research review is critical and timely given the existing perplexity in the management literature with regard to the effectiveness of paternalistic leadership. Furthermore, despite the abundant theoretical work in this area, there is still very little empirical research on paternalism. A growing body of literature on paternalistic leadership has emerged in the past two decades, but empirical research has lagged behind.

There is a significant need for sound methodological as well as conceptual work to construct a rigorous and relevant research stream in paternalistic leadership. Thus, in an attempt to guide future empirical research, we review research on the measurement of paternalistic leadership and report the most commonly used scales in the Appendix. On the basis of our review, we identify areas of agreement and disagreement among researchers as well as gaps that have yet to be addressed in the literature. In the final section, we suggest fruitful avenues for future researchers to explore. We trust that this timely review will serve as a useful guide for future inquiries to the emerging body of literature on paternalistic leadership.

Paternalistic Leadership: A Review of the Literature

Definition

Bing (2004) suggested that a boss is essentially a mutated replica of one's original authority figure: the parent. Psychiatrists (Freud, 1926) call this process "transference," whereby one's emotions originally associated with one person, such as a father, are unconsciously shifted to another person, usually an authority figure such as a manager. Maccoby (2004) suggested that some of today's best leaders are masters of manipulating the paternal transference of their followers. He gave the movie director Francis Ford Coppola as an example and stated that Coppola creates a family of his cast members, who address him as "Papa" or "Godfather."

Research on paternalistic leadership has increasingly flourished within the past two decades, but paternalism as a management concept dates back to the early works of Max Weber, who conceptualized paternalism as one form of legitimated authority. In *Economy and Society* Weber (1968) distinguished three types of legitimate domination: traditional, charismatic, and bureaucratic. Traditional forms of rule are those led by a paternal authority with a filial following. Paternalistic leadership relies on values such as personal loyalty to the leader and unquestioning obedience. According to Weber, traditional paternal authority finds its origins in the patriarchal household on which it is modeled. Padavic and Earnest (1994) argued that paternalism as an asymmetric power relationship still continues today and meets important material as well as psychological needs of workers. They further suggested that employers should consider paternalism as a viable option in their strategic repertoires.

Paternalism indicates that managers take a personal interest in workers' off-the-job lives and attempt to promote workers' personal welfare (Gelfand, Erez, & Aycan, 2007; Pasa, Kabasakal, & Bodur, 2001). In paternalistic cultures, people in authority consider it an obligation to provide protection to those under their care and in exchange expect loyalty and deference (Aycan, Kanungo, & Sinha, 1999; James, Chen & Cropanzano, 1996). Thus, paternalistic leaders guide both the professional as well as the personal lives of their subordinates in a manner resembling a parent (Gelfand et al., 2007). Not unlike the father in a family, management is believed to exercise its power within the constraint of protecting and improving the lives of its employees, which relieves considerable tension on the part of employees. This relief of tension is available not only to the employees but also to those exercising power, because the reduction of employees' tension renders them more compliant and predictable (Kerfoot & Knights, 1993).

Westwood (1997) suggested that paternalistic leadership is effective in the Chinese business context because it meets the “twin requirements” (compliance and harmony) of successful leadership. Sinha (1990) suggested that the coexistence of benevolence and authority in paternalistic leadership stems from values in traditional societies pertaining to the father figure, who is nurturant, caring, and dependable but also authoritative, demanding, and a strict disciplinarian. The interaction between paternal authority and benevolence may also reflect what Jackman (1994) referred to as “velvet glove” when she characterized paternalism. The traditional father-child relationship on which the term is based was one in which the father authoritatively dictated all the behaviors and significant life decisions of his children within a moral framework that credited the father with an unquestionable understanding of the needs and best interests of his children. Fathers were presumed to have genuine benevolent intentions toward their children, even as they exercised absolute authority over them (Jackman, 1994).

The current state of the literature on paternalistic leadership demonstrates substantial disagreement regarding the extent to which benevolent paternalistic acts are conducted with genuinely benevolent intentions (Aycan, 2006; Pearce, 2005). Western scholars question the *benevolent intent* in paternalistic leadership, which is reflected in metaphors on paternalism such as “anachronism” (Padavic & Earnest, 1994: 389) and “noncoercive exploitation” (Goodell, 1985: 252). Uhl-Bien and Maslyn (2005) argued that paternalistic leaders demonstrate benevolence expressly because they want something in return and that the obligations created via benevolent acts are based on indebtedness and oppression. However, VanDeVeer defined paternalistic acts as those “in which one person, A, interferes with another person, S, in order to promote S’s own good” (1986: 12). VanDeVeer specifically ruled out maliciousness as a motive for paternalistic acts.

More than four decades ago, McGregor (1960) suggested two fundamental approaches to managing people: Theory X and Theory Y. Theory X, as an authoritarian management style, assumes that humans inherently dislike responsibility and that an average employee wants to be directed. In contrast, Theory Y, as a participative management style, assumes that provided people are motivated, they will be self-directed, without control and punishment. Current debate regarding the “benevolent intent” in paternalistic leadership may be better understood in the context of these early management theories. For example, Uhl-Bien and Maslyn (2005) clearly perceived paternalism as a Theory X management style when they framed it in terms of “creating oppression.” On the other hand, there is abundant theoretical and some empirical literature suggesting that paternalism is strictly and genuinely benevolent and that it is distinct from authoritarianism (Aycan, 2006). Schein (1981) noted a historical trend in management systems from a period of autocracy to a period of paternalism toward the present consultative and participative models.

Ouchi (1981) conceptualized Theory Z, a hybrid form of the American organization, which capitalized on the best of both the American organization and the Japanese organization and integrated paternalism as a major dimension. He believed that Japanese management practices were not culture bound, and therefore, modified elements of the process could be successfully applied by U.S. firms. In contrast to Theory X, which states that workers must be driven to work, and Theory Y, which states that work is a natural activity, Theory Z focuses on increasing employees’ loyalty to a company by providing a strong focus on the well-being of the employees, both on and off the job. Ouchi argued that if U.S. companies

adopted the Theory Z management approach and brought the companies back to the idea that “we are one big family in this organization,” they would generate higher morale and higher loyalty. He claimed that between autocracy and democracy there lies a full range of choices and that a high degree of paternalism is not necessarily incompatible with bottom-up, consensual decision making.

Research suggests that paternalism is an effective leadership style in many non-Western cultures (Farh et al., 2006; Martinez, 2003; Pellegrini & Scandura, 2006; Uhl-Bien et al., 1990). However, in the Western context, paternalistic leadership has been equated with authoritarianism (Uhl-Bien & Maslyn, 2005), despite the negative correlation reported between paternalism and authoritarianism (cf. Aycan & Kanungo, 1998). In paternalistic leadership, the main focus is on employees’ welfare; a leader’s care and protection are genuine, and employees show loyalty out of respect and appreciation for the leader’s benevolence. In contrast, in an authoritarian relation, the relationship is based on control and exploitation, and subordinates show conformity solely to avoid punishment (Aycan, 2006). Therefore, the negative association between paternalism and authoritarianism indicates that once exploitation replaces benevolence and control replaces concern, the relationship moves away from paternalism toward authoritarianism (Aycan, 2006).

Although paternalistic leadership is perceived as authoritative and manipulative in the Western context, it has positive implications in cultures in which it is rooted in indigenous psychologies such as Confucianism (Farh & Cheng, 2000). Furthermore, paternalism is congruent with the values of collectivistic and high-power distance cultures. This is because a paternalistic leader’s involvement in employees’ personal lives is desired and expected in collectivistic cultures, whereas it can be perceived as a violation of privacy in individualistic cultures. In paternalistic relations, the superior, at times, is like a father, a close friend, or a brother who is involved in employees’ personal lives and has the right to expect personal favors from them (Aycan, 2006). Also, this type of relationship is based on the assumption of a power inequality between a leader and his or her subordinates, which is accepted in high-power-distance societies. Paternalism is criticized in the Western literature mainly because of this unquestioned power inequality. Aycan (2006) suggested that conflicting practices in high-power-distance cultures have not been easy to reconcile for Western scholars and as a result, their perceptions of paternalism as combining benevolence with control of decision making have not been favorable.

Is Cultural Context a Boundary Condition?

In a recent cross-cultural study, employees in China, Pakistan, India, Turkey, and the United States reported higher paternalistic practices than employees in Canada, Germany, and Israel (Aycan et al., 2000). In an earlier study, Mathur, Aycan, and Kanungo (1996) found Indian employees to be very high on paternalistic values, and they found no significant differences between the public and private sectors. Studies conducted by Martinez (2003, 2005) further suggest Mexican employees to have very high paternalistic values, because paternalism fits the Mexican cultural values of respect for hierarchical relations and strong family and personal relationships (Morris & Pavett, 1992).

