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General Introduction

Paternalism has always been considered complex in its nature, engendering long discussions full of ideological and moral overtones (Aycan et al., 2000). In the field of leadership, paternalism implies clear role differentiation and centralization of power, but also close relationships, protection and support to the follower. Paternalistic leadership has been traditionally defined as the combination of “strong discipline and authority with fatherly benevolence” (Farh & Cheng, 2000).

Paternalistic leaders are characterized by treating employees as part of the extended family, taking a personal interest and guiding workers’ professional and personal lives. They consider it an obligation to provide protection to those under their care, expecting subordinates’ loyalty and deference in return. However, while leaders protect and improve employees’ lives, as a parent would do, they also exercise its power and control (Aycan, 2006; Farh & Cheng, 2000). These contrasting features triggered some controversial expressions that reflected how people perceived and evaluated paternalistic leaders in organizations. While opponents considered paternalistic leadership as “benevolent dictatorship” (Northouse, 1997), defenders claimed its “legitimated authority” and “role-transcending concern” for followers (Padavic & Earnest, 1994). As a result, paternalistic leadership had been considered effective in cultures that emphasize patriarchal relationships, high power distance and collectivistic identity, such as from Asia (e.g. Farh & Cheng, 2000), the Middle East (Aycan et al., 2000) and Latin America (Martinez, 2003; Osland, Franco, & Osland, 1999). Conversely, in cultures that emphasize individualistic identities and low power distance, paternalistic leadership was considered a form of “noncoercive exploitation” (Goodell, 1985) and “a hidden and insidious form of discrimination”
(Collela, et al., 2005). Findings from these foundational studies provided evidence to suggest that Paternalistic leadership is culture-bounded (Aycan, 2006).

In recent years, however, empirical results have showed significant positive effects of paternalistic leadership (e.g., Pellegrini, Scandura & Jayaraman, 2010), indicating that such approach may benefit followers and organizations despite its national culture variation. Evidences from these studies have suggested that rather than the match between a particular leadership style and the cultural orientation of a society, the explanation on leadership effectiveness may lie in the fit between the style of a leader and that of his context – followers and organizations (e.g. Pellegrini, Scandura & Jayaraman, 2010; Liden & Antonakis, 2009; Ansari, Ahmad & Aafig, 2004).

In the present dissertation I present a collection of studies exploring Paternalistic Leadership boundaries: paternalistic leadership different endorsement by societies, having its shades across cultures; the effects of leader-follower regulatory fit on followers; and the role of leaders and organizational culture fit on followers’ attitudes and performance. The series of studies I present are only a beginning, but I believe that many issues remain to be explored.

**Overview of the dissertation**

In addition to this introduction, the dissertation consists of three independent papers. All three studies were developed as standalone research and can be read independently. Because of that, there is some overlap in the development of theoretical ideas. In addition, all studies were developed in collaboration with my advisor. For this reason, I will use “we” instead of “I” when referring to the author(s).

In the first empirical study (“Shades of Paternalistic Leadership across Cultures”), we focus on the emic vs. etic discussion surrounding Paternalistic Leadership (PL). Our
purpose is to understand: if PL is a style that is culturally bounded or if is, in fact, universally endorsed; if there are different types of paternalistic leadership; and if individuals from different societies endorse different characteristics of paternalistic leaders. We address these questions by reviewing the conceptual literature on PL and conducting empirical analyses using Project GLOBE’s leadership scales. Using multigroup confirmatory factor analyses we found measurement equivalence of a scale derived from GLOBE’s data, which enabled us to compare the endorsement of paternalistic leadership dimensions across 10 cultural clusters and 55 societies. Our study revealed that there are significant differences in the importance societies give to each dimension, suggesting that paternalism as leadership style is not universally nor homogeneously endorsed. Differently, there are distinct patterns of endorsement of each of Paternalistic leadership dimensions that give rise to idiosyncratic shades of paternalistic leadership across societies.

The second study provides a more elaborate investigation of the effects of paternalistic leadership on followers’ outcomes. We draw on Person-Supervisor Fit Theory (P-S Fit; Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005) and Regulatory Focus Theory (Higgins, 1998) to propose that the boundary condition for leadership effectiveness is the fit between leader’s style and followers’ regulatory focus. Across three experimental studies, including a business simulation, we examined the role of leader-follower regulatory fit as the mechanism through which leader style elicit followers’ positive outcomes. We compared paternalistic leadership and empowering leadership – as opposing ways through which leaders influence followers – examining their fit with followers’ prevention- or promotion- regulatory focus. We analyzed the interactive effects of leader-follower fit on followers’ attitudes, psychological resources, and in-role and creative performance. Our results showed that fit between paternalistic
leaders and prevention focused followers, and fit between empowering leaders and promotion focused followers, substantially increased followers outcomes.

In the third and last study, we investigated the interplay between organizational culture and paternalistic leadership and its effects on followers’ outcomes. We also compared paternalistic leadership, which is traditionally culture-bounded, with transformational leadership, which is considered to have attributes universally endorsed (Den Hartog, et al., 1999). We built our arguments on person-organization fit theory (P-O fit; Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005) and theories of implicit leadership (e.g. Lord, Brown, Harvey, & Hall, 2001), to suggest that different organizational culture orientations (stability vs. innovation, people-oriented vs. performance–oriented) fit with different leadership styles, and the interaction effects of leader-organization fit have positive effects of followers attitudinal and behavioral outcomes. Based on an actual leader-follower dyadic survey, conducted with professionals from several industries, we found that leadership effectiveness was contingent to organizational culture. Specifically, that paternalistic leaders had greater effects on followers when in cultures of stability and people-oriented, while transformational leaders’ greatest effects were in cultures of innovation and performance-oriented.

Finally, I believe that, although much remains underexplored in the ‘leadership puzzle’, our studies and the results obtained so far have contributed to a better understanding of Paternalistic leadership, as well as the mechanisms and contingencies that enable leadership effectiveness.
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Shades of Paternalistic Leadership across Cultures

Abstract

Although cross-cultural leadership research has thrived in international business literature, little attention has been devoted to understanding the effectiveness of non-western theories beyond their original contexts. The purpose of this study is to examine the cross-cultural endorsement of paternalistic leadership, an emerging non-western leadership theory, using data from GLOBE project. Using multigroup confirmatory factor analyses we found measurement equivalence of a scale derived from GLOBE’s data, which enabled us to compare the endorsement of paternalistic leadership dimensions across 10 cultural clusters and 55 societies. Our study revealed that there are significant differences in the importance societies give to each dimension, suggesting that paternalism as leadership style is not universally nor homogeneously endorsed. Furthermore, results suggest that different patterns of endorsement of each of these dimensions give rise to idiosyncratic shades of paternalistic leadership across societies. Implications for theory and future research on international business are discussed.

Keywords:
Paternalistic leadership; Cross-cultural studies; Project GLOBE.

Management and leadership scholars have persistently discussed whether leadership is cultural specific or whether it can be generalized across cultures (Dorfman et al., 2012; Lee, Scandura & Sharif, 2014). Receiving growing interest from organizational researchers, paternalistic leadership may reflect this emic vs. etic discussion (e.g., Aycan, 2006; Aycan, Schyns, Sun, Felfe & Saher, 2013; Farh, Liang, Chou, & Cheng, 2008). While some researchers focus on understanding paternalistic
leadership from the perspective of cultural insiders (e.g., Farh & Cheng, 2000), others seek convergences and divergences across cultures (e.g., Aycan et al. 2013).

The dominant approach to paternalistic leadership has assumed that its endorsement is culturally bounded (Aycan, 2006; Farh & Cheng, 2000). Leadership literature has suggested that paternalistic leadership is endorsed in the ‘eastern’ traditional, hierarchical and collectivistic cultures of Asia, Latin America, the Middle-East, and Africa, while in egalitarian, industrialized and individualistic ‘western’ cultures, it is negatively perceived, being described as “benevolent dictatorship” that leads to “non-coercive exploitation” (Gelfand, Erez, & Aycan, 2007; Pellegrini & Scandura, 2008). However, empirical studies comparing paternalistic leadership in eastern and western societies do not always support this distinction, showing mixed results regarding the effectiveness of paternalistic leadership in different cultural contexts (Pellegrini, Scandura & Jayaraman, 2010). Nevertheless, comparative studies across multiple and contrasting societies are still scarce.

Along with the ambiguity in terms of endorsement and outcomes of paternalistic leadership between cultures, there are also divergences among authors on how to conceptualize it. For example, Farh and Cheng (2004) define paternalistic leadership as “a fatherlike leadership style in which clear and strong authority is combined with concern and considerateness and elements of moral leadership”, considering the construct to be tridimensional. Aycan (2006), on the other hand, developed a five dimensions framework that, although focuses on benevolence and authority as core traits of paternalistic leaders, also highlights the uniqueness of paternalistic practices such as the creation of a family environment, the involvement in the work and non-work lives of employees, and the expectation of loyalty and deference from employees (Aycan et al., 2013).
Additionally to the conceptual diversity, research on paternalistic leadership has been using different approaches to its operationalization. Some studies have relied on an unidimensional measure of PL (e.g., Pellegrini, Scandura, & Jayaraman, 2010), while others have been using its dimensions independently, analyzing the effects of each one on a series of outcomes (e.g., Chou, 2012; Chen & Kao, 2009; Chen, et al., 2011). Beyond these approaches, there have been very few studies tackling the interrelations between the dimensions that constitute paternalistic leadership (Chu, 2010; Chan et al., 2012). In fact, it has been somehow underexplored (with exception of Chou et al., 2015 and Farh et al., 2008) that it is this combination of features that defines the very concept of paternalistic leadership (e.g., highly benevolent and non-authoritarian leader cannot be considered paternalistic).

Furthermore, the negative correlation between two central dimensions of paternalistic leadership, benevolence and authoritarianism, reported in most studies (e.g., Chen et al., 2011; Zhang, Huai & Xie, 2015) supports the idea that they do not reflect paternalism, but it is rather their combination that defines it. In other words, a paternalistic leader does not necessarily need to be equally authoritarian and benevolent, giving room to different nuances of paternalistic leadership, assuming a more benevolent or authoritarian form (Aycan, 2006). Exploring these distinct combinations may help to reconcile some inconsistent findings of previous studies.

Given this context of conceptual and empirical ambiguity regarding paternalistic leadership dimensions and cultural contingencies, we raise the following questions: is paternalistic leadership culturally bounded or can it be universally endorsed? Do distinct societies differently endorse the dimensions of paternalistic leadership? Do these differences shape distinctive shades of paternalistic leadership? To address the above questions and to expand the understanding of paternalistic leadership, we examine the
generalizability of a measure of paternalistic leadership model using data from Project GLOBE and compare this measure across societies. Data from the GLOBE Project should be of particular interest as it contains societies from almost all over the world (Dorfman et al., 2012).

Overall, this paper makes three main contributions to paternalistic leadership literature. First, we propose a conceptual framework of Paternalistic Leadership based on the models of Farh and Cheng (2000) and Aycan (2006), and a new measure of Paternalistic Leadership derived from Project GLOBE data. Second, we provided evidence of measurement invariance of this paternalistic leadership model in a broad set of contrasting societies, which allows for further cross-cultural comparisons. Third, by examining similarities and differences between societies and mapping the distribution and prevalence of paternalistic leadership dimensions, we provide evidence of levels of endorsement and, ultimately, of paternalistic leadership “shades” around the world. Together, these contributions extend prior research regarding paternalistic leadership conceptualization and operationalization, answer previous calls from the literature advancement (Farh et al., 2008) and enable further comparisons in a more consistent framework. By doing so, we contribute to the field of international business (IB) by broadening the scope and representativeness of paternalistic leadership theory and helping IB practitioners prepare expatriates for overseas assignments by familiarizing them with culturally specific leadership schemas.

**Frameworks of Paternalistic Leadership**

In the context of leadership, paternalism has been defined as “a style that combines strong discipline and authority with fatherly benevolence” (Farh & Cheng, 2000: 91). Aycan (2006) adds that the role of the superior is to create a family-like environment, and
provide care, protection, and guidance to subordinates in both work and non-work domains. These authors have developed two seminal frameworks to conceptualize the paternalistic leadership construct (Farh & Cheng, 2000, Aycan, 2006) that share fundamental similarities, along with some conceptual distinctions.

Farh and Cheng’s (2000) model of paternalistic leadership has three dimensions: authoritarianism, benevolence, and morality. Authoritarianism refers to leader behaviors that assert authority and control, demanding unquestioning obedience from subordinates. Under authoritarian leadership, subordinates are expected to comply and abide by leaders’ requests without dissent. On the other hand, benevolence refers to leader behaviors that demonstrate individualized and holistic concern for subordinates’ personal and professional well-being. In return, subordinates feel grateful and obliged to reciprocate. The third dimension, morality, depicts leader behaviors that demonstrate superior personal virtues, leading to respect and identification with the leader. This framework is depicted in Figure 1.

**FIGURE 2**
Paternalistic Leadership and subordinate responses (Farh & Cheng, 2000; Cheng et al., 2004)
Aycan (2006), on the other hand, developed a model comprising five main dimensions, suggesting that a paternalistic leader is characterized by: (1) creating a family atmosphere in the workplace; (2) establishing close and individualized relationships with subordinates; (3) getting involved in the non-work domain; (4) expecting loyalty and deference from subordinates; and (5) maintaining authority and status hierarchy. Although Aycan (2006) points out that paternalistic leadership can be defined around five dimensions, she argues that three of them – creating a familiar environment, involvement in non-work lives and expecting loyalty from employees – are the ones that actually set paternalistic leadership apart from other leadership constructs and probably yield the greater cross cultural differences. According to Aycan et al. (2013), some cultures may perceive these dimensions as protection and support, while others may perceive it as a form of control that undermines employee’s privacy and autonomy.

Both models focus on the authoritarian figure of the leader, recognizing that it is the leader that has the wisdom to make decisions in the name of his/her followers and whose obedience is the essence of social order. However, this authoritarian behavior is mingled with a benevolent attitude towards the followers. Benevolence should generate indebtedness, which should be reciprocated earnestly (Cheng et al., 2004). Thus, leaders’ authoritarian practices would be justified by their individualized relationship, involvement and kindness towards followers.

One of the main differences between these two frameworks is that while Farh and Cheng’s model (2000) emphasizes leader virtuous behavior, which should act as a moral role model for subordinates, Aycan (2006) highlights the fatherly role of the leader, acting as a counselor to followers in both work and family domains. In spite of some conceptual differences, the two are different ways of guiding and influencing subordinates, one more implicit (through role modeling) and the other more explicit (through coaching).
Furthermore, Aycan (2006) adds the expected loyalty dimension, which according to Cheng and colleagues (Farh & Cheng, 2000; Cheng et al., 2004) is an expected subordinate response to the benevolence of the leader, but not a trait or behavior of the leader itself. Indeed, both frameworks consider that followers should show deference and gratitude in return for the protection and consideration of the leader. This should lead to subordinate trust and loyalty towards the leader as a way to reciprocate such protection.

As described above, there are convergences and divergences in the premises of these two frameworks. However, in spite of the distinct lenses that these prevailing perspectives adopt, they share a common essence grounded on the centrality of authoritarianism and benevolence, both being key determinants in understanding a leader’s paternalistic behavior. Moreover, they consider the role of the leader as transcending the work domain and the expectation of responses from the subordinates in terms of loyalty and gratitude. Based on this common ground we aim to explore the possible heterogeneity of the construct across cultures, using data from GLOBE project to accomplish this endeavor.

**Cross-cultural leadership studies**

Culture can be defined as the group of values, norms and practices shared by members of a society. Culture provides people with a powerful set of cues as to the behaviors that are endorsed by that society, and a set of contextual forces that affect the types of leadership that people come to view as effective (Lord et al., 2001). As proposed by implicit leadership theories, cultural context influences people cognitive structures or prototypes that characterize ideal leaders (e.g. Helgstrand & Stuhlmacher, 1999). As such, leadership styles and practices that are commonly accepted in one country may not be endorsed in another.
Paternalistic leadership scholars have been pointing out that it should be endorsed in hierarchical and collectivistic societies (Aycan, 2013; Pellegrini & Scandura, 2008; Dorfman et al., 2012). Paternalistic leadership is considered to prevail where the power is unequally distributed, where leaders centralize the decisions and subordinates have greater respect for hierarchy. Similarly, paternalistic leadership is accepted in collectivistic societies, where personal relationships are especially valued and individual’s identity is developed in relation to the group one’s belong, and where leaders provide protection in return to receiving loyalty and compliance (Aycan, 2006; Pellegrini & Scandura, 2006).

Empirical evidence supporting the effectiveness of paternalistic leadership in high power distance and collectivist cultures, such as in Japan, Turkey, Mexico, Indonesia and Malaysia, reinforces the idea that paternalistic leadership is indeed culturally bounded (Uhl-Bien, Tierney, Graen & Wakabayashi, 1990; Pellegrini & Scandura, 2006; Martinez, 2003). However, recent studies have also found positive effects of paternalistic leadership on followers’ outcomes, such as commitment and job satisfaction, in low power distance and individualistic societies (e.g., Pellegrini, Scandura & Jayaraman, 2010).

Moreover, studies focused on leadership styles that overlap with some dimensions of paternalistic leadership have also found positive effects on several outcomes in both eastern and western societies. For example, autocratic, directive, nurturant, servant and ethical leadership – that share many similarities with the authoritarian, benevolent and moral dimensions of paternalistic leadership – have been individually related to followers’ job satisfaction and uncertainty reduction, employee performance, perceived leadership effectiveness and organizational citizenship behaviors (e.g., Martin, Liao & Campbell, 2013; Lorinkova, Pearsall & Sims, 2012; Jayasingam & Cheng, 2009;
Karakitapoglu-Aygun & Gumusluoglu, 2013; Öner, 2012). Together, these evidences raise doubts about the prevalence of this leadership schema only in non-western societies, thus demanding further examination.

Regarding methodological approaches, while some studies have focused on the overall concept of paternalistic leadership either in eastern or western societies (e.g., Goncu, Aycan & Johnson, 2014; Kai, 2013), others have looked at its single dimensions across cultures (e.g. Niu, Wang & Cheng, 2010). Very few, however, have delved into the combined effects of the main components of paternalistic leadership concept and, importantly, its interactions. As paternalistic leadership involve contradictory roles of an authoritarian and benevolent leader, examining its interaction might help the understanding of its mixed effects on followers.

For example, Chan et al. (2013) proposed that authoritarianism and benevolence had a joint effect on followers’ performance. Specifically, the positive effects of benevolence mitigated the negative effects of authoritarianism, resulting in a positive effect on followers’ performance. Farh et al. (2008), on the other hand, also showed that distinct arrangements of low and high authoritarianism, benevolence and morality yield different effects on followers. The authors suggest that high authoritarianism in conjunction with high benevolence represents an ideal type of leadership widely accepted in traditional Chinese culture.

In sum, paternalistic leadership is a paradoxical and complex construct that embraces conflicting elements (e.g. domineering coupled with individualized care) that work through distinct psychological mechanisms (Farh et al., 2008). It is possible that distinct cultures endorse paternalistic leadership dimensions in different ways, shaping multiple types of paternalism. Cross-cultural comparisons are needed to deepen the understanding of the construct and its generalizability across cultures.
Method

Data and participants

In the present study, we used data from the Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness (GLOBE) (House et al., 1999; House et al., 2004), a research program on leadership and culture across 62 societies. GLOBE’s participants first completed questionnaires designed to measure perceptions of leaders. Then, one half of them completed scales designed to assess organizational culture (Form A) while the other half completed scales that examined societal culture (Form B). The dataset used in the present study examined perceptions of leaders and societal culture (Form B), totalizing approximately 7,500 participants.

