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Abstract: This study investigated whether cultural values of paternalism measured at the leaders’ individual and societal level relate to leadership behaviors of managers. The findings indicated that paternalistic values are important determinants of leadership behaviors; however, the influence of paternalism on leaders’ behavioral choices was not common across the two levels of analysis. Societal level paternalism was related with structural leadership, while self-referenced ratings of paternalistic values showed a significant linkage with human resource and symbolic leadership.
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1. Introduction

Of a number of constructs that have been posited as potential determinants of leadership behavior, national culture is regarded as a crucially important behavioral factor for its long identified influential role in determining people’s behavioral choices (Brislin, 2000; Hofstede, 1983; Adler, 1997). How cultural values play an important role in shaping leadership styles and behaviors has also come under the focus of leadership researchers. Many such studies (e.g. Offerman and Hellmann, 1997; Rodrigues, 1991; Schmidt and Yeh, 1992; House et al. 1997) have stressed a strong connection between culture and leadership behaviors by reporting differences among countries with regard to use of specific leadership behaviors. For example, Smith and Peterson (1994) and Schmidt and Yeh, (1992) reported that manager’s choice of behaviors with regard to managing events and influencing followers respectively were significantly influenced by their cultural affiliation.

The cross-cultural literature has described culture in terms of value dimensions (Hofstede, 1980; Schwartz, 1994; House et al. 2004). So far a number of studies (e.g. Schneider and De Meyer, 1991; Geletkanycz, 1997; Elenkov and Manev, 2005; Rodrigues, 1991) have described interrelationship between cultural dimensions and various leadership behaviors. However, one cultural dimension that still needs an elaborate examination with regards to its influence in shaping leadership behaviors is paternalism. Paternalism, which is the degree to which people in a culture emphasize control and care of younger members of the family, and
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younger members accept such an interference in their personal lives, is argued to be a comparatively new entrant to the ongoing debate on cultural values (Aycan, 2006). It is generally believed that many Asian and south American cultures are characterized by paternalistic values (e.g. Martinez, 2005; Sinha, 1995; Aycan and Kanungo, 1998). There exists a substantial amount of knowledge on how paternalistic leadership influence employee outcomes (e.g. Cheng et al. 2002, Pellegrini et al. 2010; Pellegrini and Scandura, 2006), but earlier empirical studies have not yet examined how paternalism as a value dimension predicts behaviors of managers. More research is required to elucidate this potential link to fill the existing gap in the literature.

The purpose of the current investigation is to contribute to a better understanding of the impact of paternalistic values on leadership styles. More specifically, it empirically examines how cultural values of paternalism, measured at the leaders’ individual and societal level, relate to leader’ behavioral choices. This study is unique from other leadership studies (e.g. House et al. 2004; Offerman and Hellmann, 1997) in that it investigates how the influence of paternalistic values operates differently at the individual and societal level (Mustafa and Rune, 2012), and how managers exhibit different leadership behaviors in response to the value influence at each level of analysis. The data for the present study was collected from a single country, namely Pakistan, which according to the earlier evidence (Aycan et al. 2000; Kanungo and Aycan, 1997) is high on paternalistic characteristics alongside other countries, such as China, India, Korea and Turkey. However, the country is an understudied region with regards to the leadership literature and there is still a dearth of rigorous academic research. The present study will not only contribute to the leadership research in the Pakistani context, but it may also serve as a model to understand the leadership dynamics in other cultures that are characterized by paternalistic values.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1. Individual and Societal Level Cultural Values and Leadership

At the personal level, values refer to what individuals desire for themselves and what they think to be important as guiding principles in their life (Schwartz, 1992). Individuals may judge such values as personally important because fulfilling them leads to inherent satisfaction (Wan et al. 2007; Ryan and Deci, 2000). From a cultural perspective, values which people regard as personally important are not only a product of individuals’ distinct make-up, rather certain cultural values that people internalize during early socialization processes also become part of one’s self conceptions and personal value preferences. Individual level cultural values may initially have an extrinsic motivational source (Vauclair, 2009), but as a result of their internalization they become personally important and tap personal priorities (e.g. Ryan and Deci, 2000). Individual level cultural
values, therefore, tend to act as an inner locus of control on choice and display of leadership behaviors.

However, leaders may not internalize all cultural values that may have an inner locus of control on their behaviors, rather certain cultural values are less likely to be assimilated and leader behaviors related to such values are regulated by normative and institutional pressures in the social environment (Bardi and Schwartz, 2003). Individual values will influence leader behaviors if such behaviors are not strongly regulated by social norms. If a particular behavior is subject to social norms, personal values are likely to have no sufficient impact on this particular behavior (Fischer, 2006). Thus, societal values have an external regulatory influence on leaders’ behavioral choice regardless of their own values.

![Figure 1. Conceptual model](image)

It is generally believed that managers of foreign origin consciously choose to comply with the societal values and norms of acceptable behavior in anticipation of legitimacy, while local managers precociously conform to the various institutional pressures because of their unquestioned social validity (e.g. House et al. 1997). But for local mangers the premise may not be always accurate because not all members of a national society harbor cultural values and norms to the same degree, and they may differ from societal values on any given dimension of culture. According to Triandis (1995), all cultures possess both individualist and collectivist tendencies and more than a quarter of the total members do not fit the prevalent value pattern in their culture. Hence, it will be far-fetched to say that all members in a culture internalize all cultural values and such values in turn have an inner locus of control on their behaviors. Rather, certain cultural values are less likely to be assimilated and leader behaviors related to these values are regulated by normative pressures in the social environment. However, the degree of behavioral regulation depends on to what extent a national culture deals with discrepancy from societal values.
by creating a certain degree of tolerance. In societies where this discrepancy is much less tolerated, there are likely to be more salient and demanding norms related to such values and leader behaviors tend to be mainly regulated by societal values (Fischer, 2006).

2.2. Leadership Behaviors

Traditionally, the leadership theory and research has been overwhelmed by the dual conceptualizations of task and relationship orientation. Yukl (1998) tried to change the traditional perspective by suggesting a third broad category of ‘change behaviors’ to the existing taxonomy to broaden the understanding of leadership influence. Bolman and Deal (1991, 2003) came up with an even more comprehensive framework by proposing a multi-orientation model to investigate and explain the complex phenomenon of leadership. The concept of leadership set forth by Bolman and Deal (1991) collapses the possible perspectives into structural, human-resource, political and symbolic orientation. The authors propose that most issues related to leadership in organizations correspond to these four orientations, that leaders’ effectiveness is linked to their developing a thorough understanding of all orientations and in turn engaging in behaviors relevant to each orientation.

