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ABSTRACT

Achieving organisational effectiveness and sustainable growth is the ultimate goal of organisations in their quest to deliver the services required by society. The achievement of organisational effectiveness is not a random event; organisations rely on their employees’ ability to go the extra mile by exhibiting some organisational citizenship behaviours. In order to elicit organisational citizenship behaviours, organisations need leaders who can cultivate some commitment in employees which can arguably lead to the enactment of organisational citizenship behaviours. The culture of an organisation is often determined by the beliefs, values and behaviour of the leader. A paternalistic leadership style is likely to create a culture in which caring for subordinates is crucial, moral integrity is greatly esteemed and authority is respected. When this type of culture is evident in the organisation certain desirable behavioural patterns will come forth from the employees.

The purpose of the current research study is to answer the question, “Does paternalistic leadership have a significant influence on organisational commitment and organisational citizenship behaviour among employees working in selected organisations in the Western Cape?”

In order to answer the research question explaining the hypothesised relationships, the manner in which paternalistic leadership affect organisational commitment and organisational citizenship behaviour was discussed culminating in a theoretical model which was developed and tested in the present study. The study was conducted using employees drawn from selected organisations in the Western Cape Province of South Africa. The participants were asked to complete three questionnaires comprising the Paternalistic Leadership questionnaire developed by Cheng, Chou and Farh (2000); an adapted version of the Organisational Commitment questionnaire by Allen and Meyer (1991) and the Organisational Citizenship Behaviour questionnaire Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Moorman and Fetter (1990).
Out of 300 questionnaires that were distributed to the employees, 230 \((n=230)\) completed questionnaires were returned. Item and dimensionality analyses were conducted on all of the dimensions using SPSS version 23. Subsequently, confirmatory factor analysis was executed on the measurement models of the instruments used. The proposed model was evaluated using structural equation modelling (SEM) via the LISREL version 8.80 software. It was found that both the measurement and structural models fitted the data reasonably well. The results indicated positive relationships between benevolent leadership and organisational commitment; authoritarian leadership and organisational commitment; moral leadership and OCB; and organisational commitment and OCB. There was, however, no significant relationship between moral leadership and organisational commitment; benevolent and OCB. Due to the fact that a few studies on paternalistic leadership exist in South Africa this study adds to the board of knowledge on paternalistic leadership and how it affects employee commitment and OCB. The practical implications of the study and limitations are discussed as well as the direction for future studies.
“There is no greater discovery than seeing God as the author of your destiny.”

(Ravi Zacharias)
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION, RESEARCH INITIATING QUESTION AND RESEARCH OBJECTIVE

1.1 Introduction

Achieving organisational effectiveness and sustainable growth is the ultimate goal of organisations in their quest to deliver the services required by society (Oswal & Narayanappa, 2014). The practical side of accomplishing this goal can be quite complex as the achievement of organisational effectiveness is not a random event. The organisation therefore has to ensure the availability of the important input resources such as capital, labour, entrepreneurship and natural resources. Merely ensuring the availability of these resources, however, is not enough. Organisations need to determine the optimal combination of factors of production in order for the firm to obtain its profit maximising point (Farrel, 2005). Of these resources, labour or human capital is of paramount importance to every organisation, as it has been documented to be one of the chief determinants of organisational effectiveness and the attainment of competitive advantage (Marimuthu, Arokiasamy & Ismail, 2009). Human capital can be defined as the skills that exist within the labour force (Goldin, 2014). These skills, knowledge, abilities, values and social assets in the labour force are enhanced through training, education and other professional programmes (Marimuthu et al., 2009). Goldin (2014) further adds that human capital is the skills that are present within the labour force and these skills are considered assets or resources. The author further clarifies that this concept of human capital emphasises the idea that investments can be made in people for example in, education, training and health, and this will in turn lead to increased individual productivity. When people are developed to the extent that their full potential is reached, the entire organisation is affected positively.

Due to the ever-changing environment in which firms operate, it is vital for every business to find measures that will assist them to remain competitive. Djurica,
Djurica and Janicic (2014) assert that the knowledge, skills, originality, inventiveness, novelty, learning agility and other valuable qualities people possess have become a crucial ingredient in the modern economy, both for their earning ability and competitiveness as well as other economic performances within a firm. Human capital is of such great value in a company because it has the ability to create long term sustainable competitive advantage (Djurica et al, 2014). Rahman and Mamun (2013) agree by suggesting that human capital is the most valuable resource of a firm as it is the foundation upon which profitability and on-going business success can be built.

Below are a few characteristics that must be present in every organisation in order for it to operate successfully and hence enjoy a competitive advantage:

a) a structure where individuals clearly comprehend what is expected of them and what they will be held accountable for (Haid, Schroeder-Saulnier, Sims & Wang, 2010);
b) core people processes and systems that ensure employees exhibit the proper behaviour (Young, 2005);
c) a skilled and competent workforce (Rahman & Mamun, 2013);
d) competent and plausible leaders (Haid et al., 2010);
e) a healthy organisational culture that promotes continuous learning (Young, 2005);
f) a firm that strives for excellence (Young, 2005); and
g) open communication that channels from top to bottom, bottom to top and across peer groups (Young, 2005).

From the characteristics above it can be derived that behind every successful undertaking are people who devote their efforts and competencies to ensure the job gets done (Rahman & Mamun, 2013). It is therefore important that businesses expend great amounts of time and resources to attract and retain a workforce of superb quality, and to influence them in such a way as to perform to their fullest potential (Rahman & Mamun, 2013). One of the important outcomes of proper attention to human capital issues is the enactment of organisational citizenship behaviours by employees.
The exhibition of organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) by employees is one of the positive outcomes likely to be reaped from the investment in human capital and development. OCBs have been linked to team effectiveness (Mahembe & Engelbrecht, 2014); increased efficiency and productivity (Bergun, 2005); enhanced customer service, quality and sales performance (Cooper & Barling, 2008). In addition, Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Paine and Bacharach (2000) highlighted that OCBs also contribute to organisational performance by:

a) increasing colleague or managerial productivity;
b) releasing resources so they can be utilised for more productive purposes;
c) managing activities within and across work groups;
d) plummeting the need to allocate scarce resources to mainly maintenance functions;
e) solidifying the organisations’ capacity to attract and retain talent;
f) enhancing the stability of the organisation’s performance; and
g) facilitating the firm to adjust more effectively to environmental variations.

As one can imagine when it comes to the organisations most valuable assets namely its people, operating a flourishing business can become rather complicated. For example, the first question any organisation should ask itself is how will the firm ensure that its employees reach their full potential within a given position? How will the firm ensure that employees are loyal and faithful? And lastly how can the firm ensure that its employees would go the extra mile in order to encourage organisational efficiency? One way of addressing such questions is by taking a look into the intricate art of leadership.

Leadership originally came into existence during civilisation. It however, has changed dramatically since then. Leadership has developed from the autocratic style where workers were treated as machines to leadership styles that make the working environment more comfortable. Nowadays organisations embrace leadership that
creates a culture of empowerment, engagement, support, and personal and professional development (Stone & Patterson, 2005).

Winston and Patterson (2006, p. 7) defines a leader as “one or more people who select, equip, train, and influence one or more follower(s) who have diverse gifts, abilities, and skills and focuses the follower(s) on the organisation’s mission and objectives causing the follower(s) to willingly and enthusiastically expend spiritual, emotional, and physical energy in a concerted coordinated effort to achieve the organisational mission and objectives.” The authors assert that the leader attains this by casting vision in a way simple enough for the employees to see the future as well, and thereby coming up with an action plan to reach the set goals.