In addition to strong, traditional family norms, the legal structure also influences paternalistic practices. In Mexico, a society with no welfare or employment benefits, if an employee is fired, his or her salary is the firm's responsibility for at least 3 months (Martinez & Dorfman, 1998). In a similar cultural setting, in Turkey, when an employee is fired, a lump-sum severance payment must be made, calculated as the employee's monthly salary multiplied by his or her years of service. Furthermore, if a female employee resigns within 1 year of getting married and claims that her husband does not want her to work, she is also entitled to the same severance pay, which clearly shows the patriarchal nature of the family structure and how family norms affect business organizations. In these types of societies, the legal structure enforces a patriarchal employee-employer relationship by requiring that the responsibility for employees' welfare be shared by their families and by their employers (Martinez & Dorfman, 1998).

Research suggests that Japanese employees also place a highly positive value on paternalism. Uhl-Bien et al. (1990) stated that company paternalism is central to the effective functioning of the Japanese system and that the right type of worker in Japan would be someone with strong beliefs in company paternalism. Furthermore, Farh et al. (2006) suggested that paternalistic leadership is an effective strategy in Chinese family-owned businesses because it may help maintain control over employees as well as families' wealth. In fact, numerous studies conducted by Farh, Cheng, and colleagues have reported that Chinese and Taiwanese employees place a high value on paternalistic leadership. Recently, Cheng, Chou, Wu, Huang, and Farh (2004) suggested that paternalistic leadership is still a prevalent leadership style in current Chinese business organizations. Farh and Cheng (2000) stated that paternalism stems from Confucian ideology, which is founded on social relations, such as "benevolent leader with loyal minister" and "kind father with filial son." These principles form the cultural expectations that a leader should be benevolent to his or her followers.

Recent research from Malaysia further highlights the importance of paternalistic leadership. Ansari, Ahmad, and Aafaqi (2004) suggested that in Malaysia, paternalistic leadership acts as a positive reinforcer because paternalistic treatment is contingent on subordinates' task accomplishment. Saufi, Wafa, and Hamzah (2002) found a significant positive relationship between power distance and "telling leadership style," which may explain employees' preference for paternalistic leadership in high-power-distance societies. Because hierarchical relationships are maintained primarily through "affective reciprocity" (Roland, 1984), the benevolent aspect of paternalistic leadership is critical for effective management in these societies. In the Malaysian business context, Abdullah (1996) specifically recommended a paternal style of leadership because it fits with the values and expectations of subordinates.

In addition to Malaysia, research from Turkey suggests that paternalistic leadership may be an effective management tool in the Middle Eastern business context (Pellegrini & Scandura, 2006). The traditional Turkish business context reflects high power distance and collectivistic values (Hofstede, 2001; House et al., 2004) which makes paternalistic leadership a viable management strategy. Collectivists place a premium on maintaining relationships and place more emphasis on obligation and loyalty (Sullivan, Mitchell, & Uhl-Bien, 2003). The importance of "obligation and loyalty" in personal exchange relationships fits well with the dynamics of paternalistic relationships. In collectivistic societies, personal relationships are highly valued, and employees expect frequent contact (Hofstede, 2001).

Paternalistic leadership has a positive impact on employees' attitudes in collectivistic cultures (Gelfand et al., 2007) because the care, support, and protection provided by paternalistic leaders may address employees' need for frequent contact and close personal relationships. These research findings are further illustrated in the following comment by a Turkish employee working in New Jersey (an acquaintance of the first author):

When I worked in Istanbul, I felt extremely overwhelmed by my managers' interest in my personal life. After four years of working in the U.S., I now find myself longing for that attention. American managers are disinterested and distant. They could at least ask me how my children are doing or whether I'm planning to have more. I'm not expecting a detailed discussion about my personal life, but I feel like managers here only focus on the task and not on us—the people.

In addition to increasing research evidence from Latin America, the Middle East, and Pacific Asia regarding the effectiveness of paternalistic leadership, recent research from the United States suggests that paternalism may work in the North American business context as well. In fact, evidence from the United States suggests that even authoritarian leadership may produce member satisfaction in large, task-oriented groups (Stogdill, 1974). In a 10-country study conducted by Aycan et al. (2000), American employees reported higher paternalistic values compared with employees from Canada, Germany, and Israel. In a recent empirical study, Pellegrini, Scandura, and Jayaraman (2007) found paternalistic treatment to significantly and positively influence employees' organizational commitment in the North American context. Ansari et al. (2004) suggested that the crux of the issue is not the match between style and geographic location. Rather, the answer lies in the fit between the style of a leader and that of his or her followers, and it may be that in the United States, subordinates with certain values, such as a high need for affiliation or high respect for authority, may desire paternalism and be more productive under paternalistic leadership.

Mapping the Domain of Paternalistic Leadership as a Construct

On the basis of our review of the literature, we argue that the conflicting perspectives among researchers on paternalistic leadership do not stem from perceptual differences among Western and non-Western scholars but rather that the discrepancy results from a lack of sufficient construct clarity. A construct is literally something that scientists "construct," and therefore, construct validation is a critical issue in scientific generalization (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994).

The first step in construct validation of paternalistic leadership is specifying the domain of observables related to this construct. During our literature review, we observed that different researchers referred to different domains of the overall "paternalistic leadership" construct, whereas others referred simply to different leadership constructs. Yet they all cited "paternalism" or paternalistic leadership as their construct of interest. For example, Uhl-Bien and Maslyn referred to paternalistic leadership as "problematic and undesirable" (2005: 1), whereas Pellegrini and Scandura referred to paternalism as an "effective strategy" (2006: 268). We suggest that this divergence is a direct result of their focus on different leadership constructs, because it appears that Uhl-Bien and Maslyn studied authoritarianism, whereas

Pellegrini and Scandura's focus was on "benevolence." It is unfortunate that both studies cited paternalistic leadership as their construct of interest when they actually examined distinct leadership domains.

The domain of paternalistic leadership has mainly been studied by Farh, Cheng, and colleagues (Farh & Cheng, 2000; Farh et al., 2006) and Aycan (2006). On the basis of their research in China, Farh and Cheng (2000) proposed a model of paternalistic leadership as consisting of three dimensions: authoritarianism, benevolence, and morality. *Authoritarianism* refers to leader behaviors that assert authority and control and demand unquestioning obedience from subordinates. Under authoritarian leadership, subordinates comply and abide by leaders' requests without dissent. *Benevolence* refers to leader behaviors that demonstrate individualized, holistic concern for subordinates' personal and family well-being. In return, subordinates feel grateful and obliged to repay when the situation allows. The third dimension, *morality*, depicts leader behaviors that demonstrate superior personal virtues (e.g., does not abuse authority for personal gain, acts as an exemplar in personal and work conduct), which lead subordinates to respect and identify with the leader. On the basis of these dimensions, Farh and Cheng defined paternalistic leadership as "a style that combines strong discipline and authority with fatherly benevolence and moral integrity" (2000: 94).

Recent empirical studies conducted in East Asia found authoritarianism to correlate negatively with the other two dimensions, benevolence and morality. Authoritarianism not only correlated negatively with the other two dimensions, it was also negatively associated with subordinate outcomes, such as team members' commitment to and satisfaction with team leaders (Cheng, Huang, & Chou, 2002), loyalty toward leaders, trust in leaders, and organizational citizenship behavior (Cheng, Shieh, & Chou, 2002). In contrast, benevolence and morality were positively associated with each other and showed positive relationships with these outcome variables as well as subordinates' identification with, compliance with, and gratitude toward leaders (Cheng et al., 2004). Given the negative interdimensional correlations among the three domains, recent research by Farh, Cheng, and colleagues suggests that an overall paternalistic leadership construct is not very useful and that the scales should be used separately (Chou et al., 2005; Farh et al., 2006).

Aycan (2006) also concurred that paternalistic leadership is not a unified construct. She distinguished among four distinct leadership approaches and suggested that they are not interrelated dimensions of an overall paternalistic leadership construct but represent completely distinct styles of leadership as separate, independent constructs. On the basis of two dimensions (i.e., behavior and underlying intent), she developed a 2 × 2 matrix describing four distinct styles of leadership: benevolent paternalism, exploitative paternalism, authoritarian approach, and authoritative approach. With this model, she argued that paternalism is not a unified construct and that it is not equal to authoritarianism, as has been portrayed in the Western literature.