The structural orientation emphasizes clear direction, policies, goals and efficiency. The focus of human resource leadership is on fostering relationships and attending to the individual feelings, aspirations and preferences of followers. In the leadership literature, task behaviors closely parallel the structural orientation, while supportive leadership, concern for subordinates, humanist, collegial, relationship and employee orientation have been used as closely related terms for human-resource leadership (e.g. House, 1996; Bensimon, 1989; Blake and Mouton, 1985; Misumi and Peterson, 1985; Stogdill, 1974; Quinn, 1988)

Political orientation involves actions that relate to persuasion, negotiation, coalition making and building alliances. Symbolic leadership is about capturing the attention of followers by utilizing the important functions of various symbolic forms such as myths, rituals and ceremonies. Leaders with a symbolic focus communicate a vision of preferred organizational future, instill a sense of charisma and arouse emotional responses in followers.

Although there is a substantial body of research (Bensimon, 1989; Heimovics et al. 1993; Bolman and Deal, 1991, 1992) that has focused on the intensity of frame use and the contribution of multi-frame style to the managerial effectiveness, less attention has been directed towards the cultural antecedents of the four leadership frames. Therefore, the question arises of whether leaders’ choice of a single or multiple frame style that is appropriate in an Anglo-American context is necessarily the choice of leaders in countries which have a different value constellation? Here, the implication is that leaders with different cultural backgrounds may be influenced by cultural values through different mechanisms, i.e. value
internalization and external regulation, and they tend to differently view the organizational situations and behave in a significantly different way.

2.3. Paternalism as a Cultural Value Dimension

Paternalism is the degree to which people in a culture become involved in the personal lives of younger members of the family by emphasizing their protection, welfare and guidance, and such an involvement is acceptable to younger members (e.g. Kim, 1994; Aycan et al. 2000; Pellegrini and Scandura, 2008). In paternalthic cultures, the role of parents and elder family members is to protect the welfare of younger members, and to guide and discipline their activities, in addition to acting on their behalf in making decisions. It is common for elder members to make vital decisions on behalf of the younger family members, irrespective of the fact that the latter have sufficient economic independence and professional competence to make the decisions on their own (Yelsma and Athappilly, 1988). Paternalistic values, thus, emphasize a duality of care and control in the relationships within the family, specifically, between parents and children. The control element refers to strong discipline and authority over younger members and demands their compliance and obedience, while benevolence means that the parents/elders demonstrate individualized and holistic concern for youngsters’ protection and welfare (Farh and Cheng, 2000). This duality, in which the father is nurturing and caring with children, yet authoritative, demanding and disciplinarian (Sinha, 1990), is supported by earlier research that parental benevolence and authority are not mutually exclusive and in upbringing of children both aspects inevitably go together (Kagitcibasi, 1996).

Value systems of eastern societies such as India, China, Pakistan, Japan and Turkey are characterized by paternalistic characteristics (Aycan et al. 2000). In such cultures, paternalism may be sustained through rich traditions of interpersonal interdependence and social obligations (e.g. Kakar, 2008). People of higher status in family and other social structures are committed to control and nurture those lower in the hierarchy (Sinha, 1990). In exchange for providing protection, care and guidance, elders are not only treated with respect and deference; rather, those under their control or care develop a relationship with them which is based on loyalty, indebtedness and obligation (e.g. Uhl-Bien and Maslyn, 2005).

2.4. Paternalism-Leadership Behavior Linkage

The coexistence between paternal affection and control in paternalistic societies also permeates into the fabric of social and organizational life (Kim, 1994; Redding and Hsiao, 1995). In such cultures, incumbents of the upper echelons in the social structures assume the role of parents and tend to provide support and guidance to those who are located at lower hierarchical levels. In organizations, managers perform a similar dual role by combining strong discipline and control with benevolence in their
relationship with subordinates (Brislin, 2000; Farh and Cheng, 2000; Pasa et al. 2001; James et al. 1996). Managers not only guide professional activities of followers but also attempt to promote their well-being by exhibiting concern for their personal matters (Pasa et al. 2001; Gelfand et al. 2007). In societies where paternalism is a prevalent cultural characteristic, the leader is seen within the role of a guardian who is expected to provide support and protection to all under his control as caretaker of the work unit (Martinez, 2005; Kerfoot and Knights, 1993). Leaders expect loyalty, compliance and deference from their subordinates in exchange for guidance, support and nurturance (Aycan et al. 2000; Gelfand et al. 2007; Pellegrini et al. 2010).

Findings from Asian, Middle-Eastern and Latin American cultures suggest that managerial practices and behaviors in these societies are characterized by paternalism (Kim, 1994; Aycan et al. 2000; Ali, 1993; Osland et al. 1999). Leaders in a paternalistic relationship control employee decision making in a manner resembling a parent (Uhl-Bien and Maslyn, 2005; James et al. 1996; Martinez, 2005). Evidence from the Indian cultural context suggests that in Indian organizations, communication between junior and senior employees is regulated by strong norms. Employees in subordinate positions are expected to be aware of their own place in the hierarchy, and they strictly follow these norms when they need to approach their bosses (Zaidman and Brock, 2009). Consequently, managers are custodians of authority in the workplace whereas followers are supposed to comply with leaders’ decisions without showing any resentment (Cheng and Jiang, 2000). However, followers may shed their loyalty and deference if leaders overlook matters related to employee wellbeing and their decision making tends to become entirely authoritarian because of their sole emphasis on structural issues (Kabasakal and Bodur, 2007).

Research carried out in non-Western contexts suggest that both humane and structural concerns can exist and function together even in a hierarchical relationship (Sinha, 1980; Misumi and Peterson, 1985). Sinha (1980) labels such leaders, who exhibit concern for both task and relationships simultaneously, as nurturant-task leaders. A nurturant-task leader combines both affection and control in his behaviors and shows a strong interest in employees' needs and feelings and, concurrently, would display task-orientation to accomplish organizational goals and objectives. Similarly, Misumi and Peterson’s (1985) findings from Japan reveal that task and relationship orientations are not mutually exclusive, rather a leader can reconcile behaviors that both emphasize performance aspect of followers as well as nurturing their needs.