In the broadest sense leadership can be defined as persuading others to understand and have the same opinion about what must be completed and how it must be executed. Moreover, it is the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to carry out shared goals (Winston & Patterson, 2006). Good leadership is extremely important to the success of any organisation. It is said that a good leader is able to make success of the poorest business plan, whereas a bad leader has the ability of ruining even the best plan (Oracle white paper, 2012). Due to this observation it is not surprising that companies spend a lot of money in identifying and attracting competent leaders. The leader therefore plays a pivotal role in influencing organisational effectiveness and competitive advantage (Mahembe & Engelbrecht, 2013; Sullivan, 2011). Various leadership styles are evident in numerous organisations for example, servant leadership, transformational leadership, autocratic leadership, democratic leadership and laissez faire leadership (Saheer, Naz, Tasleem, Naz & Kausar, 2013). This study, however, will be exploring paternalistic leadership and how effective it is in ensuring the commitment of employees and their citizenship behaviour within the organisation. Paternalistic leadership had been quite a debate in many leadership circles due to the unique characteristics it encompasses.
Poaching (2009) defines paternalistic leadership as a form of father-like leadership coupled with authority. It is characterised by three elements namely benevolence, morality and authoritarianism. Erben and Güneser (2008) claim paternalistic leadership to be more than just a leadership style. Instead the authors consider it to be more of a cultural characteristic. These authors describe the essence of paternalistic leadership to be that of caring for subordinates as well as their families with the expectation of utter obedience and loyalty from those the paternalistic leader leads. Saher et al., (2013) further articulate that paternalistic leadership has numerous benefits such as increased trust amongst leader and worker, group harmony, affective motivation and lifelong employee commitment. The authors add that within this type of leadership morality and benevolence are positively linked to trust in leaders, commitment or loyalty toward leaders and organisational citizenship behaviour. One of the outcomes of a paternalistic leadership style is organisational commitment (Saher et al., 2013) which is an important element in the achievement of organisational effectiveness (Erben & Güneser, 2008).

Organisational commitment occurs when employees are psychologically tied or loyal to a particular organisation (McMahon, 2007). The author suggests organisational commitment reveals itself in three distinct ways. The first being affective commitment in which the employee feels a sense of identity and belonging in the firm, the employee is engaged in the organisation and takes pleasure in being a member of the organisation. Erben and Güneser (2008) argue that paternalistic leadership might bring about affective commitment. The second type of commitment is continuance commitment, which entails an employee’s connection with the firm based on what it would cost to leave the organisation. Finally normative commitment involves feeling morally compelled to remain and offer ones services to the organisation (Rehman & Afsar, 2012). According to Erben and Güneser (2008) moral leadership can have an influence on normative commitment. If an organisation can get to a place where its employees are competent, loyal and committed, sustainable growth is a given as employees will willingly take on extra tasks to ensure organisational effectiveness.

When employees are committed they are inclined to freely take on more responsibilities and this is referred to as OCB. According to Rehman and Afsar
OCB refers to the extra work employees choose to take on in order for the organisation to achieve its strategic objectives. The authors construe OCB to include activities such as task performance, the sharing of knowledge, providing social support to co-workers, protecting the organisation and providing recommendations of improvement. Yadav and Punia (2013) argue organisational citizenship behaviour to be crucial to any firm if they envision effective functioning. The reason being that the primary objective is to achieve the organisation’s strategic goals instead of merely accomplishing duties. Hence good leadership is required to elicit this type of behaviour in the workplace.

Paternalistic leadership results in a culture of trust between the leaders and their followers thus fostering commitment and organisational citizenship behaviour (Göncü, Aycan, Johnson, 2014). Even though servant leadership has been widely perceived as the most preferred leadership style in western cultures, the fact that the paternalistic leader portrays a genuine concern for their subordinates’ well-being may cause it to be more favourable in developing countries (Őner, 2012). Although numerous studies exist on the role that leadership plays in impacting organisational commitment and the enactment of OCBs (Göncü, Aycan, Johnson, 2014; Mahembe & Engelbrecht, 2013; Mahembe & Engelbrecht, 2014), paucity exists on how paternalistic leadership as a leadership style influences organisational commitment and the display of OCB in organisations. The goal of this research study is to test a model that explains how paternalistic leadership influences organisational commitment and OCB amongst employees at selected organisations in the Western Cape Province of South Africa. Therefore the research initiating question is “What is the influence of the paternalistic leadership style on organisational commitment and organisational citizenship behaviour on employees at selected organisations in the Western Cape?”

1.2 Research purpose

The primary goal of the study is to conduct an analysis of the relationships between paternalistic leadership, organisational commitment and OCB. The secondary goal is
to validate a theoretical model explicating the structural relationships between these variables at selected organisations in the Western Cape Province of South Africa. In so doing it will help organisations gain an in-depth understanding of how this leadership style affects employees’ loyalty and performance. Organisations would then be informed on whether they consider adopting this leadership style or move away from it.

1.3 Objectives of the study

The objectives of this study are as follows:

a) To develop and test a model that explains the manner in which paternalistic leadership influences organisational commitment and the engagement in OCB;

b) To evaluate the significance of the hypothesised paths in the model; and

c) To assess the goodness of fit of the theoretical model.

1.4 Significance of the study

Due to the intensity and importance of leadership it will be of great worth to find out what type of leadership style a given organisation should employ. It could be one specific leadership style or it can be a combination. This study on the relationship of paternalism, organisational commitment and OCB will add significance to the body of knowledge since it gives insight as to whether this type of leadership is effective or not. Due to the fact that a few studies on paternalistic leadership exist in South Africa this study adds to the board of knowledge on paternalistic leadership and how it affects employee commitment and OCB. In addition, the execution of this research study is important because it will give us an idea of how employees in firms operating in the multicultural South African society respond to paternalistic leadership.
1.5 Structure of the thesis

The thesis is made up of five chapters.

Chapter one consists of the introduction, research problem, the purpose of the research, the objectives of the study, the significance of the research investigation and the structure of the thesis.

Chapter two presents an outline of the theoretical underpinnings behind the subject under investigation and the conceptual definitions of the constructs used in the study. The theory of how paternalistic leadership has an influence on organisational commitment and organisational citizenship behaviour is examined.

Chapter three looks at how the research problem is addressed by presenting the methodology of the study. The methodology includes the research design, sampling strategy, data collection procedures, statistical techniques used and the psychometric properties of the measuring instruments.

Chapter four presents the findings of the study based on the data collected.

Chapter five provides a detailed discussion of the results as well as the theoretical and practical implications of the results, and the limitations of the study as well as direction for future studies.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

The key to successful leadership is to know how, when and how much of a particular type of leadership to use in a given circumstance (Lester, 1975). The author claims that it all depends on the judgement of the person in the leadership role. An individual’s leadership style has to alter as the organisation changes, if this does not happen the effectiveness of the firm will deteriorate (Lester, 1975). Chin, Desormeaux and Sawyer (2016) posit that the leadership style of individuals is based on their past experiences as well as the groups with which they identify themselves. This is almost similar to the view of San Diego (2016) who distinguishes between two types of leaders. The first is the kind of leader who is antisocial and imprudent. The second type of leader is one who genuinely cares for subordinates and who prevents harm from occurring in any way. The author suggests that both leaders are born with these traits. If this is the case then the characteristics of the paternalistic leader will be inherent.

Paternalistic leadership has provided organisations with many benefits. What makes paternalistic leadership unique is the fact that there are three latent subscales that come forth at different times, namely, benevolent, authoritarian and moral leadership. Previous research has proven that benevolent leadership correlates strongly with job satisfaction, organisational commitment and innovation (Anwar, 2013). A study done by Fu, Li and Si (2012) also indicated that benevolent leadership has a positive impact on both exploratory innovation and exploitative innovation. Authoritarian leadership has a significant relationship with the motivation of subordinates in the workplace (Anwar, 2013). In addition further research reveals that benevolent and moral leadership affects in-role and extra-role employee performance (Chen, Eberly, Chiang, Farh, & Cheng, 2014). According to Sichuan,
Huang, Li and Liu (2012) another advantage of benevolent and moral leadership is that it cultivates the trust between employee and employer.

The literature review discusses the definition of paternalistic leadership, organisational commitment, organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB). Thereafter the relationship between these variables will be reported on leading to the development of a theoretical model.

2.2 Conceptualising Paternalistic Leadership

Paternalistic leadership (PL) has a simple unambiguous meaning. However, the way it is perceived can vary from person to person. Mussolino and Calabro (2014) perceive paternalist leadership to be a leadership style in which the employer is so concerned about the well-being of the employees that it results in a decrease of control and independence on the part of the employee. According to Pellegrini and Scandura (2008) paternalistic leadership has become a multifaceted topic of discussion worldwide because of the cultural complexities. Previously management theorists perceived a productive and satisfied work group to stem from a form of paternalistic management that nurtures and build effective employees (Pellegrini & Scandura, 2008). Contrary to this the authors dictate that paternalistic leadership would face the risk of becoming extinct if firms become more bureaucratic and dependent on rules that protect individual rights.