Procedures

First, we derived a measure of paternalistic leadership based on leadership traits’ items from GLOBE’s questionnaire. Second, we tested the measurement equivalence of this measure across clusters of societies. Finally, we tested the endorsement of each of the dimensions of paternalistic leadership across societies. We used GLOBE’s ten cultural clusters, which group societies based on similarities of values and practices of societies along nine cultural dimensions. We listed the societies included in this study in Table 1.
TABLE 1
Societies included in this study grouped by Culture Cluster Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culture Cluster</th>
<th>Anglo</th>
<th>Confucian</th>
<th>Eastern</th>
<th>Germanic</th>
<th>Latin American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Bolivia*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Republic</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>(Former East)</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>(Former GDR)</td>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Taiwan*</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White South Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culture Cluster</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Nordic</th>
<th>Southeast</th>
<th>Sub-Saharan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>European</td>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>European</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>India</td>
<td></td>
<td>Black South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>Sweden*</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Namibia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Qatar*</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zambia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: Data from Sweden, Qatar, Taiwan and Bolivia were excluded from the analyses as it contained more than 50% of cases with missing observations in the variables of interest.

Results

Step 1. Dimensions of paternalistic leadership

GLOBE’s leadership scales were originally developed to assess 21 dimensions of leadership. The scales were composed of 112 attributes or behavioral descriptors. Participants were asked to rate each descriptor on a 7-point response scale ranging from 1-This behavior or characteristic greatly inhibits a person from being an outstanding leader to 7-This behavior or characteristic contributes greatly to a person being an outstanding leader. Since the GLOBE project did not originally develop scales to measure...
any specific style of leadership, we derived a measure of paternalistic leadership using the attribute and behavioral descriptor items.

First, we asked eight researchers in the field of Leadership to complete an exercise in which they were presented a written summary of paternalistic leadership concept. This summary was developed based on Farh and Cheng’s (2000) and Aycan’s (2006) definitions of Paternalistic Leadership, and embraced most behaviors and attitudes that emerged in our literature review. After reading the summary, participants were asked to read each of GLOBE’s behaviors and attitudes and its description, and to identify to what extent each item was reflective of paternalistic leadership. They used a 7-point response scale ranging from 1-This behavior or characteristic greatly inhibits a person from being a paternalistic leader to 7-This behavior or characteristic contributes greatly to a person being a paternalistic leader.

A total of 36 items were identified as reflecting some aspect of paternalistic leadership. We considered traits that averaged a mean above 5.0 and were rated as 4.0 or above for all participants. Then, using Bernoulli randomization, we split the database in two datasets. First, with one of the datasets, we conducted an exploratory factor analysis across all countries using the 36 standardized items. We excluded items with factor loadings below 0.5 or with factor loadings above 0.4 in two or more factors. A five-factor solution including 20 of the 36 items were retained. With the other dataset, we conducted a confirmatory factor analysis using MPlus (7.0) to test the fit of a model in which each of the 20 items was set to load only on its respective factor. We tested the hypothesized five-factor model using the robust maximum likelihood estimation (RMLE) method (Yang-Wallentin, Jöreskog, & Luo, 2010). The evaluation of model fit is based on an inferential goodness-of-fit index, in combination with descriptive indices. Results of the CFA suggested that a model including the five constructs and allowing for covariances
among them fit the data well (CFI = 0.91; RMSEA = 0.052) and a single factor model had a significantly worse fit (CFI = 0.63, RMSEA = 0.104), providing evidence to support the five-factor solution of the underlying structure of paternalistic leadership dimensions.

The five factors that emerged aligned closely with key components of previously described paternalistic leadership frameworks. Table 2 presents the dimensions of paternalistic leadership that emerged from our data. We labeled the first factor Authoritarianism (four items), as it mirrors the notions of authority and strong discipline imposed by the leader. The second factor was labeled Benevolence (three items), since it depicts the compassionate and sensitive nature of the leader, which allows establishing close and individualized relationships with the followers. The third factor was labeled Personal Virtues (four items) as it reflects virtuous traits that enable the leader to act as a moral role model to followers. This factor is closely aligned with the morality dimension of Farh and Cheng’s (2004) paternalistic leadership framework. We labeled the fourth factor Coaching (five items) as it reflects the role of leader as a senior counselor, acting as a father towards his followers and providing advice and encouragement as proposed by Aycan’s (2006) creating a family atmosphere in the workplace dimension. Finally, we labeled the fifth factor Status & Hierarchy (four items) since it captures the relevance that the leader gives to status differences and compliance to formal norms and procedures. Although this dimension is combined with authoritarianism in Aycan’s (2006) framework, our results suggest that authority and formality are different manifestations of paternalistic leadership behaviors (for example, some cultures may endorse a highly formal but not authoritarian leader or vice-versa).
TABLE 2
Paternalistic leadership dimensions emerged in the present study*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authoritarianism</th>
<th>Benevolence</th>
<th>Personal Virtues</th>
<th>Coaching</th>
<th>Status &amp; Hierarchy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Autocratic</td>
<td>• Compassionate</td>
<td>• Trustworthy</td>
<td>• Team-builder</td>
<td>• Procedural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dictatorial</td>
<td>• Fraternal</td>
<td>• Sincere</td>
<td>• Confidence</td>
<td>• Formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Domineering</td>
<td>• Sensitive</td>
<td>• Just</td>
<td>• Group-oriented</td>
<td>• Normative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ruler</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Honest</td>
<td>• Communicative</td>
<td>• Class conscious</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Columns identify the individual items (GLOBE’s traits) that compose each dimension.

**Step 2. Paternalistic leadership measurement invariance among cultural clusters**

Once the overall factor structure was confirmed, we tested its invariance across GLOBE’s clusters of societies. Measurement invariance of paternalistic leadership between the 10 clusters was tested by means of multi-group CFA as in Cheng et al. (2014). We compared an unrestricted model – with all parameters freely estimated for each group – to a model with equal loadings between groups (metric invariance). Finally, a constraint on the equality of intercepts is added (scalar invariance). Table 3 presents the results.

TABLE 3
Comparison of nested models for measurement invariance test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>ΔDF</th>
<th>Δχ2</th>
<th>ΔCFI</th>
<th>ΔRMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metric versus unconstrained</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>743*</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scalar versus metric</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>7351*</td>
<td>-0.114</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scalar versus metric (partial invariance)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1580*</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the 1% level

Although the chi-square tests for nested models comparisons were significant, large sample size renders these tests to be oversensitive. So, we followed Chen (2007) who suggested that, for sample sizes larger than 300, the measurement model can be
considered equivalent among groups unless there is a change higher than -0.01 in CFI and a change higher than 0.015 in RMSEA or a change higher than 0.03 in SRMR (for loading invariance), and 0.01 (for intercept invariance) in the nested models comparisons. All changes in RMSEA and SRMR are out of this range for metric invariance. For scalar invariance, 18 intercepts (out of 200) had to be unconstrained to reach invariance according to the criteria above. Thus, partial measurement invariance across groups is supported. Obtaining partial invariance is acceptable as it is quite unrealistic to expect there is full measurement invariance across multiple groups, as in the case of country comparisons (e.g., Muthen & Asparouhov, 2013). This result is consistent with previous studies of measurement invariance of Paternalistic Leadership among countries that also found partial invariance (e.g., Cheng et al., 2014).

Table 4 presents descriptive statistics of the constructs and indicates a negative correlation of authoritarianism with benevolence. This finding highlights a critical inconsistency of studies that consider paternalistic leadership as a second order reflective measurement model (e.g., Chen et al., 2011; Wu et al., 2012). Such a model assumes that authoritarianism and benevolence positively co-vary in such a way that more paternalistic leaders should be more authoritarian and more benevolent. However, the negative correlation indicates that it is not the main effect of benevolence, together with the main effect of authority that defines what paternalistic leadership is. Rather, it indicates that these two behaviors interact to define a model of paternalistic leadership. In other words, our results suggest that societies may endorse different combinations of benevolence or authoritarianism, which could define distinctive shades of paternalistic leadership across cultures.
### TABLE 4
Means, standard deviations and correlations between Paternalistic Leadership dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Authoritarianism</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Benevolence</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>-0.26**</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Personal Virtues</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.05**</td>
<td>0.69**</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Coaching</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.12**</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>0.53**</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Status &amp; Hierarchy</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>-0.15**</td>
<td>-0.14**</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
<td>0.43**</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: values in the main diagonal indicate composite reliabilities. **p < 0.01

**Step 3. Cross cultural endorsement of paternalistic leadership dimensions**

After establishing the model measurement invariance across clusters, we conducted a series of one-way analyses of variance (ANOVAs) for each PL dimension to determine if there were significant differences between clusters. We aggregated the 7,494 individual responses to the country level to conduct the ANOVAs. Our sample included data from 55 different societies, since participants of 3 societies did not complete the leadership traits scale and 4 societies had missing data in more than 50% of cases.

Results indicated significant differences between cultural clusters along the five dimensions of paternalistic leadership: Authoritarianism ($F_{(9,46)} = 3.04, p < 0.01, \eta^2 = 0.373$); Benevolence ($F_{(9,46)} = 4.35, p < 0.01, \eta^2 = 0.460$); Personal Virtues ($F_{(9,46)} = 1.61, p = 0.14, \eta^2 = 0.239$); Coaching ($F_{(9,46)} = 2.66, p < 0.05, \eta^2 = 0.343$); and Status & Hierarchy ($F_{(9,46)} = 8.18, p < 0.001, \eta^2 = 0.616$). Results of the Eta-squared ($\eta^2$) effect size statistic, which represents the proportion of variance in the dimension explained by categorization in one of the culture clusters, indicated that cultural clusters had considerable influence on the significance of the paternalistic scores. For example, approximately 46% of the variability in scores across societies regarding the endorsement of Benevolence as important for paternalistic leadership was attributable to the cluster that a particular society was categorized in.
Results show that there are significant differences among clusters regarding the endorsement of paternalistic leadership dimensions. For example, Latin America and Confucian Asia clusters both strongly endorse Benevolence as a leadership trait, while Nordic European cluster does not value this characteristic as much. The only exception is Personal Virtues, which seems to be universally endorsed as a relevant attribute of an outstanding leader. Table 5 summarizes the results.

**TABLE 5**
Means and ranking of societal culture clusters based on the endorsement of each dimension of paternalistic leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Authoritarianism</th>
<th>Benevolence</th>
<th>Personal Virtues</th>
<th>Coaching</th>
<th>Status &amp; Hierarchy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>2.37 (8th)</td>
<td>4.69 (5th)</td>
<td>6.19 (4th)</td>
<td>6.26 (3rd)</td>
<td>4.07 (8th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confucian Asian</td>
<td>3.00 (1st)</td>
<td>4.87 (4th)</td>
<td>5.84 (8th)</td>
<td>5.86 (9th)</td>
<td>4.50 (5th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern European</td>
<td>2.81 (2nd)</td>
<td>4.30 (8th)</td>
<td>5.94 (7th)</td>
<td>5.93 (8th)</td>
<td>4.48 (6th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germanic European</td>
<td>1.84 (10th)</td>
<td>4.45 (7th)</td>
<td>6.25 (3rd)</td>
<td>6.06 (5th)</td>
<td>3.85 (9th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin American</td>
<td>2.62 (6th)</td>
<td>4.92 (2nd)</td>
<td>6.28 (2nd)</td>
<td>6.29 (1st)</td>
<td>5.09 (1st)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin European</td>
<td>2.43 (7th)</td>
<td>3.84 (9th)</td>
<td>5.98 (6th)</td>
<td>6.02 (6th)</td>
<td>4.38 (7th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>2.74 (3rd)</td>
<td>4.55 (6th)</td>
<td>5.53 (10th)</td>
<td>5.44 (10th)</td>
<td>4.88 (2nd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordic European</td>
<td>2.01 (9th)</td>
<td>3.83 (10th)</td>
<td>6.45 (1st)</td>
<td>6.28 (2nd)</td>
<td>3.63 (10th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asian</td>
<td>2.69 (5th)</td>
<td>5.11 (1st)</td>
<td>6.16 (5th)</td>
<td>6.06 (4th)</td>
<td>4.86 (3rd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>2.72 (4th)</td>
<td>4.92 (3rd)</td>
<td>5.82 (9th)</td>
<td>6.01 (7th)</td>
<td>4.69 (4th)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 56 (Anglo n = 7; Confucian Asian n = 5; Eastern European n = 9; Germanic European n = 5; Latin American n = 9; Latin European n = 5; Middle Eastern n = 5; Nordic European n = 2; Southeast Asian n = 5; Sub-Saharan African n = 5).

To highlight the different endorsement levels of paternalistic leadership dimensions we plotted results for Latin American, Confucian Asian and Nordic European clusters in a radar graph – see Figure 2. The graph shows that Nordic Europeans do not endorse paternalistic leadership as a broad construct although they value Personal Virtues and Coaching. On the other hand, both Confucian Asians and Latin Americans seem to
consistently value all dimensions of paternalistic leadership albeit not in the same manner. Although they equally value Benevolence as a leader trait, Confucian Asians place higher importance on Authoritarianism, while Latin Americans strongly endorse Status & Hierarchy. These results suggest that paternalistic leadership is not a homogenously endorsed construct across cultures, but that different patterns of endorsement of its individual dimensions give rise to idiosyncratic shades of paternalistic leadership across societies.

**FIGURE 2**
Paternalistic Leadership dimensions per cluster

To further explore these shades of paternalistic leadership, we analyzed them at the country level as, although the clusters aggregate similar societies, the existing variance within each cluster may hide subtle nuances in the endorsement of paternalistic leadership. Furthermore, given the complexity of all the possible combinations of the five dimensions across all societies, for parsimony sake, we focus on the two core dimensions of paternalistic leadership, as they are common to the main theoretical frameworks –
authoritarianism and benevolence. Also, the presence of these two dimensions has been shown to be a necessary condition for paternalistic leadership to be effective, as benevolence interacts with authoritarianism to mitigate its negative effects (Chan et al., 2012). Figure 3 illustrate the endorsement of each of these two dimensions across societies.

**FIGURE 3**
Endorsement of authoritarianism and benevolence across societies

As shown in Figure 3, results illustrate Turkey and Indonesia as examples of a balanced endorsement of both authoritarianism and benevolence. On the other hand, while Mexico represents an authoritarian form of paternalism (higher endorsement of authoritarianism and lower of benevolence), China represents a benevolent shade of paternalistic leadership (higher endorsement of benevolence and lower of authoritarianism). Some societies clearly do not endorse neither authoritarianism nor
benevolence (e.g., Finland), while others endorse only one of them (e.g. Russia and Austria), rejecting the concept of paternalistic leadership as a whole.

Discussion

The main purpose of this study was to understand if paternalistic leadership is culturally bounded or if it is universally endorsed. To do so we examined how the dimensions of paternalistic leadership are differently endorsed by distinct societies, shaping distinctive shades of paternalism around the world. Results showed that there are significant differences in the importance societies give to each dimension of paternalistic leadership, suggesting that paternalism as leadership style is not universally endorsed. While some cultural clusters endorse paternalistic leadership’s core dimensions (e.g., Latin America and Confucian Asia), others tend to value only some of its less distinctive features. For example, Nordic European and Germanic clusters endorse personal virtues and coaching as leadership traits, but not authoritarianism or benevolence.

Indeed, from the five dimensions that emerged from the data to qualify paternalistic leadership, some were universally endorsed across cultural clusters as they represent prototypical behaviors expected from effective leaders, such as personal virtues and coaching. On the other hand, results showed that dimensions such as authoritarianism, benevolence and status and hierarchy – which combined are the crux of paternalistic leadership (Aycan, 2006) – were less homogeneous in their endorsement among the clusters. For example, China endorses a more benevolent paternalism, while Mexico endorses a more authoritarian form of paternalistic leadership. Turkey, on the other hand, endorses both benevolence and authoritarianism in a more balanced way. If we assumed a one-dimensional perspective of paternalistic leadership without systematically considering the possibility that the relationships between dimensions may
meaningfully differ in different contexts, Mexico and China would be considered to equally endorse paternalistic practices. That is, a one-dimensional perspective does not allow us to fully understand leadership effectiveness since societies endorse different aspects of paternalism. Our approach allows us to differentiate between shades of paternalism across cultures, providing a better framework to analyze and distinguish the effects of paternalistic leadership on followers.

The five-dimensional structure that emerged from our data integrated elements from the two main frameworks of paternalistic leadership (Aycan, 2006; Farh & Cheng, 2000). From the five dimensions, three reflected authoritarianism, benevolence and morality as proposed by the tridimensional model of Farh and Cheng (2000), while the other two were related to Aycan’s dimensions of maintaining status and hierarchy, and creating a family atmosphere in the workplace (leader behaves as father, providing encouragement and support). Our framework suggests that paternalistic leaders may influence followers both through moral role modeling, as well as through active encouragement and counseling, as a senior family member would do. On the other hand, our results also suggest that paternalistic leaders tend to emphasize authority and control, demanding obedience and compliance from subordinates, at the same time they stress the importance of procedural and normative conduct of followers in order to highlight power and status differences.

Yet, further examining the model showed that the five factors, in general, were not highly correlated. As expected, coaching, personal virtues and benevolence are positively correlated, since they reflect behaviors and characteristics that contribute to a person being an effective leader across cultures (Resick, et al., 2006). Authoritarianism, on the contrary, was negatively related to these dimensions, but positively related to status and hierarchy. These results are coherent with previous studies showing that
authoritarianism and benevolence are two components of paternalistic leadership, which imply opposite effects on followers: authoritarianism tends to impair, whereas benevolence tends to enhance, the work performance of subordinates (Aycan, 2006; Farh & Cheng, 2000; Chan et al., 2013). As shown by previous research, benevolence mitigates the negative effects authoritarianism may have on followers, allowing paternalistic leadership to be considered an effective leadership style (Chan et al., 2012). That is, it may be possible for followers to emotionally reconcile most authoritarian practices with the benevolence and nurturing figure of the father (Chou, Sibley, Liu, Lin & Cheng, 2015). Finally, the positive correlation with formality is consistent with Aycan’s (2006) authoritarianism-benevolence matrix, which considers that authoritarianism can act as a control, not only as exploitation, but both approaches still demands conformity and dependency from subordinates.

These findings highlight an underlying assumption about a second-order measurement model of paternalism. The literature has considered a reflective model, which implies that different dimensions of paternalism (e.g., benevolence and authoritarianism) are consequences of paternalism and should consequently be correlated. In this case, a leader would be more authoritarian and benevolent because she/he is more paternalistic. This perspective was not supported considering the negative observed correlation between authoritarianism and benevolence. By empirically showing that authoritarianism and benevolence are weakly or negatively correlated, it is possible to assume that the two are independent and can be seen together in different ways and, instead of consequences of the level of paternalism, both dimensions are independent causes of it. We argue that it is the combination of different levels of benevolence and authoritarianism that defines how paternalistic the leader is. In other words, without individualized relationships that provide support and affection, the leader may send the
negative idea of behaving in a rude and hostile manner, being seen as an authoritarian leader. Thus, both dimensions can vary independently, in a non correlated way, to define different types of paternalism. From this standpoint, a formative measurement model seems more adequate.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that the CFAs conducted with the five-factor model of paternalistic leadership showed its measurement invariance, meaning that the same instrument can be used in different cultural contexts. The measurement invariance also enabled us to compare how societies endorse each of the paternalistic leadership dimensions independently.

**Implications and limitations**

In examining the implications of this study, we highlight the following contributions. First, we presented a cross-cultural examination of Paternalistic Leadership, in contrast to the majority research that contextualizes paternalistic leadership within a single society (e.g. Zhang et al., 2014; Chen et al., 2014) or in groups of societies with similar cultural values (e.g. Cheng et al., 2014). Although there are studies contrasting cultures (e.g. Cem-Ersoy et al., 2012; Pellegrini, Scandura & Jayamaran, 2010), to our knowledge there are no cross-cultural research on paternalistic leadership that compare it from a global perspective.