2.5. Paternalism and Leadership in the Pakistani Context

In two different cross cultural studies Aycan et al. (2000) and Kanungo and Aycan (1997) found Pakistan to carry high paternalistic values alongside China, India, and Turkey. This might be due to the Pakistani family system characterized by relationships such as care and nurturance of children
combined with discipline, and respect of elders to the extent of complying with their decisions without question.

The paternalistic nature of Pakistani culture can be attributed to Islam as the religion of the majority population, and feudal and tribal systems that still exist in many parts of the country. The earlier evidence suggests that Islam is one of the most influential factors that have shaped Muslim value systems (Ali, 1986). The social and ethical obligations of a Muslim are based on the belief that one should be kind and caring towards one's own children and other younger members of the society. Specifically, Islamic teachings strongly emphasize effective guardianship of those under one's care. Such guardianship includes a true concern for their welfare, making vital decisions on their part, and providing guidance in the rest of their life activities. Younger members, in return have been ordained to be compliant and deferent towards their parents and elders. Thus, Islamic traditions have a profound focus on obligations and duties associated with each tier in the hierarchy (e.g. Gelfand et al. 2007), which is evident in the paternalistic nature of Pakistani culture. The deep imprint of feudal and tribal systems on the country's social life is another important factor that sustains and promotes the paternalistic characteristics of the society. Feudal lords and tribal chieftains have large followings, and their relationship with their followers and tenants is a blend of paternal and maternal images. They believe in strong authority but also look after the wellbeing of people under their control.

Organizational life in the country also portrays the paternalistic characteristics of the Pakistani society. At the workplace, inequalities in power distribution are accepted by all. The management practices that reflect unequal distribution of power in organizations has been reinforced by more than three decades of military rule in the country and legacy of a highly authoritarian bureaucracy left by British colonial rule. But Pakistani leaders are not characterized by authoritarian attributes alone in that they also show benevolent consideration towards their followers. The manifestation of task and humane orientations in their leadership is sustained through their religious affiliation and their links to a patriarchal family system. Islamic teachings place strong emphasis on effective leadership and suggest efficiency and performance, and concern for followers' welfare as core prescriptions for effective management (e.g. Beekun and Badawi, 1999; Rahman, 1990; Ahmad, 1976). Thus, a typical Pakistani leader is expected to promote patronage relationship with his/her subordinates, which implies that a leader maintains strong authority and attaches a lot of value to work but he/she equally exhibits behaviors that are conducive for employee welfare and protection.
3. Hypotheses Development
3.1. Paternalism and Humanistic Leadership

In paternalistic cultures there exist strong traditions of unconditional love and care of the young child by parents and other close relations. Children receive an ungrudging care and support from their parents and elders (Chhokar, 2007; Kakar, 2008). Children in such cultures are therefore exposed to a benevolent orientation in their early life in that their relationship with their parents and other family members centers on consideration and altruism. From early exposure of being connected with their parents through a bond involving nurturance and protection, children tend to develop the ability for relating to other individuals in the family (e.g. Fischer, 2006). They tend to take a benevolent interest in the matters related to younger siblings and other younger members of the family (Sinha, 1990). Thus, in their family lives, individuals more often value those practices that contribute to younger members’ development, protection and welfare, than pursing their own goals and interests (e.g. Kagitcibasi, 1997). Fischer (2006) argues that the nature of the bond with primary attachment figures during formative stages in life influences the way people develop perceptions about themselves with regards to individual or relational selves in their later lives. Thus, parents and other family elders serve as important socialization figures in the adaptation of younger family members into the larger social milieu. From a paternalistic perspective, having a strong attachment to one’s parents and growing up in a family where one receives unconditional love and acceptance is likely to turn an individual caring and protective for the people under his/her control.

The above suggests that paternalistic values related to caring and nurturing practices (benevolence) are communicated during early years in one’s life and tend to be well integrated as part of leaders’ self conceptions, and have an inner locus of control on display of behaviors. Managers bring these values to their later leadership roles and responsibilities and tend to engage in behaviors that emphasize showing concern and care for follower welfare and development (Brislin, 2000; Pasa et al. 2001; Gelfand et al. 2007). Managers may authentically endorse follower nurturance rather than espousing such practices in the face of normative pressures or external regulations (Inghilleri, 1999).

Since humanistic leadership indicates that a leader cares for subordinates, satisfies their individual feelings and needs, and gives them nurturance and appropriate support (Bolman and Deal, 2003; Bensimon, 1989; House, 1996), we expect the benevolence dimension of paternalistic values to predict managers’ human resource leadership behaviors. We suggest that the influence of paternalism on human resource leadership will operate at the level of managers’ individual values because practices related to benevolence tend to become well internalized. As noted earlier, values that are well internalized become personally important in one’s life (e.g. Ryan and Deci, 2000) and fulfilling them may lead to inherent satisfaction (Wan et al. 2007; Ryan and Deci, 2000). At the individual level,
managers may regard benevolence as personally important and it may influence their humanistic leadership behaviors mainly through a self-driven inclination rather than an externally produced societal effect. Consequently, we suggest the following

**H1:** Managers' paternalistic values will have a stronger positive effect on their humanistic leadership than that of societal level paternalistic values.

### 3.2. Paternalism and Structural Leadership

In paternalistic relationships, vital decisions are made by high ups in the family and other social structures (e.g. Yelsma and Athappilly, 1988). Members who are low in family hierarchy are expected to wholeheartedly accept the directions and decisions of their parents and elders in order to maintain family coherence and harmony (Sinha 1990; Zaidman and Brock, 2009; Seymour, 1999). However, children in their early family lives are exposed more to a benevolent orientation, and experience to components of authority and control comes later in one’s life. As a result, control related aspects of patronage tend to be less internalized than practices that attach value to altruism and consideration (Chirkov *et al.* 2003, 2005).

Furthermore, exerting control is concerned with inducing voluntary compliance and conformity from people in subordinate positions, but only individuals who experience high levels of intimacy with their elders are more likely to accept authority over themselves. In fact, if parents and elders overlook matters related to wellbeing of those under their control and emphasize on structural aspects alone, they may lose the voluntary compliance and loyalty of their followers (Kabasakal and Bodur, 2007). This suggests that compliance to the decisions of high ups is not automatic that is driven by an intrinsic motivation, rather it is heavily dependent on to what extent elders exhibit a genuine interest with regards to the matters of junior members’ nurturance and care.