According to Liberman (2014), many scholars have criticised paternalistic leadership as they regard it as a form of benevolent dictatorship or a slight form of discrimination. Some paternal leaders have a large amount of discretion over the employees’ activities and conduct which is considered constructive by some, yet others view it as undesirable. Another downside of paternalistic leadership is also that employees may fail to take initiative and accountability for errors, leading to a lack of personal development (Liberman, 2014). Despite all the criticism a study by
Rodríguez and Ríos (2007) on paternalism was done in two well-known Chilean banks and it was found that both banks had a paternalistic leader without it having an adverse effect on productivity. This implies that this type of leadership may after all be suitable in developing and developed countries (Liberman, 2014). Additionally new paternalism as it is now being referred to, moves towards humanising and re-moralising the workforce (Aycan, 2006). Thus it provides employees with security and protection against the labour market (Warren, 1999).

Saher, Naz, Tasleem, Naz and Kausar (2013) explain paternalism as a relationship that consists of an act of discipline, fatherly authority and morality. The authors construe benevolence and authority within the paternalistic leader encourages the notion of a traditional father-like leader. Furthermore, Saher et al., (2013) dictate the idea of paternalistic leadership is based on a father child relationship, where the father exercises authority over the child. The father morally makes significant life decision on behalf of the child as the father has comprehensive knowledge of the child’s needs and best interest. Fathers who tend to exercise authority over their children were still supposed to have true benevolent intention toward them.

Therefore with reference to the workplace the paternalistic leader must sincerely care for and nurture his or her devotees, but at the same time also discipline and exercise authority over them. It is important for this kind of leader to know how and when to make use of his or her authority.

As a result Liberman (2014) describes paternalism as a warm and sincere bond between the leader and the devotee together with a cautious balance between benevolence and authority. Liberman (2014) continues by defining the paternalism style of management as a hierarchical based relationship in which the person in authority directs both the personal and professional lives of the employee, in a way similar to that of a parent. The employees in exchange provide the paternal leader with loyalty and respect.
The model used by Farh and Cheng (2000) suggests that paternalistic leadership consists of three fundamental components namely; authoritarianism, benevolence, and moral leadership. The authors define authoritative leadership as the authority the leader has over the employees and the assurance of their obedience in return. Furthermore the authors postulate that authoritarianism is exercising control and portraying business owner influence, hence the skilfulness of the leadership is based on coordination between the leader and the devotee. Benevolent leadership refers to the care and individualised concern the leader has for the well-being of the employees. In addition to this benevolence is similar to the show casing of elegance, showing concern from the business owners. Moral leadership entails possessing high moral qualities, being selfless and self-disciplined. The authors expound that the leader must conduct higher moral excellence and model the behaviour and values desired to be seen in the employees.

According to Erben and Güneser (2008) paternalism requires the followers to be dependent on the leader, should they refuse to obey this rule they face the possibility of chastisement. The paternalistic leader has various responsibilities towards those who follow. For example having to attend their personal or social events such as funerals, wedding ceremonies (including the followers’ children), camps, sitting and dining with them at department dinners (Erben & Güneser, 2008).

Kai (2013) describes paternalistic leadership as a leader having the qualities that a parent would illustrate when raising a child. Kai (2013) agrees that the traits this leader displays, is that of authority, fatherly benevolence and moral leadership. The author terms the three prominent elements, namely: kindness, virtue and authority. Kindness is explained as the leaders’ genuine concern for employees. Virtue refers to leaders taking the lead in demonstrating certain moral behaviours they wish to see in employees, the leader should hence be extremely individually self-disciplined and possess high virtue. Authority means that the leader has absolute power and control over the employees and it is expected that the subordinates utterly obey the leader.
The way the leader behaves determines how the employee will respond. Farh and Cheng (2000) provide a summary of how employees will react to the different behaviours illustrated by the leader as depicted in Figure 2.1. The manner in which subordinates tend to respond every time a leader acts in a certain way will produce the culture of the organisation.

2.3 Paternalistic Culture

The culture of an organisation will determine the leadership style the individual will demonstrate (Anwar, 2013). If the culture is putrid strategies can be implemented to change the climate into a more positive one. This is thus dependent on the leader; essentially the leader decides which values and beliefs they want in the organisation (Robbins & Judge, 2012). Scholars have come to the conclusion almost a decade ago that if firms focus more on employees rather than on meeting production targets, employees will be more satisfied and this will increase their performance and in turn their productivity levels (Anwar, 2013).

Paternalistic leadership places great value on the employee. This was evident in a study done by Rowan (2003) on a company in the UK. The author showed that this paternal leader shaped the culture of the organisation, through demonstrating benevolence, morality, and exercising authority. The paternalistic leader’s philosophy at the firm was creating a culture of unity; the leader believed in co-partnership and said that it yielded finer and better individuals. A culture was to be created in which the employees or representatives and employers worked closely with one another and not in warfare. This is what ultimately led to the success of this organisation.

Consequently, it is evident that paternalistic leaders are the ones who create the atmosphere in which employees work. Anwar (2013) proclaims the paternalistic leader produces a friendly, caring and father-like environment which then becomes the culture of that particular organisation.
Figure 2.1 Paternalistic Leader behaviour & subordinate responses

**LEADER BEHAVIOUR**

**Authoritarianism**
- Authority and control:
  - Unwilling to delegate
  - Top down communication
  - Information secrecy
  - Tight control
- Underestimation of subordinate competence:
  - Ignore subordinate suggestions
  - Belittle subordinate contributions
- Image building:
  - Act in a dignified manner
  - Exhibit high self-confidence
  - Information manipulation
- Didactic behaviour:
  - Insist on high performance standards
  - Reprimand subordinates for poor performance
  - Provide guidance and instructions for improvements

**Benevolent leadership**
- Individualised care:
  - Treat employees as family members
  - Provide job security
  - Assist during personal crises
  - Show holistic concern
  - Avoid embarrassing subordinates in public
  - Protect even grave errors of subordinates

**Leader Morality and Integrity**
- Unselfishness:
  - Does not abuse authority for personal gain
  - Does not mix personal interests with business interests
  - Put collective interests ahead of personal interests
  - Lead by example:
    - Act as an exemplar in work and personal conduct

**SUBORDINATE RESPONSE**

- **Compliance:**
  - Show public support
  - Avoid open conflict with boss
  - Avoid expressing dissension

- **Obedience:**
  - Accept leaders directives unconditionally
  - Loyal to leader
  - Trust in leader

- **Respect and fear:**
  - Show deep respect
  - Express fear in awe of leader

- **Having sense of shame:**
  - Willing to confess mistakes
  - Take leaders instruction seriously
  - Correct mistakes and improve

- **Show gratitude:**
  - Never forget leaders favours

- **Strive to reciprocate:**
  - Take leaders instruction seriously
  - Meet leaders expectation
  - Work diligently

- **Identification:**
  - Identify with leader’s values and goals
  - Internalise leader’s values

- **Modelling:**
  - Imitate Leader behaviour

Source: Farh and Cheng (2000, p.98)
Due to the fact that paternalistic leadership and its benefits are mostly prevalent in Eastern countries it would be meaningful to see how it works in non-traditional countries. Assessing whether the South African citizens appreciates a paternal environment of kindness and care would be worth exploring.

2.3.1 Paternalism in non-traditional cultures

It is evident when reviewing various literature that the culture of paternalism stems from Eastern countries such as Turkey, China and Pakistan to name a few. Thus it would be valuable to look at some differences between Eastern and the South African cultures. According to Qingxue (2003), the way in which Asians communicate with each other is usually indirect and implicit due to the fact that they know one another quite well. In contrast, the Westerners communicate in a direct and explicit manner. This is a result of not being aware of their surroundings. They therefore have to rely on communication as their main source of conveying information. Qingxue (2003) professes that the Western culture prefers information to be presented in a clear, detailed and definite way. They are not fond of vague and indefinite information mostly related to limited data.