The overt leader behavior shared by benevolent and exploitative paternalism is "care and nurturance." In *benevolent paternalism*, a leader has a genuine concern for employees' welfare, and employees' show loyalty and deference out of respect and appreciation for the employer's care and protection (Aycan, 2006). In contrast, the overt leader behavior in *exploitative paternalism* is also care and nurturance, but it is provided solely to elicit employees' compliance to achieve organizational objectives. Employees in exploitative relationships show loyalty and deference primarily because the leaders are capable of fulfilling their needs as well as depriving them from critical resources (Aycan, 2006).

The overt leader behavior shared by authoritarian and authoritative leadership is “control.” What distinguishes the two styles is the underlying intent. In authoritarian management, a leader exploits rewards and punishments to make subordinates comply. In other words, subordinates show conformity to receive rewards or avoid punishment. In contrast, authoritative leaders also exercise control, but the underlying intent is to promote subordinates’ welfare (i.e., benevolence). Subordinates know that the rules are for their benefit and respect the leader’s decisions and willingly comply with the rules (Aycan, 2006).

With Aycan’s (2006) delineation of distinct paternalistic leadership styles, it became more apparent that the disagreements among authors on the effectiveness of paternalistic leadership originated primarily from a lack of construct clarity. For example, Uhl-Bien and Maslyn suggested that “the type of obligation created by paternalism is one of indebtedness and oppression” (2005: 2). They further argued that “paternalistic leaders demonstrate ‘benevolence’ expressly because they want something in return. They do not do it for the good of the employee” (2005: 2). Clearly, despite their reference to paternalistic leadership, they actually criticized “exploitative paternalism.” On the other hand, we suggest that Martinez focused on “benevolent paternalism” when she suggested that paternalistic leaders’

supportive actions move the employment relationship into boundaries that are not typical of most employment relationships (i.e., personal loans, high degree of personal interest). As a result, leaders possess subtle control over employees’ responsiveness to flexibility in work schedules, overtime hours, and other dimensions of the employment relationship. (2003: 16)

Similar to Martinez, Pellegrini and Scandura also commended benevolent paternalism when they referred to paternalism as an “effective strategy” (2006: 268).

Accordingly, we may infer from previous research that exploitative paternalism does not predict desired outcomes (Uhl-Bien & Maslyn, 2005), but benevolent paternalism may influence positive employee attitudes (Gelfand et al., 2007; Pellegrini et al., 2007). Future research needs to probe further into benevolent paternalism and examine how it affects cognitive and behavioral outcomes in work organizations.

Measurement in Current Paternalistic Leadership Research

Much previous research on leadership took place before measurement quality was adequately investigated, and one consequence of this is that a substantial proportion of these large bodies of literature is seriously compromised with respect to interpretability (Schriesheim, Hinkin, & Podsakoff, 1991). We have specifically been concerned about measurement quality in paternalistic leadership research, and in fact, we have become convinced that the disparity among authors as well as conflicting and uninterpretable findings stem from the fact that substantive paternalistic leadership research began before measurement quality was adequately investigated.

We suggest that an accepted measure of either “benevolent” or “exploitative” paternalistic leadership has not yet emerged. There are a number of previously used scales (Aycan et al., 2000; Cheng, Chou, & Farh, 2000; Pellegrini & Scandura, 2006), but there is insufficient information regarding their psychometric properties. For example, Cheng et al. (2000) conceptualized paternalistic leadership as a three-dimensional construct involving benevolence

(i.e., holistic concern for subordinate's well-being), morality (i.e., demonstrating superior personal virtues), and authoritarianism (i.e., authority and control over subordinates). In later studies, they found authoritarianism to negatively correlate with the other two dimensions and concluded that each dimension represented distinct leadership styles rather than subdomains of an overall paternalistic leadership construct. They developed a scale for each leadership style (see the Appendix), but the scales were specifically developed for use in China and have not been validated outside of the Chinese context. Therefore, at present, these are indigenous scales that are yet to be validated in the Western business context. In addition, Pellegrini and Scandura (2006) used a scale of benevolent paternalism measured with the item pool developed by Aycan (2006). They used the scale in the Turkish, Indian, and North American business contexts (Pellegrini & Scandura, 2006; Pellegrini et al., 2007), but it needs to be validated in other cultures.

Furthermore, more research is needed to establish statistical divergence from theoretically related constructs. Cheng (1995) proposed paternalism to be similar to but distinct from leader-member exchange (LMX) by suggesting that the exercise of paternalistic leadership is highly personal in nature; that is, the boss does not treat all subordinates the same but routinely categorizes subordinates into in-group and out-group members. Pellegrini et al. (2007) examined the relationship between benevolent paternalism and LMX and established discriminant validity via a confirmatory factor analysis. Cheng et al. (2004) suggested that transformational leadership and paternalistic leadership sound similar because they both involve "individualized care." Accordingly, they examined whether paternalistic leadership would have unique explanatory power on outcomes while controlling for transformational leadership, and they found all three dimensions (benevolence, morality, and authoritarianism) to account for additional variance in explaining identification, compliance, and gratitude.

Another measurement concern is that research has yet to examine paternalistic leadership from the leader's perspective. Previous research has focused primarily on subordinates' responses, but the correlation between leaders' and subordinates' ratings of similar leadership scales is low enough to raise questions about scale validity for one or both sources. For example, Gerstner and Day (1997) found that the association between LMX and performance was stronger when LMX was measured from the leader's point of view. Also, Raabe and Beehr (2003) found that mentors believed they were giving more career support than protégés believed they were getting, but protégés reported greater psychosocial support than mentors indicated providing. Measurement perspective is an important issue because it may act as a moderator of the relationship between paternalism and its correlates. For example, the association between benevolent paternalism and employees' organizational commitment may be stronger when paternalism is measured from employees' perspective compared with a leader's point of view.

Establishing construct validity is essential in developing a theoretically grounded research program. Accordingly, in paternalistic leadership literature, a substantial amount of research is needed to determine the construct validity of the commonly used scales and what outcome variables they are related to. More rigorous empirical research, along with more systematic construct validation, should advance the rigor and relevance of research on paternalistic leadership.

Research Findings

Much of the early empirical research on paternalistic leadership studied paternalism as a unidimensional construct. These studies found paternalistic leadership to be positively related to numerous outcome variables, such as LMX, job satisfaction, obligation, and goal setting (Aycan et al., 1999; Uhl-Bien et al., 1990). With Cheng et al.'s (2000) delineation of three dimensions (i.e., benevolence, authoritarianism, and morality), Cheng and colleagues started to examine paternalism as a multidimensional construct, studying the differential impacts of different domains on outcome variables. Research using Cheng et al.'s triad model of paternalistic leadership has exclusively been conducted in China and Taiwan. On the other hand, Aycan et al. (1999, 2000) examined paternalism as a unidimensional construct in their empirical studies, conducted primarily in Canada, India, the United States, and Turkey. Recently, Pellegrini and Scandura (2006) and Pellegrini et al. (2007) studied paternalism in the Turkish, Indian, and North American business contexts and suggested that paternalistic practices may positively influence employees' attitudes regardless of the cultural context.

Over the past two decades, an impressive body of research on paternalistic leadership has emerged. To provide a reference for the reader, Tables 1 and 2 summarize the empirical studies on paternalistic leadership to date. Table 1 lists the variables that have been examined as antecedents of paternalism. Table 2 lists the outcome variables as well as the moderator and mediator variables that have been examined. Tables 1 and 2 also include references to the measurement instruments used in these studies (see the Appendix for scale items).

Antecedents of Paternalistic Leadership

Although management scholars are increasingly enthusiastic about paternalistic leadership research, researchers have only recently focused attention on the development (i.e., antecedents) of these relationships. Currently, there is very limited cumulative knowledge regarding the antecedents of paternalism. However, to further validate paternalistic leadership research, we need to identify the various causal mechanisms through which paternalistic relationships develop. In search of a deeper understanding of paternalism in the contemporary organizational context, Martinez (2003) conducted field interviews with Mexican managers and identified several antecedent variables, such as employees' respect for social hierarchy, family-like organizational climates, frequent interactions with decision makers, high value for personal relationships, and limited employee decision making. Martinez also observed that the limited formalization of rules and procedures may facilitate situational-based decision making, which provides greater leverage for paternalistic leaders to respond to employees' needs and requests.