Prior studies (Chirkov *et al.* 2005; Ryan and Deci, 2003) contend that practices such as submitting to authority and exerting power according to the popular norms tend to be less well internalized for their poor psychological functions in supporting one’s well being. However, related to such practices there are norms which entail criticism and disapproval for deviant behaviors. In paternalistic societies, leading in an authoritative way is a societal expectation and showing discrepancy is intolerable, which may lead managers to behave in socially acceptable ways even if it is not congruent with their personal values (see Bardi and Schwartz, 2003). For instance, there is a strong norm in paternalistic societies that leaders take charge and control of affairs, and issue instructions and directives instead of sharing or delegating decision-making authority (Morris and Pavett, 1992; Hui *et al.* 2004; Robert *et al.* 2000). In such societies managers are expected to take responsibility and make decisions because empowerment is viewed as a negligence or shortcoming of leadership (Offerman, 2004).
This suggests that leaders in a paternalistic context tend to mainly perform authoritarian practices under a socially induced pressure, even when an authoritarian orientation is inconsistent with the leaders’ personal preferences.

Since structural leadership focuses on efficiency and productivity, and assumes that organizations work best when the efforts of followers are organized through authority, setting direction and pursuing clear goals (Bolman and Deal, 1991), we expect leaders’ display of structural behaviors to be consistent with paternalism. However, influence regarding enactment of structural behaviors is likely to operate at the level of societal values because vertical practices tend to be less well internalized, but in paternalistic cultures there exist strong normative pressures to lead in an authoritative way. Based on the above discussion, we suggest the following:

H2: Societal values of paternalism will have a stronger positive effect on managers’ structural leadership than that of leaders’ individual level paternalistic values.

3.3. Paternalism and Political Leadership

Paternalistic relations are based on interpersonal attachment that go beyond economic and political gains and involve social transactions as primary outcomes (e.g. Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005). In a paternalistic relationship, elders provide patronage while children reciprocate with personal commitment that is driven by obligation, indebtedness and loyalty. Power inequality between high ups and those lower in the hierarchy has wider social acceptance in paternalistic cultures (Cheng and Jiang, 2000). Elders in the family system are vested with powers to make vital decisions, whereas younger members are expected to show obedience (Pasa, 2000). Thus, individuals in paternalistic cultures tend to voluntarily comply with the decisions of their elders without showing resentment (Cheng and Jiang, 2000; Yelsma and Athappilly, 1988; Zaidman and Brock, 2009). The result is that people raised in paternalistic societies learn to receive patronage from their elders, and in turn, attach importance with similar practices in their dealings with younger members (Sinha, 1990). Hence, they are less exposed to political tactics in their early socialization experiences, which is likely to result is less internalization of norms and practices that emphasize politically motivated behaviors. Managers of paternalistic cultures, therefore, tend to develop less personal preferences to use political behaviors with people in subordinate positions.

Further, the patriarchal relationships that are characteristic of family system in paternalistic societies also permeate into the social and organizational life (Pasa, 2000). The leader is seen within the role of a guardian whom followers expect to take charge and provide support and protection to all under his/her control (Martinez, 2005; Kerfoot and Knights, 1993). Followers are supposed to respect the leaders' authority (Yan and
Hunt, 2005) and accept their views and suggestions as if the leaders’ values are their own (Cheng and Jiang, 2000). By virtue of that subordinates have high dependence on superiors, and they have an implicit preference for receiving directions instead of taking initiatives on their own (Pasa, 2000). Consequently, in the workplace, managers are expected to wield strong authority on followers rather than espousing behaviors that emphasize political tactics (e.g. Uhl-Bien and Maslyn, 2005). This suggests that leaders in paternalistic cultures are not confronted with societal pressures to exhibit political tactics while managing their subordinates. We, therefore, assume that leaders in such cultures are less likely to engage in political behaviors through an externally produced pressure, because behaviors that involve political tactics are less demanding on leaders having no clear and strong societal norms attached. Based on the above discussion, we contend that political leadership, which values tactics such as persuasion, negotiation, bargaining and making alliances for effectiveness (Bolman and Deal, 2003) seems to be inconsistent with leaders’ individual and societal level paternalistic values. Consequently, we suggest the following:

H3: (1) Managers’ paternalistic values and (2) societal values of paternalism will have no explanatory impact on managers’ political leadership.

3.4. Paternalism and Symbolic Leadership

The focus of symbolism is on management of meaning, which involves defining the reality to others to create legitimacy for managers’ demands (Pettigrew, 1977). The symbolic actions are taken for eliciting motivation in subordinates and mobilizing their support in favor of an intended program or a leader’s vision for the organization. (e.g. Hardy, 1991; Bolman and Deal, 1991).

Paternalistic values do not seem to predict symbolic behaviors, because people high on paternalism are not likely to seek legitimacy for their decisions and actions through display of symbolism; rather, they tend to believe that legitimacy is associated with providing their children with authentic care, protection and guidance. It is the patronage provided by parents and elders that turn younger family members loyal, compliant and deferent to the elders and make them accept and execute their decisions without challenging their legitimacy (Sinha, 1990; Pasa, 2000; Cheng and Jiang, 2000). This suggests that symbolic behaviors are less likely to be communicated to people in their socialization processes, and that is why there exist scant chances that symbolic practices will become part of the leaders’ personal value priorities. We therefore expect that managers in a paternalistic relationship will place less emphasis on symbolic behaviors. Organizations operating in paternalistic societies develop structures that clearly define obligations associated with various roles in the hierarchy (e.g. Cheng and Jiang, 2000). Followers tend to be less motivated to accept a
new program by leaders’ use of ritualistic behaviors; rather, the parenthood ascribed to the leadership role confers legitimacy to the various managerial practices. Thus, in paternalistic cultures there tend to be less clear and demanding norms related to symbolic practices that may have an external influence on managers to regulate their behaviors through pressures in the social environment. Consequently, we propose the following:

H4: (1) Managers’ paternalistic values and (2) societal values of paternalism will have no explanatory impact on managers’ symbolic leadership.