Easterners believe that people who rely heavily on information are less credible. The Eastern culture holds the belief that silence speaks volumes and anyone who depends on words does not possess information (Qingxue, 2003). The author signifies in Western cultures people value individualism which is all about the person whereas collectivism is embraced by the Eastern people which is all about relying on groups to take care of them (they are more family centric). Another disparity between Eastern and Western Cultures is that Easterners value hierarchical systems while Westerners value equality. Furthermore Western cultures are very assertive whilst Eastern cultures find significance in interpersonal harmony (Qingxue, 2003).
Looking at the attributes of the Eastern culture it is no wonder that paternalism has such a remarkable impact on the success of the organisations, but due to the extensive use of the internet nowadays the issue of acculturation becomes more and more prevalent (Börekçi, 2009). The author posits global trends and cultures do influence individuals across the world due to education, media and the internet; this is referred to as e-culture. The author thus assessed whether paternalism can survive in this type of e-culture. If it does then surely it directs us to the possibility that it may have a positive influence even in western cultures.

E-culture focuses more on getting the job done and the employee cares mainly about excelling in his or her work in order to get good references (Börekçi 2009). Consequently both the employer and employee does not focus much on maintaining a good relationship which is ultimately not a good thing especially if the organisation aims to create a culture in which the wellbeing of employees is priority. Börekçi (2009) declares that in e-culture, due to the lack of emphasis on relationships, employees may feel isolated and secluded from the company. The paternalistic leader can improve this by exhibiting traits such as benevolence toward the employees.

The author came to the conclusion that the type of paternalistic leadership in e-culture will be that of facilitating and that a weakened form of paternalism will allow leaders to lead their teams of professionals and virtual organisations more efficiently. This is because the focus is mainly on work and not on establishing healthy enduring relationships. The author argues that commitment towards the organisation or leader is provisional and feeble in comparison to paternalism in traditional settings where they are enduring and strong.

According to Börekçi (2009) employees in an e-culture are not committed to their patron but to their work, therefore as soon as the work or project ends they may move on to better opportunities. Trust amongst employer and employee does exist in this kind of culture but it is only for the duration of the project or to preserve the
relationship for future connections and for references. In closure Börekçi (2009) suggests in e-culture exchanges of resources and starting patronage connections are easier and alleged fairness is greater than those in traditional culture. One can therefore determine that when operating an organisation in this type of culture, paternalism is more authoritative than that in traditional culture.

Pellegrini, Scandura and Jayaraman (2010) have done research on paternalism in western cultures and they found that even though paternalistic leadership does not correlate with job satisfaction in the United States it proved to have a significant relationship with organisational commitment. The researchers therefore argue that paternalism may be generalised across cultures.

When paternalistic leadership takes place the main emphasis is on the employee’s welfare by the employer. Consequently, employees show commitment and deference out of respect and appreciation for the employer’s benevolence, morality and authoritarian behaviour. The success of this type of leadership is also dependent on the sincerity of the leader.

2.4 Conceptualising Organisational Commitment

Organisational commitment is a pivotal subject in the study of organisational behaviour. This is because it is argued that there is a positive relationship between organisational commitment and the attitudes and various behaviours depicted in the workplace (Angle & Perry, 1981). A study done by Saliu, Gbadeyan and Olujide (2015) proves that there is a significant positive relationship between organisational commitment and job satisfaction. Furthermore when individuals find meaning in what they do at work and are engaged in the workplace the commitment to the organisation of these individuals increase (Geldenhuys, Laba & Venter 2014). A research study done by Osa and Amos (2014) also suggests that organisational commitment has a positive influence on employee performance, and organisational productivity.
The most common type of organisational commitment investigated over the past decades is attitudinal which refers to the strength of the individuals’ identification with the firm’s objectives and core values and the individual’s willingness to maintain his or her membership at the organisation (Küçükbayrak, 2010).

Organisational commitment is defined by McLaggan, Bezuidenhout and Botha (2013) as a versatile concept that includes hard work, participation in organisational activities as well as implicit and explicit identification of organisational values. Commitment to the firm is a sense of loyalty the employee shows and it is a continuous process. Bhal (2005) describes organisational commitment as the extent to which the subordinate is able to identify him or herself with the particular firm and the degree of their involvement in the organisation. Lamastro (1999, p. 1-2) professes that commitment encompasses three elements namely:

a) “a strong belief in and acceptance of the organisations goals and values;

b) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organisation; and

c) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organisation.”

Various organisational commitment models exist which can be uni-dimensional or multidimensional. Four models will now be briefly discussed.

2.4.1. O'Reilly and Chatman's model

This model originates from the idea that commitment is based on the attitude the employee exhibits towards the organisation (O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986). Moreover O'Reilly and Chatman’s model suggests these attitudes can be developed through diverse method. The developers of this model (O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986) assert commitment comprises of three components, namely:

**Compliance** which refers to the adoption of new attitudes and behaviours to obtain specific incentives;
Identification which transpires when the individual accepts influence to develop or continue membership with the firm; and

Internalisation which is when the organisational values are in line with the attitudes and behaviours the employees possess, this make it easier to accept influence.

2.4.2 Morrows major commitments

This model has been developed by Morrow (1993). It has five dimensions that may possibly have mutual influence on one another. According to Cohen (1999), the dimensions are protestant work ethic, job involvement, career commitment, affective organisational commitment and continuance commitment. These five subscales are further categorised into two groups. Mguqulwa (2008) says commitment that has a significant impact exclusively on the manner in which the employee works falls in the first group. This type of commitment has nothing to do with the commitment of the subordinate towards the organisation. The second group entails commitments directly influenced by the organisation, including both affective and continuance organisational commitment (Mguqulwa, 2008).

2.4.3 Mayer and Schoorman’s two factor model

Mayer and Schoorman (1992) created The Mayer and Schoorman’s two factor model. According to Hughes and Palmer (2007), the two factor model consists of two dimensions, namely, continuance commitment and value commitment. Continuance commitment is defined as the cost involved in leaving the organisation and it is exchanged based. Value commitment refers to the belief in and acceptance of the firms objectives and values and the willingness to put forth considerable effort in support of the organisation (Hughes & Palmer, 2007).
2.4.4 Allen and Meyer three component model

Jaros (2007) articulates that the most prominent research done on organisational commitment is administered by Allen and Meyer (1990). These authors developed a model of organisational commitment over 20 years ago which is widely being used in the world of research today. The three component model suggests that employees remain at an organisation because they want to, have to and feel the need to (Solinger, van Olffen, & Roe, 2008). According to the Allen and Meyer (1990) model, there are three dimensions of commitment the individual can experience and these are: affective commitment, normative commitment and continuance commitment. Each of these elements will now be investigated.

**Affective commitment**

Miao, Newman, Schwarz and Xu (2013) define affective commitment as the degree to which individuals feel attached to their place of employment. Individuals who possess affective commitment remain with an organisation because they desire to. As stated by Jaros (2007) individuals feel psychologically or emotionally attached to the organisation as a result of pleasant work experiences. Saxena and Saxena (2015) postulate that committed employees find it easy to relate to the goals of the firm because they feel a sense of belonging. Affective commitment is arguably the most widely used component of commitment for predictive purposes (Mahembe & Engelbrecht, 2013).

**Continuance commitment**

Continuance commitment refers to the financial attachment of the employee. It originates from the alleged costs to the individual as a result of ending the membership with the firm (Miao, Newman, Schwarz & Xu, 2013; Saxena & Saxena, 2015). Jaros (2007) construes it is the monetary and social costs recognised by the employee.
Normative commitment

Individuals who are normatively committed to the firm feel morally compelled to stay (Miao, Newman, Schwarz & Xu, 2013). The reason for feeling morally obligated could stem from an organisational culture that values reciprocity (Jaros, 2007).

In this study the Allen and Meyer Three Component Model is employed. This tri-dimensional model conceptualises organisational commitment in three dimensions that is, affective, normative and continuance. This model has also been used in western countries making it a good measuring instrument to use in South African organisations.

Committed employees have the tendency to do more than their compulsory tasks at the workplace as they believe the firm is part of them, hence they care about reaching strategic goals. This is what OCB is all about.

2.5 Conceptualising Organisational Citizenship behaviour

When employees wholeheartedly support an organisation, even the weakest firm will have the strength to operate successfully. Organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) is a key concept in organisational psychology as this is the state in which most if not all businesses want to operate.