Another contribution, which possibly sets paternalistic leadership apart from other established leadership constructs in the literature, is the development of a wider conceptual framework, including the most traditional models of Farh and Cheng (2000) and Aycan (2006). Our conceptual model aimed to capture paternalistic attitudes and behaviors that are unique to societies as well as to identify more universal attributes that characterize paternalistic leadership. Then, verified the measurement equivalence of the
model, we provided a starting point for better understanding core paternalistic leadership differences and similarities across cultures.

We must mention, however, that there are differences in values and norms within and between societies, even though regions within a society and societies within a cluster endorse similar forms of leadership (House et al., 2004). Then, our findings provide indication of how societies, on average, endorse certain facets of paternalistic leadership. For example, the Latin American cluster endorsed a relational-benevolent orientation that considers the leader a role model, and also values leader’s status and hierarchy. Although some of the dimensions appear to be universally supported (such as Coaching’s group-orientation and encouragement, that are viewed as behaviors and characteristics that contribute to a person being an effective leader across cultures), there were different levels of endorsement across all clusters.

This variation in the degree of endorsement of paternalistic leadership dimensions and its different patterns of combination has to be taken into account by organizations when structuring leadership development programs and dealing with businesses’ internationalization processes. Since it is important for expatriates and local managers to consider etic (universals) and emic (culturally-contingent) lenses as to be more effective when working with people from different cultures (Johnson, Lenartowicz, & Apud, 2006), leaders in international assignments can use the findings highlighted in this study to focus their initial observations of how leadership behaviors that at first may seem universal (i.e., encouragement, group-orientation) can be enacted in unique ways in different countries (i.e., more relational-oriented).

Even though we based our study on a large and reliable dataset that allowed us to examine beliefs about some of the important aspects of paternalistic leadership across 55 different societies, the GLOBE dataset was not originally designed to address
paternalistic leadership construct. One important dimension – involvement in employees’ non-work lives – could not be measured using our data. This limitation should be acknowledged.

Conclusions

Acknowledging how to effectively lead people within diverse cultural contexts has become an imperative for international business research. Our study is an attempt to contribute to paternalistic leadership literature, a non-western leadership theory, by analyzing its endorsement globally. Through our study, we have shown that paternalistic leadership is not universally nor homogeneously endorsed across societies. In fact, we observed that cultures value distinct ‘shades’ of paternalistic leadership. Our findings, however, are not an “answer” but rather a place to start a discussion on how to conceptualize paternalistic leadership and better understand it cross culturally, triggering further advance of theoretical and practical research to the field of leadership.
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Leader-Follower Fit on Followers’ Attitudes, Psychological Resources and Performance

Abstract

Paternalistic leadership is a flourishing area in leadership literature, traditionally assumed to be culture bounded. However, empirical evidences have suggested that rather than national cultures, the conditions under which paternalistic leaders are effective can be related to the fit between the style of a leader and that of his or her followers. In the present research, we focus on paternalistic leadership and contrast it with empowering leadership, as two opposite ways on how leaders influence followers, to explore the individual conditions under which both styles can be effective. Adopting a follower-centered approach, we base our arguments on person-supervisor (P-S) fit theory and regulatory focus theory to propose that leadership effectiveness may be contingent to followers’ own values and motivational needs. We expected paternalistic leadership behaviors (e.g., authority, benevolence, support) to supply motivational needs for predominantly prevention-focused followers, and empowering leadership behaviors (e.g., empowerment, encouragement and autonomy) to supply motivational needs for predominantly promotion-focused followers. Using data collected from two experimental studies and a business simulation, we found support for these ideas, showing that fit increased followers’ perception of attitudinal and behavioral outcomes, such as in-role and creative performance.

Keywords: Paternalistic leadership, Empowering Leadership, Regulatory Focus, Person-Supervisor Fit, Regulatory Fit.
Paternalistic leadership has traditionally been considered culture bounded, limiting most of theoretical and empirical research that investigated its effectiveness under the lens of national cultures’ differences (e.g., Aycan et al., 2013). Empirical evidences, however, suggest that rather than the match between style and national cultures, the explanation on paternalistic leadership effectiveness may lie in the fit between the style of a leader and that of his or her followers (e.g. Pellegrini, Scandura & Jayaraman, 2010; Ansari, Ahmad & Aafaqi, 2004).

The question of when and how leadership is effective has been debated for several decades. Since mid-1960s, situational models of leadership have demonstrated that leaders’ effectiveness is contingent to specific conditions, which can be related to the organizational context itself or their relationship with subordinates (e.g., Hersey & Blanchard, 1969, 1993; House, 1971; Fiedler, 1967). Similar to the fact that leaders have different values and motivations, resulting in different leadership styles, followers have different needs, benefiting from different types of leader. That is, leadership effectiveness should be contingent upon the factors within the situation, specifically, upon the fit with the follower.

In the present research, we focus on paternalistic leadership and contrast it with empowering leadership, as two opposite ways on how leaders influence followers, in order to explore the individual conditions under which both styles can be effective. While Paternalistic leadership reflects a classical view of leadership (i.e., more directive), empowering leadership reflects a more participative and approach to leadership (Pearce et al., 2003).

The main difference between paternalistic and empowering leadership is the way leaders develop their relationship with followers, differing on how they fulfill followers’ needs and encourage them to achieve organizational goals. Paternalistic leaders focus on
centralization, close relationships, protection and support to the follower, combining “strong discipline and authority with fatherly benevolence” (Farh & Cheng, 2000). Although it has been described as “a hidden and insidious form of discrimination” (Collela et al., 2005), or a form of “non-coercive exploitation” (Goodell, 1985), research has shown that it positively affects LMX, extra-role performance, goal setting and employee voice (e.g. Aycan et al., 2000; Zhang, Huai & Xie, 2015; Tang & Naumann, 2015). Conversely, empowering leaders focus on encouragement, independence and less bureaucracy. Empowering leaders highlight the significance of work to employees, supporting their autonomy, providing participation in decision making and conveying confidence that performance will be high (Amundsen & Martinsen, 2014; Ahearne, Mathieu & Rapp, 2005). Even though empowering leaders are known to “share power with subordinates” (Vecchio, Justin, & Pearce, 2010) positively affecting in-role performance, creativity and self-leadership (e.g. Amundsen & Martinsen, 2014; Stone, Deci, & Ryan, 2009; Boudrias et al., 2010; Raub & Robert, 2010), research has shown that empowering leaders might lead to overconfidence, resulting in weaker engagement and performance (Dong, Bartol & Zhang, 2015).

Clearly, paternalistic and empowering leaders fundamentally diverge in what they value and on how they influence followers, engendering either positive or negative outcomes for individuals. The conditions under which both leaders can be effective, however, remain unclear. As such, we propose that their effectiveness may be contingent to followers’ own values and motivational needs, and the way they pursue goals in their work environment. Instead of adopting a culturally-centered approach, we build our arguments on person-supervisor (P-S) fit theory (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005), which suggests that when individuals’ needs are met by environmental supplies (needs-supplies fit) employees tend to experience more positive job attitudes.
and increased performance (Kristof, 1996). Specifically, we focus on the fit between followers’ regulatory focus and the way leaders fulfill followers’ needs and influence them to achieve desired outcomes. While followers’ regulatory focus refers to preferences for construing goals in certain ways, types of standards that attract attention, and situational characteristics that are preferred during the goal-pursuit process (Scholer & Higgins, 2011; Higgins, 1997), the way leaders provide direction, implement plans, and motivate their followers refers to their leadership style.

Considering the key role of regulatory focus in the context of social interactions (e.g., De Cremer, Van Dijke, Mayer, Schouten & Bardes, 2009), theories of need fulfillment (e.g., Locke, 1976), and social exchange theory (Blau, 1964), we expect that when leaders influence followers in a way that meet their motivational needs, followers are likely to experience an overall increase in task-related outcomes, relationship with the leader and individual motivation. In other words, when there is fit between leadership style and followers’ regulatory focus, followers will be especially motivated to put effort in their work and to behave in congruence with the values and goals that this leader makes salient, which are similar to the values and goals that followers pursue (c.f. Higgins, 1997).

We distinguish regulatory motivations between a prevention focus (i.e., followers motivational needs are driven to security, their goal is to avoid negative situations, focusing on rules and obligations) and a promotion focus (i.e., followers motivational needs are driven to self-actualization, their goal is to attain positive outcomes, focusing on attaining an ideal self) (Higgins, 1997, 1998; Lockwood, Jordan & Kunda, 2002). Then, we expect paternalistic leadership behaviors (e.g, authority, benevolence, support) to supply motivational needs for predominantly prevention-focused followers, and
empowering leadership behaviors (e.g. empowerment, encouragement and autonomy) to supply motivational needs for predominantly promotion-focused followers.

By examining more closely how a basic aspect of followers’ motivation plays a role in two very distinct types of leaders, we believe that we contribute to leadership, regulatory focus and P-S fit literature. First, because it identifies an important moderator variable that specifies when paternalistic – in contrast to empowering leadership – is likely to be most effective, helping to explain followers’ increase in motivational and performance outcomes, beyond national culture conditions. Then, because it provides evidence that followers’ regulatory focus – especially prevention focus of regulation – can determine both leadership and, importantly, leader-follower relationship effectiveness, which is important to highlight given the lack of research on the effects of regulatory focus on interpersonal interactions (Johnson et al., 2015; De Cremer, et al, 2009; Brebels, De Cremer, & Sedikides, 2008 for similar views). Moreover, because it demonstrates that fit between leaders and followers can be crucial in enhancing or mitigating the effects of leadership practices on employees’ attitudes and behaviors (e.g., Kim & Kim, 2013). Finally, by adopting a follower-centered approach, mostly neglected by previous research (Chan, Huang, Snape & Lam, 2013; De Cremer et al., 2009), to understand the effects of paternalistic and empowering leaders on followers, which are leadership styles known to have little behavioral overlaps (e.g., Amundsen & Martinsen, 2014). Given that leaders do not exist without followers, it is important to understand how followers’ characteristics are essential to determine leadership effectiveness.

**Paternalistic and Empowering Leadership Styles**

Since the emergence of contingency theories in mid 1960s (e.g. Hersey & Blanchard, 1969, 1993), the extent to which leader behaviors interplay with follower
characteristics have been put to test. According to these theories, followers are the most critical aspect in leadership such that, as followers vary, so does the appropriate style of supervision. Beyond understanding how leaders influence followers, we sought to investigate when and why certain effects may (or may not) occur. We thus examine followers’ regulatory focus as such a process, focusing on paternalistic and empowering leadership styles.

Coming from the Latin root “pater” meaning “father”, paternalistic leadership (PL) is associated with a style that restricts “the freedoms and responsibilities of subordinates in what is considered or claimed to be their best interests” (OED, 2009). At the same time they stress their power and maintain a sense of hierarchy, paternalistic leaders are also concerned for subordinates’ general well-being. In general, paternalistic leaders are both directive and supportive (Farh & Cheng, 2000). They assert authority and control but also demonstrate individualized, holistic concern for subordinates’ personal and family well-being, demonstrating superior personal virtues and concern for employees work and non work lives (Aycan, 2006). In contrast, empowering leaders influence subordinates through power sharing and development support with intent to promote their experience of self-reliance, motivation, and capability to work autonomously (Amundsen & Martinsen, 2014). A central assumption is that empowering leaders are assumed to practice self-leadership, serving as observable models for their subordinates (Manz & Sims, 1987, 2001). Based on that, paternalistic and empowering leaders may influence followers to behave accordingly, in terms of fulfilling different motivational needs and of how to pursuing goals.

From one side, paternalistic leaders interact with openness and truthfulness, promoting interpersonal trust and creating an environment characterized by mutual respect where people are comfortable expressing their differences (Chen et al., 2014). By
communicating the importance of trust and mutual respect, leaders encourage followers to show their concerns, guaranteeing that it will not have negative repercussions for the individual. Stimulating followers to show their concerns in this work climate may result in followers feeling psychologically safe and free to speak up (Cheng et al., 2014; Chan, 2014; Saher et al., 2013; Cheng, Chou, Wu, Huang & Fahr, 2004). Second, paternalistic leaders clearly define contingent rewards and provide information regarding which employee behaviors are desired and expected (they provide followers with security to perform, minimizing undesirable outcomes). These behaviors have been associated with in role and extra role performance (Goncu, Aycan & Johnson, 2014). Third, by taking full responsibility and centrality in the decision making processes, paternalistic leaders control risk taking, making followers feel that it is expected to avoid negative outcomes. Finally, when paternalistic leaders take an individualized, concerned and ‘paternal’ relationship-based approach (Pellegrini & Scandura, 2006), followers may feel encouraged to vigilantly aim for accuracy and to be apprehensive about failing their leader’s minimal standards.

Although paternalistic leaders are known to protect and support followers in professional and familiar domains (Aycan, 2006) and to assume responsibility over decisions and tasks, they also exercise their control with authoritarian behaviors (Farh & Cheng, 2000; Aycan, 2006). That is, the fatherly benevolence of paternalistic leaders is combined with strong discipline and authority, which has been considered to have pervasive and sometimes “problematic and undesirable” effects on followers (e.g. Uhl Bien & Maslyn, 2005; Chan et al., 2013). These authoritarian attributes are considered not to be part of an “ideal” leader (Lord & Maher, 1991), being generally seen as demotivating followers (Chan et al., 2013) and weakening leader-follower relationship (Tang & Naumann, 2015).
From the other side, empowering leaders foster the process that increases employees’ feelings of self-efficacy and control and creates conditions that encourage a sense of power in followers (Arnold et al., 2000). These conditions involve participative decision making (Manz & Sims, 1987), autonomy, self-direction, and control over their work environment, allowing them the freedom to be flexible according to circumstances (Amundsen & Martinsen, 2014). Empowering leaders communicate organization’s overall goals and mission to followers, therefore enhancing the meaningfulness of work (Conger & Kanungo, 1988). Empowering leadership should yield benefits in terms of not only motivating followers, but also stimulating them so that they can create new ways of doing things, minimizing bureaucracy and working smart to achieve organizational goals more efficiently (e.g. Rapp et al, 2006). Employees that are empowered have more flexibility and can more readily adapt (Schultz, 2014). These behaviors direct followers to think on new perspectives, thus stimulating novel ways on doing things (as opposed to the maintenance of the status quo). It also creates opportunities (and not decision obstacles) and encourages followers, signaling that risk taking and achieving positive outcomes comes before than having fear of taking risks and avoiding failures.

While empowering leadership may stimulate self-leadership on followers and their ability to rapidly overcome organizational obstacles, enabling faster decision making (Amundsen & Martinsen, 2014; Scott & Bruce, 1994), leaders can also create environments that lack clear directions, guided assistance or activities’ checks. These environments can be seen as too flexible, not having strong signals on how to perform tasks and deal with responsibilities. As such, followers may exert less effort as a response to the great empowerment fostered by their leaders (Randolph & Sashkin, 2002; Rapp et al., 2006). In addition to that, by stimulating participative decision making in all work
domains, empowering leaders can simultaneously generate perceptions of role overload, which can affect followers’ engagement and, ultimately, performance.

Building on these differences between paternalistic and empowering leadership, we focus on distinct motivational needs and ways that individuals pursue goals – their regulatory focus (Higgins, 1997) – to investigate specific conditions under which both styles can be effective.

**Regulatory Focus Theory and Leader-Follower Fit**

According to regulatory focus theory (Higgins, 1997, 2000), individuals may differ in their motivational orientation. An orientation towards security needs, with the goal of avoiding undesired end-states by minimizing the possible risks or losses is a prevention focus, while an orientation towards nurturance needs, with the goal of approaching desired end states by maximizing the possible ideals or gains is a promotion focus (Higgins, 1997).

Prevention focused individuals tend to be more cautious in their behavior and motivated by a sense of obligation, preferring a more clinical and controlled approach. They have a short-term perspective, being more concerned with comparing alternatives before acting and appraising their performance in comparison to pre-existing standards (Higgins, Idson, Freitas, Spiegel, & Molden, 2003; Kruglanski et al., 2000). They avoid mistakes minimize negative outcomes (e.g., errors, rule violations; Higgins, 2000) and value feeling safe, protected and guided (Higgins et al., 2003). Prevention focus leads individuals to prefer stability over change (Liberman, Idson, Camacho, & Higgins, 1999).

Individuals with a promotion focus mindset tend to be more exploratory in their behavior and motivated by a sense of achievement (Kark & Van Dijk, 2007). They maximize positive outcomes, such as advancement and accomplishment, requiring
responsibility and autonomy to make decisions. Because they have a long-term temporal perspective, they deal naturally with novel events (Trope & Liberman, 2010). Promotion focused individuals are concerned for development and progress (Higgins, 1997), being ready to take risks (Hamstra, Bolderdijk, & Veldstra, 2011). Finally, promotion focus leads individuals to prefer change over stability (Liberman et al., 1999).

Based on the regulatory fit hypothesis (Higgins, 2000), when individuals’ have their regulatory motivational needs met, they feel ‘right’. This feeling “right” is an experience of correctness, or that what is being done is proper, which goes beyond just a pleasant feeling (Camacho, Higgins & Luger, 2003). Such feelings of rightness indicates that a situation supplied one’s needs, intensifying ones’ motivations and evaluation relating to other things such as targets and messages which elicited the fit to begin with (Hamstra, Van Yperen, Wisse, & Sassenberg, 2013). Then, individuals who experience such “feeling right” from greater regulatory fit, also derive greater “value from fit” (Higgins, 2000, 2002; Cesario, Grant, & Higgins, 2004; Hamstra, Van Yperen, Wisse, & Sassenberg, 2014), which can be transferred to other value experiences (Higgins et al., 2003). We expect that “value from fit” will lead to greater evaluations of who led followers to increase their own motivational needs (i.e., leaders), and greater psychological resources associated with the experience of fit (i.e. the needs-supply fulfillment). Finally, we propose that leader-follower fit will have an impact on behavioral responses, such as in-role and creative performance.

Specifically, we expect that prevention-focused followers will have a better fit with paternalistic leaders, whereas promotion focused followers will fit better with empowering leaders. From one side, by expressing sincere and holistic concern about followers’ personal welfare (both work and nonwork related) paternalistic leaders induce positive feelings in them. As a result, they develop higher levels of interpersonal trust and
provide overall support, making the environment more predictable, consistent, and nonthreatening. These behaviors supply prevention-focused needs for security and protection against unpredictability. Moreover, as part of paternalistic leaders’ image of strength and dominance, they often centralize and control the decision making process, assuming full responsibility for decisions and protecting subordinates from possible failures. All these paternalistic leadership behaviors meet prevention-focused followers’ needs for safety (Higgins, 2000) and makes them secure on not suffering possible social consequences that are threatening to their selves (Higgins et al., 2003).

From the other side, we expect that promotion-focused motivational needs will match empowering leadership behaviors. Empowering leaders promote encouragement and development of self-leadership on followers, increasing their responsibility on doing tasks. These behaviors make individuals find tasks more meaningful and impactful (Srivastava, Bartol & Locke, 2006), creating a sense of accountability to perform and make decisions without asking for formal and restrict guidelines. Followers with a promotion focus may respond positively to such direction, drive, and persistence, especially because of their ambitions, eager to advance, and a preference for changing situations (Kruglanski et al., 2000). Moreover, empowering leaders emphasize facilitation and support for autonomy, by delegating, sharing information and encouraging initiative (Manz & Sims, 2001; Amundsen & Martinsen, 2014). Together, these behaviors supply promotion-focused followers’ needs for achievement, progress, and their keeness to try out new things.