3.5. Moderation by Societal Level Paternalism

The societal values will create a positive reinforcement contingency to influence the link between leaders’ individual level values and humanistic behaviors, while the link between individual values and structural behaviors is likely to be influenced by a negative social reinforcement mechanism (see Schwartz, 1994; Triandis, 1989). Since, the benevolence aspect of paternalistic values tends to be well assimilated; leaders may experience the enactment of humanistic behaviors as autonomous through their individual level values. However, knowing also that the society in which they live prefers such values would provide a clear context in which to understand the leaders’ transactions with their social environment. Societal values will encourage the activation of such type of values and will stimulate the pursuit of humanistic behaviors. Thus, leaders will have a cultural fit as a result of the concordance of their individual values and those shared in the society. As a result, their transactions with the social environment are bound to be smooth (Lu, 2006), which will strengthen the link between their paternalistic values and humanistic behaviors.

As noted earlier, the major influence on enactment of behaviors related to vertical practices tends to come from external regulation for the reason that such practices are less likely to be well internalized. This suggests that structural behaviors may not be strongly related to endorsement of individual level values. If a leader’s values are not in congruence with the societal culture, his/her transactions with the social environment are not likely to be smooth (Lu, 2006). Nonetheless, people in paternalistic cultures keep others’ needs ahead of their own to maintain social harmony (Seymour, 1999), and exhibit steady conformity to societal values in an attempt to harmonize social expectations with individual preferences (see Rohan and Zanna, 1998). As a result of prolonged conformity, people are likely to show some convergence between personal and societal values, and the kind of social expectations that are imposed upon them may be psychologically well accessible (Vauclair, 2009). Thus, the effect of leaders’ individual paternalistic values on structural behaviors is likely to be high if strong normative judgments are associated with the control aspect of paternalism in a society. Based on the above discussion, we suggest the following:
H5: Societal paternalism moderates the relationship between leaders’ paternalistic values and their humanistic behaviors, such that the relationship will be stronger when societal paternalistic values are higher.

H6: Societal paternalism moderates the relationship between leaders' paternalistic values and their structural behaviors, such that the relationship will be stronger when societal paternalistic values are higher.

4. Method and Data Collection
4.1. Research Site, Participants and Procedure

The data for this study was collected from a public sector organization in Pakistan. Pakistan as our research site was selected because of the earlier evidence regarding association of paternalistic values with Pakistani culture (Kanungo and Aycan, 1997). The choice of organization was made based upon its suitability for a national representative sample, as it employed a workforce that represented all segments of the Pakistani society.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Demographic data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age range, years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 - 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Master degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Bachelor degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent tenure, years 1 – 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 and above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants were 61 senior and junior level managers with a varying span of control ranging from 2 to a higher number of followers. Four individuals did not complete the investigation. The participants were randomly recruited from field offices of the organization in four major cities of the country. Participation was sought on a voluntary basis to complete a survey questionnaire designed in English. The questionnaires were administered by the first author at the organization’s facilities in the above cities. The researcher visited each sub office and collected data on site. A senior manager, wherever it was felt necessary, was requested for facilitation in the distribution and collection of the questionnaires. Access to
data collection proved to be comparatively easier due to acquaintance of the first author with some members of the organization.

4.2. Measures

4.2.1. Paternalism

To measure paternalism, Dorfman and Howell’s (1988) cultural scale was used. The scale is designed to elicit cultural dimensions of PD, UA, collectivism/individualism, paternalism and masculinity/femininity. On the survey five items address UA, six items measure collectivism/individualism, six items measure PD, seven items address paternalism, and five items measure masculinity/femininity. Segal et al. (1998) validated Dorfman and Howell (1988) cultural scale. The authors reported reliability, estimated with coefficient alphas for all cultural dimensions, and paternalism yielded a coefficient of 0.80.

The measures of personal and societal paternalistic values were similar in form and length. Both measures of paternalism included 7 items, which participants rated on a 5-point scale in accordance with the Dorfman and Howell (1988) response format. For the personal version of the value survey, managers were asked to rate each statement for its importance in their life. For the societal version, participants responded to the same statements but were asked to rate the perceived importance of each value statement for people in the Pakistani society. The rational for using this measurement approach was to separately seek perceptions of study respondents about their individual value emphasis, and their estimation about endorsement of a certain value by an average member of their national society. Sample items of the scale use are: Managers should help employees with their family problems; Managers should take care of employees as they would treat their children; and a manager should help employees solve their personal problems.

4.2.2. Leadership Behaviors

Bolman and Deal (1990) leadership instrument (Self) was used with permission of Lee Bolman to collect the leadership data. The Bolman and Deal instrument (1990) has two forms, one for self rating (Leadership Orientations- Self) and the other for superior, peer and subordinate rating (Leadership orientations-Other). The first section of the instrument was administered, which uses a list of 32 statements representing leadership behaviors to which the respondents indicate how often they themselves are engaged in these behaviors. The 32 statements are grouped into four leadership orientations, which are structural, human resource, political, and symbolic. The items were to be ranked on a Likert type scale ranging from 1-never to 5-always. Sample items were: strongly believes in clear structure and chain of command; shows high levels of support and concern for others; develops alliances to build strong base of support; and communicates a strong and challenging vision and sense of mission.
Bolman and Deal (1990) leadership instrument was selected for its tested reliability, brevity, clarity and its ability to categorize the subjects' responses by four leadership behaviors. Bolman and Deal report coefficient alphas for structural, human resource, political and symbolic frames as 0.92, 0.93, 0.91, and 0.93 respectively.

4.3. Factor Analyses and Reliability Test

Before proceeding with testing the hypotheses, the psychometric properties of the paternalism and leadership measures were examined in detail using SPSS 18.0 software. Items for all measures were subjected to factor analysis using a principle component analysis method. For a single factor solution, items not loading highly (lower than 0.4) or cross loading were deleted from the analysis. Factor loading ranged from 0.61 to 0.83. Next, reliability analysis was carried out for the personal and societal versions of paternalism and the four leadership orientations. For all measures, any item that had negative inter-item correlations with other items or a low (less than 0.3) corrected item-total correlation, and caused to attenuate the reliability was dropped. A reliability coefficient for leaders' values of paternalism and societal values of paternalism resulted in alphas of 0.75 and 0.64 respectively. For leadership frames, coefficients as for structural frames, human resource frame, political frame and symbolic frame were 0.85, 0.84, 0.70, and 0.72 respectively. The societal measure of paternalism yielded Cronbach’s alpha of 0.64. This is not very high, but it had a mean inter-item correlation of 0.38, which is acceptable (e.g. Briggs and Cheek, 1986).