Organisational citizenship behaviour transpires when employees do more than what is expected of them, when they defend the organisation even when it is being criticised and when they urge others to invest in the company (Ucho & Atime, 2013). OCB generally refers to the positive conduct of employees that benefit the organisation as a whole and its members (Ucho & Atime, 2013).

Different types of organisational citizenship behaviours have been explored by researchers. Since its formation the construct of OCB has been deemed multi-dimensional (Ucho & Atime, 2013).
According to Ucho and Atime (2013), initially two dimensions were proposed which refers to altruism and general compliance. These two dimensions serve to enhance organisational effectiveness in various ways. Altruism in the work environment fundamentally involves helping others. General compliance behaviour serves to profit the organisation via utilising a range of methods. Individuals demonstrating this type of behaviour will not frequently stay absent, they strictly adhere to rules and they will ensure that the business operates efficiently. Afterwards, however, general compliance was deconstructed and additional constructs were added making it the five factor model. According to Dash and Pradhan (2014) the five factor model consists of these dimensions: altruism, civic virtue, courtesy, conscientiousness, and sportsmanship.

**Altruism** refers to the willingness of an individual to help fellow workers and new employees with their tasks (Ajgaonkar, Baul, & Phadke, 2012).

**Civic virtue** occurs when employees attend voluntary business activities or functions such as voluntary meetings, responding immediately to letters (Agca & Ertan, 2013).

**Courtesy** can be described as carefulness in the way individuals behave as to prevent work-related conflict. This is also an act of helping but it is also a means to prevent workplace problems from taking place (Dash & Pradhan, 2014).

**Conscientiousness** is defined as discretionary actions that go beyond what is basically required of the job in terms of being obedient to work rules, attendance and job performance. In the same way conscientiousness refers to the strict adherence of company rules and procedures, even when no one is around to keep an eye (Agca & Ertan, 2013).

**Sportsmanship** is when the employee tolerates the little shortcomings of the organisation like a delay in compensation for instance (Ajgaonkar, Baul, & Phadke, 2012).

Ucho and Atime (2013) argue that OCB comprises two distinct characteristics. The first is that it does not form part of the employees’ job description. Secondly OCB stems from the specific as well as unexpected tasks completed by subordinates which are anticipated by the employers, this allows the employer to see how successful the employee is.
According to Jain (2009) the constructs of organisational citizenship behaviour were divided into two dimensions, that is, OCB- individuals and OCB- organisation. The author suggests OCB- individuals are advantageous to the organisation indirectly, as its impact is on the individual’s peers and colleagues. OCB- individual is linked to altruism and courtesy for the reason that these constructs are more aimed at other individuals. OCB-organisation entails conduct on behalf of the employee that benefits the organisation as a whole, for example coming up with ideas to make the organisation more successful, punctual and comply with the rules and regulations of the company (Jain, 2009).

Another three dimensional model was introduced which encompasses obedience, loyalty and participation (Dash & Pradhan, 2014). The authors define obedience as valuing orderly structures and processes. Loyalty is described as encouraging and defending community and exerting additional effort for the common good. Participation is getting involved and actively contributing to the process of community self-governance.

Through reassessing assorted literature pertaining to OCB seven common dimensions were discovered (Dash & Pradhan, 2014). The first one is helping behaviour that refers to willingly helping others. Secondly, sportsmanship was identified and described as individuals who do not grumble or protest when they are slightly inconvenienced by other persons and who are able to uphold the positive attitudes they have in the midst of difficult situations. Thirdly, organisational loyalty is when the employee advertises the organisation to outsiders and being devoted to the business even during negative situations (Ajgaonkar, Baul, & Phadke, 2012). Fourthly, organisational compliance was also recognised and defined as adherence to company policies and procedures. The fifth common dimension found was individual initiative which involves individuals whose performance of duties exceed what is normally required of them to resolve a problem (Ajgaonkar, Baul, & Phadke, 2012). The sixth dimension is civic virtue, and it is defined as the participation of employees in a responsible and positive manner. Lastly, the self-development dimension refers to the willingness of employees to voluntarily improve their knowledge, skills, and abilities in order for them to perform at a better level. This dimension, however, did not obtain any empirical verification (Dash & Pradhan, 2014).
The dimensions developed by different scholars overlap and there are cases in which some are not adequate enough to describe the complete framework. It is due to this that this study will make use of the dimensions developed by Organ (1988), as it is widely accepted, however the OCB questionnaire developed by Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Moorman & Fetter (1990) based on Organ (19988) will be used.

2.6 The Relationships between Paternalistic Leadership, Organisational Commitment and Organisational Citizenship Behaviour

2.6.1 Paternalistic Leadership and Organisational Commitment

Employees who feel forced to continue the employment relationship with an organisation, who have no sense of flexibility at work and who become disinterested in what they do will become uncommitted employees. What any organisation should attempt to prevent is losing talent if they strive to maintain some competitive advantage. That is why managers have to enforce a leadership type that will enhance employee commitment (Afsar, 2014).

Rehman and Afsar (2012) assert that paternalistic leadership does in fact influence organisational commitment. Afsar (2014) suggests the reason for this is that new paternalism organisations elicit loyalty, efficiency and team work outputs due to the focus being on the personal lives of the employees.

According to Saher et al., (2013), the dimensions of paternalistic leadership differently impact the commitment of employees. Caring and nurturing employers or superiors produce loyal and committed employees (Erben & Güneser, 2008). It should also be noted that it is not only paternalistic leadership that has an impact on organisational commitment, but research has revealed that transformational leadership has an influence as well (Almutairi, 2015). The transformational leader leads with charisma and intellectually inspires those who follow. This type of leader does not merely use an authoritarian approach but encourages followers through individualised consideration, charm, intellectual stimulation and inspiration to aim for accomplishments that surpass the expectation of others. It is, therefore, argued that paternalism and transformational leadership has something in common.
Transformational leadership encompasses a style of individualised care that is almost similar to benevolent leadership. Transformational leadership generally accepted in western cultures and paternalistic leadership widely accepted in eastern cultures may therefore possess transactional behaviours making these styles applicable to any cultural group as well as local behaviours making them indigenous to a specific culture only (Erben & Güneser, 2008).

Due to the fact that benevolent leadership contains what is called shi-en behaviours which refers to favour granting, for instance individualised care and considerate and forgiving, it might bring forth affective commitment of employees. According to Afsar (2014), extensive research regarding paternalism has been conducted in eastern societies and because this type of benevolent behaviour is not often exhibited they found that it does not have a significant influence on employee commitment.

Erben and Güneser (2008) assert moral leadership as a characteristic of paternalism consists of “shuh-der” behaviours, in other words setting an example. Examples would be modelling behaviours such as integrity, performing one’s duties, not exploiting others and being selfless. The authors hence suggest that moral leadership can have an impact on normative commitment for the reason that the employee feels coerced to remain at the firm because they believe it is their duty or moral obligation. Furthermore Afsar (2014) asserts that causes of normative commitment include promotion opportunities, training and development provided career counselling given and other long term investments by the organisation. The author therefore argues that moral leadership has an impact on normative commitment because they feel it is their duty and they are expected to remain.

According to Erben and Güneser (2008), authoritarian leadership entails five types of awe inspiring behaviours also known as “li-wei” behaviours. They are powerfully subduing, authority and control, intention hiding, rigorousness and doctrine. Afsar (2014) proposes authoritarian leadership may lead to organisational commitment because employees fear the leader.
2.6.2 Paternalistic Leadership and Organisational Citizenship Behaviour

When an employee takes on additional work outside his or her basic requirements of the job it is termed organisational citizenship behaviour. OCB as stated by Afsar (2014) consists of task performance, doing difficult tasks, feeling a sense of belongingness to the organisation, providing social support for co-workers, and resolving problems and providing suggestions to cultivate the organisation’s performance and being innovative and thinking about entrepreneurship within the firm.

Paternalistic leadership highlights collective task accomplishment, gaining knowledge by sharing experiences and assigning authority which fosters employees’ performance. Afsar (2014) dictates that paternalistic leadership thus creates a culture in which the employees’ sense of motivation, meaning, aspiration and self-management help them in demonstrating organisational citizenship behaviour.

