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Abstract

The serious threats to organizational survival and growth in the contemporary environment of volatile markets have heated the debate on Affective leadership style. Both researchers and practitioners have devoted considerable attention to explore this phenomenon. In spite of increased research in this area major gaps still remain in our understanding especially related to context suited leadership style and the factors influencing to this prodigy. Our study addresses this glitch and aspires to explore Paternalistic leadership in Pakistan. The aim is to investigate moderating effect of trust in leader on the relationship between paternalistic leadership (PL) and commitment in Pakistani context. In this way, we tend to investigate the effect of trust in leader in Pakistani culture where trust deficit is mounting up at a very high speed. The research will help leaders for developing effective strategies in stimulation of commitment by improving their trust.
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1. Introduction

Affective leadership is a need of today. Leadership strategies and behaviors can be adopted and applied by individual and organizations only after understanding its theories. Appropriate leadership style directs people to work efficiently because people tend to respond only to suitable sort of leadership approaches (Likhitwonnnawut, 1996). Leadership styles vary from culture to culture and should be adapted according to the cultural context (Jing & Avery, 2008). It is the culture mainly which will determine the appropriate leadership style and the leader must know which approach to exhibit according to the situational need as well. Leadership theories give emphasis that leader for achieve desired results of the organization, should create relationships with followers for stimulation of their commitment (Bass, 1990). An ideal leader would be able to build teams and should be able to provide them with cohesion, direction, energy and support for the endorsement of change and organizational learning (Tushman & Nadler, 1986). There are different types of leadership: autocratic, charismatic, bureaucratic, participative, laissez-faire, transformational democratic and transactional leadership etc (Mosadeghrad, 2003). The focus of this study is on paternalistic leadership.

Paternalistic leadership style is center of attraction for many researches like other leadership style. Uhl-Bien, Tierney, Graen & Wakabayashi (1990) recommended that paternalism promotes trust among leader and workers, group harmony, affective motivation and lifetime employee commitment. In Paternalism, morality and benevolence are positively associated to trust in leaders, loyalty toward leaders and OCB (Cheng, Shieh, & Chou, 2002). Commitment and loyalty produced by the followers are said to be the main outcomes which paternalistic leaders would like to influence (Hayek, Novicevic, Humphreys, & Jones, 2010). Researchers had investigated the moderating role of affective trust on the relationships between paternalistic leadership and employee performance (Chen, Eberly, Chiang, Farh, & Cheng, 2011). Trust in leader has been studied as a moderator in many researches (Frost & Moussavi, 1999; Cenkci & Otken, 2012; Sgro, Worchel, Pence, & Orban, 1980) such as on relationship of PL and ethical climate (Cenkci & Otken, 2012). Trust will be taken as a moderator to investigate the relationship between Paternalistic leadership style and commitment as this relationship is not tested in Pakistani context.

The finding can be helpful for the Pakistani leaders in employing appropriate leadership techniques by fostering a culture where trust exists. This is important because for achieving loyalty and commitment the leaders don’t only have to show care and concern for employees but s/he has to build an environment of trust to inspire her/his followers to perform.

The objective of the study is to find out how Paternalistic Leadership style leads to commitment in a culture where distrust is increasing day by day? Does Paternalistic leader gain trust of their followers through their care
and support, which will further helpful in enhancing commitment with them and organization? This paper tends to depict an emic picture of the phenomenon under study.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Paternalistic Leadership

Paternalism refers to a father-like leadership with the combination of authority (Westwood & Chan, 1992). Paternalistic leadership is said to be a “style that combines strong discipline and authority with fatherly benevolence and moral integrity” (Farh & Cheng, 2000, p. 94).

The scholarship from Pakistan, India, China and Turkey revealed prevalence of PL in these countries. In this phenomenon, subordinates accept the paternal authority of their seniors in return of protection and care that they get from authority. People in authority provide protection; support and care to those under them, consider it as an obligation and in return expect respect and loyalty (Aycan, Kanungo, & Sinha, 1999). Management is supposed to exercise power like a father in family, mainly to protect employees and for improving their lives (Kerfoot & Knights, 1993).

Farh & Cheng (2000) proposed that paternalistic leaders exhibit three features:

(i) Authoritarianism: they are supposed to assert strong control and authority over subordinates to maintain power status and in return demand obedience without dissent.