For individual level paternalism, all items except item 1 and 2 were retained, whereas for societal level paternalism items retained were 5, 6, and 7. For two levels of analysis, survived items were not exactly similar but there was an overlap with regards to item commonality. After certain deletions, the survived items still had the ability to capture important aspects of paternalistic values the way that the paternalism construct has been explicated in the literature. The construct validity, therefore, will not be impaired even after deletion of certain items.

4.4. Results and Hypotheses Testing

For testing the hypotheses, this research used a Pearson correlation and multiple regression analyses as the main methods of analysis. The correlation results show that the relationship between leaders' values of paternalism and human resource frame is positively significant (r=0.56, p<0.01) and also significantly related to the symbolic frame (r=0.34; p<0.05). The correlation with the structural frame was close to the significance level (r=0.253, p=0.057), however, the correlation with the political frame was not significant (r=0.17, p=0.21). The correlations yielded societal values of paternalism as positively related to the structural frame (r=0.37, p<0.01). Societal level Paternalism did not show a relationship with human resource, political and symbolic frames. Table 1 shows correlation
results between individual and societal level paternalism and leadership behaviors.

### Table 2. Correlation coefficients for paternalism and leadership behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>St Frame</th>
<th>HR Frame</th>
<th>Pol Frame</th>
<th>Sym Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>0.564**</td>
<td>0.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc.</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.373**</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td>0.511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Next, regression analysis was applied in order to examine the relationship between personal and societal values of paternalism as independent variables and each of the four leadership frames as dependent variables. First, the structural frame was regressed on the two paternalism variables. Societal level paternalism ($\beta=0.33$, $p<0.05$) retained a statistically significant regression weight, while the personal paternalism variable ($\beta=0.16$, $p=0.24$) could not approach significance level. Together, self and societal level paternalism explain 16% of the variance in the structural frame with societal level paternalism explaining a higher level of variance (9%) and individual level paternalism with a unique contribution of only 2%.

The results of regressing the human resource frame on two predictor variables indicated that only the beta value associated with personal level paternalism supports its relationship to human resource frame ($\beta=0.61$, $p<0.001$). The model as a whole explains a variance of 34% in human resource frame, of which 33% of the variance uniquely comes from individual level paternalism. The results of the regression analysis for the political frame showed that none of the paternalism betas were statistically significant, while regression results for symbolic frame indicate that only personal level paternalism led to a statistically significant beta weight ($\beta=0.30$, $p<0.05$). Of a total of 13% variance, individual level paternalism records a higher level of contribution (8%) to the explanation of variance in the symbolic frame. Table 3 shows results for regressing paternalism variables on leadership behaviors.
Next, analysis was conducted to assess if societal level paternalism moderates the influence of individual level paternalism on structural and human resource frames. The R square change was not significant for both structural, F(1,53)=0.000, p=0.985 and human resource frames, F(1,53)=0.004, p=0.582. This indicates that the societal level paternalism, which was presumed as moderator variable does not moderate the effects of individual level paternalism on the dependent variables (structural and human resource frames).

Hierarchal multiple regression was used to examine the effects of societal level paternalism on the structural frame, and individual level paternalism on human resource and symbolic frame after controlling for the influence of managers’ age, gender, tenure, and level of education. The predictor variables survived in their ability to explain significant variance in the outcome variable. Age, gender, tenure and level of education did not make unique contributions.

The results of correlation and regression analysis strongly support H1. As hypothesized, the individual level paternalism was significantly related to leaders’ human resource behaviors, whereas the societal level paternalism came out as a poor predictor of the human resource frame. With H2, we postulated that societal paternalism has a stronger positive impact on structural behaviors. Our findings showed that societal values of paternalism significantly predict leaders’ structural behaviors. These results again confirm the second hypothesis. Contrary to the results obtained for

### Table 3. Results of regression analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable: Structural frame</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self paternalism</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>1.193</td>
<td>0.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal paternalism</td>
<td>0.327*</td>
<td>2.503</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² =0.16, N=57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable: Human resource frame</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self paternalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal paternalism</td>
<td>0.606***</td>
<td>5.221</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² =0.34, N=57</td>
<td>-0.141</td>
<td>-1.212</td>
<td>0.231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable: Political frame</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self paternalism</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>1.123</td>
<td>0.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal paternalism</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>0.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² =0.03, N=57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable: Symbolic frame</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self paternalism</td>
<td>0.299*</td>
<td>2.252</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal paternalism</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>0.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² =0.13, N=57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p*<0.05; p**<0.01; p***<0.001
structural and humanistic behaviors, none of the paternalism variables predicted political behavior. The results, thus, provide support for hypothesis H3. The findings indicate that leaders’ paternalistic values explain variance in the symbolic frame, while societal paternalism did not appear as a predictor of symbolic behaviors. These findings provide partial support for hypothesis 4. H5 and H6 were not supported in that our presumed moderator (societal paternalism) did not weaken or strengthen the relationship of predictor variable (individual level paternalism) with outcome variables of structural and human resource frames.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

The broader objective of the present study was to examine the impact of paternalism as a predictor of leadership styles. To understand the way leaders’ individual value priorities and their transactions with social environment influence their choice of behaviors, the study specifically addressed the question of how individual and societal level values of paternalism relate to leaders’ self reported leadership behaviors. First, we took a micro-level perspective to examine the impact of paternalism as a cultural value orientation at leaders’ individual level. Second, taking a macro-level perspective, we examined whether perception of paternalism at the national level influences leadership behaviors. Paternalism at both levels was found to be associated with self-reported leadership behaviors of managers. Structural behaviors were found to be associated with societal level paternalism, while human resource and symbolic behaviors indicated a significant linkage with self-referenced ratings of paternalistic values.

These findings indicate that individual level paternalism appears to be an important predictor of the human resource frame. This suggests that paternalistic values related to caring and nurturing practices tend to become well integrated as part of leaders’ self conceptions, and have an inner locus of control on managers’ leadership behaviors. Humanistic behaviors seem to be mainly regulated by individual level paternalism, as managers tend to authentically endorse them by virtue of their internalization instead of espousing them in the face of external regulations or introjected pressures (Inghilleri, 1999).