LMX is another antecedent variable that has been examined in previous studies. Ansari et al. (2004) suggested that in Malaysia, paternalistic leadership is provided only to those who have high-quality exchange relationships with leaders and that paternalistic treatment is contingent on subordinates' task accomplishment. Recent empirical research from Turkey

Table 1
Antecedents of Paternalistic Leadership (PL)

Author(s)	PL Construct Measured	Predictor Variable(s) and Source	Type of Study	Sample Characteristics	Measure and Source of PL
Martinez (2003)	Paternalism	Respect for social hierarchy (L) Organizational culture (L) Organizational structure (L)	Field interview	7 Mexican leaders	Field interviews (L)
Pellegrini & Scandura (2006)	Paternalism	Leader-member exchange (M)	Field survey	185 employees in Turkey	Pellegrini & Scandura (2006) (M)

Note: L = variable assessed on the basis of leader reports; M = variable assessed on the basis of member reports.

also found LMX quality to be a significant correlate of paternalistic leadership (Pellegrini & Scandura, 2006). Pellegrini and Scandura (2006) suggested that paternalism implies voluntary compliance, and therefore, followers who experience high levels of trust, obligation, and respect in their relations with a leader (i.e., high-quality LMX) may be more likely to accept the boss's authority as a father figure. Furthermore, paternalism necessitates a considerable investment on the part of a leader, and therefore, leaders may be more willing to engage in paternalistic practices with those employees with whom they have high-quality LMX relationships. However, more research is needed to uncover antecedents separately for leaders and subordinates to better understand the dynamics of paternalistic relationships, because different variables may be differentially important for leaders and followers. Also, research that examines the longitudinal development of paternalistic relations over time is needed to better understand the dynamics of these developmental relationships.

Outcomes of Paternalistic Leadership

The vast majority of research on paternalistic leadership has focused on the outcomes of paternalistic leadership. Also, as shown in Table 2, research on consequences of paternalism has so far been exclusively conducted in field settings.

On the basis of their research, Uhl-Bien et al. (1990) suggested that Japanese employees place a highly positive value on paternalism and that company paternalism is central to the effective functioning of the Japanese business system. They suggested that paternalism fosters trust among workers and managers, affective motivation versus economic motivation, cooperation throughout the organization, group harmony, and lifetime employee commitment. They also found paternalism to be positively and significantly related to formal and

Table 2
Outcomes of Paternalistic Leadership (PL)

Author(s)	PL Dimension Measured	Outcome Variable(s) and Source	Moderator/Mediator Variables and Source	Type of Study	Sample Characteristics	Measure and Source of PL
Uhl-Bien, Tierney, Graen, & Wakabayashi (1990)	Company paternalism	Formal career development (M) Informal career investment (M) Leader-member exchange (M) Job satisfaction (M)		Field survey	1,075 employees in Japan	Uhl-Bien et al. (1990) (M)
Aycan, Kanungo, & Sinha (1999)	Paternalism	Autonomy (M) Goal setting (M) Empowerment (M) Performance-extrinsic reward contingency (M) Participation (M) Participation (M) Proactivity (M) Obligation toward others (M)	Internal locus of control (M) Malleability (M) Proactivity (M) Reactivity (M) Obligation (M)	Field survey	165 employees in Canada and 482 employees in India	Mathur, Aycan, & Kanungo (1996) (M)
Aycan et al. (2000)	Paternalism	Job satisfaction (M)		Field survey	1,954 employees in 10 countries	Aycan et al. (2000) (M)
Wu, Hsu, & Cheng (2002)	Authoritarian	Job satisfaction (M)	Angry emotional feeling (M) Suppression of angry emotions (M)	Field survey	609 employees in Taiwan	Cheng, Chou, & Farh (2000) (M)

(continued)

Table 2 (continued)

Author(s)	PL Dimension Measured	Outcome Variable(s) and Source	Moderator/Mediator Variables and Source	Type of Study	Sample Characteristics	Measure and Source of PL
Cheng, Huang, & Chou (2002)	Benevolent Authoritarian	Satisfaction with leader (M) Commitment to team (M) Self-ratings of performance (M) Intent to stay (M)	Vertical team interaction (M) Horizontal team interaction (M) Intrateam interaction (M)	Field survey	400 employees in Taiwan	Cheng et al. (2000) (M)
Cheng et al. (2002)	Benevolent Authoritarian Moral	Organizational citizenship behavior (L)	Affective loyalty to leader (M) Obligatory loyalty to leader (M) Trust in leader (M)	Field survey	509 principal-teacher dyads in Taiwan	Cheng et al. (2000) (M)
Martinez (2003)	Paternalism	Flexibility (L) Loyalty (L) Trust (L) Friendship (L)	Trust in leader (M)	Field survey	7 Mexican leaders	Field interviews (L)
Cheng et al. (2004)	Benevolent Authoritarian Moral	Identification (M) Compliance (M) Gratitude (M)	Subordinate authority orientation (M)	Field survey	543 employees in Taiwan	Cheng et al. (2000) (M)
Chou, Cheng, & Jen (2005)	Benevolent Authoritarian Moral	Loyalty to supervisor (L) Organizational citizenship behavior (L)	Subordinate job dependence (M) Subordinate affective dependence (M) Leader's managerial competence (M)	Field survey	275 leaders and 142 subordinates (matched dyads) in Taiwan	Cheng et al. (2000) (M)

(continued)

Table 2 (continued)

Author(s)	PL Dimension Measured	Outcome Variable(s) and Source	Moderator/Mediator Variables and Source	Type of Study	Sample Characteristics	Measure and Source of PL
Pellegrini & Scandura (2006)	Paternalism	Job performance (M)		Field survey	185 employees in Turkey	Pellegrini & Scandura, 2006 (M)
Farh, Cheng, Chou, & Chu (2006)	Benevolent Authoritarian Moral	Identification (M) Compliance (M) Gratitude (M) Subordinate fear of supervisor (M) Supervisor satisfaction (M) Organizational commitment (M)	Subordinate traditionality (M) Subordinate dependence (M) Subordinate fear of supervisor (M) Gratitude (M)	Field survey	292 employees in China	Cheng et al. (2000) (M)
Pellegrini, Scandura, & Jayaraman (2007)	Benevolent	Organizational commitment (M) Job satisfaction (M)		Field survey	207 employees in India and 215 employees in the United States	Pellegrini & Scandura, 2006 (M)

Note: L = variable assessed on the basis of leader reports; M = variable assessed on the basis of member reports.

informal career investments, high-quality LMX relations, and employees' job satisfaction. Given the effectiveness of paternalism in the Japanese context, Uhl-Bien et al. concluded their study by asking, "What is the American analogue of company paternalism?" (1990: 428). They called for research for a corresponding construct rather than studying paternalism in the Western context, because they believed that paternalism implied submissiveness and dependency and would therefore be ineffective in the North American context. We agree that exploitative paternalism would be ineffective in the United States because of its emphasis on high power distance and implications of forced submissiveness and dependency, but we suggest that benevolent paternalism may have potential as a viable leadership strategy across cultural boundaries. We concur with Ouchi's (1981) recommendation that benevolent paternalism may generate higher morale and higher loyalty in the North American context and therefore may provide the answer to Uhl-Bien et al.'s inquiry.

Another early empirical work on paternalism was conducted by Mathur et al. (1996) in India. These researchers compared public and private organizations in terms of their human resources practices by studying the effects of five sociocultural variables, one of which was paternalism. They found paternalism to be a highly salient cultural dimension, and its significance showed no variation between public and private enterprises. Aycan et al. (1999) built on this early work by comparing Indian and Canadian business organizations on organizational culture and human resource practices. Their results suggested that Indian employees valued paternalistic leadership to a greater extent than Canadians. They also found strong positive relations among paternalism, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and loyalty toward community. Furthermore, via a series of mediated multiple regression analyses, they found paternalism to be positively related to employees' reactivity and obligation, which in turn influenced joint decision making. In addition, paternalism was negatively related to proactivity and internal locus of control, which in turn influenced low autonomy, low empowerment practices, and low performance-reward contingency. In a more recent study, Aycan et al. (2000) built on this research with a 10-country comparison examining the effects of four sociocultural dimensions (one of which was paternalism) on work outcomes. They found India, Pakistan, China, Turkey, and the United States to be higher on paternalistic values compared with Israel, Germany, Romania, Russia, and Canada. In all countries except Romania, the United States, and China, paternalism positively influenced obligation toward others. Furthermore, in Germany, Israel, Romania, Russia, and China, paternalism negatively influenced employees' proactivity. Aycan et al. (2000) stated that paternalism (compared with fatalism, power distance, and loyalty toward the community) yielded the largest difference among these countries.