(ii) Benevolence: “they express holistic and individualized concern for subordinates’ well-being”; and expect reciprocation and gratitude from subordinates.

(iii) Morality: they demonstrate superior moral character, which encourages identification and respect in subordinates.

Sinha (1990) proposed that authority and benevolence in paternalistic leader, supports a traditional father-like leader who is considered to be caring, nurturing the dependable along with authoritarian and strict disciplinarian characteristics. “The traditional father child relationship on which the term is based was one in which the father authoritatively dictated all the behaviors and significant life decisions of his children within a moral framework that credited the father with an unquestionable understanding of the needs and best interests of his children” (Pellegrini & Scandura, 2008, p.569). Fathers if tend to exercise authority over their children were still supposed to have true benevolent intention toward them (Jackman, 1994). If benevolent paternalism takes place “the main emphasis is on the employee’s welfare by the employer. Consistently employees show loyalty and deference out of respect and appreciation for employer’s benevolence”(Aycan, 2006, p. 455).

“Paternalism has positive implication in cultures in which it is rooted in indigenous psychologies such as Confucianism” (Farh & Cheng, 2000). The vertical relationship between superiors and subordinates is an important aspect of Confucian Chinese culture, which supports the leader’s supremacy, concern for the followers, recognition of the leader’s moral teachings and to reciprocate the leader’s favors (Niu, Wang & Cheng, 2009).

Paternalism correlates with collectivistic and high-power distance cultural values. The concern of paternalistic leader in personal lives of employees can be evident in collectivistic cultures, though it is considered as “violation of privacy” in individualistic context. In collectivistic culture with strong sense of family ties and loyalty, paternalistic leader (who provides care, protection and maintain close personal relation with employees) has positive impact on employee’s attitudes (Gelfand, Erez, & Aycan, 2007). And the acceptance of authority and due power inequality between the subordinates and leader relate it with high power distance cultures (Aycan, 2006). Thus Aycan (2006) claims that such conflicting practices related to power distance is different from paternalism due to benevolence, with authority of decision making. Saufi, Wafa and Hamzah (2002) declare paternalistic leadership as “telling leadership style”, and people in high power distance culture prefer it and hierarchical relationships sustain mostly through unquestionable obedience (Roland, 1984). Research has found a strong positive relation among uncertainty avoidance, power distance, paternalism and loyalty (Aycan et al., 1999).

2.2 Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment can be defined in different ways. According to Allen & Meyer (1991) organizational commitment is considered to be “a psychological state that binds the individual to the organization”. The word “commitment” can be defined as “the strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization” (Porter, Steers, Mowday & Boulian, 1974).

Meyer and Allen (1991) define it with reference to its three dimensions which maintain employee’s relationship with organization.
i. Affective commitment that is “the employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with and involvement in the organization”.

ii. Continuance commitment means “an awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organization”

iii. Normative commitment that is a “feeling of obligation to continue employment”.

Scholarship reveals that organizational commitment is strongly influenced by work itself, salary, culture of company, company’s leadership and direct behavior of leader. Thus, leadership style has moderate to strongly impact on employee’s commitment (Randeree & Chaudhry, 2012). Another study has explored the effect of leadership style and organizational culture on organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Lok & Crawford, 2004). It is found that organizational commitment would be higher where benevolence-based culture prevails. Benevolent paternalistic leadership has strong effect on continuance commitment and moderate effect on affective commitment due to individual-focused care of the leader, which make employees emotional attached to the organization (Erben & Gu¨nes, 2008). Pellegrini, Scandura, and Jayaraman (2007) in their recent study in the North American context figure out that paternalistic behavior to positively influence employee’s commitment. According to Jackman (1994) commitment and loyalty are found to be the main outcomes of paternalistic leadership style.

Dimension of Paternalism differently influence employee commitment: Authoritarianism is negatively associated with satisfaction and commitment of team member’s with team (Cheng, Huang, & Chou, 2002) as compare to benevolent paternalism which has the strong association with employees’ organizational commitment. Morality and Benevolence are said to be positively related to organizational commitment (Farh, Cheng, Chou, & Chu, 2006), satisfaction with team’s leader (Cheng et al., 2002). Research contends that if leaders exhibit different leadership style than benevolent and moral leaders bring out more encouraging employee outcomes (Niu, Wang, & Cheng, 2009). Uhl-Bien, Tierney, Graen & Wakabayashi (1990) recommended that paternalism promotes trust among leader and workers, group harmony, affective motivation and lifetime employee commitment.