**Overview of current research**

The current research aimed to test our fit hypothesis, and its effects on followers’ behavioral and psychological outcomes. We did so across three experimental studies. In
our first study, we manipulated leadership styles using vignettes and primed followers’ regulatory focus, as to test the effect of leader-follower fit on who elicited the fit. We focused on the effects related to the leader – perception of leadership effectiveness – and related to leader-follower relationship – perception of LMX quality. In the second study, we manipulated leadership styles using video clips and primed followers’ regulatory focus (as in Study 1) to test the effect on psychological resources associated to followers’ experience and source of fit. Specifically, we investigated the effects on followers’ psychological safety and psychological empowerment. In the third study, we conducted a business simulation activity (e.g. Bono & Judge, 2003) to evaluate how leadership styles, interacting with followers’ regulatory focus, influence an actual behavioral outcome. We expected that in-role and creative performance (of a series of tasks) would be higher as a function of the fit between leaders’ paternalistic behavior and followers’ prevention focus, and as a function of the fit between leaders’ empowering behavior and followers’ promotion focus.

**Study 1**

Our purpose for Study 1 was to manipulate both leadership styles and individuals’ regulatory focus by priming either prevention or promotion state. We tested the hypothesized interaction using a scenario experiment, which allowed us to draw cause-effect conclusions. We specifically focused on testing whether individuals primed with prevention focus perceive paternalistic as more effective than empowering leadership and whereas individuals primed with promotion focus perceive empowering as more effective than paternalistic leadership. Besides perceived effectiveness, we tested the interaction effects on followers’ perceptions of LMX quality.
Due to the importance that followers draw from the “value from fit” (Cesario, Grant, & Higgins, 2004), we expect these outcomes to increase. Specifically, the experience of fit means that follower’s regulatory focus is congruent with leader’s style. Due to this similarity, followers come to perceive leaders as a valid source of leadership influence, evaluating them as valuable and good. In addition, when followers share values and beliefs with leaders, and behave consistently with them, they increase their commitment to the leader, become aware regarding the leader’s needs (Sluss & Ashforth 2007), and sensitive to the leader’s expectations regarding their behaviors (Wang & Rode 2010). In return, followers receive more recognition and praise from their leader. The outcome is a higher quality of social exchange relationship with the leader (e.g. Wang et al., 2005).

Method

Participants and procedure

One hundred and twenty one individuals from the United States were recruited through Amazon’s Mechanical Turk, to participate in a study about perception of leadership behaviors. The sample (64% males) varied from 19 to 73 years old, with an average of 33 years ($SD = 12.32$).

Participants were randomly assigned to a two (regulatory focus: prevention vs. promotion) by two (leadership style: Paternalistic vs. Empowering) mixed factorial, between-subjects design. We initially primed participants with promotion or prevention focus using a word search puzzle containing either promotion or prevention eliciting words. Participants were informed that the puzzle contained 4 words ranging from 4 to 10 letters, all positioned horizontally from left to right direction, and were asked to write in a text box the first three words they found in the puzzle. In the following page,
participants were asked to read a vignette with a description about a leader and to complete a questionnaire assuming they were subordinates of the leader they had read about. Participants were randomly provided with a vignette describing detailed characteristics and behaviors of either a paternalistic or an empowering leader. Given the scenarios, participants were then asked to answer items assessing the leader and themselves, as followers of that leader, regarding perception of leader effectiveness, and perception of LMX quality. Participants then answered to demographic questions and manipulation checks.

**Manipulation**

The regulatory focus manipulation consisted of word search puzzles of prevention or promotion eliciting words (Appendix A). The prevention puzzle had the words “failure”, “worry”, “fear”, and “barrier”, while the promotion puzzle contained the words “future”, “success”, “challenge”, and “autonomy”. Puzzles had twelve lines and twelve columns of letters, and words were positioned horizontally, from left to right direction. To minimize indirect effects, we positioned the prevention or promotion words similarly: the first letter of each word was placed in the same line and column in both puzzles.

The leadership manipulation consisted of vignettes. The scripts presented core characteristics and behaviors of either a paternalistic or an empowering leader. In the paternalistic condition, the leader is described as being authoritarian, benevolent and moral, as creating a familiar environment and expecting loyalty from subordinates, as establishing close relationships and involving in employees’ work and non-work lives. The description was developed in ways consistent with the aspects outlined by Aycan (2006) and Farh and Cheng (2004). The empowering condition followed Ahearne et al. (2005) framework, meaning that the leader was described in terms of making decisions.
together with his employees, empowering them in doing their tasks and believing that employees have the ability to perform at a high level.

**Measures**

*Perceived leadership effectiveness* was measured using 3 items adapted from van Knippenberg and van Knippenberg (2005). In a 7-point scale (“Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree”) participants answered to items such as: “My leader seems to be a good leader” and “My leader seems to be very effective”. We averaged the items to form a measure of participants’ perception of leader effectiveness ($\alpha = 0.89$).

*Perception of LMX quality* was measured using the 12-item LMX-MDM scale (Liden & Maslyn, 1998). This measure captures the affect, contribution, loyalty, and professional respect dimensions of LMX. We adapted the items as to measure a perception of LMX quality, for example: “I would not mind working my hardest for my leader”. Participants used a 7-point scale, and higher scores represented higher LMX ($\alpha = 0.89$).

*Control variables* used were age and gender, as prior research suggests it may potentially influence leadership processes and outcomes (Bass, 2008).

**Manipulation Check**

Manipulation check of the leadership style was conducted at the end of the questionnaire. Participants had to rate 3 items that reflected paternalistic and 3 items that reflected empowering leadership dimensions. The items were based on the Paternalistic Leadership Questionnaire (PLQ; Aycan et al., 2013) and on the Empowering Leadership Questionnaire (ELQ; Arnold et al., 2000). The items were slightly adapted to reference the specific immediate supervisor used in the scenario. Participants were asked to answer
to what extent they agreed that each statement described the leader from the scenario ranging from 1 = “Strongly Disagree” to 5 = “Strongly Agree”. Paternalistic leadership scale presented a reliability of $\alpha = 0.84$, and empowering leadership scale a Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.77$. In the paternalistic condition, leaders were perceived more paternalistic than empowering ($F_{(1,119)} = 39.67, p < 0.000; M_{PL} = 4.23, M_{EL} = 3.44$), and in the empowering condition, leaders were seen as more empowering than paternalistic ($F_{(1,119)} = 32.47, p < 0.000; M_{PL} = 3.73, M_{EL} = 4.37$).

To check the word search puzzle, we conducted a test with a separate sample of 60 participants who were randomly presented with either prevention or promotion puzzle. Participants were asked to write the first 3 words found in the puzzle. Subsequently, they answered Sassenberg et al.’s (2007) measure, which identify participants’ salient regulatory focus. They were presented with 4 strategy dyads: I’d take risks/ act cautious; I’d strive for security/ strive for success; I’d try something new/ follow rules; and I’d act thoroughly/ act superficially. Participants were asked to rate between 1 and 9, indicating to what extent that they would, at that moment, most certainly adopt one of the behavioral strategies. High scores indicated promotion-oriented strategies while lower scores indicated prevention-oriented strategies. Items 1, 3, and 4 were reversed coded. Independent-sample t tests showed significant differences ($t (60) = 2.39, p <0.05$) between prevention ($M = 4.96, SD = 1.03$) and promotion-primed groups ($M = 5.65, SD = 1.13$).

**Results**

To test our hypotheses, we computed a series of Two-Way ANOVAs to assess the interactive effects of leadership styles and follower’s regulatory focus on perceived leader effectiveness and LMX quality. Our results showed a significant interaction effect on
predicting leadership effectiveness \((F(1,115) = 14.2, p < 0.001; \eta^2_p = 0.11)\) and LMX quality \((F(1,115) = 9.71, p < 0.01; \eta^2_p = 0.08)\). Table 1 presents the means and standard deviations of these outcomes as a function of leadership style and follower regulatory focus.

**TABLE 2**

Means and Standard Deviations of Perceived Leadership Effectiveness and LMX quality as a Function of Leadership Style and Follower Regulatory Focus (Study 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulatory Focus</th>
<th>Perceived Leader Effectiveness</th>
<th>Perception of LMX Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empowering</td>
<td>Paternalistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Entries are means on 7-point scales, with higher values indicating higher scores.*

No main effects were found for leadership styles or followers’ regulatory focus. Simple effects tests showed that the effect of leadership style on perceived effectiveness was significant when followers were primed with prevention focus \((\beta = 0.36, p < 0.01)\), as well as when followers were primed with promotion focus \((\beta = -0.40, p < 0.05)\). Regarding LMX Quality, the effects of leadership styles were significant when followers were primed with prevention focus \((\beta = 0.25, p < 0.01)\), as well as when followers were primed with promotion focus \((\beta = -0.10, p = 0.08)\). Figure 1 shows these effects.

**Discussion**

This study provided support for the idea that the effects that paternalistic and empowering leaders have on followers may be contingent to followers’ differences on motivational needs. Results showed that leader-follower fit increases perceptions of leadership effectiveness and LMX quality.
Specifically, paternalistic leadership effects on followers were significantly higher when followers were prevention focused, rather than promotion focused. As for empowering leadership, promotion focused followers perceived empowering leaders more effective than paternalistic leaders, but the effects on LMX quality were marginally significant. That is, individuals with focus on promotion, rather than prevention, perceive empowering leaders as effective and have greater LMX Quality. To extend these preliminary findings, we conducted Study 2 to investigate the effects that leader-follower fit has on followers’ psychological resources.

**Study 2**

Our primary purpose for Study 2 was to replicate findings from Study 1 by investigating the leader-follower interaction effects on psychological safety and psychological empowerment – resources we believe are associated with the experience of fit with the leader. From one side, we argue that experiencing fit with the leader, followers have confidence to believe that they respond to leaders’ expectations. Thus,
they believe that acting themselves and letting their guard down is possible and, more importantly, appropriate (May, Gilson & Harter, 2004; Olivier & Rothmann, 2007). In other words, fit increases followers’ feelings of being able to employ one’s self without fear of negative consequences to status, career, or self-image (Kahn, 1990). Fit promotes a safe environment in which followers do not believe that they will receive negative reactions if they put themselves on the line (Edmondson, 1999, 2004). From the other side, fit makes leaders, through their greater understanding of subordinates, more effective in portraying the job as being meaningful. When followers perceive their job as worthwhile, useful, and valuable (Kahn, 1990), they increase their self-efficacy (the competence component of empowerment). Based on these arguments, we expect fit to increase followers’ psychological safety and psychological empowerment.

Method

Participants and procedure

One hundred and fifteen individuals from the United States were recruited through Amazon’s Mechanical Turk, to participate in a study about perception of leadership behaviors. The sample (69% males) varied from 19 to 61 years old, with an average of 33.7 years (SD=10.91).

We conducted a two (regulatory focus: prevention vs. promotion) by two (leadership style: paternalistic vs. empowering) mixed factorial, between-subjects design. Participants were randomly assigned to one of the four conditions. As in study 1, we primed participants with promotion or prevention focus using the same Word Search Puzzle. Then, participants had to watch an empowering or a paternalistic leader movie clip. We used movie clips because they improve experimental manipulation and are more realistic scenarios than vignettes, more fully engaging participants’ senses (see Aguinis
& Bradley, 2014). To minimize possible indirect effects, we chose characters performed by the same actor (Russell Crowe). The paternalistic movie clip presented General Maximus (Gladiator, 2000), whereas the empowering movie clip presented Robin Hood (Robin Hood, 2010). After watching the movie clips, participants answered items that assessed psychological safety and psychological empowerment. Finally, they informed their age and gender, and answered to manipulation checks.

**Manipulation**

The leadership manipulation consisted of movie clips (Appendix B) The paternalistic movie clip presented scenes where General Maximus exhibited attitudes and behaviors (verbal and non-verbal) that characterized a paternalistic leader. First, by being authoritarian towards his soldiers (“At my sign, unleash hell!”) and establishing hierarchy, which is responded by subordinates’ deference and respect (soldiers standing up when the General passes, making reverence at the command to fight, being called by “general” and “sir”). Then, by showing closeness, protection and concern for soldiers’ work and non work lives (“Cicero, my old man”, “How long have the men been in Ostia?”, “How do they look?”) which is responded by subordinates’ loyalty (“For you, they can fight tomorrow”, “We’ll wait here for you, Maximus”). Finally, by being a moral role model to subordinates (“Strength and Honor”). The empowering movie clip contained scenes where Robin Hood exhibited such style. First, by making a speech among the village soldiers, suggesting that in order to build a strong community and to achieve desirable outcomes, it is necessary to give power to people (“Empower every man, and you will gain strength”) and to discourage authoritarianism (“In tyranny, lies only failure”). Then, by delegating responsibility for his comrades, giving directions to archers and encouraging them before a battle (“Will and Allan, you may get on the
rooftops and pick up your targets” or “Archers, you go to the clifftop, we wait for you there”).

**Measures**

*Psychological safety* was measured with 6 items from Edmondson’s (1999) Team Psychological Safety Scale, adapted to reflect a shared belief that the individual is safe for taking risks on working with the leader. The items are meant to suggest a sense of confidence that the leader will not embarrass, reject, or punish someone for speaking up, based on mutual respect and trust among leader and follower (Kahn, 1990). For example, “I feel safe on asking my leader for help”. Specifically, the decision was made on a 7-point scale varying from 1=“Strongly Disagree” and to 7= “Strongly Agree” (α =0.71).

*Psychological Empowerment* was measured using 4 items of Spreitzer (1995) empowerment scale. Each item represented one of the four dimensions of psychological empowerment: meaning, confidence, self-determination, and impact. The items were “My job activities would be personally meaningful to me” (meaning); “I would feel confident about my ability to do my job” (confidence); “I would have a great deal of control over what happens at work” (self-determination); and “I would have significant autonomy in determining how to do my job” (impact). Participants also answered on a 7-point scale (“Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree”) (α = 0.81).

*Control variables* used were age and gender.

**Manipulation Check**

In a separate sample, we conducted a manipulation check of the leadership movie clips. Forty-two undergraduate students (51% women) participated for credit in an introductory management course. Participants watched each movie clip and indicated to
what extent they agreed that items described each leader. Paternalistic leadership items were: “Maintains authority and hierarchy, expecting respect from his followers”, “Establishes a fatherly relationship of proximity and nurturance with his followers”, and “expects loyalty and deference from his followers”. Empowering leadership items were: “Encourages his followers to make decisions and act by themselves”, “Delegates responsibilities and empower his followers to perform”, and “Feels responsible for his followers’ well-being and their development”. Paired samples T-test showed that, in the paternalistic scenario, the leader was perceived more paternalistic than empowering ($t(41) = 4.567, p < 0.000; M_{PL} = 4.09, M_{EL} = 3.54$). In the empowering scenario, the leader was perceived as more empowering than paternalistic ($t(41) = 2.171, p < 0.05; M_{PL} = 3.23, M_{EL} = 3.57$).

Results

We conducted a series of Two Way ANOVAs to assess the effects of the interaction between leadership style and regulatory focus on psychological safety and psychological empowerment. As expected, the interaction effect on both psychological safety ($F(1,109) = 4.39, p < 0.05; \eta^2_p = 0.04$) and psychological empowerment ($F(1,109) = 4.70, p < 0.05; \eta^2_p = 0.04$) were significant. Table 2 presents the means and standard deviations of the interaction effect on these outcomes.

TABLE 2
Means and Standard Deviations of Psychological Safety and Psychological Empowerment as a Function of Leadership Style and Follower Regulatory Focus (Study 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulatory Focus</th>
<th>Psychological Safety</th>
<th>Psychological Empowerment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paternalistic</td>
<td>Empowering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Entries are means on 7-point scales, with higher values indicating higher scores.*
No main effects of the leadership style or regulatory focus were significant for psychological safety or empowerment. Simple effects tests showed that the effect of leadership on psychological safety was significant when followers were primed with promotion focus ($\beta = -0.27, p < 0.05$), but not when primed with prevention focus ($\beta = 0.06, p = n.s.$). Similar results were found for psychological empowerment. Followers’ primed with a promotion focus of regulation reported greater psychological empowerment with empowering leaders ($\beta = -0.33, p < 0.05$), but when followers were prevention-focused, the effects of leadership were not significant ($\beta = 0.08, p = n.s.$). Although we found no significant differences between the effects of leadership styles on prevention focused followers, the direction of these effects and the patterns of the interactions were consistent with our predictions. Figure 2 shows these effects.

**Discussion**

Although our results did not show that fit between prevention-focused followers and paternalistic leadership had increased psychological outcomes significantly, Study 2 provided support for the idea that the effects that leaders have on followers may be contingent to followers’ differences on motivational needs.

**FIGURE 2**
Interaction between leadership style and follower regulatory focus on psychological safety and psychological empowerment (Study 2).
Together, results from Study 1 and Study 2 suggests that fit between leadership style and regulatory focus may increase followers’ outcomes. Nevertheless, to test if these interactions have effects on actual behaviors, we conducted a business simulation (Study 3). Our purpose was to investigate if leadership styles, fitting with followers’ regulatory focus, yielded positive effects on performance.

**Study 3**

Our purpose for Study 3 was to extend findings from Study 1 and 2 by examining actual behavioral effects of leader-follower fit. To do so, we conducted a business simulation to assess these interaction effects on in-role and creative performance. We manipulated leadership styles using a trained actor and, instead of activating, we measured followers’ regulatory focus.

**Method**

*Participants and procedure*

One hundred and eighteen undergraduate and graduate students from a private university were recruited to participate as voluntaries in a behavioral lab experiment. Participants (55% males) varied from 18 to 39 years old, with an average age of 21.2 years ($SD = 3.33$). They received complementary credit toward their course for taking part in a 1-hour study, a snack voucher, and the opportunity to earn up to $15 for their participation.

Prior to the experimental sessions, volunteers were recruited via flyers, emails and social media. They were asked to subscribe their names online, indicating which session they wanted to participate. Experimenters confirm day/time of scheduled sessions through email. The recruitment process took about 15 days. We conducted seventeen
sessions of approximately one hour long, with an average of 7 participants per session. As all scheduled participants entered the room, the experimenter informed that the study took approximately one hour and was computer based. Then, the experimenter presented the purpose of the study and what participants were expected to do.

The experimenter informed the study was developed by the sales director of a construction company ("MKS") with the purpose to test an activity that would be used in the future as a training tool for trainees and consultants on how to conduct investment decisions. They were informed that the sales director was ahead of the activity and was going to evaluate their efforts. Thus, they were going to watch a video clip where he presented the company, himself, and the proposed activity.

The simulation began with commitment terms of ethics in research. Participant’s agreement was considered once they moved to the next screen. Then, they were asked to rate items related to their regulatory focus. The next screen contained the leadership video clip. The video presented the leadership experimental treatment (detailed below). Conditions were randomly and evenly assigned to participants.

After watching the video clip, they began the proposed activity (detailed below). Activity tasks were based on a decision making exercise from Sobral and Peci (2013), named “The Illusion of Rationality”. This exercise is based on the principles of bounded rationality (e.g. Simon, 1960), such that there were no right or wrong answers. In the first task, participants had 5 minutes to read an investment scenario and evaluate a comparative table containing information about five possibilities of lands that MKS could invest to construct residential buildings. They were asked to indicate which of the five options they would recommend for the sales director to invest. In the subsequent screen, participants were asked to write a brief report justifying their decision to the sales director. Although brief, they were asked to provide convincing arguments to justify their recommendation.
They were given 10 minutes to complete this task. In the third and final task, participants were asked to create slogans related to the land they decided to recommend. They were informed that the director expected them to create from three to seven different slogans. They had 8 minutes to present their ideas. Once finished these tasks, participants had to answer items related to director’s behavior, as a manipulation check for the leadership treatment, and demographic information. Once finished, they were asked to sign a commitment term declaring they were aware of research ethical guidelines. Finally, they were thanked and debriefed.