Paternalism has also been widely researched in the Chinese business context, because some of the key elements of paternalistic leadership are deeply rooted in Chinese traditions and can be traced back to China's patriarchal family system, Confucian ethic of respect for vertical order, and long history of imperial rule (Farh & Cheng, 2000; Redding, 1990). Empirical research on paternalism flourished with Cheng et al.'s (2000) depiction of paternalistic leadership as consisting of three dimensions: benevolence, authoritarianism, and morality. However, subsequent research consistently found authoritarianism to be negatively related to the other two dimensions as well as subordinate outcomes. Research suggests that authoritarianism evokes angry emotions (Wu, Hsu, & Cheng, 2002) and subordinates' fear of their supervisors (Farh et al., 2006). It also negatively affects team interaction (Cheng,

Huang, et al., 2002). Furthermore, Farh et al. (2006) found authoritarianism to be positively related to subordinates' fear of their supervisors, which is in turn negatively related to organizational commitment. In contrast, benevolence and morality were found to be positively related to satisfaction with a team's leader, commitment to the team (Cheng, Huang, et al., 2002), organizational commitment (Farh et al., 2006), loyalty toward leaders, trust in leaders, organizational citizenship behavior (Cheng, Shieh, et al., 2002), identification, compliance without dissent, and gratitude (Cheng et al., 2004).

Redding (1990) suggested that autonomous and independent subordinates may likely reject paternalism. Accordingly, several subsequent studies examined as a moderator "subordinate traditionality," which refers to the extent to which individuals are willing to respect hierarchy in the society (Yang, Yu, & Yeh, 1989). Cheng et al. (2004) found that for subordinates high in traditionality, authoritarianism had a positive relationship with identification, compliance without dissent, and gratitude, whereas for those low in traditionality, authoritarianism was negatively correlated with these outcome variables. Traditionality did not interact with either benevolence or morality to influence subordinate outcomes. A subsequent study also found authoritarianism to show a positive effect on subordinates with high authority orientation but no effect on subordinates with low authority orientation (Cheng et al., 2004). More recently, consistent with previous findings, Farh et al. (2006) found leader authoritarianism to be more negatively associated with satisfaction with supervision for employees with low rather than high traditionality values.

Another variable that has been examined as a moderator is "subordinate dependence." Farh et al. (2006) found that subordinates who are dependent on their supervisors for work resources, benefits, and job content tend to respond more favorably to authoritarianism than those who are not dependent. Also, authoritarianism had a stronger positive effect on fear of supervisor when subordinate dependence was high than when it was low. Chou, Cheng, and Jen (2005) studied both affective as well as job dependence. The former involves the degree to which a subordinate cares about a supervisor's judgment and seeks the supervisor's social support during their interaction, whereas the latter refers to the material resources that are needed for job completion and performance awards (Cheng, 1995). The results suggested that authoritarian leadership was negatively related to loyalty to supervisor, organizational citizenship behavior, and job performance at low levels of affective and job dependence, whereas the relationships were slightly positive for high levels of subordinate dependence.

Paternalism is one of the most salient dimensions in Pacific Asian business contexts (Dorfman & Howell, 1988) such as China, Japan, and India. In addition, the emerging literature from Latin America as well as the Middle East suggests paternalism to be a prevalent managerial strategy in these cultural contexts (Ali, 1993; Aycan et al., 2000; Ayman & Chemers, 1991). In Latin America, people produce work for others primarily because of personal relationships. Employers can rely on employees to perform tasks because they have a sense of personal loyalty to their employers (Osland, Franco, & Osland, 1999). Formal job descriptions are simply not enough to guarantee compliance or service. Albert (1996) suggested that the successful management approach in Latin America is "personalism," which refers to the personalized attention given to employees. Also, both Latin America and the Middle East are collectivistic cultures (Hofstede, 2001; House et al., 2004) in which strong senses of family ties and loyalty and obligations owed to family members are also evident in organizational life (Osland et al., 1999). According to Dickson, Den Hartog, and Mitchelson

(2003), cultures of developing countries tend to share such characteristics as being high on power distance, having strong family bonds, and expecting organizations to take care of their workers as well as the workers' families. These unique attributes are reflected in a paternalistic style of leadership, which makes it a prevalent management style in cultures that value collectivism as well as hierarchical social relations. In these business contexts, employees expect bosses to take a personal interest in their nonwork lives, such as attending baptisms, weddings, and funerals (Pellegrini & Scandura, 2006). For example, it is not uncommon for companies to routinely place newspaper advertisements extending their condolences to the family when an employee's relative dies (Osland et al., 1999).

Much research on paternalism in Latin America emerged from Mexico, where paternalism is a prevalent management style (Martinez, 2005; Morris & Pavett, 1992). According to Boyer (2000), paternalism is a successful strategy because it is derived from traditional family roles and established Catholic precepts that cast employers as caretakers and family of their workers. Martinez (2005) argued that personal relationships are highly valued in Mexican society, which is exhibited in employees' expectations for frequent contact. She suggested that the benefits accrued from managers' frequent and close contact spill over to employees' performance and quality of work.

Research from the Middle East emerged primarily from Turkey, where paternalistic leadership is a highly prevalent leadership approach (Aycan et al., 2000; Pellegrini & Scandura, 2006). Despite the fact that most research emerged from Turkey, the unifying role of Islam in this region plays an important role in creating a common culture in the Middle East. Also, the presence of the Ottoman Empire's (now Turkey) influence over the region has been a driving force toward commonalities in sociocultural values (Dorfman & House, 2004). For example, in the Middle East, the concept of leadership is rooted in traditional military concepts (Scandura, Von Glinow, & Lowe, 1999) which reinforces authoritarian leadership practices. Additionally, Pellegrini and Scandura (2006) suggested that in an economically unstable environment, it is important for employees to feel secure and protected, which makes paternalistic leadership an effective management style in countries with unstable cycles of economic recovery. Recently, Pellegrini and Scandura found paternalism to be strongly and positively related to employee job satisfaction in the Turkish business context. Furthermore, paternalism fully mediated the positive relationship between LMX and job satisfaction. In another recent study, Pellegrini et al. (2007) found benevolent paternalism to be positively related to organizational commitment in the North American context, which suggests that benevolent paternalism may also have merit in the Western business context.

In addition to outcomes related to employees' work attitudes and behavior, the benefits of paternalistic relationships may accrue at the organizational level as well as the management level. Some studies have suggested that paternalistic practices benefit organizations via increased employee flexibility (Padavic & Earnest, 1994), decreased turnover intentions (Cheng et al., 2002; Kim, 1994), reduced costs and increased control (Padavic & Earnest, 1994), increased job performance (Chou et al., 2005), and organizational commitment (Farh et al., 2006). However, there is still much room for theoretical development for outcomes associated with paternalistic leadership at the organizational level. For example, institutional theory (Meyer & Rowan, 1977) may be applied to better understand whether paternalistic practices occur more frequently in certain types of organizational structures, such as in bureaucratic compared with entrepreneurial settings.

Directions for Future Research

With increasing globalization, corporate downsizing, and hypercompetitive markets, the bond between employers and employees has shifted from a long-term relationship involving loyalty and commitment to a contractlike economic exchange (Tsui & Wu, 2005). On the other hand, research suggests that the traditional loyalty approach produces the most productive, loyal, and committed employees, along with strong company performance (Tsui, Pearce, Porter, & Tripoli, 1997). Accordingly, in the past several years, leadership researchers have focused their attention on interpersonal and relational skills as being important for leadership effectiveness (Dickson & Den Hartog, 2005). One such relational leadership approach is paternalistic leadership, but despite the prevalence of paternalistic leadership in Latin America, the Middle East, and Pacific Asia, still little is known about it. This study is only a beginning, and many issues remain to be explored.

Our review suggests that empirical research on paternalistic leadership has been relatively limited in scope and offers few consistent findings and that many aspects of this developmental relationship remain unexplored. Thus, paternalistic leadership presents tremendous opportunities for future empirical research. Below, we address some methodological and theoretical issues in the current literature and discuss a number of fruitful directions for future research.