Our research objective is to examine the relationship between Paternalistic leadership and commitment. Actually most of the researches have taken commitment to study different workplace perspectives. Research revealed that commitment had a significant relationship with work outcomes i.e. job involvement, job performance, and job satisfaction (Loui, 1995). According to Brown (2003) commitment can be used as an effective tool to measure leadership behaviors i.e. relations-oriented and task-oriented. Commitment and its three constructs help every organization to measure work place outcomes and organizational goals (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Loui (1995) highlights that employee depicts a strong relationship among job involvement, trust and job satisfaction. Past studies unleash that work outcomes i.e. job involvement, trust and satisfaction considered as major determinants of Organizational commitment (Brown, 2003).

Our paper will treat both paternalistic leadership and organizational commitment as a latent variable to investigation the impact of paternalistic leadership on employee commitment in Pakistan. Thus, our hypothesis is:

**H1: Paternalistic leadership is positively related to Commitment.**

But we will also examine different dimension of paternalistic leadership separately to investigate that which dimension is more effective and predominant in Pakistani context.

2.3 Trust in Leader

Trust has been considered as a center of attention in social sciences (Terri, Scandura, & Pellegrini, 2008). Trust means “willingness to depend on another party” (Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995). The commonly used definition of trust is “willingness to be vulnerable” (Mayer et al., 1995: 712). “Trust is a psychological state comprising the intention to accept vulnerability based on positive expectations of the intentions or behavior of another” (Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt & Camerer, 1998, p.395). For interpersonal as well as for institutional relationships; trust is considered to be the main element (McAllister 1995). According to McKnight, Cummings, and Chervany (1998) trust compromises of two elements: first, trusting belief “one believes the other person is benevolent, competent, honest, or predictable in a situation; and second, trusting intention “one is willing to depend on the other person in a given situation” (p. 474).
According to McAllister (1995) trust is “an individual’s belief in and willingness to act on the basis of the words, actions and decisions of another” (p. 25). They proposed two types of trust:

i. **Cognition-based trust;** based on cognitive reasons.

ii. **Affect-based trust;** base on affection which creates emotional ties between the individuals.

Trust is supposed to be a multidimensional construct involving interpersonal trust or dyadic trust, societal trust, between leader and subordinates, peer trust in the workplace, trust, organizational trust and political trust (Chen, Eberly, Chiang, Farh, & Cheng, 2011). Interpersonal trust are said to be having cognitive and affective foundations (Lewis & Wiegert, 1985).

For development of relationship trust is important because different forms of trust would influence that relationship in different ways (Shapiro et al., 1992). Trust is considered as a true predictor which can predict satisfaction of an individual. Obviously, if there is feeling of trust between the two persons, it means that both persons are satisfied with each other (Frost & Moussavi, 1999).

Leader-member exchange theory of leadership emphasizes on the two-way relationship between supervisors and subordinates and highlights trust as an essential requirement for a social exchange process (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994). In this way for leader member exchange trust is considered to be an important element (Schriesheim, Castro, & Cogliser, 1999). And for trust, integrity and credibility are core foundations. Credibility means “walks the talk”. Leaders provide guidance to employees as “people turn to personal relationships for guidance, and the quality of these relationships is mainly determined by the level of trust” (Cenkci & Otken, 2012, p. 528). Talking about trust in leader, it is “to place oneself in a position of personal risk based on expectations that the trustee will not behave in a way those results in harm to the trustor” (Atkinson and Butcher, 2003, p. 289). It is the trust that binds the followers to the leader so the leader has to be trusted by his followers (Nanus, 1989). This is important because only than the follower will generate extra effort for efficient performance. For high levels of satisfaction, commitment and performance requires trust in the leader (Bartram & Casimir, 2007). Posner and Schmid’s (1984) contend that “trustworthiness and honesty” are considered the most important characteristics for a supervisor (Frost & Moussavi, 1999). Effectiveness of an organization can be recognized by effective leadership and mutual trust is essential to develop strong relationship between the leader and his followers (Cenkci & Otken, 2012).