Afsar (2014) further postulate that this leadership style motivates employees to take on more responsibility and it fosters their beliefs about their abilities to help others and become citizens of the organisation. The author suggests paternalistic leadership increases the participation of employees in helping behaviours, altruism, sportsmanship, courtesy and extra role behaviours. On the other hand when it comes to authoritarian leadership OCB decreases both at an organisational and individual level.

When trust is present and intact in the relationship between the supervisor and subordinate due to the leader’s enactment of benevolent and moral leadership the relationship turns into a social exchange in nature (Chen, Eberly, Chiang, Farh & Cheng, 2011). When the employees eventually start perceiving their relationship beyond the standard economic contract, they will be eager to counter the socio-emotional benefits a paternalistic patriarch gives in the relationship. Individuals will exhibit desired behaviours when they perceive the leader demonstrating caring and considerate deeds. Consequently these employees may expend considerable time on required work and they will be keen on doing more than what their job description specifies in an attempt to benefit wider organisational goals (Chen et al., 2011). The authors posit that subordinates do not merely perform extra role activities
because they are motivated to do so but it is because do not feel as vulnerable and do not fear chastisement when things do not go right. Furthermore in the study done by Chen et al., (2011) the authors determined that benevolent leadership positively affects OCB.

In a research study by Paoching (2009) the results reveal benevolent leadership and moral leadership affects OCB. Authoritarian leadership however did not have a significant relationship with OCB.

2.6.3 Organisational Commitment and Organisational Citizenship Behaviour

Organisation citizenship behaviour is extra voluntary duties whereas organisational commitment occurs when the employees provide their energy and time besides making an extra effort to achieve the objectives of the firm. This gives reason to suggest that organisational commitment does affect organisation citizenship behaviour (Özdem, 2012). Employees are committed to their organisation because of the opportunities presented to them and this result in organisational citizenship behaviour which benefits the entire firm. A significant relationship was found between organisational commitment and OCB within various studies (Williams & Anderson 1991; Mohammad, Habib & Alias 2011) but there were a few other scholars who found no relationship at all (Mehrabi, Alemzadeh, Jadidi & Mahdevar, 2013). OCB was found to have both a positive and adverse relationship with some of the dimensions of organisational commitment, namely, affective commitment and continuance commitment (Özdem, 2012).

Kiliç (2013) also asserts that organisational commitment leads to organisational citizenship behaviour. The author first assessed the relationship between the subscales of organisation citizenship behaviour with organisational commitment and found that there is a significant link between altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship (positive but weak), courtesy, civic virtue and organisational commitment. The author found that the OCB dimension that had the strongest connection with organisational commitment was altruism, hence she is of the
belief that when employees are committed to the firm their altruistic behaviour increases. Secondly Kiliç (2013) evaluated the impact the subscales of organisational commitment had on the dimensions of OCB. The researcher obtained the following results: affective, continuous and normative commitment affects altruism; normative commitment affects conscientiousness and sportsmanship, courtesy and civic virtue is impacted by affective commitment. Hence the author concluded that affective commitment has the greatest influence on all dimension of OCB except for conscientiousness.

Asiedu, Sarfo and Adjei (2014) argue that when people are committed, they will generally go the extra mile in an attempt to achieve corporate goals and objectives. The authors state that commitment has a positive impact on organisational effectiveness and efficiency because it involves employees feeling affiliated and attached, moreover it leads to citizenship behaviour which enhances the performance of the organisation.

The research done by Chang, Tsai and Tsai (2011) corresponds with that of Kiliç (2013) and Asiedu et al., (2014) in that it also indicates a connection between organisational commitment and organisational citizenship behaviour. Chang et al., (2011) have the perception that as long as organisations are equally loyal to employees they will remain committed , similarly with OCB, if the organisation treats employees well they will perform above and beyond their required tasks.

Based on the arguments presented above, the following relationships were postulated:

**Hypothesis one:** Benevolent leadership affects organisational commitment.

**Hypothesis two:** Moral leadership affects organisational commitment.

**Hypothesis three:** Authoritarian leadership affects organisational commitment.

**Hypothesis four:** Benevolent leadership affects organisational citizenship behaviour.
Hypothesis five: Moral leadership affects organisational citizenship behaviour.

Hypothesis six: Organisational commitment affects organisational citizenship behaviour.

Founded upon the hypothesis and taking into consideration various literature a theoretical model was derived which will now be illustrated.

2.7 Theoretical model

After an in-depth investigation of the literature, a conceptual model was derived. Figure 2.2 illustrates the conceptual model that depicts the specific hypothesised causal linkages between paternalistic leadership, organisational commitment and OCB.

Figure 2.2 The conceptual model
2.8 Conclusion
This chapter provides an overview of the research literature on paternalistic leadership, organisational commitment and organisational citizenship behaviour in order to answer the research question. Paternalistic leadership was discussed as well as its dimensions namely benevolent leadership, moral leadership and authoritarian leadership. Three types of commitment: Affective commitment, continuance and normative commitment were also discussed. Lastly, the Organ (1988) five factor model (sportsmanship, conscientiousness, civic virtue, courtesy and altruism) has been found to be the most widely used in defining OCB and it is used in this study.
CHAPTER THREE

METHOD

3.1 Introduction

In Chapter Two, the conceptual definitions of paternalistic leadership, organisational commitment and organisational citizenship behaviour were highlighted. The discussion of the previous studies did not only shed some light on what previous findings reported on the relationship among the variables under study, it also helped in the formulation of research hypotheses postulated in the present study. The present chapter outlines the methodology used to answer the research question under investigation. The study seeks to answer the question “does paternalistic leadership have an influence on organisational commitment and organisational citizenship behaviour?” In order to answer the research question as well as test the postulated hypotheses, the research plan (strategy) and how it was executed is discussed, information about the participants is also provided including how they were selected. In addition the research instruments chosen to obtain information on the constructs being evaluated, and the methods that were applied to analyse the data are presented. The ethical considerations when collecting data from participants is also discussed.

3.2 Research design

Rajasekar, Philominatha and Chinnathambi (2013) define research design as the various techniques that are employed to answer the research problem. Additionally the research design must specify the sources and information associated with the problem, the time frame as well as the costs involved. Williams (2007) posits that there are three different approaches for carrying out research studies these techniques are quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods.
Qualitative research designs are aimed at obtaining information via a narrative approach (Creswell, 2003). The qualitative research design follows the interpretivistic or phenomenological paradigm. Reality according to the interpretivistic approach is socially constructed therefore subjective experiences play a big role in understanding human behaviour (Khan, 2014). Examples of qualitative data are in-depth interviews, telephonic interviews and focus groups (Bryman, Bell, Hirschsohn, Dos Santos, Du Toit, Masenge, Van Aardt & Wagner 2014). The advantage of qualitative research is the in-depth understanding it provides thereby producing quality information. The disadvantage is that it takes time and can be quite costly. Furthermore, it is difficult to generalise the results due to small sample sizes used.

Quantitative research alternatively focuses on the numerical aspect of the research being studied (Tewksbury, 2009). Quantitative research can be described as the gathering of numerical data to gain more insights on a particular topic and it originates from the scientific methods used in physical science (Williams, 2007). The quantitative design follows the positivistic paradigm. The positivistic paradigm defines participants' reality in terms of numbers and employs the methods and techniques used in the natural science to study human behaviour (Khan, 2014). Some of the benefits of quantitative research in the opinion of Tewksbury (2009) are that it is a good predictor, and it is cost and time effective. In contrast there are a few disadvantages too. With quantitative instruments bias creeps in and respondents may give inaccurate information as the participants sometimes provide socially desirable responses.

The mixed methods approach, as the name suggests refers to a blend of both qualitative and quantitative data (Creswell, 2003). The mixed methods approach can be of value because it tackles confirmatory and exploratory research questions all at once (Venkatesh, Brown & Bala, 2013). A limitation of this research method is the uncertainty of how validity must be conceptualised.

Due to the nature of the present study which intends to test research hypothesis as indicated in a theoretical model provided in figure 3.1 this study employed the quantitative research design.
3.3 Statistical Hypotheses

Theoretical Model

Figure 3.1 illustrates the conceptual model derived from the literature study, which depicts the specific hypothesised causal relationships between paternalistic leadership, organisational commitment and organisational citizenship behaviour.