Methodological Issues

First, there is a need to investigate the psychometric properties of the various measurement scales of paternalistic leadership. Sound measurement is essential to the development of research agendas (Hinkin, 1995). It is interesting to note that unlike other areas of organizational behavior and leadership, measures of paternalistic leadership were developed in countries other than the United States and are now being translated into English for use in cross-cultural comparative work. Thus, measurement equivalence of these scales will be a necessary step in the construct validation process in this area. There is a need to compare the different measures to determine the degree to which they correlate with one another and the degree to which some measures tap aspects of paternalistic leadership that others do not. Studies of convergent and discriminant validity are needed to assess the degree to which paternalistic leadership is similar to or different than other leadership constructs, such as LMX and mentoring. Some measures of paternalism appear to have other constructs embedded in them, such as organizational commitment and empowerment (Aycan, 2006). Mapping the domain of paternalistic leadership is clearly needed. At present, researchers appear to be using the scales separately, but research is in need to see if a configurational approach may be more appropriate in this research agenda. This approach refers to "any multidimensional constellation of conceptually distinct characteristics that commonly occur together" (Meyer, Tsui, & Hinings, 1993: 1175). Meyer et al. (1993) suggested that most leadership theories represent a reductionist stance in that they typically focus on a limited number of variables and treat relationships as deterministic. They suggested that an alternative would be to study leadership as a multidimensional phenomenon and analyze leaders' relations to their

contexts and the outcomes they achieve as configurational problems. Addressing such questions may move leadership research beyond univariate and bivariate analyses toward multivariate analyses of reciprocal and nonlinear relationships (Meyer et al., 1993). At present, we recommend that substantive research be approached with appropriate caution until more is known about the psychometric qualities of paternalistic leadership scales.

Theoretical Issues

There is also much room for improvement on the theoretical front. Paternalistic leadership research has been steadily maturing over the past 15 years, but more research is needed on the outcomes of paternalistic leadership. In particular, research is needed on the performance impact and the possible differences among different paternalistic leadership styles in this regard. For example, research needs to investigate whether benevolence is more strongly related to performance than authoritarian behavior. Also, interaction effects should be explored; it may be that benevolence compensates for authoritarian leadership. More complex three-way interactions may exist if one uses Cheng et al.'s (2000) conceptualization, which includes benevolent, moral, and authoritarian leadership.

Individual difference moderators may play a role in how subordinates react to paternalistic leadership. For example, subordinates with counterdependent or independent attitudes toward authority may not respond to authoritarian leadership. Benevolence may be viewed as manipulative for those with low levels of dispositional trust (Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995; McKnight, Cummings, & Chervany, 1998). It would also be interesting to explore the relationship between negative affectivity (Necowitz & Roznowski, 1994; Watson & Clark, 1984) and reactions to benevolent leadership. Those who view the world as negative in general may interpret the authoritarian aspect of paternalism differently than those who are more optimistic about people and relationships at work.

Context may also play a role in how subordinates react to paternalism. There is great potential in this area for research on multiple levels of analysis. For example, groups within organizations may develop paternalistic cultures fostered by their leaders as group members emulate the leaders' behavior. Paternalism may operate at the organizational level of analysis. Some organizations may be more paternalistic than others, and the locus of the effects of paternalism may be due more to the organizational culture of paternalism than to the leader's behavior. Analytical techniques such as within-and-between-analysis (Dansereau, Alutto, & Yammarino, 1984) or hierarchical linear modeling (Hofmann, 1997) can be used to explore the effects of paternalism at different levels of analysis.

Research will be needed to measure perceptions of paternalism from both supervisors and subordinates given this trend in leadership research (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). It would be interesting to examine the degree to which supervisors and subordinates agree on perceptions of paternalism and the relationship of this agreement to attitudes and performance. Supervisors may not view their behavior as authoritarian, because of their benevolent intent, but subordinates may interpret this very differently. This would be an aspect of benevolent leadership that would benefit from qualitative inquiry to explore the meaning of paternalism in dyads.

Paternalism may change over time. There is little conceptualization regarding how the course of the development of the relationship may affect paternalism. For example, does authoritarian behavior occur less in mature leader-member relationships? Does benevolence grow over time, or is it a constant? Longitudinal research is needed to examine the course of development of paternalism. Because paternalism is an emerging area in leadership research, these unaddressed questions are all ripe directions for future research.

Conclusions

Our review of the literature on paternalistic leadership reveals an emerging and fascinating new area for research. As with all new concepts, care must be taken with conceptualization and measurement prior to substantive research. It would be of benefit to this new field of research to carefully examine existing measures and to develop consensus on a measure so that future research is comparable across studies and over time. In this review, we suggest that benevolent paternalism may represent a breakthrough in leadership research that may be generalizable across cultures. The authoritarian content in some conceptualizations of paternalistic leadership needs careful examination, because this might be questioned in certain cultures that have a more egalitarian set of values. Benevolence, on the other hand, might be a construct that has more widespread endorsement as well as practical implication. Clearly, there is a need for further research on benevolence at the workplace.

Research has examined outcomes of paternalism, but there is a need to focus attention on the antecedents of paternalism, which has been limited to date. Field interviews with seven leaders in Mexico have suggested that there may be structural antecedents of paternalistic leadership. However, the only variable that has been empirically examined as an antecedent is LMX. Although our review shows that paternalistic leadership is a relatively new area in management research, evidence is supportive of the relationships between paternalism and positive work attitudes in a number of business cultures, including the Middle East, Latin America, and Pacific Asia. There is a need to examine the relationships of paternalistic leadership to performance and turnover. A number of moderators have been examined to date in this line of research, suggesting that there are key contingencies that should be considered, particularly individual differences among members on such variables as locus of control and traditionality. Research on other levels of moderators is sparse, with one study examining team processes. It is notable that there is a lack of research on organizational culture or organizational structure, which would seem to be important situational moderators.

This review updates the status of research on paternalism. We summarized the currently available alternative measures of paternalism, noting that care must be taken in the selection of a measure and that the measure used should be aligned with the substantive purpose of the research. Our review has revealed a number of areas in which future research is needed, and we have offered some suggestions for the next steps in the development of this new field. We see a great deal of potential in this concept and hope that our review will encourage other researchers to explore the relationships of paternalistic leadership to their own research agendas.

APPENDIX
Paternalistic Leadership Scales

Mathur, Aycan, and Kanungo (1996)

Six-point, Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*).

Paternalism

1. The ideal boss is like a parent.
2. Managers should provide fatherly advice and directions to their subordinates in solving their problems.

Aycan, Kanungo, Mendonca, Yu, Deller, Stahl, and Kurshid (2000)

Six-point, Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*).

Paternalism

1. The ideal boss is like a parent.
2. Superiors know best what is good for their subordinates.
3. Managers should provide fatherly advice and directions to their subordinates.
4. People in authority should take care of their subordinates as they would take care of their children.
5. The experience and wisdom of superiors are the best guidelines for subordinates.

Cheng, Chou, and Farh (2000)

Six-point, Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*).

Benevolent Leadership

1. My supervisor is like a family member when he/she gets along with us.
2. My supervisor devotes all his/her energy to taking care of me.
3. Beyond work relations, my supervisor expresses concern about my daily life.
4. My supervisor ordinarily shows a kind concern for my comfort.
5. My supervisor will help me when I'm in an emergency.
6. My supervisor takes very thoughtful care of subordinates who have spent a long time with him/her.
7. My supervisor meets my needs according to my personal requests.
8. My supervisor encourages me when I encounter arduous problems.
9. My supervisor takes good care of my family members as well.
10. My supervisor tries to understand what the cause is when I don't perform well.
11. My supervisor handles what is difficult to do or manage in everyday life for me.

Moral Leadership

1. My supervisor never avenges a personal wrong in the name of public interest when he/she is offended. (Reversed)
2. My supervisor employs people according to their virtues and does not envy others' abilities and virtues.
3. My supervisor uses his/her authority to seek special privileges for himself/herself. (Reversed)
4. My supervisor doesn't take the credit for my achievements and contributions for himself/herself.
5. My supervisor does not take advantage of me for personal gain.
6. My supervisor does not use *guanxi* (personal relationships) or back-door practices to obtain illicit personal gains.

Authoritarian Leadership

1. My supervisor asks me to obey his/her instructions completely.
2. My supervisor determined all decisions in the organization whether they are important or not.
3. My supervisor always has the last say in the meeting.
4. My supervisor always behaves in a commanding fashion in front of employees.
5. I feel pressured when working with him/her.
6. My supervisor exercises strict discipline over subordinates.
7. My supervisor scolds us when we can't accomplish our tasks.
8. My supervisor emphasizes that our group must have the best performance of all the units in the organization.
9. We have to follow his/her rules to get things done. If not, he/she punishes us severely.

Pellegrini & Scandura (2006)

Five-point, Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*).