In collectivistic culture where people share similar believes and values affective based trust is considered more valuable as compare to cognition-based trust. The trust between the leader and follower is considered to be a predominant factor in paternalist and collectivist culture (Ertürk, 2008). Trust in leader greatly influences paternalistic leadership to create the clear perceptions of the practices in organizations (Cenkci & Otken, 2012). Pellegrini & Scandura (2006) propose that paternalism involves “voluntary compliance”, and the followers probably accept the authority of leader as a father in this way they exhibit respect and high levels of trust for their leader. Uhl-Bien and associate (1990) recommend that paternalism promotes trust among leader and follower, group harmony, affective motivation and lifetime employee commitment.

According to Dirks & Ferrin (2002) trust in leader has significant influence on organizational outcomes, like job satisfaction and performance etc. (De Coninck, 2011). Dimensions of Paternalism i.e. morality and benevolence are positively associated to trust in leaders, loyalty toward leaders and OCB (Cheng, Shieh, & Chou, 2002). Similarly Tan and Tan’s (2000) argue that benevolence, leader’s integrity and ability are its antecedents. Affective trust is considered to be positive emotions towards trustee which is based on care and concern for her/him (Chen et al., 2011). This type of relation is a sort of social exchange in nature; the follower displays affective trust only when the leader exhibits benevolent and moral leadership behaviors (Chen et al., 2011). Trust is related to some of the attitudinal outcome such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002). Trust in leadership contributes to organizational commitment, job satisfaction and decreases the intention to quit (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002).

“Given that trust in the leader enhances satisfaction with the leader, trust in the leader may also influence other important outcomes such as organizational commitment” (Bartram & Casimir, 2007: p.15). Scholarship figures out the impact of established trust by the leader with her/his followers on their performance and other outcomes (Chen et al., 2011) as it is taken as a mechanism for this relationship (paternalistic leadership and employee outcomes) (Pellegrini & Scandura, 2008). “Affective trust plays a particularly critical role in influencing follower performance, so the behaviors, which may solicit affective trust (benevolence and morality), are critical
for leaders to exhibit” (Chen et al., 2011: p.17). Research proposes that trust is said to be an important mechanism for the explanation of the reason which make the followers of benevolent and moral paternalistic leaders to be more loyal, committed and perform better (Chen et al., 2011). Generally researchers follow the “theoretical framework of social exchange to explicate the relationships between paternalistic leadership and employee performance and the mediating role of affective trust” (Chen et al., 2011, p.3).

Researches point out that in collectivist cultures affective trust prevails but no study find out the existence of cognition-based trust in the same cultural context. Various studies highlight the association between Paternalistic leadership and trust in leader through which different organizational outcomes can be achieved. Paternalistic leadership leads to commitment and it can only be possible when the follower has trust in his leader. Paternalistic leadership through love and care enhances trust of their follower in leader that would be helpful in achieving further desired outcomes i.e. commitment.

Researches trust “as a strong potential moderator in determining successful leader-member relationships” (Frost & Moussavi, 1999). Trust positively affects the paternalistic leadership and commitment. Trust in leader has been studied as a moderator in many researches (Frost & Moussavi, 1999; Cenkci & Otken, 2012; Sgro et al (1980) such as on relationship of PL and ethical climate (Cenkci & Otken, 2012). Consistently our hypothesis is:

H2: Trust in leader moderates the relationship between PL and commitment.

2.4 In-depth study of Pakistani Culture
Some of the main characteristic of Pakistani culture and some of its common practices are highlighted as to have a better understanding of context of the study. Pakistan is considered to be a high collectivist and high power distance country. A cross-cultural study found high paternalistic values in China, Pakistan, Turkey, India, and the United States (Aycan et al., 2006). As a father has authority over his family in Confucian ethics, the leader like a father manages organization with authority while promoting unity, helping behavior and harmony in organization which is the core spirit of collectivism (Trindis, 1995). Pakistan is high power distance and in-group collectivistic country where high paternalistic values prevail. Asymmetrical power relationships along with collective self-identity and inequality are found throughout Pakistan’s culture (Lyon, 2002). Talking about predominant values of this cluster of countries; Javidan & House (2001, p. 298) found:

“In countries like Iran, India, and China, being a member of a family and of a close group of friends, an in-group, is very important to people. Family members and close friends tend to have strong expectations from each other. Taking care of their needs and satisfying their expectations is critical to each individual. It is not unusual to forgo due diligence, or equal employment opportunity, and to favor a close friend or family member in recruiting or in allocating rewards and promotions. Making regular references to one’s family and especially one’s father is quite acceptable and can go a long way in opening doors.”