![Figure 3.1 The conceptual model](image)

In order to test the validity of the proposed relationships in the structural model, the following specific research hypotheses were tested:

**Hypothesis one**

Benevolent leadership affects organisational commitment.

**Hypothesis two**

Moral leadership affects organisational commitment.
Hypothesis three
Authoritarian leadership affects organisational commitment.

Hypothesis four
Benevolent leadership affects organisational citizenship behaviour.

Hypothesis five
Moral leadership affects organisational citizenship behaviour.

Hypothesis six
Organisational commitment affects organisational citizenship behaviour.

3.4 Sampling and research participants

3.4.1 Population

A population is the total group of people who possess certain characteristics that the researcher will find valuable in the investigation (de Vos, Strydom, Fouche & Delport, 2002; Sekaran, 2001). The population focus of this study is on the employees in selected service organisations in the Western Cape Province of South Africa.

3.4.2 Sample size

De Vos et al., (2002) define a sample as the participants who are extracted from the population that will contribute valuable information to the research study. As a result not all elements in a population would necessarily form a sample. A sample provides an idea or comprehension of what generally happens in the population (Sekaran, 2001). For conclusive research purposes a sample size of 230 employees was used to conduct the research.
The sample consisted of mostly female participants (56.4%). The predominant age groups of the sample were between 31-40 (33.5%) and 41-50 (35.2%). Furthermore most of the participants were Afrikaans. The majority of those who took formed part of the sample were coloured people (55.5%) followed by white people (19.5%). The highest qualification obtained by most of the participants was matric (33.1%) and a certificate or diploma (34.3%). Regarding years of service the majority have been working for 1-5 years (23.7), 6-10 years (24.6) and 15 years and above (23.7). Pertaining to religion most of the participants in this sample indicated that they were protestant Christians (50.8%).

3.4.3 Sampling procedure

Two types of Sampling procedure exist namely, probability sampling and non-probability sampling (Sekaran, 2001). Probability sampling is a type of sampling where participants are selected randomly, whereas in non-probability sampling the selection of participants is indefinite. The sampling group used in this study was non-probability sampling, which will briefly be looked at.

3.4.3.1 Non-Probability sampling

De Vos et al., (2002) state that non-probability sampling means the chance of participants being chosen to participate is the study is non-probable or less. The type of non-probability sampling employed in this study was convenience sampling as it is in line with the expectations and intentions of the researcher.

Convenience sampling also known as accidental sampling is a type of sampling where the participants are conveniently chosen to take part in the research study (Etikan, Musa & Alkassim, 2015). The individuals chosen simply met the practical criteria of accessibility, geographic nearness, availability and willingness to participate. According to Teddlie and Yu (2007) convenience sampling is referred to accidental sampling due to the fact that participants may be chosen because they
just happen to be located spatially or administratively close to where the researcher is conducting the research. The fundamental purpose of convenience sampling is to gather information from individuals who are easily reachable to the researcher (Etikan et al., 2015). The authors articulate that with convenience sampling it is presumed that the members of the target population are homogeneous, meaning that if the same study were to be administered in an inaccessible location the same results would be obtained.

The expediency of convenience sampling is that it is inexpensive, quite easy and participants are freely available (Creswell, 1998; Etikan et al., 2015). The authors furthermore provide some shortcomings of convenience sampling. The first is that it will most probably present biased results. And secondly outliers are possibly the greatest disadvantage. Outliers are cases that do not belong to the data; consequently these cases do not correlate with the bulk of the data. Outliers therefore threaten the homogeneity of the population and the psychometric properties of the study’s findings if they are not correctly dealt with (Farrokhi, 2012).

Whenever choosing the type of sampling to use, it is important that it must be consistent with the assumptions and purposes of the researcher (Etikan et al., 2015).

3.5 Data collection Procedure

Due to the fact that a quantitative survey design was used data was obtained by issuing a self-report instrument to the potential participants. The questionnaires were personally delivered to the selected organisations in the Western Cape area after the permission to conduct the research was obtained from both the University’s research committee and the organisations from which participants were drawn. The participants received a questionnaire comprising an information sheet, biographical section and the three measuring instruments namely paternalistic leadership, organisational commitment and organisational citizenship behaviour. The information sheet gave information pertaining to the reason for the study and basic instructions on completing the questionnaire.
In terms of questionnaire administrative procedures, the questionnaires were left with the secretaries who distributed them among the workers. The questionnaires were collected from the secretaries. A total of 300 questionnaires were distributed to participants and 230 were returned.

3.6 Measuring instruments

The measuring instruments used when measuring the constructs being investigated were the paternalistic leadership questionnaire, the organisational commitment questionnaire and the organisational citizenship behaviour questionnaire. The first section (section A) consists of the demographic information. The other three sections (sections B, C & D) comprised the measuring instruments which will be briefly discussed below.

3.6.1 Paternalistic leadership

The 26-item Paternalistic leadership questionnaire developed by Cheng, Chou and Farh (2000) was utilised. Paternalism ensures that workers are not exploited as was evident in the past. Aycan (2006) proclaims that eliminating the strict management systems and contractual relationships between the supervisor and subordinate is another goal of paternalistic leadership. For this reason it will be interesting to see whether or not it is present in some organisations in non-eastern cultures and what the outcome of this type of leadership is.

The Paternalistic leadership scale was developed to define three characteristics of a paternal leader. The first being benevolent leadership which according to Chen, Eberly, Chiang, Farh and Cheng (2014) refers to the employer portraying a caring trait towards the employees and their family members. A sample item would be “beyond work relations my supervisor expresses concern about my daily life.” The second subscale is authoritarian leadership; here the leader exercises control and authority over the employees expecting loyalty in return. A sample item would be “my
supervisor emphasises that our group must have the best performance of all the units in the organisation.” The final subscale is moral leadership which refers to the leader exhibiting moral behaviour such as unselfishness and integrity which subordinates ought to imitate. An item example is “My supervisor never avenges a personal wrong in the name of public interest when he / she is offended.”

A seven-point Likert scale was used. The Likert scale ranges from 1 indicating that the respondent agrees to a very little extent; to 7 indicating that the respondent agrees to a very great extent. The reliability coefficient for each subscale is 0.89 for authoritarian, 0.95 for benevolence and 0.85 for morality.

3.6.2 Organisational Commitment

A slightly modified version of the three component Organisational Commitment Survey developed by Allen and Meyer (1990) was used to assess organisational commitment. The questionnaire consists of three dimensions and 18 items, each scale consisting of 6 questions. A seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 strongly disagree to 7 strongly agree was used. The reliability for affective, continuance and normative scales are 0.83, 0.74, and 0.87 respectively (Sersic, 1999). Example items are (1) I am happy working in this organisation (affective); (2) changing organisations would be difficult for me to do (continuance) and (3) I would feel guilty if I left the organisation (normative).

3.6.3 Organisational citizenship behaviour

Organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) was measured using the Organisational Citizenship Behaviour Scale (OCBS) developed by Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Moorman and Fetter (1990). The instrument consists of five subscales as conceptualised by Organ (1988) namely: altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy and civic virtue. The OCBS has sound psychometric attributes (Moorman, 1991; Hui, Law & Chen, 1999). The reliability coefficients for the subscales ranged from 0.70 for civic virtue to 0.85 for altruism. A study by Mahembe, Engelbrecht, Chinyamurindi and
Kandekande (2015) reported reliabilities ranging from $\alpha=.80$ to $\alpha = .98$ on a South African sample.

### 3.7 Ethical Considerations

According to Fouka and Mantzorou (2011), the word ethics stem from Greek philosophy which morally correct. Furthermore, the author deems ethics to be principles by which the actions of the researcher are guided. The following ethical considerations were taken into account when conducting this research study (Sekaran, 2001):

**Scientific Misconduct:** Accurate and true representations of reports were rendered within this study. Data was not fabricated.

**Confidentiality and anonymity** was ensued since participants were not asked to place their names on the questionnaires.

**Voluntary participation:** Within this study no one was forced to participate. Their decision to or not to take part was highly respected. Informed consent was sought from the participants before the administration of the questionnaires.