Paternalism

My manager:

1. Is interested in every aspect of his/her employees' lives.
2. Creates a family environment in the workplace.
3. Consults his/her employees on job matters.
4. Is like an elder family member (father/mother, elder brother/sister) for his/her employees.
5. Gives advice to his/her employees on different matters as if he/she were an elder family member.
6. Makes decisions on behalf of his/her employees without asking for their approval.
7. Knows each of his/her employees intimately (e.g., personal problems, family life, etc.).
8. Exhibits emotional reactions in his/her relations with the employees; doesn't refrain from showing emotions such as joy, grief, anger.
9. Participates in his/her employees' special days (e.g., weddings, funerals, etc.).
10. Tries his/her best to find a way for the company to help his/her employees whenever they need help on issues outside work (e.g., setting up home, paying for children's tuition).
11. Expects his/her employees to be devoted and loyal, in return for the attention and concern he/she shows them.
12. Gives his/her employees a chance to develop themselves when they display low performance.
13. Believes he/she is the only one who knows what is best for his/her employees.

Aycan (2006)

Five-point, Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*extremely unlikely*) to 5 (*extremely likely*).

Employee Commitment to the Company

1. Employees should always be concerned with company's future and welfare.
2. Whenever need arises employees should voluntarily work overtime.
3. Employees should perceive and accept the workplace as their own family.
4. Employees must show loyalty and deference to the company as well as their superiors.
5. When an emergency occurs in the company, managers have the right to ask employees to immediately attend to the situation even if this requires employees to compromise their private life.

6. An ideal manager is able to create a family atmosphere at workplace.

Superior's Involvement in Subordinate's Personal Life

1. An employee's happiness and sorrow is his/her supervisor's happiness and sorrow.

2. An ideal manager/supervisor should be involved in and concerned with different aspects of his/her subordinate's lives.

3. An ideal manager/supervisor is someone who could guide his/her employees in matters that concern their private lives.

4. When an employee has marital problems, the supervisor is expected to act as a mediator between the employee and his/her spouse.

5. An ideal manager/supervisor takes care of his/her employees the same way as s/he would do for his/her own children.

"Father" Role of the Superior

1. An ideal manager/supervisor provides advice and guidance.

2. An ideal manager/supervisor is like a father.

Superior's Empowering Behavior

1. An ideal manager/supervisor consults employees in decisions concerning them.

2. One of the basic responsibilities of supervisors is to contribute to personal and professional development of employees.

Superior as the Team Integrator and Harmonizer

1. When there is conflict between two employees, their supervisor should speak with one of them on behalf of the other to solve the problem.

2. An ideal manager/supervisor protects employees from outside criticisms.

References

- Abdullah, A. 1996. *Going glocal: Cultural dimensions in Malaysian management*. Kuala Lumpur: Malaysian Institute of Management.
- Albert, R. D. 1996. A framework and model for understanding Latin American and Latino/Hispanic cultural patterns. In D. Landis & R. S. Bhagat (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training* (2nd ed.): 327-348. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ali, A. J. 1993. Decision-making style, individualism, and attitudes toward risk of Arab executives. *International Studies of Management and Organization*, 23(3): 53-73.
- Ansari, M. A., Ahmad, Z. A., & Aafaqi, R. 2004. Organizational leadership in the Malaysian context. In D. Tjosvold & K. Leung (Eds.), *Leading in high growth Asia: Managing relationship for teamwork and change*: 109-138. Singapore: World Scientific.
- Aycan, Z. 2006. Paternalism: Towards conceptual refinement and operationalization. In K. S. Yang, K. K. Hwang, & U. Kim (Eds.), *Scientific advances in indigenous psychologies: Empirical, philosophical, and cultural contributions*: 445-466. London: Sage Ltd.
- Aycan, Z., & Kanungo, R. N. 1998. *Paternalism: Towards conceptual refinement and operationalization*. Paper presented at 14th International Congress of Cross-Cultural Psychology, Bellingham, WA.
- Aycan, Z., Kanungo, R. N., Mendonca, M., Yu, K., Deller, J., Stahl, G., et al. 2000. Impact of culture on human resource management practices: A 10-country comparison. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 49: 192-221.
- Aycan, Z., Kanungo, R. N., & Sinha, J.B.P. 1999. Organizational culture and human resource management practices: The model of culture fit. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 30(4): 501-516.
- Ayman, R., & Chemers, M. M. 1991. The effect of leadership match on subordinate satisfaction in Mexican organizations: Some moderating influences of self-monitoring. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 40: 299-314.

- Bing, S. 2004. *Sun Tzu was a sissy: Conquer your enemies, promote your friends, and wage the real art of war*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Boyer, C. 2000. The threads of class at La Virgen: Misrepresentation and identity at a Mexican textile mill, 1918-1935. *American Historical Review*, 105(5): 1576-1598.
- Cheng, B. S. 1995. Paternalistic authority and leadership: A case study of a Taiwanese CEO. *Bulletin of the Institute of Ethnology Academia Sinica*, 79: 119-173.
- Cheng, B. S., Chou L. F., & Farh, J. L. 2000. A triad model of paternalistic leadership: The constructs and measurement. *Indigenous Psychological Research in Chinese Societies*, 14: 3-64.
- Cheng, B. S., Chou, L. F., Wu, T. Y., Huang, M. P., & Farh, J. L. 2004. Paternalistic leadership and subordinate responses: Establishing a leadership model in Chinese organizations. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 7: 89-117.
- Cheng, B. S., Huang, M. P., & Chou, L. F. 2002. Paternalistic leadership and its effectiveness: Evidence from Chinese organizational teams. *Journal of Psychology in Chinese Societies*, 3(1): 85-112.
- Cheng, B. S., Shieh, P. Y., & Chou, L. F. 2002. The principal's leadership, leader-member exchange quality, and the teacher's extra-role behavior: The effects of transformational and paternalistic leadership. *Indigenous Psychological Research in Chinese Societies*, 17: 105-161.
- Chou, L. F., Cheng, B. S., & Jen, C. K. 2005. *The contingent model of paternalistic leadership: Subordinate dependence and leader competence*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Academy of Management, Honolulu, Hawaii.
- Colella, A., Garcia, F., Reidel, L., & Triana, M. 2005. *Paternalism: "Hidden" discrimination*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Academy of Management, Honolulu, Hawaii.
- Dansereau, F., Alutto, J. A., & Yammarino, F. J. 1984. *Theory testing in organizational behavior: The variant approach*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Dickson, M. W., & Den Hartog, D. N. 2005. What good is this to me? Managerial implications of global leadership research. In R. R. Sims & S. A. Quatro (Eds.), *Leadership: Succeeding in the private, public, and not-for-profit sectors*: 348-366. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- Dickson, M. W., Den Hartog, D. N., & Mitchelson, J. K. 2003. Research on leadership in a cross-cultural context: Making progress, and raising new questions. *Leadership Quarterly*, 14: 729-768.
- Dorfman, P. W., & House, R. J. 2004. Cultural influences on organizational leadership: Literature review, theoretical rationale, and GLOBE project goals. In R. J. House, P. J. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. W. Dorfman, & V. Gupta (Eds.), *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*: 49-71. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dorfman, P. W., & Howell, J. P. 1988. Dimensions of national culture and effective leadership patterns: Hofstede revisited. In E. G. McGoun (Ed.), *Advances in international comparative management* (Vol. 3): 127-149. Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Drost, E. A., & Von Glinow, M. A. 1998. Leadership behavior in Mexico: Etic philosophies/emic practices. *Research in International Business and International Relations*, 7: 3-28.
- Farh, J. L., & Cheng, B. S. 2000. A cultural analysis of paternalistic leadership in Chinese organizations. In J. T. Li., A. S. Tsui, & E. Weldon (Eds.), *Management and organizations in the Chinese context*: 84-127. London: Macmillan.
- Farh, J. L., Cheng, B. S., Chou, L. F., & Chu, X. P. 2006. Authority and benevolence: Employees' responses to paternalistic leadership in China. In A. S. Tsui, Y. Bian, & L. Cheng (Eds.), *China's domestic private firms: Multidisciplinary perspectives on management and performance*: 230-260. New York: Sharpe.
- Follett, M. P. 1933. The essentials of leadership. In *Proceedings of the Rowntree lecture conferences*. London: University of London Press.
- Freud, S. 1926. Psychoanalysis: Freudian school. In *Encyclopedia Britannica* (13th ed.). London: Cambridge University Press.
- Gelfand, M. J., Erez, M., & Aycan, Z. 2007. Cross-cultural organizational behavior. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58: 479-514.
- Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. 1997. Meta-analytic review of leader-member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82: 827-844.
- Goodell, G. E. 1985. Paternalism, patronage, and potlatch: The dynamics of giving and being given to. *Current Anthropology*, 26: 247-257.