In Pakistani culture race, community, groups and families are more important than individual units. More importance is given to group and personalized relationship, as paternalism is based mainly on personalized relationship and less importance is given to efficiency (Rodriguez & Rios, 2009). “Individuals invoke different relationships at different times. Sometimes the bonds of the relationships impose themselves on individuals” (Lyon, 2002, p.2).

Lyon (2002) argued, “Pakistani culture encourages collective action over individual action. Pakistanis encourage indebtedness as a cultural expression of allegiance. They encourage people to think of the strength and position of their group as if it were a direct reflection of their individual strength and position” (Lyon, 2002, p.2).

Another distinct feature of Pakistani society is shame. Shame culture prevails in Pakistan where people are not willing to take responsibilities. Pakistani people are brought up in a way that the dependence is embedded in them. According to Khilji (2003) Pakistan is family-centered where head of the family takes care of family members and individual is expected to be obedient to elders; and all individual decisions are influenced by the family members and dependency is incorporated in her/him. In line centralized decision making and centralized empowerment is part of Pakistani culture so people are not willing to take decisions or responsibilities. Women and children are dependent on family males for any kind of decisions (Lyon, 2002). Lyon (2002) has described Pakistani culture:
“Intervention is offered for even trivial matters and refusal of help is tantamount to a denial of the importance of the relationship. It is anti-social to refuse help from family and friends. With interventionist expectations embedded within household relations and wider family relations, it is a matter of transference to the extra-domestic and non-kin domain for intervention to become a part of the social norms of the wider society. These relationship patterns emerge from asymmetrical relations of age within the family (i.e. father: son::elder brother: younger brother:: mother-in-law: daughter-in-law etc.).” (p.1-2).

Chen and Francesco (2000) argue that Asian Organizations are more likely to be hierarchical, bureaucratic and have central decision making and commitment is considered to be loyal to the top manager. Farh and associates (2006) highlight that if followers are supposed to be dependent on their leader for benefits, work resources, and job content, then they are more likely to favor authoritarianism than those who are not dependent; and if there is high dependence so authoritarianism is considered to be shaving more positive effect on fear of manager. Exocentric approach of Pakistani people made paternalistic leadership more supportive; “to the extent that individual judgment cannot be trusted, paternalistic constraints on choice emerge as a remedy” (Rachlinski, 2003, p. 1166). Economically unstable environment is a major reason for existence of co-dependence in the culture so that follower can feel protected and secure and the leader needs commitment and loyalty from them (Pellegrini & Scandura, 2008).

In-group collectivism can be witness in Pakistan as family-like ties are found between the socially integrated groups, which has more privileged over the rule and breaking of law is well accepted. Selection, promotion and job related decision are taken on the basis of familial or political connections (Kanungo & Mendonca, 1994). Saher (2012) discussed this undue favor to the in group as an “establishing family like relationship with non-kin is institutionalized on the embedded assumption of ‘Vartan Bhanji’ in Punjabi Culture (one of the main sub-cultures of Pakistan).” According to Eglar (1960) “Vartan Bhanji (VB) is a system of establishing and maintaining relationship through gift exchange” (cited in Saher, 2012). Making ones network or in-group strong exchange of gifts is one of the tactics commonly used in Pakistan. There is a high rate of unemployment, poverty, illiteracy and corruption prevailing in Pakistan due to in-group/out-group orientation and cast systems (Khilji, 2003). Whereas Lyon (2002) believes that “class has rarely been a successful mobilising instrument in Pakistan because individual loyalties are primarily kin and caste based” (p.20).