**Leadership treatment**

As in past laboratory experiments on leadership styles (e.g. Bono & Judge, 2003; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996), a trained actor was hired to represent both leader conditions. Even though videos might seem impersonal, leadership treatment was entirely consistent across participants. We developed two leadership scripts—paternalistic and empowering—based on the vignettes used in Study 1 and on key content elements of both styles. The scripts differed on verbal and non verbal communication according to both styles, but all factual information about the company and instructions to activity were the same. Specifically, the movie clips consisted of three scenes, where the leader: a) described MKS and its business; b) presented himself and the way he conducts his team and activities; and c) interacted with an employee to invite participants to enroll in the following task. The leader repeated key phrases and used real examples to illustrate his style.

Prior to recording the videos, the actor was made aware of these key elements and asked to act accordingly (e.g. express authority as well as support when paternalistic). Whenever possible, to use voice inflection and facial expressions that displayed cues of
both styles. The actor was blind of our hypotheses. Finally, to control for any context effects, the actor wore the same clothing in the same physical setting. Both video clips had similar length (around 3 minutes each). We equalized audio and video settings to minimize possible differences in sound or image. Video links are in Appendix B.

**Experimental tasks**

Tasks were based on “The Illusion of Rationality” (Sobral & Peci, 2013), a decision making exercise on land investment for residential construction. In the introduction of the activity, participants were asked to imagine themselves as responsible for recommending a land for MKS to invest. They were presented with a comparative table containing information about each of the five lands. The dimensions were price of the square meter, total area available, number of habitants per square kilometer, shopping/trade and entertainment quality of the neighborhood, distance from downtown, traffic quality, and recent residential building launches. Participants were informed that the last recommendation for investment that the sales director had put forward had failed, and that he held high expectations about participants’ decision. However, they only had few minutes to evaluate the possibilities before recommending. They were given 5 minutes to read, evaluate the comparative table and indicate their decision. This task had no right answer, being just the scenario to complete the following tasks that measured in-role and creative performance. After choosing one of the lands, participants had to prepare a report to justify their decision. The comparative table was available for them to improve their arguments. There were no instructions regarding the number of arguments needed in the report, but it was stressed that the report had to convince the sales director that the decision made was the best. They had 10 minutes to do the report task. The third task aimed to evaluate participants’ creative performance. They were asked to create slogans
to advertise new residential buildings in the land they recommended. They were informed that the director expected from three to seven slogans, and they had 8 minutes to do so.

**Measures**

*Followers’ regulatory focus* was measured using 10 items of the Regulatory Focus Scale (RFS; Fellner, Holler, Kirchler & Schabmann, 2007). The items used forms of words that were as value-neutral as possible, placing value on referencing to the present day, in contrast to the RFQ (Higgins et al., 2001). Participants answered the items using a 7-point scale ranging from 1 = “strongly disagree” to 7 = “strongly agree”. An example of a prevention item is “Rules and regulations are helpful and necessary for me” ($\alpha = 0.64$). An example of promotion item is “I like to do things in a new way” ($\alpha = 0.70$). We subtracted the promotion from the prevention score to determine participants’ predominant regulatory focus. Values greater than zero indicated predominance of a promotion focus and values below zero indicated predominance of a prevention focus.

*In-role performance* was measured in the report activity, considering the number (quantity) and accuracy (quality) of arguments used to justify the decision made. Specifically, the report was used as a way to justify a decision in a scenario with no right or wrong answers. Thus, we suggest participants were especially likely to develop a complete and accurate report, to reassure their recommendation to the leader, as a function of how they fitted his style or how they were motivated to accomplishing tasks. The reports were evaluated by two coders blind to conditions, using the comparative table as basis. They independently identified how many arguments each participant used and verified its convergence to the recommended land. The coders agreed on their evaluation on 92% of the cases. In the 8% of cases where there was not initial agreement, they revised their codings and reached a final agreement. In this way, we had 100% of agreement on
the number of arguments presented. The final score was obtained by dividing the number of accurate arguments by the total number of arguments (e.g. Visser et al, 2013).

Creative performance was measured by means of fluency, flexibility, originality and experts’ assessment of creativity, indicators of creative performance behaviors on idea generation (Guilford, 1967; Sternberg & Lubart, 1999; Amabile, 1983). Fluency was the number of slogans created. Flexibility was assessed via the number of distinct semantic categories a person accessed. An independent rater coded each slogan assigning to it as many semantic categories as assessed. The coding process generated a list of thirty-four semantic categories, assigned to each slogan created by participants. Based on the categories created by the first rater, a second independent rater coded participants’ slogans. The coders agreed on 78% of the ratings. They revised the 22% of slogans and reached a final agreement. The two coders were blind to experimental conditions. We considered the sum of the number of semantic categories used in each slogan a participant created. For example, if a participant created three slogans, each assessing a different semantic category, flexibility was rated 3; or if a participant created five slogans but all of them assessed a single semantic category, flexibility was rated 1. Originality was based on the average infrequencies of use of semantic categories, so that higher score reflected greater originality. We calculated participants’ originality score by summing the infrequency of each semantic category used divided by the number of slogans created. Experts’ assessment of creativity was measured via judgments from experts using the consensual assessment technique (CAT; Amabile, 1983). We used judges who were familiar with the domain of the proposed activity because they can rely on their implicit definitions of novelty and usefulness (Amabile, 1996). Two independent judges, blind to experimental conditions, rated participants’ slogans. Judges were instructed to familiarize themselves with the slogans before rating them. They rated the slogans based on their
level of overall creativity (defined as novelty and usefulness) using a 5-point scale ranging from 1 = “not creative at all” to 5 = “extremely creative”. The raters were asked to consider the fact that the slogans were created by students with different backgrounds, to ensure that the evaluation of creativity considered participants’ experience (Amabile, 1996).

*Control variables* were age and gender.

**Manipulation check**

Manipulation check of the leadership style was conducted at the end of the study. Participants indicated which leadership summary best described the sales director. Summaries were adapted from the vignettes used in Study 1. Chi-square test of independence showed significant differences ($\chi^2(1) = 53.21$, $N = 114$, $p < 0.001$), confirming manipulation efficacy and that respondents correctly perceived director’s leadership style.

**Results**

We conducted moderated multiple regression analysis to test whether fit between leadership style and follower’s regulatory focus led to performance. We coded paternalistic leadership as (1) and empowering as (-1) and mean centered variables for products. Results showed there was a significant interaction effect on followers’ in-role performance ($\beta = -0.48$, $p < 0.001$). Regarding creative performance, we found significant interaction effects on flexibility ($\beta = -0.38$, $p < 0.05$), on originality ($\beta = -0.17$, $p < 0.001$) and overall creativity ($\beta = -0.19$, $p < 0.01$). Regarding fluency, results showed no significance of the interaction effect ($\beta = 0.07$, $p = n.s.$), but a significant main effect of followers’ regulatory focus ($\beta = 0.26$, $p = n.s.$). Table 3 presents the regression results.
We derived simple slopes from the interactions, to test the relationship between leadership styles and followers’ outcomes, from 1 SD above and below followers’ regulatory focus – which indicated followers’ predominance on promotion (+1SD) or prevention (-1SD). We found significant effects of paternalistic leadership on in-role performance for followers with predominance of prevention focus (β = 0.53, p < 0.01), as well as empowering leadership effects for followers with predominance of promotion focus (β = -0.43, p < 0.05).

**TABLE 3**

Interaction effects of leadership style and followers’ regulatory focus on followers’ outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control variables</th>
<th>In-role Performance</th>
<th>Fluency</th>
<th>Flexibility</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Overall creativity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.26*</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.24*</td>
<td>-0.28*</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.22***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Main Effects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Style (LS)</th>
<th>Fluency</th>
<th>Flexibility</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Overall creativity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Followers’ regulatory focus (RF)</th>
<th>Fluency</th>
<th>Flexibility</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Overall creativity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.26*</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LS x RF</th>
<th>Fluency</th>
<th>Flexibility</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Overall creativity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-0.48***</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.38*</td>
<td>-0.17***</td>
<td>-0.19**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R² (ΔR²)</th>
<th>LL (0.09)</th>
<th>UL (0.00)</th>
<th>LL (0.05)</th>
<th>UL (0.10)</th>
<th>LL (0.07)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.01*</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>2.30*</td>
<td>3.46**</td>
<td>5.09**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bootstrap results of moderation effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect (95%)</th>
<th>Effect (95%)</th>
<th>Effect (95%)</th>
<th>Effect (95%)</th>
<th>Effect (95%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LL; UL</td>
<td>LL; UL</td>
<td>LL; UL</td>
<td>LL; UL</td>
<td>LL; UL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RF M – 1 SD</th>
<th>LL; UL</th>
<th>LL; UL</th>
<th>LL; UL</th>
<th>LL; UL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.53**</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.14; 0.92)</td>
<td>(-0.46; 0.27)</td>
<td>(-0.12; 0.68)</td>
<td>(0.06; 0.32)</td>
<td>(0.02; 0.36)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RF M + 1 SD</th>
<th>LL; UL</th>
<th>LL; UL</th>
<th>LL; UL</th>
<th>LL; UL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-0.43*</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.48*</td>
<td>-0.16*</td>
<td>-0.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-0.83; -0.02)</td>
<td>(-0.29; 0.47)</td>
<td>(-0.90; -0.06)</td>
<td>(-0.30; -0.02)</td>
<td>(-0.37; -0.02)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=118; *p < .10, *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001; 5,000 bootstrap samples, 95 % CI confidence interval, LL = lower limit confidence interval; UL = upper limit confidence interval

Similar results were found for originality and overall creativity, such that paternalistic leaders had greater effects on prevention rather than promotion (originality: β = 0.19, p < 0.01; overall creativity: β = 0.19, p < 0.05), and empowering leaders had
greater effects on promotion, rather than prevention (originality: $\beta = -0.16$, $p < 0.05$; overall creativity: $\beta = -0.22$, $p < 0.05$). Regarding flexibility, empowering leaders had a significantly greater effect on promotion-focused followers, rather than prevention ($\beta = -0.48$, $p < 0.05$). However, no significant differences were found for the effects on paternalistic leaders ($\beta = 0.29$, $p = n.s.$). Together, these results suggest that the effects of leadership on followers’ outcomes are contingent to the fit between leader’s style and follower’s regulatory focus. Figure 3 shows simple slopes of interaction on followers’ in-role performance, flexibility, originality and overall creativity.

**FIGURE 3**
Interaction effects of leadership style and followers’ regulatory focus on study outcomes
Discussion

Overall, our results expand previous findings of Study 1 and 2, showing that followers’ regulatory focus moderated the effects that leadership had on levels of performance, both related to in-role and creativity. These findings are important because it supports the proposition that leader-follower fit promotes greater performance, and not only attitudes or psychological resources. Results showed that fit between paternalistic leadership and prevention-focused followers, as well as fit between empowering leadership and promotion-focused followers, had a significant effect on in-role and creative performance – originality and overall creativity. Followers’ creative flexibility was significantly higher only when there was fit between empowering leaders and promotion focused followers. Finally, leader-follower fit did not influence creative fluency; rather, there was a main effect of followers’ regulatory focus (marginally significant). Results showed that followers with predominance of promotion focus of regulation, under any leadership style, had greater fluency – created more slogans. With exception of this effect on fluency, we did not find any other main effects of leadership styles or regulatory focus on performance outcomes. We discuss our findings below.

General Discussion

The purpose of the present research was to address the effects of fit between leadership styles and followers’ regulatory focus on followers’ attitudinal, psychological and behavioral outcomes. Based on person-supervisor fit theory (Kristof, 1996) and on regulatory fit theory (Higgins, 2000) we explained the different effects that paternalistic and empowering leaders have on followers. Across three studies, including a business simulation, we found support for our interaction hypothesis, showing that leaders’ influence is contingent to followers’ focus of regulation. We hypothesized that the
relationship between paternalistic leadership and followers’ outcomes would significantly increase when followers were prevention focused, and the relationship between empowering leadership and followers’ outcomes would significantly increase when followers were promotion focused. Our results confirmed the predicted interactions, providing evidence that leader-follower fit yields greater outcomes for followers. Specifically, we found that fit increased followers’ perception of leader effectiveness and perception of LMX quality (outcomes related to who elicited the fit), followers’ psychological safety and empowerment (outcomes related to the experience of fit) and finally, followers’ in role and creative performance.

Although fit effects were significant for most outcomes investigated, results suggested that fit increases followers’ psychological outcomes only between empowering leaders and promotion focused followers. These results are not surprising if we consider previous research on the effects of empowering leaders and promotion focus of regulation on outcomes such as empowerment and safety (e.g. Zhang & Bartol, 2010; Baer & Frese, 2003). At the same time empowerment is central to differentiate empowering leaders from other leadership styles that also promote participation and autonomy (e.g. shared leadership) (Amundsen & Martinsen, 2014), promotion focused individuals are driven by needs of doing things without formal rules or regulations (Higgins, 1997). This congruence between empowering leadership and promotion focus have direct effects on followers’ psychological empowerment.

Differently, paternalistic leaders do not incorporate the concepts of delegation and autonomy, since decision making is typically centralized (Farh & Cheng, 2000; Chen et al., 2013). Even though paternalistic leaders may stimulate followers to have autonomy through their supportive behavior, it may not yield effects on followers who are prevention-focused avoid making decisions as a way to protect themselves from failure
(Higgins, 1997). Thus, effects on empowerment could be unrelated to paternalistic-prevention fit.

Though we had proposed that fit between paternalistic leaders and prevention-focused followers would increase psychological safety, it is possible that authoritarian and controlling behaviors of the leader overcome the positive effects that protection could have on promoting feelings that it is safe to take risks (e.g. Chen et al., 2013). Moreover, taking risks is something that individuals focused on prevention would avoid. Then, we could expect fit not to increase followers’ psychological safety.

Regarding creative performance results, it is possible that the absence of fit effects (fluency) could be due to task instructions. We may have restricted participants’ creativity by informing them that the leader expected from 3 to 7 slogans and by setting time for them to complete the task (e.g. Baer & Oldham, 2006; Herman & Reiter-Palmer, 2011). Thus, higher fluency could result from individual differences. The main effect of promotion focus followers suggests that individuals who created more slogans were those who followed a more “risky”, explorative processing style (Friedman & Forster, 2001).

Finally, besides significant interaction effects that we found, it is important to highlight the absence of significant main effects of leadership styles. This result adds to our propositions that leadership effectiveness and effects on followers may be contingent to the fit leaders have with their followers.

**Limitations and suggestions for future research**

Although our findings call attention to the interplay between regulatory focus theory and leadership, other individual and contextual differences may predispose followers to favor specific leadership styles. For example, self-determination theory suggests that people may differ in their tendency toward self-determined behavior (Deci
& Ryan, 1985). Thus, dimensions such as autonomy vs. control could also play a role in explaining fit between leaders and followers. Moreover, explore contextual differences on the organization (e.g. organizational culture) could be another contingency to explain leaders’ effectiveness. Future research could investigate the effects of these variables.

Our results showed that fit affected both psychological safety and empowerment, as well as performance (for promotion-focused followers). Previous research shows that these psychological variables can mediate the effects that leaders have on followers’ outcomes, especially job performance (e.g. Zhang & Bartol, 2010). Thus, we suggest that future research could investigate if these mechanisms explain the effects of empowering-promotion fit on performance in a moderated mediation model. Moreover, since fit between prevention followers and paternalistic leaders had no effects on these psychological mechanisms, and benevolence strongly promotes subordinates’ identification with the leader (Farh et al., 2008), exploring the mediating effect of this variable could provide insights to explain the connective link between fit and performance.

Conclusions

The present study explored followers’ regulatory focus as an important factor to understand the effects that paternalistic and empowering leaders have. We found that individuals with a stronger focus of prevention responded more favorably to paternalistic leaders, and individuals with a stronger focus of promotion responded more favorably to empowering leaders. Specifically, fit determined leadership effectiveness, such that their effects on followers depended on leader-follower fit. Most importantly, our research demonstrates that empowering, and paternalistic leadership effectiveness, can be contingent to individual conditions, going beyond traditional assumptions of cultural
boundaries for paternalistic leadership, as well as universal endorsement of empowering leadership attributes.
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Appendix A – Regulatory Focus Manipulation
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Appendix B – Leadership Manipulation

Study 1 – Vignettes

Empowering Leadership

The following description is about Mr. Peter Martin, an executive director of AMK Home & Entertainment.

Peter Martin is the executive director of AMK Home & Entertainment sales department. This factory produces Electronics (audio and video) and home appliances (such as coffee machines, mixers, blenders). Today, Mr. Martin is in charge of eight subordinates who work directly with him. Peter helps subordinates understand the importance of their work to the overall effectiveness of the company. It is very important for Peter to make decisions together with his employees. He believes that his subordinates can handle demanding tasks, having the ability to perform at a high level and to improve when they make mistakes. However, Peter does not provide clear directions to his subordinates. Peter allows his subordinates to do their job their way. He makes it more
efficient for them to do their job by keeping the rules and regulations simple. Therefore, Peter allows his employees to make important decisions quickly to satisfy customer needs.

Paternalistic Leadership

The following description is about Mr. Peter Martin, an executive director of AMK Home & Entertainment.

Peter Martin is the executive director of AMK Home & Entertainment sales department. This factory produces Electronics (audio and video) and home appliances (such as coffee machines, mixers, blenders). Today, Mr. Martin is in charge of eight subordinates who work directly with him. Peter behaves like a family member towards his employees. It is very important for Peter to create a family environment at work. He always asks his subordinates their opinion and suggestions when making decisions. However, Peter establishes his authority and hierarchical status as the leader, having the final word in all decision making processes. Peter frequently gives fatherly advice to his subordinates, feeling responsible from them as if they were his own children. He is ready to help employees with their non-work problems, whenever they need. Peter also attends to special events of employees, such as weddings and graduation of children. Whenever an employee has problems in his/her private life, Peter is prepared to act as a mediator. In exchange of his care and nurturance, he expects deference and loyalty, placing more importance to that loyalty than performance in evaluating employees. Peter truly believes that he knows what is best for his employees.
Study 2 - Movie clip links

http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLDmRD7LkAoFd3zsT_gvsm9X760yIRdDyv

Study 3 – Movie Clip links

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ouQu_CKXnNY&list=PLDmRD7LkAoFf4oRiDN67L4uxXW2O-PVIB
The Role of Organizational Culture on Determining Fit between Paternalistic Leadership, Organizations and Followers

Abstract
Paternalistic leadership (PL) literature has traditionally considered its effectiveness to be culture-bounded. However, the role of organizational culture orientations on paternalistic leadership effectiveness has often been neglected. Both organizational culture and leadership are deeply integrated within an organization, influencing individuals’ expectations, values and goals. As such, the effects of their interplay can further contribute to explain PL effects, beyond national cultures’ boundaries. In the present study, we investigated the influence of organizational culture orientations on leadership effectiveness, comparing paternalistic with transformational leadership. Across two experimental studies and a dyadic leader-follower survey with professionals of different industries, we tested our predictions of organizational culture as a contextual contingency to PL effects on followers’ attitudes and performance. Our results showed that the interplay between leadership styles and organizational culture may explain significant differences on followers’ motivation, satisfaction and performance. Specifically, our findings suggest that leadership yields greatest outcomes for followers when there is fit between leadership and organizational culture.