On the other hand, significant effects of societal level paternalism on structural behaviors suggest that vertical practices are not likely to be well assimilated by managers. Because of poor internalization but existence of strong institutional pressures, major influence on enactment of such behaviors stems from societal values than by an internally produced motivational force (Chirkov et al. 2003, 2005). Managers in such cultures tend to have a series of clearly articulated goals and targets with prescribed timelines. Managers are mainly evaluated on their performance to meet the assigned targets. The attention to organizational policy, organizational structure, and the goals of the organization are therefore central to what managers pay heed to in their day to day official business. This is because
emphasis on structure and process oriented leadership is strongly endorsed in paternalistic cultures, and showing discrepancy with this societal expectation may fetch severe criticism and result in poor assessment of the leader. Managers are, therefore, expected to display structural behaviors irrespective of the fact that they are not internally driven by internalized values.

Contrary to expectations, individual level paternalism was found to be related to symbolic behaviors. It appears that symbolic behaviors may be an intrinsically motivated choice of managers even in the absence of cultural influence to produce such behaviors through mechanisms of internalization or external regulation. Managers may think that their control and caring behaviors will be more efficacious if they present themselves as visionary and charismatic leaders. This is because paternalistic managers, who become a source of inspiration for their subordinates may create an intense emotional bond in their relationship with followers and the result is enhanced follower trust and loyalty in leader (Nahavandi, 1997). The value dimension of paternalism centers on consideration, and a desire for controlling and guiding others' activities. As symbolic leadership is allied with creating an emotional bond with followers and reduction of uncertainty through display of visionary behaviors, it can be assumed that paternalism may emerge as a predictor of leaders' preference for symbolic behaviors. It seems plausible that without a leader's inclination for promoting subordinates' well-being and structuring and guiding their activities, neither an emotional bond may be created nor is uncertainty likely to be reduced. It is, however, contended that symbolic issues often lurk in the background vis-a-vis strong emphasis on task and relationship orientations (Bolman and Deal, 1992). Conceptually, this suggests that when children are exposed to paternalistic values during early family life, symbolic orientation may not strongly register its internalization. Being overshadowed by humanistic and structural dimensions, strong societal norms may not develop either that may externally regulate symbolic behaviors in a paternalistic culture. Although there might be norms about showing symbolic behaviors, these norms may not entail strong normative judgments. Thus, paternalistic managers may have an intrinsic motivation to practice symbolism and such behaviors tend to be related to the endorsement of personal values. However, the motivational source for displaying symbolic behaviors is not extrinsic that relates to one's cultural environment, rather it stems from one's own distinct make-up and is primarily intrinsic in nature (Vauclair, 2009).

These findings might also be interpreted as a reflection of the Pakistani cultural setting in which the study was conducted. The social culture of Pakistan is characterized by Islam. Islam, as argued by Ali (1986), is one of the most influential factors which have shaped Muslim value systems. Islamic teachings and traditions place strong emphasis on effective leadership and suggest efficiency and performance, and concern for followers' welfare as core prescriptions for effective management (e.g. Beekun and Badawi, 1999; Rahman, 1990; Ahmad, 1976). Islamic
leadership is both guardianship and service oriented. The leader’s job is to both give importance to the business motives and to bring about the best in those whom he/she leads (Ahmad, 1976). Charismatic and visionary qualities in leaders are also important from an Islamic perspective of leadership. Leaders who have charisma and power to communicate a compelling vision may create an emotional bond with followers and generate a strong follower commitment (see Rahman, 1990). However, in an Islamic society leaders’ competence for providing direction and devising appropriate strategies come under a close societal scrutiny than displaying humanistic behaviors. The explanation is multifold: children in their early family lives are exposed more to an altruistic orientation and exposure to components of structure comes later in one’s life. As a result, structural behaviors are subject to a strong external influence because a structural orientation tends to be poorly internalized than practices which centre around consideration. Second, leaders are accountable and responsible for their actions and evaluating leaders for their lapses and performance is more concrete and tangible on structural lines. Third, structural behaviors are more in the spotlight because a leader’s appropriate direction and well thought-out plans serve as a support to achieve the goals of follower welfare. The association of symbolic behaviors with self-referenced ratings of paternalism also makes sense from an Islamic perspective of leadership. There exist no strong societal judgments to regulate leaders’ symbolic behaviors because charisma is considered to be a God gifted quality.  

The inability of societal paternalism to moderate the influence of individual level paternalism on human resource frame indicates that cultural values that become strongly internalized are not in need of the external stimulation to be activated. Such values serve as strong motivational goals as guiding principle in one’s life (Schwartz and Bilsky, 1990), and a leader who has deeply internalized certain cultural values seems to show considerable autonomy from external environment with respect to enactment of behaviors. The absence of moderating effects for the structural frame does not support earlier contention that internalization is a lifelong process in that people show some convergence between personal and societal values as a result of prolonged conformity (Allport, 1955; Fischer, 2006). This suggests that members of a national society not always truly endorse all prevalent values of that society for the reason that they are residents of the given national context (Chirkov et al. 2003, 2005). Indeed, members of all national societies may often display behaviors that correspond to cultural values, not because fulfilling them leads to inherent satisfaction but because of institutional forces in the socio-cultural environment (Inghilleri, 1999). This implies that values that are not internalized during formative stages in one’s life, or that do not support one’s psychological needs, may not be internalized in later socialization experiences (see Chirkov et al. 2003, 2005). Rather, people endorse such values as a patch-up strategy between social expectations and personal priorities that resultanty shifts much of influence on behavioral enactment from personal to societal values. The inability of age, gender, tenure and
level of education to make a unique contribution in the outcome variables suggest that the influence of these individual level factors tends to be overshadowed when values act a source of internal motivation or external regulation.

These results suggest that cultural values influence leadership behaviors through dual routes of internalization and external regulation. Nonetheless, all cultural values are not internalized and behavioral enactment is not entirely dependent on external regulation; rather, individual level cultural values may vary from dominant societal conceptualizations (e.g. Au, 1999; Triandis, 1995; Oyserman et al. 2002; Gerhart and Fang, 2005). Our results indicate that cultural values explain ample variance in leadership behaviors but leaders’ individual values are not entirely subservient to larger societal cultural effects.