Talking about national value systems of Pakistan, “dominance of elite classes, culture of broken promises” can also been observed. There is tug-of-war between the elite classes and the promises made by ruling classes which has created an environment of distrust and corrupt government (Khilji, 2003). It is quite interesting to explore the relationship between paternalistic leadership and commitment in a culture where trust does not prevail. Generally, paternalistic leader through their care and support gain trust of their followers, which will further helpful in enhancing commitment in them. But in a case like Pakistan where followers don’t find their leaders trustworthy, how do they satisfy their needs and what are the bases of their commitments. This is an interesting situation which is going to be explored in this paper.

As benevolent intentions are related to the sub construct of Paternalistic leadership and in turn linked with cognitive interpersonal trust (McAllister, 1995). Benevolence refers to a leader’s good intentions which help followers to outperform their tasks effectively and remain committed to their organizations (Yang, 1999). Western researchers are of the view that “affect” based relations play a vital role in influencing behaviors (Tyler & Kramer, 1996). In general personal characteristics are the bases for cognitive trust, whereas trust on one another due to their relationship is affective trust (Yang, 1999). The question arises in collectivist societies like Pakistan which type of trust (cognitive trust or affective trust) have more influencing power. Research explains that committed employees demonstrate more job satisfaction, commitment and high productivity as a resultant of trust (Ladd, Travaglione, & Marshall. 2006).

Recent scholarship on interpersonal trust in Pakistani context concludes that factors such as economic ups & downs, socio-political instability, technological advancements and global changes force organizations to respond to context volatility effectively; and focus more on employees’ motivation, innovative leadership tools, and considered organizational as an effective tool behind positive organizational outcomes (Hassan, Toylan, Semercioz & Aksel 2012).
Research findings of Ladd, Travaglione and Marshall (2006) point out that consequence of trust antecedents increase autonomy, satisfaction and affective commitment. In the context of leadership association with commitment, Henkin and Moye (2006) depict that employees who have high level of autonomy in their organization tend to have significant levels of trust in their leaders. Thus our hypothesis is:

\[ \text{H3a: Cognition based trust moderates the relationship between Paternalistic leadership and commitment in Pakistan} \]

\[ \text{H3b: Affection based trust moderates the relationship between Paternalistic leadership and commitment in Pakistan.} \]

3. Research Methodology

Quantitative research methodology was employed to gather first hand data. Survey was conducted on 11 private organizations of Pakistan. The respondents of this study were full time worker ranging in age from 20 to 50 years. Most of the respondents of this study have sixteen years of education, highly competent and well aware of work ethics. In line with busy schedule and unavailability of respondents in these private organizations purposive sampling was used. In total 150 questioners were distributed and 136 were considered for analysis. This shows a sufficient sample size for analyzing results after discarding 14 responses.

A 46-item survey questionnaire was established to investigate our research objective and to draw a conclusion. The questionnaire of our research study was comprised of three constructs: Paternalistic leadership (Independent Variable), Commitment (Dependent Variable) and Trust as a moderating variable. The Paternalistic leadership ($\alpha = 0.683$) i.e. Benevolent leadership, moral and Authoritarian leadership were measured by Cheng, Chou, and Farh (2000) scale. A total of 21 items were used for Paternalistic leadership eight items of the Benevolent and Authoritarian leadership, five items of the moral leadership, Sample items include: “My supervisor is like a family member when he/she gets along with us,” and “My supervisor takes very thoughtful care of subordinates who have spent a long time with him/her”.

Trust variable ($\alpha = 0.76$) was measured by Yang (2005) developed scale. A total of 8 items would be used, 4 items of Cognitive Trust in Supervisor and 4 items of Affective Trust in Supervisor. Trust Measures scores Cognitive Trust in Supervisor ($\alpha = 0.76$) and Affective Trust in Supervisor ($\alpha = 0.66$). Sample items include: “I can rely on my supervisor to do what is best at work.” “My supervisor fulfills all commitments he/she makes,” “I have faith in my supervisor because I feel (s) he would make sacrifices for me if I were in need,” and “If I shared my problems with my supervisor, I know (s) he would respond with care”.

Commitment measure scores ($\alpha = 0.79$). Meyer & Allen’s (1997) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) was used to measure organizational commitment. OCB only contained 18 items (6 items for each scale). Sample items include: “This organization deserves my loyalty,” “This department has a great deal of personal meaning for me,” and “I owe a great deal to my organization”. All variables were scored on a five-point Likert type scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree.