Keywords: Paternalistic Leadership; Transformational Leadership; Organizational Culture; Person-Organization Fit; Implicit Leadership Theory

Paternalistic leadership (PL) is a recent construct in leadership theory, which still needs theoretical and empirical refinements (Pelegrini & Scandura, 2008; Aycan et al., 2013). Considered to be culture-bounded, paternalistic leadership is a style that combines authority, benevolence and morality in a familiar and supportive work environment (Fahr
Paternalistic leadership was first investigated in Chinese organizations (e.g. Farh & Cheng, 2000; Cheng, Chou, Wu, Huang & Farh, 2004; Farh et al., 2008), being mostly explored under the lens of eastern societies (e.g. Aycan et al., 2000). Yet, beyond collectivistic and high power distance cultures of the ‘East’, paternalistic leadership has long faced several criticisms of the western literature (e.g. Northouse, 1990; Uhl Bien & Maslyn, 2005; Colella, Garcia, Reidel, & Triana, 2005).

Despite negative views from the ‘West’, paternalistic leadership has been shown to yield positive outcomes regarding followers’ attitudes and behaviors in diverse cultures around the world (e.g. Pellegrini & Scandura, 2006; Martinez, 2003, 2005). Most of these studies, however, have to some extent considered the role of national culture to explain the expression of paternalistic leadership behaviors (Pellegrini & Scandura, 2008). Very few studies have delved into other contextual conditions that may clarify paternalistic leadership effectiveness.

The role of context in leadership has been explored since mid-1960s, when situational models of leadership proposed different answers to the question of when and how leadership is effective (e.g. Fiedler, 1967; House, 1971). These models have demonstrated that leaders’ effectiveness is contingent to specific conditions, which can be related, for example, to the dyadic relationship between leaders and subordinates or the interplay between leaders and the organizational context itself. Considering the key role that organizational culture plays on influencing employees’ lives (Schein, 2004; Yu, 2014), we argue that organizational culture, beyond national culture, can help to better understand the expression and effects of paternalistic leadership.

Drawing on person-organization fit theory (P-O fit; Caplan, 1987; Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005; Oh et al., 2014) and theories of implicit leadership (Lord, 1985; Lord, De Vader, & Alliger, 1986; Lord, Brown, Harvey, & Hall, 2001; Dihn &
Lord, 2012), we explore the interplay between organizational culture and leadership styles on influencing attitudes and behaviors of followers. Person-Organization fit theory addresses the compatibility between people and entire organizations, such that individuals will be most successful in organizations that match their individual needs (Tom, 1971; Witt & Nye, 1992). In other words, P-O fit suggests that when leaders have congruent values with the organization and can express their social identity, they experience fit, leading them to perform significantly better (Yu, 2014; O’Reilly, Chatman & Caldwell, 1991). As a result, leadership styles become inextricably rooted in contexts (Antonakis, Avolio & Sivasubramaniam, 2003), such that leaders’ effectiveness can be continuously shaped by values and norms shared within the organization (Schein, 1990).

In addition to that, context is argued to constrain what behaviors are considered prototypical, such that organizational cultures create experience with, and preferences for, certain types of behavior (Lord, Brown, Harvey, & Hall, 2001; Lord, Foti, & De Vader, 1984). The similarity of leadership schemas that both individuals and organization have, within an organizational culture, makes leadership prototypes, as well as successful leadership, adjusted to cultural orientations (e.g., Lord et al., 2001). Moreover, in cultures that are not similar, different leader behaviors are required to match the prototypical expectations of followers (Lord et al., 1984). That is, cultural orientations could alter followers’ prototypical expectations of leadership (Antonakis et al., 2003; Lord et al., 2001). Considering that organizational culture can influence leadership effectiveness and followers’ prototypical schemas of leadership, it may also change the effects that a particular leadership style has on leader outcomes (e.g. Antonakis et al., 2003; Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996). Based on these arguments, we suggest that organizational culture can represent a boundary condition under which a leadership style is effective.
Specifically, we compare Paternalistic leadership and Transformational leadership (TL) effectiveness under different organizational cultures, since the two styles share key divergences (Aycan et al., 2013). Paternalistic leaders, at the same time they centralize decision and use authority to control the environment, they are also benevolent, protecting followers in all domains of their lives through support and care. Differently, transformational leaders are proactive and help followers achieve extraordinary goals, communicating organizational vision and challenging followers to think creatively. They pay attention to the professional needs of followers, allowing them to develop and self-actualize. Moreover, while PL effectiveness is considered by some to be culture-specific (Aycan, 2000; Aycan et al., 2013), TL is argued to be the ‘ideal’ leadership model, transcending organizational and national boundaries (Bass, 2007) with attributes considered universally endorsed (Den Hartog et al., 1999; Dorfman at al., 2012). Apart from the common grounds that PL and TL may have (e.g. Aycan et al., 2013), we suggest that their interaction with specific organizational cultures have different effects on followers’ attitudes and behaviors.

By examining more closely how cultural orientations play a role in two distinct, but to some extent overlapping types of leaders, we believe to contribute to the broader leadership, but especially, to paternalistic leadership literature. First, because it identifies an important condition that specifies when paternalistic leadership is likely to be effective, beyond national culture contingencies, even in western cultures. Second, by showing a boundary condition that questions transformational leaders’ effectiveness, our findings may challenge the generalizability of TL attributes and its cultural endorsement across societies. Additionally, because we provide evidences to suggest that fit between leaders and organizations may determine the fit between leaders and followers, affecting followers’ attitudinal and behavioral outcomes (e.g., Astakhova, 2016).
**Paternalistic and Transformational Leadership**

During the last two decades, paternalistic leadership has increased its relevance in the leadership literature. This stream of research started in the 1990s when studies analyzing the Chinese and Asiatic eastern context found that effective leaders were those whose paternal authority and benevolent behavior coexisted (Sinha, 1990; Westwood, 1997). As these findings revealed significant differences from the western description of effective leaders – exclusively oriented toward professional environment and empowering employees (Cheng et al., 2004; Pellegrini & Scandura, 2008) –, several subsequent studies were conducted to investigate PL construct and effectiveness (Cheng et al., 2004; Farh & Cheng, 2000). Results confirmed the prevalence and effectiveness of an authoritarian and benevolent paternal figure of the leader and its positive impact on followers’ trust, job satisfaction commitment and extra-role effort (Chen et al., 2011; Pellegrini, Scandura & Jayaraman, 2010; Wu et al., 2011). However, since PL effects were still seen as paradoxical and not generalizable across cultures, it was suggested PL to be culture-bound (Aycan, 2000, 2006).

The main argument of the bounded hypothesis is that PL is majorly found in high power distance and collectivistic societies (Aycan, 2006; Pellegrini & Scandura, 2008; Dorfman et al., 2012). Societies with high power distance orientation endorse leaders who “combine strong discipline and authority with fatherly benevolence and moral integrity” (Farh & Cheng, 2000), expecting subordinates to be loyal, recognize status and have respect and deference for hierarchy (Aycan, 2006, Pellegrini & Scandura, 2006). In collectivistic societies, where personal relationships are valued, individuals develop their lives around groups, shaping their identity, as well as providing them protection in return for loyalty (Aycan, 2006; Cheng et al., 2004).
Differently, in individualistic and low power distance societies, paternalistic leaders are rarely accepted, because they often go against the proactive orientation of employees. Paternalistic leaders have been portrayed as “benevolent dictatorship” (Northouse, 1997), and their controlling behaviors coupled with the involvement in employees’ personal lives raised issues of invasions of privacy and even forms of discrimination (Aycan, 2006; Collela & Garcia, 2004).

Despite criticisms of the western literature, as well as cultural contingencies suggested by previous research, recent studies have found positive effects of PL on outcomes such as commitment and job satisfaction, even in low power distance and individualistic societies (e.g., Pellegrini, Scandura & Jayaraman, 2010). These findings suggest that other factors can explain why some characteristics of paternalism are valued in a leader, independent of the power distance and individualism of a particular national culture. For example, leadership behaviors such as protection and security of followers, and the ability to make followers feel included and have a sense of belonging to a group, considered to improve leader-follower relationships (Messick, 2005), are highly related to the idea of paternalistic leadership (Lee, Scandura & Sharif, 2014; Tang & Naumann, 2015).

Different from paternalistic leadership, transformational leadership (TL) is known to be effective in most cultural orientations, having many of its attributes universally endorsed (Dorfman et al., 2012). This broader acceptance – opposed to PL – helps to explain the great attention given to TL and strengthens its relevance in contemporary literature (Avolio & Bass, 1999; Christie, Barling & Turner, 2011; Grant, 2012; Judge & Piccollo, 2004). Transformational leaders are expected to promote idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration. These behaviors suggest that transformational leaders communicate with followers in such a
way that motivates them to accomplish tasks, and have the ability to create an environment where employees have high levels of autonomy (Judge & Piccollo, 2004).

Still, transformational leadership is considerably different from PL in many other ways. For example, PL and TL seem to induce different emotions on followers. While transformational leaders are associated to optimism and excitement, paternalistic leaders are linked to emotions as identification, respect and gratitude (Chen et al., 2011). Considering paternalistic and transformational leadership divergences, we expect that the differences in their endorsement can be explained by contextual characteristics apart from national culture (Nielsen & Cleal, 2011; Pellegrini, Scandura & Jayaraman, 2010). In this vein, a comparative analysis of the effectiveness of both styles in different organizational contexts can provide fruitful insights to a better understanding of PL.

**Leadership effectiveness and organizational culture**

Despite individual variance, the common patterns on how people behave and relate to others in a given society are explained by the same cultural values they share (Dickson et al., 2012). Although the national level of culture plays an important role on organizational management (Dorfman et al., 2012; Hofstede, 1980; House et al., 2004), the organizational level of culture has also provided strong foundations to understand individual differences in values and behaviors within organizations (Javidan et al., 2010).

Organizational culture can be defined as “a pattern of shared basic assumptions that was learned by a group” and can “be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems” (Schein, 2004, p. 17). As organizational culture encompasses the values and norms shared by members of the organization (Schein, 1990), it provides a common background to employees, influencing how individuals make sense of their context, reducing uncertainty, and increasing their
sense of identity and capacity to cooperate in an organization (e.g. Kwantes & Boglarsky, 200).

Person-organization fit theory (P-O fit; O’Reilly, Chatman & Caldwell, 1991) suggests that when organization’s values, norms and goals match employees’ motivational expectations, individuals perform better (Kristof, 1996; O’Reilly, Chatman & Caldwell, 1991). Specifically, the expectation-based model of P-O fit suggests that when leaders’ goals, vision and values are congruent with those that the organization communicates and demonstrates to endorse, it increases the predictability of the work environment. With increased predictability, leaders tend to increase their trust that the organization will fulfill their needs. These needs include the possibility to express their values and to behave in consistency with them (Yu, 2014). Because of the congruence between leader and organization, and the fulfillment of leaders’ expectations, they have their social (and leadership) identity endorsed, resulting in a significantly better performance (Yu, 2014; O’Reilly, Chatman & Caldwell, 1991). For leaders, considered main representatives of an organization, fit makes them more effective in the role of influencing followers to achieve organizational goals and vision (Posner & Kouzes, 1985), as well as making them experience positive attitudes and increase behavioral outcomes (Kristof-Brown et al, 2005). As a result, leadership effectiveness become dependent of contexts (e.g. Antonakis et al., 2013), such that their effectiveness will be contingent to the values and norms shared within the organization that leadership processes occur (Schein, 1990).

In addition to that, the organizational context is argued to constrain what behaviors are considered prototypical, such that organizational cultures create experience with, and preferences for, certain types of behavior (Lord, Brown, Harvey, & Hall, 2001; Lord, Foti, & De Vader, 1984). Then, within an organizational culture, the similarity of
leadership schemas that individuals and organization hold define prototypes of ideal leadership (Implicit leadership; ILT, Lord & Maher, 1991; Lord et al. 2001), as well as successful leadership, adjusted to cultural orientations (e.g., Hall et al., 1998). In particular, mental representations of how an ideal leader should be are viewed as context-sensitive, dynamic states, rather than as static entities (Smith, 1998). Moreover, leadership is considered an emerging social process, produced by the interaction of several factors such as context, tasks, group histories, and the personal qualities of leaders and followers (e.g. Lord & Smith, 1999). Lord and Smith (1999) suggest that leadership is embedded in a social system (e.g. organizational culture), through a (mental) process of activating relevant behavioral tendencies in leaders, as well as perceptual constructs in followers. These processes imply dynamic mental representations that may facilitate the emergence of leadership perceptions capable of representing changes across contexts (Lord et al., 2001).

We assume these changes in leadership perception to be consistent with leadership categorization theory (Lord et al., 1984). Leader categorization has recognizable consequences on the behaviors of both leaders and followers (Shondrick & Lord, 2010) and on performance outcomes (Ayman & Chemers, 1983). Although similarities in leadership prototypes have been identified to hold across national cultures (Den Hartog, House, Hanges, Ruiz-Quintanilla, & Dorfman, 1999), implicit notions of leadership (ILT) are social constructs that are largely shaped by an individual’s past interactions and unique personal experiences and may thus show variability (Shondrick, Dihn & Lord, 2010). Then, independent on one’s national culture, organizational culture can create – or shape – shared prototypes of “ideal” leaders, based on the values and norms embedded in the organization. As a result, followers’ leadership categorization will consider actual leaders’ configuration (target stimulus) are compare to relevant model (examplars or
prototypes). It is in this stage of prototype activation – the categorization of leaders – that organizational culture plays a role, as a situational constraint to leadership prototypes adjustment. Finally, because organizational cultures create experience with, and preferences for, certain types of behaviors, employees from different organizations may be sensitive for different leader behaviors, required to match their expectations of leaders (Lord, Foti, & De Vader, 1984).

Considering that organizational culture determine leader-organization fit, and shape followers’ prototypical schemas of leadership, it will also influence leadership effectiveness (e.g. Antonakis, Avolio & Sivasubramaniam, 2003; Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996). Thus, leadership effectiveness will be higher when leaders are perceived to fit with organizational culture, through followers’ categorization of the leaders, based on their implicit prototypes of leadership (once shaped by the organizational culture). As a result of perceived fit – between leader and organization, and between follower’s own categorization of leaders and organization’s shared prototype) followers may increase their attitudes and behaviors. For example, if a culture is oriented “not to question authority and the status quo”, it seems that paternalistic leadership effects would be different than in a culture where “questioning authority and challenging the status quo” is highly valued (e.g., Chen, 2004). Then, we propose that different organizational culture orientations influence the effects that Paternalistic leadership – as well as transformational leadership – has on followers’ attitudinal and behavioral outcomes.

**Overview of current research**

We tested our predictions in three independent studies. First, we conducted two experimental studies to assess the interactive effects of organizational cultures and
leadership styles on followers’ outcomes. While the first study manipulated organizational culture considering an orientation toward people vs. performance, as opposing dimensions, the second study replicated the first study manipulating organizational culture considering cultures of stability vs. innovation. Finally, we followed up by collecting data on actual leader–follower relationships from a sample of executives. Leaders were asked to rate organizational culture and followers’ performance, while subordinates were asked to evaluate leadership styles, as well as to rate their own work attitudes.

Study 1

The purpose for Study 1 was to manipulate Paternalistic and Transformational leadership styles and organizational culture to draw cause-effect conclusions. We tested the hypothesized interaction using video clips to convey leadership styles, and vignettes to express organizational culture orientations. We focused on testing whether these interactions had effects on followers’ motivation, satisfaction with the leader and perception of leadership effectiveness.

Specifically, we analyze the influence of two dimensions of organizational culture on the relationship between leadership and followers’ outcomes: cultural orientation toward people vs. orientation toward performance. These two cultural dimensions reflect opposite demands in organizations. From one side, organizational cultures oriented toward people have a predominant focus on internal demands such as integration, communication and well-being of employees, through cohesion and morale. Consequently, organizations oriented toward people are those in which values of cooperation, mutual respect and support between employees are prevalent. From the other side, an orientation toward performance predominantly focuses on external demands,
expecting growth, resource acquisition and productivity returns through goal setting, flexibility and readiness. Such organizations value efficiency, emphasizing goals achievement and rewarding employees according to their outcomes (Bradley & Parker, 2001; Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983; Dellobe, Haccoun & Vanderberghe, 2002).

We expect that paternalistic and transformational leadership differently interact with these opposing dimensions. Paternalistic leaders centralize decisions and expect deference of followers, but also provide support and attention to them (Aycan, 2006; Pellegrini & Scandura, 2008). Such leaders create a family environment, protecting and guiding subordinates in work, as well as non-work domains of their lives (Aycan et al., 2013). As a result, when evaluating performance, they not only consider followers’ achievement of goals, but also the extent to which they express loyalty and respect toward the leader and members of a group (Aycan, 2006; Aycan et al., 2013). Based on these characteristics, we expect greater endorsement of PL in contexts that values group collaboration and human resource development.

On the contrary, transformational leaders display an individualized consideration to followers by paying attention to their developmental needs and by delegating assignments as opportunities for growth (Bass, 1999). Such orientation to work objectives has been supported by research demonstrating the augmentation effect of transformational on transactional leadership. In other words, transformational leadership adds substantially to the impact of transactional leadership, meaning that consideration for followers are considered reinforcements of positive behavior (Bass, 1999; Judge & Picollo, 2004). Therefore, inspiring subordinates to move beyond expectations is mainly based on the achievement of organizational goals. That explains why transformational are expected to be better evaluated than paternalistic leaders in societies oriented toward performance (Dickson et al., 2012; Dorfman et al., 2012).
Method

Participants and procedure

One hundred and ninety individuals from the United States were recruited through Amazon’s Mechanical Turk to participate in a study about leadership behaviors. The sample (52% males) varied from 18 to 73 years old, with an average of 35.8 years ($SD = 11.64$). Respondents have already formally worked, with average tenure range from 10 to 15 years of experience.

We conducted a two (PL vs. TL) by two (People vs. Performance) mixed factorial between-subjects design, in which we manipulated leadership styles and organizational culture using movie clips and vignettes. We believe that movie clips improve experimental manipulation of leadership behaviors because they are more realistic than written descriptions of scenarios, more fully engaging participants’ senses (see Aguinis & Bradley, 2014). Participants were informed that it was an academic research about leadership and they were going to watch a movie clip. They were asked to pay attention to leader’s verbal and non verbal behaviors, attitudes and relationship with followers. Participants were randomly assigned to one of the four conditions, being initially presented with either a paternalistic or a transformational leadership movie clip. The paternalistic leader was represented by General Maximus (Gladiator, 2000), whereas the transformational leader was represented by William Wallace (Braveheart, 1995). The movie clips were previously tested and validated by a separate sample to check whether the intended meaning had been conveyed clearly enough. After watching the video, participants had to read a vignette with either a performance-oriented or people-oriented organizational culture. Vignettes followed Zammuto et al. (1999), Dellobe et al. (2002) and O’Reilly, Chatman and Caldwell’s (1991) descriptions of these orientations. After reading the vignettes, participants were asked to imagine they would start to work in the
company described, with a supervisor as the leader in the clip. They were asked to answer items that assessed work motivation, satisfaction with leader and perceived leadership effectiveness. The questionnaire ended with demographic questions and manipulation checks.

**Manipulation**

The leadership manipulation consisted of two movie clips. General Maximus (Russell Crowe, Gladiator, 2000) represented a paternalistic leader, such that scenes showed attitudes and behaviors (verbal and non-verbal) that characterized the paternalistic style. First, by being authoritarian towards his soldiers and establishing hierarchy, responded by subordinates’ deference and respect in the battle field. Then, showing closeness, protection and concern for soldiers’ work and non work lives, when he asks about former soldiers after a long time without contact, which is responded through subordinates’ express of loyalty. Finally, by being a moral role model to subordinates when deciding to do what was the “right thing to do”.