- Graen, G. B. 2006. In the eye of the beholder: Cross-cultural lesson in leadership from project GLOBE. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 20(4): 95-101.
- 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. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6: 219-247.
- Hinkin, T. R. 1995. A review of scale development practices in the study of organizations. *Journal of Management*, 21(5): 967-988.
- Hofmann, D. A. 1997. An overview of the logic and rationale of hierarchical linear models. *Journal of Management*, 23: 723-744.
- Hofstede, G. 2001. *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (Eds.). 2004. *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Jackman, M. R. 1994. *The velvet glove: Paternalism and conflict in gender, class, and race relations*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- James, K., Chen, D. L., & Cropanzano, R. 1996. Culture and leadership among Taiwanese and U.S. workers: Do values influence leadership ideals? In M. N. Ruderman, M. W. Hughes-James, & S. E. Jackson (Eds.), *Selected research on work team diversity*: 33-52. Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- Kerfoot, D., & Knights, D. 1993. Management, masculinity and manipulation: From paternalism to corporate strategy in financial services in Britain. *Journal of Management Studies*, 30(4): 659-677.
- Kim, U. M. 1994. Significance of paternalism and communalism in the occupational welfare system of Korean firms: A national survey. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications*: 251-266. London: Sage Ltd.
- Maccoby, M. 2004. The power of transference. *Harvard Business Review*, 82(9): 76-85.
- Martinez, P. G. 2003. Paternalism as a positive form of leader-subordinate exchange: Evidence from Mexico. *Journal of Iberoamerican Academy of Management*, 1: 227-242.
- Martinez, P. G. 2005. Paternalism as a positive form of leadership in the Latin American context: Leader benevolence, decision-making control and human resource management practices. In M. Elvira & A. Davila (Eds.), *Managing human resources in Latin America: An agenda for international leaders*: 75-93. Oxford, UK: Routledge.
- Martinez, S. M., & Dorfman, P. W. 1998. The Mexican entrepreneur: An ethnographic study of the Mexican empresario. *International Studies of Management and Organization*, 28(2): 97-123.
- Mathur, P., Aycan, Z., & Kanungo, R. N. 1996. Work cultures in Indian organizations: A comparison between public and private sector. *Psychology and Developing Societies*, 8(2): 199-223.
- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. 1995. An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 20: 709-734.
- McGregor, D. 1960. *The human side of enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- McKnight, D. H., Cummings, L. L., & Chervany, N. L. 1998. Initial trust formation in new organizational relationships. *Academy of Management Review*, 23: 473-490.
- Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. 1977. Institutional organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83: 343-363.
- Meyer, A. D., Tsui, A. S., & Hinings, C. R. 1993. Configurational approaches to organizational analysis. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(6): 1175-1195.
- Morris, T., & Pavett, C. M. 1992. Management style and productivity in two cultures. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 23: 169-179.
- Munsterberg, H. 1913. *Psychology and industrial efficiency*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Necowitz, L. B., & Roznowski, M. 1994. Negative affectivity and job satisfaction: Cognitive processes underlying the relationship and effects on employee behaviors. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 45: 270-294.
- Northouse, P. G. 1997. *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. 1994. *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Osland, J. S., Franco, S., & Osland, A. 1999. Organizational implications of Latin American culture: Lessons for the expatriate manager. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 8: 219-234.

- Ouchi, W. G. 1981. *Theory Z: How American business can meet the Japanese challenge*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Padavic, I., & Earnest, W. R. 1994. Paternalism as a component of managerial strategy. *Social Science Journal*, 31(4): 389-405.
- Pasa, S. F., Kabasakal, H., & Bodur, M. 2001. Society, organizations, and leadership in Turkey. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 50: 559-589.
- Pearce, J. L. 2005. *Paternalism and radical organizational change*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Academy of Management, Honolulu, Hawaii.
- 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*, 37(2): 264-279.
- Pellegrini, E. K., Scandura, T. A., & Jayaraman, V. 2007. *Generalizability of the paternalistic leadership concept: A cross-cultural investigation* (working paper). St. Louis: University of Missouri–St. Louis.
- Raabe, B., & Beehr, T. A. 2003. Formal mentoring versus supervisor and coworker relationship: Differences in perceptions and impact. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24: 271-293.
- Redding, S. G. 1990. *The spirit of Chinese capitalism*. New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Redding, S. G., Norman, A., & Schlander, A. 1994. The nature of individual attachment to theory: A review of East Asian variations. In H. C. Triandis, M. D. Dunnett, & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*: 674-688. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychology Press.
- Roland A. 1984. The self in India and America. In V. Kavolis (Ed.), *Designs of selfhood*: 170-191. Rutherford, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.
- Saufi, R. A., Wafa, S. A., & Hamzah, Y. Z. 2002. Leadership style preference of Malaysian managers. *Malaysian Management Review*, 37: 1-10.
- Scandura, T. A., Von Glinow, M. A., & Lowe, K. B. 1999. When East meets West: Leadership “best practices” in the United States and the Middle East. In W. Mobley (Ed.), *Advances in global leadership*: 235-248. Stamford, CT: JAI.
- Schein, E. H. 1981. Does Japanese management style have a message for Americans? *Sloan Management Review*, 23(1): 55-68.
- Schriesheim, C. A., Hinkin, T. R., & Podsakoff, P. M. 1991. Can ipsative and single-item measures produce erroneous results in field studies of French and Raven's (1959) five bases of power? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(1): 106-114.
- Sinha, J.B.P. 1990. *Work culture in Indian context*. New Delhi, India: Sage.
- Stogdill, R. M. 1974. *Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York: Free Press.
- Sullivan, D., Mitchell, M., & Uhl-Bien, M. 2003. The new conduct of business: How LMX can help capitalize on cultural diversity. In G. Graen (Ed.), *Dealing with diversity*: 183-218. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Tsui, A. S., Pearce, J. L., Porter, L. W., & Tripoli, A. M. 1997. Alternative approaches to the employee-organization relationship: Does investment in employees pay off? *Academy of Management Journal*, 40: 1089-1121.
- Tsui, A. S., & Wu, J. B. 2005. The new employment relationship versus the mutual investment approach: Implications for human resource management. *Human Resource Management*, 44(2): 115-121.
- Uhl-Bien, M., & Maslyn, M. 2005. *Paternalism as a form of leadership: Differentiating paternalism from leader-member exchange*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Academy of Management, Honolulu, Hawaii.
- Uhl-Bien, M., Tierney, P., Graen, G., & Wakabayashi, M. 1990. Company paternalism and the hidden investment process: Identification of the “right type” for line managers in leading Japanese organizations. *Group and Organization Studies*, 15: 414-430.
- VanDeVeer, D. 1986. *Paternalistic intervention: The moral bounds of benevolence*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Watson, D., & Clark, L. 1984. Negative affectivity: The disposition to experience aversive emotional states. *Psychological Bulletin*, 96: 465-498.
- Weber, M. 1947. *The theory of social and economic organization* (A. M. Henderson & T. Parsons, Trans.). New York: Free Press.
- Weber, M. 1968. The types of legitimate domination. In G. Roth & C. Wittich (Eds.), *Economy and society* (Vol. 3): 212-216. New York: Bedminster.
- Westwood, R. 1997. Harmony and patriarchy: The cultural basis for “paternalistic headship” among the overseas Chinese. *Organization Studies*, 18: 445-480.

- Westwood, R., & Chan, A. 1992. Headship and leadership. In R. Westwood (Ed.), *Organisational behaviour: Southeast Asian perspectives*: 118-143. Hong Kong: Longman.
- Wu, T. Y., Hsu, W. L., & Cheng, B. S. 2002. Expressing or suppressing anger: Subordinate's anger responses to supervisors' authoritarian behaviors in a Taiwan enterprise. *Indigenous Psychological Research in Chinese Societies*, 18: 3-49.
- Yang, K. S., Yu, A. B., & Yeh, M. H. 1989. Chinese individual modernity and traditionality: Construct definition and measurement. In K. S. Yang & A. B. Yu (Eds.), *Chinese psychology and behavior*: 241-306. Taipei, Taiwan: Laureat.

Biographical Notes

Ekin K. Pellegrini earned her PhD from the University of Miami. She is an assistant professor of management at the University of Missouri–St. Louis. Her research interests include cross-cultural leadership, leader-member exchange, and mentoring.

Terri A. Scandura is dean of the Graduate School and a professor of management at the University of Miami, Florida. She received her PhD in organizational behavior from the University of Cincinnati. Her research interests include leadership, mentorship and applied research methods. She has authored numerous articles and book chapters.