3.1 Demographic Analysis

Gender, age, level of education, and experience were encompassed in the questionnaire to acquire the data concerning demographic profile of respondents. Demographic factors were used in the analysis of data to check the control variables.

4. Results and Discussion

Different tests are applied in this study to find the results such as reliability analysis used to check the reliability of scale, correlation coefficient test to examine the correlation between all variables that is represent in Table 1. Regression analysis is used to test the hypotheses that are representing in Table 2. First the relationship between Paternalistic leadership (PL) and commitment (COM) has been inspected using correlation and regression. Then connection among benevolence, morality and authoritarianism with commitment has been observed by applying correlation and regression. The Correlation coefficients and descriptive statistics of the measures of Paternalistic leadership (PL), commitment (COM) and Trust in leader (TRUST) is shown in Table 1.
It is observed that there is a durable significant relationship among Paternalistic leadership (PL) and commitment (COM). It is examined that commitment is positively correlated with Table 1: Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>COM</th>
<th>TRUST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>3.4643</td>
<td>.42823</td>
<td>(.683)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>3.1259</td>
<td>.53104</td>
<td>(.793)</td>
<td>.284(**)</td>
<td>(.756)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUST</td>
<td>3.3079</td>
<td>.67063</td>
<td>- .211(*)</td>
<td>-.206(*)</td>
<td>(.756)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed), n=136
Alpha values in parenthesis

Paternalistic leadership with 
\( r = .284 \). But trust is negatively related \( r = -.206 \) with commitment and have a negative relation with \( r = -.211 \) paternalistic leadership. Negative relationship of trust shows prevalence of distrust in culture.

Regression test was applied to test hypothesis and results were exhibited in Table 2. In the first regression analysis Commitment was taken as dependent variable and revealed that approximately 81 percent of the variance of commitment was explained by Paternalistic leadership, PL \( R^2 = .081 \). Beta value was .284 and \( t \) value is 3.434 shows strong positive relationship between Paternalistic leadership and commitment. Paternalistic leadership is found to be a strong predictor of commitment in Pakistan. Thus we accept Hypothesis 1. As we see different dimensions of paternalistic leadership, it is found that benevolence style prevails in Pakistan which further strongly predicts commitment \( R^2 = .108 \), \( b = .328 \), \( t =-4.018 \). People in Pakistan gives more importance to group and personalized relationship (Rodriguez & Rıos, 2009) and shows much concern regarding community, groups and families. Caring and helping of others is embedded in Pakistani culture and the results of study support the presence of benevolence leadership style in the culture.

Taking the other dimensions of paternalistic leadership style, presence of morality and authoritarianism style is not supported by the results. Corruption prevails in Pakistan to support in-group/out-group orientation and cast systems (Khilji, 2003) and use of backdoors, a common practice proves the absence of morality in Pakistan. Those who are in authority seek privileges for themselves and for their in-groups and people are in habits of taking credits of other achievements etc. in such kind of cultural morality hardly exits and our findings supports existence of such practices in Pakistan.

Findings do not support the relationship between authoritarianism leadership and commitment, may be because the sample is of private sector in which authoritarianism style is not been considered. Participative style prevails to some extend and exercise of authority is not valued here. Employees are empowered; rather than imposing authority because private sector more follows the international standards.

Trust is negatively related to PL and commitment, which means presence of distrust in culture. As previous studies shows that trust is moderating the relationship of paternalistic leadership and commitment in other countries. Trust in leader as a latent variable does not moderate the relationship between PL and Commitment in Pakistan mainly because of economic factors. Employees mostly continue their job because of scarcity of jobs in Pakistan. When alternatives are not available so they have to remain committed to their current job, because staying with current organization is much likely to be a matter of necessity not considered as a desire.