The transformational movie clip contained scenes where William Wallace (Mel Gibson, Braveheart, 1995) exhibited such style. First, by motivating and letting followers’ aware he had a vision that the Scottish would win their independence from the king of England. Then, showing to never give up hopes when inspiring Scottish, demonstrating confidence about his vision, and recognition of followers growth. Finally, by encouraging Scottish to create new ideas and embrace risk-taking in order to achieve superior goals. Links to the movie clips are available in Appendix A.

Organizational culture vignettes were designed following Zammuto et al. (1999), Dellobe et al. (2002) and O’Reilly, Chatman and Caldwell’s (1991) descriptions of organizational culture orientations (see Appendix B). In the performance-oriented
scenario, the organization (Fountain Pharmaceuticals) was described as being recognized by its competitive orientation and its focus on work outcomes. The organization was also described as stimulating employees to get the best results they could, where workers were expected to be proactive and were mainly rewarded based on their work performance. In the people-oriented scenario, the organization was described as being recognized by its good work environment, where employees’ welfare came in the first place and special attention was given to work conditions. The organization was also described as stimulating support and respect among colleagues through the existence of a familiar environment where good results are consequence.

**Measures**

* Satisfaction with leader was measure using 3-item scale proposed by Conger et al. (2000). An example item is: “I would feel good to be around him in this company”. Participants rated to what extent they agreed with each statement using a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 = “Strongly Disagree” to 5 = “Strongly Agree” (α = 0.85)

* Perception of Leadership Effectiveness was measured using three items adapted from Giessner & Knippenberg (2008). One of the items was: “A leader with these characteristics would satisfactorily achieve the company goals”. Participants rated to what extent they agreed with each statement using a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 = “Strongly Disagree” to 5 = “Strongly Agree” (α = 0.80).

* Work Motivation was measured using three items adapted from Niu, Wang & Cheng (2009) work motivation scale. Participants rated to what extent, ranging from 1 = “Strongly Disagree” to 5 = “Strongly Agree”, they agreed with items such as “I would be willing to work hard under this style of leadership in this company” (α = 0.82)
Control Variables used were age and gender, since they can influence followers’ perceptions of leadership style and effectiveness (Bass, 2008; e.g. Pellegrini & Scandura, 2006; Cheng et al., 2004).

Manipulation Checks

In a separate sample, we checked the efficacy of the leadership manipulation. Forty-two undergraduate students (49% men and 51% women) were asked to watch both video clips and classify leaders’ behaviors. Subsequent to each video, they rated items according to what extent they agreed that each statement described the leader presented in each movie clip. Paternalistic leadership was measured using three items based in Farh and Cheng’s (2000) and Aycan’s (2006) descriptions of paternalistic leadership and three items based on Avolio and Bass’ (1999) descriptions of transformational leadership. All items were assessed with a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = “Strongly Disagree” to 5 = “Strongly Agree”. Results from the paired samples T-test showed that, in the paternalistic scenario, the leader was perceived more paternalistic than transformational ($t(41) = 4.94, p < 0.000; M_{PL} = 4.07, M_{TL} = 3.48$), and in the transformational scenario, the leader was perceived as more transformational than paternalistic ($t(41) = 2.70, p = 0.01; M_{PL} = 3.98, M_{TL} = 4.37$).

We also tested the efficacy of the leadership manipulation in the end of the questionnaire. Participants were presented with short summaries of both styles and asked to indicate which best described the leader presented in the movie clip. Chi-square test of independence showed significant differences ($X^2 (1) = 25.72, N = 190, p < 0.001$), indicating that the manipulation worked.

The organizational culture manipulation was also checked with a separate sample. One hundred and two participants recruited through Amazon’s Mechanical Turk were
randomly presented with an organizational culture vignette and asked whether the company described was oriented toward performance (N = 55) or toward people (N = 47). Significant differences were found in Chi-square test of independence ($X^2 (1) = 65.92$, $N = 102$, $p < 0.001$), suggesting that participants perceived the cultural orientation in the intended direction.

**Results**

We conducted a series of Two Way ANOVAs to assess the effects of the interaction between leadership style and organizational culture orientation on followers’ satisfaction with leader, work motivation and perception of leadership effectiveness. The interaction effects of leadership style with organizational culture on perceived leadership effectiveness ($F(1,184) = 5.17, p < 0.05; \eta^2_p = 0.03$) and on followers’ work motivation ($F(1,184) = 7.04, p < 0.01; \eta^2_p = 0.04$) were significant. However, the interaction effect on satisfaction with the leader showed to be marginally significant ($F(1,184) = 2.96, p = 0.09; \eta^2_p = 0.02$). Table 1 presents these effects on followers’ outcomes and the means of interaction.

**TABLE 1**
Means and Standard errors of Leadership Effectiveness, Satisfaction with Leader and Work Motivation as a Function of Leadership Style and Organizational Culture (Study 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culture</th>
<th>Leadership Effectiveness</th>
<th>Work Motivation</th>
<th>Satisfaction with Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$PL$</td>
<td>$TL$</td>
<td>$PL$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>s.e</td>
<td>$M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership x Culture</td>
<td>5.17**</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.04**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *$p < .10$, *$p < .05$; **$p < .01$; ***$p < .001$
We derived simple slopes from the interactions, to test the relationship between leadership styles and followers’ outcomes under culture orientation toward people (-1) or performance (+1). There was a significant effect of the interaction between paternalistic leadership and orientation toward people on followers’ perception of leadership effectiveness (β = 0.19, p < 0.01), work motivation (β = 0.12, p < 0.05), and satisfaction with the leader (β = 0.15, p < 0.05). No significant effects of the interaction between transformational leadership and orientation toward performance were found on followers’ perception of effectiveness (β = -0.03, p = n.s.) or satisfaction with the leader (β = -0.02, p = n.s.). The interaction between transformational leadership and orientation toward performance on work motivation was marginally significant (β = -0.11, p = 0.08). Figure 1 presents the interaction effects on followers’ outcomes.

**FIGURE 1**

Interaction effects of leadership style and organizational culture on followers’ outcomes (Study 1)
Discussion

The goal of Study 1 was to understand if the interaction between leadership styles and organizational culture orientations influenced followers’ outcomes. We specifically analyzed the interplays between paternalistic and culture orientation toward people, and transformational leadership and culture orientation toward performance, and their effects on work motivation, satisfaction with the leader and perceived leadership effectiveness. Results were in line with our expectations, such that significant interaction effects on the outcomes investigated were found. These results support the idea that leader-context alignment may determine leadership effectiveness (Dorfman et al., 2012; Kwantes & Boglarsky, 2007; Jackson & Johnson, 2012; Liden & Antonakis, 2009; Schein, 2004).

Simple main effect tests indicated that PL effects on followers were contingent to the interaction with culture oriented toward people, such that they were perceived as more effective by followers, who reported greater work motivation and satisfaction with the leader. However, results of the simple main effect tests showed that transformational leaders, in cultures oriented toward performance, did not increase, or marginally increased followers’ outcomes when compared to cultures oriented toward people. In order to expand these results and test new interactions between leadership styles and culture, we conducted Study 2. Instead of orientation toward people or performance, we investigated the role of cultures of stability or innovation.

Study 2

With the purpose to expand findings obtained in Study 1 and deepen the understanding of the effects that organizational culture orientations have on leadership effectiveness, we conducted Study 2. We analyzed the interaction effects of PL and TL with two other cultural dimensions: stability vs. innovation.
These two cultural dimensions reflect competing organizational demands for flexibility and innovation on the one hand and for control and stability on the other (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983; Zammuto, Gifford & Goodman, 1999). Organizations with cultures of innovation are dynamic, open to new ideas and, as a consequence, organizations’ rewards are linked to individual initiative. Differently, organizations with a culture of stability values control, formalization of procedures, establishment of rules and a hierarchical structure (Bradley & Parker, 2001; Dellobe, Haccoun & Vanderberghe, 2002; O’Reilly, Chatman, Caldwell, 1991; Sheridan, 1992).

Previous evidence suggests that PL and TL may relate differently with these dimensions. As mentioned before, intrinsic to paternalistic leadership is not just the benevolence and care to followers, but also the formality and status embedded in a hierarchical relationship between superior-subordinate, where the leader centralizes decisions and expects deference from subordinates (Aycan, 2006; Pellegrini & Scandura, 2008). This means that paternalistic leaders value control and that their behaviors are well accepted in contexts where there is a clear hierarchy between subordinates and superiors (e.g. Pellegrini & Scandura, 2006; Aycan, 2006; Dorfman et al., 2012).

Regarding transformational leadership, the relationship seems to be the opposite. TL is usually represented by leaders with the ability to inspire followers, to empower them and stimulate the development of new ideas (Avolio & Bass, 1999; Judge & Piccollo, 2004). In this sense, studies have demonstrated positive correlation between transformational leadership and levels of creativity, entrepreneurship and innovation in organizations (Ling et al., 2008; Jansen, Vera & Crossan, 2009), as well as positive evaluations in low hierarchy contexts (Aycan, 2013; Dorfman et al., 2012).

Considering these premises, we expect that paternalistic leadership has a better fit with organizational cultures of stability rather than innovation. Conversely, we expect
that transformational leadership has a better fit with organizational cultures of innovation. As a result of such fit, leaders influence followers in a way that increases their perception of leadership effectiveness, as well as their satisfaction with leader and work motivation.

**Method**

*Participants and procedure*

One hundred and eighty eight individuals from the United States were recruited through Amazon’s Mechanical Turk, to participate in a study about leadership behaviors. The sample (55% males) varied from 18 to 65 years old, with an average of 35.6 years (SD = 11.58). Respondents have already formally worked, with average tenure range from 10 to 15 years of experience.

We conducted a two (PL vs. TL) by two (Stability vs. Innovation) mixed factorial between-subjects design, in which we manipulated leadership styles and organizational culture using video clips and vignettes, as in Study 1. Procedures were similar to those adopted in Study 1. Participants were randomly assigned to one of the four conditions, being asked to watch a movie clip with attention to leader’s behaviors and relationship with followers, and to read an organizational culture vignette. The vignettes were similar to those of Study 1, but describing either a stability or innovation culture. Participants were asked to imagine they would start to work in the company described, with a supervisor as the leader in the movie clip, and asked to rate items that assessed work motivation, satisfaction with leader and perceived leadership effectiveness. The questionnaire ended with demographic questions and manipulation checks.

*Manipulation*

The leadership manipulation consisted of the same movie clips used in Study 1. Vignettes also followed Zammuto et al. (1999), Dellobe et al. (2002) and O'Reilly,
Chatman and Caldwell’s (1991) descriptions of organizational culture. In the innovation scenario, the organization was described as being recognized by its distinct innovative orientation, as having flat hierarchical structure and a flexible routine of work, where employees were stimulated to experiment new ideas. The organization was also described as fostering empowerment and where risk taking was encouraged. In the stability scenario, the organization was described as being recognized by its tradition, as being very hierarchical and having a structured routine of work, where formal rules and superiors’ decisions determined what employees had to do. The organization was also described as having a centralized decision making process and where risk taking was not welcome.

**Measures**

We used the same measures of Study 1. Participants rated to what extent they agreed with items that measured their satisfaction with the leader, work motivation, and perceived leadership effectiveness using a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 = “Strongly Disagree” to 5 = “Strongly Agree”. All scales demonstrated reliability: satisfaction with the leader ($\alpha = 0.83$); work motivation ($\alpha = 0.87$); and perceived leadership effectiveness ($\alpha = 0.78$). We also used participants’ age and gender as control variables.

**Manipulation Checks**

We tested the efficacy of the leadership manipulation presenting short summaries of PL and TL and asking them to indicate which summary best described the leader presented in the movie clip. Chi-square test of independence showed significant
differences ($X^2 (1) = 38.81, N = 188, p < 0.001$), thus confirming manipulation efficacy and that respondents correctly perceived the leadership style presented in the movie.

We checked cultural orientation manipulation in the end of the experiment. Participants were asked whether the company described in the vignette was oriented toward stability or toward innovation. Results suggest that participants perceived the cultural orientation in the intended direction. Significant differences were found in Chi-square test of independence ($X^2 (1) = 98.30, N = 188, p < 0.001$), giving evidence that vignettes’ descriptions were appropriate to manipulate cultural conditions.

Results

We conducted a series of Two Way ANOVAs to assess the interaction effects of leadership style and organizational culture orientation on followers’ satisfaction with leader, work motivation and perception of leadership effectiveness. Results showed significant effects on perceived leadership effectiveness ($F(1,182) = 10.06, p < 0.01; \eta^2_p = 0.05$). The effects on followers’ work motivation ($F(1,182) = 2.80, p = 0.10; \eta^2_p = 0.02$) and satisfaction with leader ($F(1,182) = 3.68, p = 0.06; \eta^2_p = 0.02$), were marginally significant. Table 2 presents means and standard errors of the interaction effects on these outcomes.

**TABLE 2**

Means and Standard Errors of Leadership Effectiveness, Satisfaction with Leader and Work Motivation as a Function of Leadership Style and Organizational Culture (Study 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culture</th>
<th>Leadership Effectiveness</th>
<th>Work Motivation</th>
<th>Satisfaction with Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership x Culture</td>
<td>10.06**</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.80*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Entries are means on 5-point scales, with higher values indicating higher scores. 
* $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$. 
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We derived simple slopes from the interactions, to test the relationship between leadership styles and followers’ outcomes under cultures of stability (-1) or innovation (+1). There was only a significant simple effect on followers’ perceived leadership effectiveness when paternalistic leadership interacted with stability ($\beta = 0.43$, $p < 0.01$). It was also found a marginally significant effect on leadership effectiveness when transformational leadership interacted with culture of innovation ($\beta = -0.28$, $p = 0.07$). Figure 2 presents the interaction effects on followers’ outcomes.

**FIGURE 2**
Interaction effects of leadership style and organizational culture on followers’ outcomes

[Diagram showing interaction effects]

**Discussion**

The goal of Study 2 was to replicate Study 1 and increase the understanding of how both leadership styles interacts with organizational culture. We analyzed the effects
of cultures of stability and innovation to the effectiveness of PL and TL. As in the first study, we found significant interactive effects for leadership effectiveness, but marginally significant for satisfaction with leader and work motivation. Simple effects analyses suggest, however, that PL and TL effects on followers were only significant for leadership effectiveness and moderated by culture orientation.

Based on the results obtained in both experimental studies, we followed up by conducting a dyadic survey with leaders and followers to measure actual organizational culture (considering the four orientations), leadership styles and their interaction effects on followers’ performance.

**Study 3**

Both previous studies provided evidence for the hypothesized interactions between leadership styles and organizational culture. However, some issues we needed to address with a third and final study. From one side, in previous studies we experimentally manipulated both leadership and organizational culture, and although we had high internal validity, it lacked external validity of effects. Thus, our purpose for Study 3 was to examine actual effects of the interaction between leadership style and organizational culture. To do so, we conducted a survey with leader-follower dyads to assess such effects. In addition to that, in the third study we assessed followers’ performance (van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg, 2005) and included innovative work behaviors as a second outcome, to more fully address leadership effectiveness. We considered these two behavioral outcomes since they are directly related to each of the two pairs of organizational culture dimensions (innovation and performance orientations). Importantly, they were rated by the leader, which increases validity of results. Finally, since we wanted to deepen the understanding of the effects of paternalistic leadership, we
analyzed the moderating effects of organizational culture on the relationship between PL and followers’ outcomes, controlling for leaders’ transformational leadership levels.

Method

Participants and procedure

To test the proposed relationships, 330 professionals from several industries participated in the study. Industry types included government, technology, education, finance, law, retail, oil and gas, energy, media, manufacturing, construction, insurance, security, tourism, consultancy and pharmaceutical, to avoid contextual influences from any particular industry and to enhance generalizability of our findings across multiple industries. Invitations were sent to 965 professionals who had participated in part-time MBA at a large private university in Brazil. In total, 407 participants identified themselves as professionals who directly supervised / managed subordinates. These professionals (as leaders) were asked to answer questions regarding one of his/her subordinates, indicating their name to participate as a follower, thus establishing the dyad. Once leaders completed their questionnaire, they received a number code to link with the indicated follower. Followers were sent an email with the number code and the link of their survey. One hundred and seventy (42%) followers were matched with respective leaders via code. Participants who had their questionnaires matched by the code participated in a lottery for an iPad Mini©.

Although questionnaires were identified, both leaders and followers were assured confidentiality about their responses, minimizing possible social desirability bias. To clarify confidentiality and to motivate respondents to provide accurate data, the questionnaire cover letter explained how the information would be treated. We emphasized that all opinions would be valued, having no right or wrong answers.
Managers answered questions regarding organizational culture, followers’ performance and followers’ innovative work behaviors. Managers also indicated how much they believed that organizational values influenced their followers and the organization’s industry. Both questionnaires ended with demographic questions, such as gender, age, and tenure. Subordinates answered items regarding perceptions of paternalistic and transformational leadership, individual motivation and job satisfaction. They also informed how long they worked with their manager.

Our final sample contained 165 valid dyads (leader-follower). Regarding demographic characteristics, 54% percent of the subordinates were male, had an average age of 32.5 years ($SD = 8.75$), an average organizational tenure between 5 and 10 years, and average time working with respective leader of 3.91 years ($SD = 3.31$). All subordinates were fulltime employed. Regarding managers, 69 percent of them were male, and an average age of 38 years ($SD = 8.97$). All managers were fulltime employed, and their average tenure within the organization ranged from 10 to 15 years.

**Measures**

*Paternalistic Leadership* (PL) was measured using 15 items of the Paternalistic Leadership Questionnaire (PLQ; Aycan et al., 2013). Each of the 5 dimensions were measured using 3 items. Subordinates answered the items using a 5-point scale ranging from 1 = “strongly disagree” to 5 = “strongly agree”. An example item is “My leader controls all my work activities” ($\alpha = 0.70$).

*Transformational leadership* (TL) was measured using 16 items of Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ form 5X; Bass & Avolio, 1985). Each 4 items represented one of the 4 dimensions. Subordinates answered the items using a 5-point
scale ranging from 1 = “Not at all” to 5 = “Frequently/Always”. An example item is “My manager talks optimistically about the future” ($\alpha = 0.92$).

*Employee performance* was measured using the ten-item measure of work effort and work quality developed by Kuvaas and Dysvik (2009). Leaders indicated the extent to which they agreed with statements about subordinates’ performance using a 5-point scale from 1 = “strongly disagree” to 5 = “strongly agree”. Example items are “My subordinate… tries to work as hard as possible” and “…delivers higher quality than what can be expected from someone with his/her type of job” ($\alpha = 0.87$).

*Innovative work behavior* was measured using 6 items from De Jong and Den Hartog (2010). We used the innovative output scale, rated by supervisors. They indicated the extent to which they agreed with statements about subordinates’ innovative work behavior, such as “my subordinate…make suggestions to improve current products or services” and “…produce ideas to improve work practices” ($\alpha = 0.80$).

*Motivation to work* was measured using 3 items from Gagne (2014). Subordinates answered the items using a 5-point scale ranging from 1 = “strongly disagree” to 5 = “strongly agree”. An example item is “I put effort on my work because I enjoy doing it” ($\alpha = 0.76$).

*Job satisfaction* was measured with a 4-item scale derived from the Job Satisfaction Index (Brayfield & Rothe, 1951) using a 5-point scale ranging from 1 = “strongly disagree” to 5 = “strongly agree”. An item is “I am very satisfied with my current job” ($\alpha = 0.80$).