6. Implications and Study Limitations

6.1. Managerial Implications

This study’s findings provide some useful insights for managers. The results show that cultural value dimension of paternalism does not equally serve as an antecedent of structural, human resource, symbolic and political orientations. It tends to impact structural behaviors by normative and regulatory influences, and through the process of value assimilation predicts leaders’ preferences for humanistic behaviors. It appears that managers’ tilt towards humanistic orientation may reflect a higher level psychological need. Thus, it is highly unlikely that it is lost over time or overshadowed by professional and social acculturation. On the other hand, a paternalistic cultural profile seems to have a strong influence on managers’ structural orientations, but this influence may not be enduring owing to the reason that intensity of such preference may change with varying degrees of institutional pressure. This might affect managers’ preference for display of leadership styles in numerous transnational contexts. In a culture where strong societal norms related to structural practices do not exist, such managers tend to show a weak inclination towards task-oriented behaviors. For instance, such managers are likely to pay less attention to structural issues when working in a feminine society, but they may be overly task-oriented while performing managerial activity in a masculine culture. Within multinational organizations, when paternalistic managers are selected to work in feminine and egalitarian societies, advance consideration may be given to balance their structural and humanistic propensities by subjecting them to structural elements in the work environment. However, a foreign subsidiary of paternalistic origin may equally emphasize structural and humanistic tendencies in a feminine and individualist society under the influence of an ethnocentric organizational culture. If such a foreign company draws its managerial team exclusively from a paternalistic culture, it may face societal disapproval for managerial approaches atypical of the host culture. It is worthwhile that management team composition should equally comprise members from the host country.
so that paternalistic and autonomous orientations of two groups of managers could be balanced and managerial practices look familiar to employees and other stakeholders.

These findings are also likely to affect leaders’ display of behaviors in a paternalistic context. A manager operating in such a cultural setting would be well advised to emphasize both task and humanistic behaviors. However, to determine the extent to which emphasis need to be placed on structural or humanistic behaviors he/she can look at the environmental cues to explore the strength of the normative influence and the preferences of employees respectively. If a manager does not show benevolent tendencies, subordinates of a paternalistic culture may respond negatively to such deviant behaviors because they tend to attach personal importance to humanistic orientation, and by virtue of that will have a strong propensity to be looked after by their managers. Managers’ emphasis, therefore, need to be on observing subordinate reactions to explore how subordinate paternalistic values can be served by adapting leadership behaviors to a humanistic orientation. The study suggests that organizational life is closely observed and scrutinized externally in terms of task and structural issues in a paternalistic context, which may exert influence on leaders’ display of structural behaviors. This implies that any attempt to put more emphasis on a leadership style to the exclusion of structural behaviors may undermine organizational efforts to successfully respond to the legitimating effects of the social environment. Since leaders are not directly exposed to institutional pressures to a great extent, such influence mainly reaches them through the society-organization interaction. Organizations operating in paternalistic cultures need to adopt clear policies and strategies typical of the host culture and this should be reflected in leadership approaches and practices.

The prevalent societal norms related to structural practices may also influence subordinates’ expectations regarding leadership behaviors. Despite their preference for benevolent managerial behaviors, subordinates may expect their managers to guide their activities, provide direction and implement decisions. The preference for both types of leadership behaviors indicates that paternalistic employees may wish their managers to display personal consideration as well as task orientation. Thus, managers working in a paternalistic culture may best serve paternalistic values of their followers by displaying a leadership style that combines structural and humanistic orientations.

Our findings indicate that the study participants endorsed symbolic behaviors even though such behaviors are neither emphatically communicated in socialization processes, nor is their endorsement socially regulated through strong norms and practices. This indicates that irrespective of strong societal judgments, symbolic leadership seems to supplement structural and humanistic orientations. But at the same time this suggests that whether leaders’ symbolic behaviors will be received favorably or not is dependent on follower individual level values. For managers it is advisable that they identify whether the combination of
symbolism with structural and humanistic behaviors is viewed positively by their followers. To better understand whether such behaviors will elicit positive reactions, managers need to develop implicit theories of follower values. The development of refined conceptualizations of follower values is possible through an experiential learning process (Kolb, 1984). This may incorporate managers’ learning from their own experiences of how followers react to different leadership behaviors.

6.2. Study Limitations and Research Implications

Several limitations of the present study necessitate further attention in future research. First, the sample of our study represented managers from the country’s central revenue organization, who because of their training and professional socialization, tend to have a lot in common, and as a whole, may not truly characterize their culture. We assume that tax managers due to a heavy public mandate may be more prone to external scrutiny and criticism for their efficiency and performance, which might have led to a strong relationship between societal level paternalism and structural behaviors. Future studies may test the generalizability of our findings by broadening the sample size of organizations and extending the research into multiple cultures.

Another limitation stems from use of a single cultural dimension. Future studies may include other cultural dimensions, in order to confirm the link between cultural values and leadership preferences as manifested in the work place, and simultaneously to develop a deeper understanding of the conceptual and empirical connections between cultural value dimensions and managers’ behavioral choices. The study’s findings suggest that people may have cultural values that are neither internalized nor externally imposed, and these individual level cultural values tend to predict behavioral preferences at work. It will be useful if future research clarifies the psychological functions of individual and societal level values with regards to employee well-being and suggest implications for adapting managerial behaviors.

Certain other limitations of the study may be attributed to the collection of data using a cross-sectional method, a small sample size and reliance on self-report responses. Managers simultaneously reported on their own values, their leadership behaviors, and the paternalistic values of the national society, which may lead to the likelihood of common source bias. The ability to determine the causality of relationship between independent and dependent variables was limited by the use of a cross-sectional design. The relatively small sample size of managers (57) tends to limit the statistical power of this study. Future studies should include subordinates’ ratings of their leaders’ behaviors. To capture the societal values, perceptions from a more heterogeneous sample should be elicited regarding cultural values endorsed by the average people of the society. A bigger sample size and the use of longitudinal and experimental designs are some other directions for future studies.
Finally, we suggest some important research implications with particular reference to the Pakistani context. Pakistan, despite having an overarching national value pattern, is characterized by considerable regional, linguistic and ethnic diversity, i.e. Punjabi, Sindhi, Pushtoon, and Baloach, and below the layer of national culture there exist various subculture effects. In addition, the rural and urban areas of the country differ in their emphasis on different values. This implies that people belonging to different subcultures will vary in their emphasis on different values, which may lead to variation in their behavioral choices. Future studies should attempt to explore the extent of cultural heterogeneity within Pakistani society and examine the influence of subculture effects on leadership behaviors vis-a-vis the impact of national culture. The need is then to find out to what extent leaders’ individual values overlap with subculture and societal values. By conducting such an investigation, subculture and national culture effects on leadership styles through processes of value internalization and external regulation may be identified.
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