Economically unstable environment is a major reason for existence of Co-dependence in the culture so that follower can feel protected and secure and the leader needs commitment and loyalty from them (Pellegrini & Scandura, 2008). Secondly distrust in culture prevails at macro level. The culture of broken promises, made by ruling classes had created an environment of distrust and proved to be a corrupt government (Khilji, 2003). Questioners are filled up at micro level where subordinates are asked questions regarding their immediate supervisor not about their national leader. There will be decrease in trust of leader when the leader fail to met the expectation of employee because it is considered a breach of a psychological contract (Robinson, 1996) but in economically unstable environment trust can never be a reason that can effect commitment of an employee because continuous commitment is due to some other factors.
High rate of unemployment, poverty, illiteracy and corruption in Pakistan (Khilji, 2003) will never make an employee to quit a job only because of distrust in his leader. So we reject the hypothesis 2.

Cognition based trust moderates (β=-2.187, t=-2.985, $R^2=.214$) the relationship between PL and commitment and a negative effect on the relationship which weakened the relationship. Affective based trust fails to do so (β =-1.267, t=-2.081, $R^2=.113$). In-group collectivism supports the presence of cognition based trust because people stick to their group not due to affection but they know that staying with the in-group will benefit them in every aspect of life. Cognitive based trust in leader weakens the relationship (PL and organization Commitment) as people’s commitment with the organization lessens because they keep committed with their group due to some personal affairs. When selection, promotion and job related decision are taken on the basis of familial or political connections (Kanungo & Mendonca, 1994) so everyone will feel secure to stay with their in-group rather than committed to organization. Corruption prevails in Pakistan due to in-group/out-group orientation (Khilji, 2003) survival is in staying with in-group. Employees in Pakistan tend to maintain a close relation with immediate supervisor and maintain connection to higher management (Khilji, 2003) not due to the trust they have in their leader but to get benefits they can avail as part of their in-group. Second reason is that people are opportunist whenever they get a better opportunity they will quit the existing job for more benefits or increase in pay etc that shows people’s bent towards cognition-based trust. Lack of affection-based trust proves to be distrust prevails in Pakistani culture. So we accept Hypothesis 3a and reject hypothesis 3b.

5. Conclusion
The research results reveal that Paternalistic leadership is positively related to commitment. Results has proved that this kind of leadership increase commitment through the care and concern of leader about their employees, which can be helpful in achieving organizational goals as proposed by Hayek et.al. (2010). The leader supports their in-group mainly and people are committed not due to the care and support but staying with any group would be beneficial for them. Efficiency is not the criteria for carrier success; it is based on networking mainly so people find their survival in association with any group only. The purpose of the study was to investigate the moderating role of trust in leader on the relationship between PL and commitment in Pakistani context. Through the care and support, leaders gain trust of their followers which is not affect based trust but here the trust is based on cognition. Personal interests of followers tend to attach them towards the leader and employees prove to be committed and loyal.

Trust in leader plays a critical role which has been considered as a side factor in achieving organizational goals. Pakistan is a country in which we find strong roots of in-group collectivism where loyalty to group is preferred over work performance (Rodríguez & Ríos, 2009). Extra support for in-group will be responsible for creating “low morale, frustration and a feeling of dissatisfaction” among out-group members (Khilji, 2003) and in result a culture of distrust is being established in Pakistan as is highlighted by the findings. The negative relationship of trust in leaders proves to be distrust in culture. Followers although don’t find their leader trustworthy in Pakistan but still show commitment. The decline of economy in Pakistan, make the people stay committed to organization as substitutes are not available so employees stick to their organization. The obedience of lower class and the acceptance of authority is the only way for survival.
Caring and helping others in Pakistani culture supports presence of Benevolence style which strongly predicts commitment. Use of backdoors and habits of taking credits of other actions supports the absence of morality in Pakistani culture. Although shame culture and strong dependence supports authority acceptance but due to empowerment of employees in private sector the results don’t support it. The finding can be helpful for the Pakistani leaders in employing appropriate leadership techniques by frosting a culture where trust exists. This is because leaders cannot gain loyalty and commitment of employees only through showing care and concern for employees but building an environment of trust is essential to achieve organizational goals of survival and growth in turbulent times of international economic downturn.

This study is limited to a small size of sample and is limited to only Pakistani private sectors and this relationship of paternalistic leadership and commitment can be studied in other sectors as well specially in public sector. PL is a vast topic and much research has been done on this topic but still there is a lot to be done. In future, data should be collected from different geographic regions of Pakistan so that maximum Pakistani employees' response could be examined.
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