*Organizational culture* was measured using the Organizational Culture Profile (OCP; O’Reilly, Chatman & Caldwell, 1991). We used 20 value statements assessing attitudes toward innovation (5 items), stability (5 items), orientation toward people (6 items) and orientation toward performance (4 items). Leaders’ were asked to sort the 20
values into five categories ranging from “most characteristic of my firm’s culture” to “most uncharacteristic of my firm’s culture”. We average the items of each dimension to create a measure of innovation ($\alpha = 0.68$), stability ($\alpha = 0.73$), orientation toward people ($\alpha = 0.87$) and orientation toward performance ($\alpha = 0.82$). We considered two culture profiles: cultures of innovation or stability, and orientation toward performance or people. We calculated the difference between innovation and stability scores, subtracting the latter from the first (Innovation-stability). We repeated this procedure with orientation toward performance and people (performance-people).

As control variables, we considered gender similarity between leader and follower, leader and follower age difference, dyadic tenure (total years working together), and job tenure of both. We also considered the strength that organizational culture would influence subordinates’ behavior. Leaders evaluated culture’s strength from 0 to 100 according to how much they believed that culture influenced followers’ behavior. Finally, although the range of industry types could be beneficial for generalizability of the results, it was possible that the different industry types might influence the results.

Results

Table 3 presents the means, standard deviations, and correlations among the study variables. To test whether fit between PL and organizational culture led to followers’ performance, innovative behavior, motivation and satisfaction, we conducted moderated multiple regression analyses. Results showed there was a significant interaction effect between PL and performance-people orientation on performance ($\beta = -0.40, p < 0.05$), innovative work behavior ($\beta = -0.57, p < 0.01$), and satisfaction ($\beta = -0.53, p < 0.05$). Regarding followers’ motivation, the interaction effect was marginally significant ($\beta = -0.38, p = 0.06$). Table 4 presents regression results.
We derived simple slopes from the interactions, to test the relationship between PL and followers’ outcomes, from 1 SD above and below organizational culture orientation – which indicated predominance of people (-1SD) or performance (+1SD). Figure 3 the interaction effects on followers’ outcomes. There was a significant effect of PL on followers’ performance when culture was oriented toward performance ($\beta = -0.40$, $p = 0.02$), indicating that lower levels of paternalistic leadership leads to higher performance.

We also found a significant effect of PL on followers’ innovative work behavior when culture is oriented toward people ($\beta = 0.38$, $p = 0.02$) and marginally significant when culture is oriented toward performance ($\beta = -0.33$, $p = 0.07$). In such cases, results suggested that in cultures oriented toward performance, the lower the PL, the higher the innovative work behavior. Conversely, in cultures oriented toward people, higher PL leads to higher innovative behavior.

Regarding followers’ attitudes, when organizational culture is oriented toward people, there was a significant effect of PL on motivation ($\beta = 0.50$, $p < 0.01$) and satisfaction ($\beta = 0.40$, $p = 0.03$).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender similarity</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age Difference</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>9.69</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Leaders' Tenure</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>.414**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Followers' Tenure</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>-.382**</td>
<td>.301**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Dyadic Tenure</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>.222**</td>
<td>.335**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Industry Type</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Culture Strength</td>
<td>79.28</td>
<td>15.59</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Transformational leadership</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>.151*</td>
<td>.153*</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>-.133*</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Paternalistic leadership</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>.148*</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.419**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Culture Innovation or Stability</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>-.134*</td>
<td>-.183*</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Culture Performance or People</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>-.079</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>.158*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Performance</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.166*</td>
<td>.223**</td>
<td>.190*</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.176*</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.135*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Innovative Work behavior</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.251**</td>
<td>.247**</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.213**</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.138*</td>
<td>.615**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Motivation to work</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>.131*</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>-.150*</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.568**</td>
<td>.407**</td>
<td>.133*</td>
<td>-.072</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.487**</td>
<td>.282**</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>-.173*</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.736**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .10, *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001
### TABLE 4
Interaction effects of paternalistic leadership and organizational culture of performance-people on followers’ outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control variables</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Innovative Behavior</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender Similarity</td>
<td>- 0.15*</td>
<td>- 0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>- 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age difference</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader’s Tenure</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.07*</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Followers’ Tenure</td>
<td>0.13**</td>
<td>0.13**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyadic Tenure</td>
<td>0.03*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>- 0.03*</td>
<td>- 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry Type</td>
<td>- 0.05</td>
<td>- 0.06</td>
<td>- 0.06*</td>
<td>- 0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture Strength</td>
<td>0.01**</td>
<td>0.01**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.58***</td>
<td>0.58***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Main Effects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paternalistic Leadership (PL)</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Innovative Behavior</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 0.15</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.27*</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culture Performance-People(P-P)</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Innovative Behavior</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.13*</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>- 0.10</td>
<td>- 0.21**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PL x P-P</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Innovative Behavior</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 0.40*</td>
<td>- 0.57**</td>
<td>- 0.38*</td>
<td>- 0.53*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F Test</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Innovative Behavior</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.61***</td>
<td>3.89***</td>
<td>9.18***</td>
<td>6.04***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R² (ΔR² after cross-product)</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Innovative Behavior</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.21 (0.02)</td>
<td>0.22 (0.04)</td>
<td>0.40 (0.01)</td>
<td>0.30 (0.02)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bootstrap results of moderation effects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect (95% LL; UL)</th>
<th>Effect (95% LL; UL)</th>
<th>Effect (95% LL; UL)</th>
<th>Effect (95% LL; UL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culture M – 1 SD</td>
<td>0.10 (-0.21; 0.41)</td>
<td>0.38* (0.06; 0.69)</td>
<td>0.50** (0.19; 0.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.40* (0.05; 0.75)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture M + 1 SD</td>
<td>-0.40* (-0.75; -0.06)</td>
<td>-0.33* (-0.68; 0.02)</td>
<td>0.04 (-0.31; 0.38)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .10, *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001; 5,000 bootstrap samples, 95 % CI confidence interval, LL = lower limit confidence interval; UL = upper limit CI

Gender similarity was coded 0 = different, 1= same; Tenure was coded 1 = from 1 to 5 years; 2 = from 6 to 10 years; 3 = from 11 to 15 years; 4 = above 15 years.

Industry was coded 0 = Manufacturing 1=Service; Values intensity was measured from 0 to 100.
We conducted the same procedures of regression analyses to examine the interaction effects of paternalistic leadership and culture of stability or innovation on followers’ outcomes. In line with our expectations, this analysis yielded significant interaction effects on followers’ performance ($\beta = -0.34, t_{(153)} = -2.18, p < 0.05$).

The same procedure was conducted to test the interaction effects on followers’ innovative work behavior. Results showed there was a significant interaction between PL and innovation-stability culture ($\beta = -0.46, t_{(153)} = -2.87, p < 0.01$). Table 5 presents regression results. Regarding followers’ motivation, regression analysis showed there was no
interaction effect between PL and culture ($\beta = -0.07$, $t_{(153)} = -0.42$, $p = n.s.$). Yet, there was a main effect of PL ($\beta = 0.28$, $t_{(153)} = 2.47$, $p < 0.05$). As for satisfaction, results showed no interaction or main effects of PL and organizational culture of innovation-stability.

We derived simple slopes from the interactions, to test the relationship between PL and followers’ outcomes, from 1 SD above and below organizational culture orientation – which indicated predominance of stability (-1SD) or innovation (+1SD). There was a significant effect of PL on followers’ performance when culture is oriented toward innovation ($\beta = -0.44$, $p = 0.02$), but not when in cultures of stability ($\beta = 0.07$, $p = n.s.$). As with innovative work behavior, results showed a significant effect of in culture of innovation ($\beta = -0.37$, $p = 0.05$), as well as when culture is oriented toward stability ($\beta = 0.32$, $p = 0.03$). Figure 4 presents the simple slopes and interaction effects.

**FIGURE 4**
Interaction effects of PL and Organizational Culture of Stability or Innovation on Followers’ outcomes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control variables</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Innovative Behavior</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender Similarity</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age difference</td>
<td>0.01+</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader’s Tenure</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Followers’ Tenure</td>
<td>0.14**</td>
<td>0.14**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyadic Tenure</td>
<td>0.03*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.02*</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry Type</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture Strength</td>
<td>0.01**</td>
<td>0.01**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.57***</td>
<td>0.56***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Main Effects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paternalistic Leadership (PL)</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Innovative Behavior</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.19*</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.28*</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture Innovation-Stability (I-S)</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.11*</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PL x I-S</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Innovative Behavior</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-0.34*</td>
<td>-0.46**</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**F Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F Test</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Innovative Behavior</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.21***</td>
<td>3.88***</td>
<td>8.77***</td>
<td>4.91***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² (ΔR² after cross-product)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R² (ΔR² after cross-product)</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Innovative Behavior</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.19 (0.03)</td>
<td>0.22 (0.04)</td>
<td>0.39 (0.00)</td>
<td>0.26 (0.00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bootstrap results of moderation effects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bootstrap results of moderation effects</th>
<th>Effect (95% LL; UL)</th>
<th>Effect (95% LL; UL)</th>
<th>Effect (95% LL; UL)</th>
<th>Effect (95% LL; UL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culture M – 1 SD</td>
<td>0.07 (-0.22; 0.35)</td>
<td>0.32* (0.03; 0.61)</td>
<td>0.33* (0.05; 0.62)</td>
<td>0.03 (-0.31; 0.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture M + 1 SD</td>
<td>-0.44* (-0.80; -0.09)</td>
<td>-0.37* (-0.73; -0.00)</td>
<td>0.23 (-0.13; 0.59)</td>
<td>0.24 (-0.18; 0.66)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .10, **p < .05; ***p < .01; 5,000 bootstrap samples, 95% CI confidence interval, LL = lower limit confidence interval; UL = upper limit CI

Gender similarity was coded 0 = different; 1 = same; Tenure was coded 1 = from 1 to 5 years; 2 = from 6 to 10 years; 3 = from 11 to 15 years; 4 = above 15 years. Industry was coded 0 = Manufacturing 1=Service; Values intensity was measured from 0 to 100.
These results indicated that when organizational culture is oriented toward innovation, lower levels of paternalistic leadership have a positive effect on followers’ performance and innovative work behavior. Conversely, when organizational culture of stability, there is a significant effect of higher levels of PL on followers’ innovative behavior, but not on performance.

**Discussion**

The purpose for Study 3 was to examine the interaction effects between leadership style and organizational culture, in actual leader-follower dyads, on followers’ attitudinal and behavioral outcomes. Leaders rated organizational culture dimensions and their followers’ behaviors, while followers rated their leaders’ style and their own attitudes. Specifically, we tested whether Paternalistic leadership – controlled by transformational leadership – yielded greater outcomes on followers when in cultures of stability and oriented toward people, rather than in cultures of innovation and oriented toward performance.

Results from the analyses of the moderating effects of organizational culture on the relationship between PL and followers’ outcomes showed that the proposed interaction was significant in almost all outcomes. Considering cultures oriented toward people and performance, PL seemed to have positive and significant effects on followers’ attitudes – work motivation and satisfaction with the leader – under cultures oriented toward people. Lower levels of PL, however, were not significantly better in cultures oriented toward performance.

Considering cultures of stability and innovation, PL seemed to have positive and significant effects only on performance and innovative work behaviors, and not on
followers’ attitudes. Such results are similar to those found in study 2, which already indicated a marginally significant effect on attitudes.

Together, the results obtained in Study 1, 2 and 3 provided evidence to support our propositions that organizational culture is a contextual variable that explains paternalistic leadership effectiveness beyond the contingencies of national cultures. We further discuss our findings, present our theoretical and practical contributions, limitations of our studies and propose directions for future research.

**General Discussion**

The present research investigated Paternalistic leadership and its impacts on followers taking into account the role of organizational culture as a key contextual condition under which PL is effective, beyond national culture. Taken together, the three studies described here provide strong supportive evidence of our main proposition that organizational culture moderates the effect of Paternalistic leadership on follower’s behavioral and attitudinal outcomes. Specifically, our results showed that this relationship is stronger in cultures of stability and oriented toward people. This effect was established in two experimental studies in which we manipulated paternalistic, transformational leadership and organizational culture. Based on these findings, we compared their effects in a real dyadic leader-follower study in which we measured leadership styles and organizational culture. In the following paragraphs, we discuss in detail our findings and their implications.

One important finding of this research is that across all three studies, we found that paternalistic leaders increase their effectiveness when leaders were under cultures of stability or under cultures oriented toward people. These findings suggests that fit between Paternalistic leaders and organizational cultures oriented toward people or
stability leads to greater performance (Kristof-Brown, et al., 2005). That is, organizations oriented toward people (or stability) fits paternalistic leaders in such a way that this leader-organization fit increases their effectiveness. For example, people oriented cultures, which stimulates individualized concern for employees (O’Reilly, Chatman & Caldwell, 1991) fit paternalistic leaders’ attention and care for followers. Similarly, cultures oriented to stability share their drive toward maintenance of status quo, orientation to rules, security and risk-avoidance (O’Reilly, Chatman & Caldwell, 1991), thus fitting with paternalistic leaders’ authoritarian, controlling and centralizing behaviors (Farh & Cheng, 2000). In any case, P-O fit increases leaders’ performance, which is reflected in followers’ own performance (e.g. Van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg, 2005).

Although we had focused on PL effectiveness, our results showed that transformational leadership effectiveness is also influenced by organizational culture or, in other words, that culture moderates the influence that leaders exert on followers. That is, P-O fit is also necessary for transformational leaders to be effective. Specifically, cultures of performance and innovation are expected to match transformational leaders’ values, as well as to match followers’ prototypical expectations of leaders (Lord, Foti, & De Vader, 1984). Then, transformational leaders are culturally endorsed by the organization, seen as “ideal” leaders and, as a result, they have better performance. These results are important to highlight because they provide evidence that TL effectiveness is also contingent to context conditions, challenging the universality of TL’s attributes (Den hartog et al., 1999)

Our choice of organizational culture as such a moderating variable aligned well with our aim to provide empirical support for the idea that leadership effectiveness, and PL in special, may have contextual boundaries beyond national culture. That is, we built on the gap that current literature has mainly focused only on the analysis of national culture to contextualize the effectiveness of paternalistic leadership and has also lacked
comparisons with other leadership styles (Martinez, 2003, Niu, Wan & Chang, 2009; Pellegrini & Scandura, 2006). By relying on recent studies and findings on paternalistic leadership (Aycan et al., 2013; Cheng et al., 2004; Göncü, Aycan & Johnson, 2014; Pellegrini, Scandura & Jayaraman, 2010) and the studies which explore organizational culture effects on leadership (Dorfman et al., 2012; Kwantes & Boglarsky, 2007), we hypothesized and found support for our propositions.

**Contributions, Implications, and Future Research**

First of all, this study contributes to the literature of paternalistic leadership indicating that contextual factors beyond national culture can explain the endorsement of this leadership style. Although research suggests that national culture could affect organizational culture (Aycan et al., 2000), mainly because employees and managers bring their cultural background to the workplace (Schneider, 1988), several studies suggest that national culture does not constrain people’s behavior (Dastmalchian et al., 2000; Muijen & Koopman, 1994). These studies assume that variability among individuals within a culture makes them malleable to create, maintain, and change the organization culture (Adler & Jelinek, 1986). Individuals enter the organizations as independent entities and their malleability and exchange with contexts’ orientations has the potential to erase the effects of national culture (Adler & Jelinek, 1986). Thus, considering organizational culture and national culture as independent contexts, our results can help to explain under which conditions paternalistic leaders and transformational leadership are effective.

The comparative analysis with TL also provided evidences to suggest that transformational leadership can be contingent to contextual boundaries. Adding to previous research that indicated contextual moderators of the relationship between transformational leadership and individual-leader outcomes (Cole, Bruch & Shamir, 2009), our results suggested that organizational culture orientations may differently fit
with transformational leaders making them behave and relate with followers according to this fit. In addition, few are the studies that have specifically analyzed the way organizational context affects transformational leadership (see Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996). Therefore, our study can help to understand TL’s different expressions as a matter of contextual differences. Finally, our findings provide evidences to suggest that paternalistic endorsement can be stronger than transformational leadership, depending on the organizational culture. From one side, we suggest that future comparative and contextualized analysis is needed to better understand both constructs. In addition, that since TL research was developed in an American context, our results can help to increase the legitimacy of paternalistic leadership among Western scholars, broadening its validity beyond cultures of the ‘east’. Finally, that universality of transformational leadership attributes may be specific to national culture analysis, but not to organizational culture orientations.

We also contribute to explain the relationship between organizational culture and leadership. Studies have often considered these two intangible organizational resources to explain firms’ performance (e.g. Wilderom, Berg & Wiersma, 2012). However, when further analyzing how they interact, most studies have only focused on the influence of leaders to organizational culture (Schein, 2004) but not the opposite. By providing evidence that organizational culture influences the endorsement of leadership behaviors in organizations, we also contribute to the understanding of how context can explain aspects of the leadership puzzle (Liden & Antonakis, 2009). We suggest future research efforts to deepen the understanding of the effects that the interplay between organizational culture and leadership has on leader and follower outcomes.

Notwithstanding these implications, the present study also contribute to the practice of management by highlighting the importance of context on shaping individuals,
as well as organizations (Dorfman et al., 2012; Kwantes & Boglarsky, 2007). Following previous research on person-organization fit (P-O fit), we showed that the match between individuals and organizations can result in mutual benefit for both (Kristof, 1996, Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). Consequently, we argue individuals should look for organizations that fit their values while organizations should look for employees who are congruent with their “personality” (Yu, 2014). Considering these findings, we also suggest that context is important to consider while organizations are developing leaders’ skills. Since organizations differ in demands, in order to increase the efficacy of leadership development programs, organizations must consider organizational goals, and cultural orientations have to be taken into account.

**Conclusion**

In the last two decades, studies have analyzed the influence of national culture to explain paternalistic leadership effectiveness; however, there are cues that contextual variables can help to better explain PL endorsement more broadly. This study aimed to extend the understanding of paternalistic leadership by considering different contextual conditions and by comparing its conditioned effects with transformational leadership – highly endorsed cross-culturally (Dorfman et al., 2012). Results indicate that PL and TL are contingent to organizational context, interacting differently with four distinct dimensions of organizational culture. Although we believe the present study have collaborated to better clarify the conditions under which paternalistic leadership is effective, much more investigation is needed. It is possible that PL relevance for leadership literature has been underestimated by negative connotations and research conducted on cultures from the ‘west’. We believe that a deeper understanding of PL specificities can reveal their effectiveness beyond societies from the ‘east’.
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Appendix A - Leadership movie clips

Paternalistic Leadership
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=721-RxtF5Ik

Transformational Leadership
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QblIrVTym3M

Appendix B – Organizational Culture Vignettes

Orientation toward People

Fountain Pharmaceuticals is a well succeed company in its sector. This company is recognized by its good environment of work and many people believe that this is result of its organizational culture. In the values of this company the well-fare of employees comes in first place, in this sense the organization pays attention to the work conditions and employees are stimulated to support and respect their colleagues. In other words, it is created a family environment where the good results are consequence.

Orientation toward Performance

Fountain Pharmaceuticals is a well succeed company in its sector. This company is recognized as really competitive and many people believe that this is result of its organizational culture. The values of this company are oriented to the outcome of the work, in this sense employees are stimulated to get the best results they can and their rewards are based mainly on their performance. In other words, workers are expected to be proactive and the final outcome of their actions is what really matters.
Orientation toward Stability

Fountain Pharmaceuticals is a well succeed company in its sector. This company is recognized by its tradition, many people believe that this is result of its organizational culture. The company is very hierarchical and employees face a structured routine of work, where formal rules and the decisions of the superiors determine what they have to do. In other words, decisions are centralized and risk taking is not well seen.

Orientation toward Innovation

Fountain Pharmaceuticals is a well succeed company in its sector. This company is recognized as a really innovative company and many people believe that this is result of its organizational culture. The company presents a flat hierarchy and employees face a flexible routine of work, where they are stimulated to experiment new ideas. In other words, workers are empowered in this company and risk taking is encouraged.