The **self-esteem** and **self-respect** of the subjects were not violated. The research was not focused on specific departments and the results will only be made use for the purpose of this research study.

**Negative impact on career:** This is important because this may cause individuals to assess whether or not they would want to remain in the organisation. The research did not adversely affect the careers of the participants.

**No harm to respondents:** The research did not cause any physical or emotional harm to the participants.
3.8 Statistical Analysis

3.8.1 Missing values

Prior to analysing the data the problem of missing values had to be dealt with. The researcher has to decipher the reason for the missing data. The question that needs to be answered is, was the data simply randomly lost or was there a refusal or inability to respond (Williams, 2015). Missing values are the values failed to get during the collecting of data; there are diverse reasons why participants chose not to respond to certain questions in a questionnaire (Kaiser, 2014). Missing values have to be attended to in such a way that it does not affect the analyses negatively.

There are different ways in treating missing values. The easiest way to solve this problem is by simply eliminating the missing values, but this will decrease the substance of information from the data in terms of sample size (Kaiser, 2014). The author also proposes that missing values can be replaced with the mean or median, the most common attribute value could also be used in its place. Single imputation as well as multiple imputation can be used.

There is a programme available that can solve the issue of missing values called the PRELIS module found in LISREL. The various ways in which it addresses the problem is by using: case wise methods which consists of listwise and pairwise deletion; single imputation methods such as replacing the mean, substituting the group, regression based imputation, random hot deck imputation and imputation by matching and multiple imputation (IM). In the present study the multiple imputation option available in the PRELIS module in the LISREL program was used.

3.8.1.1 Case Methods

There are different ways in which to solve the problem of missing values. The case methods to be discussed in this section is, listwise deletion, pairwise deletion, single – imputation methods and multiple – imputation methods.
**Listwise deletion**

According to Pallant (2010), listwise deletion entails the elimination of a variable in the cases where even one piece of data was missing a case will be fully eliminated from all the analysis. The disadvantage of listwise exclusion is that it can restrict your sample size severely.

**Pairwise deletion**

With regards to Pairwise deletion, cases are only deleted if the data required for the specific analysis is absent (Pallant, 2010). If the necessary information is present the cases will still be included in the analyses. According to William (2015) pairwise deletion is calculated by utilising for each pair of variables the cases that have values. This procedure is acceptable only if data is missing at random.

**Single – imputation methods**

Takahashi and Ito (2012) define single imputation as using predicted values to fill in the missing data; examples are mean imputation, cold deck imputation, hot deck imputation and regression imputation. The disadvantage of this method is that an unknown value is substituted by a single value and then it is treated as if it was the actual value. Takahashi and Ito (2012) assert that as a result of ‘false’ values the single imputation method ignores uncertainty and in most cases undervalues the variance.

**Multiple imputation methods**

Multiple imputation occurs when the researcher imputes more than one value for the lost item (Tonini, Scartoni, Paoli, Nizzardo & Capriati, 2015). The authors postulate the benefit of multiple imputation to be the fact that it signifies the hesitation about which value to assign. Takahashi and Ito (2012) claim that multiple imputation solves the error of uncertainty and the underestimation of the variance found in single imputation, by taking into consideration within-imputation ambiguity and between-imputation ambiguity.
3.8.2 Item Analysis

Item (reliability) and exploratory factor analyses (EFA) was performed to identify any poor items (i.e. factor loadings < 0.30; complex items loading on more than two factors) on the factors defining the latent factor structure of the constructs using in the study. The application of the eigenvalues-greater-than-unit rule was used to identify the number of factors that underlie the observed correlation matrix for each of the subscales in the process of testing for the uni-dimensionality of the sub-scales. Data was analysed using structural equation modeling via LISREL version 8.80 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 2006). The Gamma and beta matrices were used to determine whether the hypothesised relationships were confirmed or not. The goodness of fit statistics was also interpreted to determine the model fit.

Item analysis is the process of removing items that are not related to the entire subscale score or the items have a very low relationship with the dimension. The purpose of carrying out an item analysis is to enhance the homogeneity of the items within a given subscale. Item analysis was executed using the reliability-analysis procedure available in SPSS version 23. Item-total correlation, item mean and standard deviation was calculated through the item analysis procedure. In cases where items had an item-total correlation of less than 0.30 the item would be removed. The elimination of the item would then cause a considerable increase in the scale internal consistency.

3.9 Construct Analysis using Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)

According to Costello and Osborne (2005) the purpose of factor analysis is to eliminate any latent variables that cause evident variables to differ in the same time period.

Exploratory factor analysis is a statistical approach that is commonly used in social sciences (Costello & Osborne, 2005). As the name suggest EFA is a type
of factor analysis in which the researcher does not anticipate the number or nature of the variables (Williams, Brown & Onsman, 2012). The researcher therefore only explores the key dimensions to produce a theory or model from a fairly large set of hidden constructs usually characterised as items (Williams et al., 2012).

The reason for conducting exploratory factor analysis on the dimensions were to ensure that all items are uni-dimensional, that is, the items for each subscale load only on one factor.

The eigenvalues-greater-than-unit rule will be used to determine the amount of scales to remove. There were certain guidelines followed in determining which items to delete and which items to include when doing the exploratory factor analysis:

a) if an item received an item-total correlation of greater than 0.30 it was excluded, since this is an indication that it is a poor item (Pallant, 2010);
b) the number of factors to be removed should not be greater than the number of eigenvalues greater than 1.00 (Yong & Pearce, 2013);
c) when dimensions obtained a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy value greater than 0.5 which is the acceptable standard, it was included for factor analysis (Yong & Pearce, 2013); and
d) an item that loads greater than 0.30 on more than one factor would be extracted if there is a difference of 0.25 between the maximum and minimum loading (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001).

3.10 Construct Analysis using Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)
Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) is typically conducted through structural equation modelling. CFA is a statistical technique utilised to confirm the factor structure of a set of observed variables, in other words it reveals whether the observed data correlate with the latent variables according to the form defined in the measurement
model by creating a sequence of fit indices (Suhr, 2006). These indices indicate how well the measurement model with its parameter estimates fits the data gathered (Mahembe & Engelbrecht, 2013). The researcher uses theoretical knowledge, experiential research or both and then statistically evaluates the hypotheses (Suhr, 2006).

Prior to confirmatory analysis the following must be done: continuous and categorical data must be specified, data must be normalized, the problem of missing data must be solved, the sample size must be adequate, item validation must be done and the theoretical basis of the model must be taken into account (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001).

3.10.1 Structural Equation Modelling

Structural equation modelling (SEM) is a type of confirmatory analysis different from exploratory factor analysis. It is utilised to assess a theory, and the prerequisite of doing SEM is to have prior knowledge or hypotheses about possible relationships between variables (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Mahembe and Engelbrecht (2013) postulate that SEM assists in defining the patterns of covariance researchers discover amongst manifest variables pertaining to the correlations that the measurement and structural models hypothesised. When using SEM as a factor analysis technique a sample size of at least 200 must be used when analysing small or medium models (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001).

The advantages of using SEM in the investigation of experiments are that meditational procedures can be assessed and data relating to the appropriateness of the manipulations can be incorporated in the analysis. Another benefit of structural equation modelling is that the missing data instrument can be added in the model (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001).

A few limitations of SEM exist especially since SEM is used for exploratory work without ensuring the necessary controls (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). The author's state that one of the reasons for the bad impression SEM made on certain researchers can be due to the fact that is sometimes referred to as causal modelling.
It should therefore be noted that SEM is not causal in the sense of inferring causality. Ascribing causality has to do with the design; it is not a statistical matter.

3.11 Conclusion

The research methodology employed in this study was discussed in this chapter. The methodology as well as the statistical methodology was reported on. The measuring instruments and psychometric properties were outlined as well as how the data was evaluated in order for the research problem to be answered. The results are presented in chapter four and discussed in chapter five.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

4.1 Introduction

The theoretical model originating from available literature concerning the influence of paternalistic leadership on organisational commitment and organisational citizenship behaviour led to the formulation and specification of hypotheses that need to be tested. The purpose of this chapter is to present the results of the statistical analyses that were performed to test the hypotheses, as described in chapter three. The statistical programme used for the analyses and presentation of data is the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 23 and the LISREL 8.80.

This chapter starts with addressing the missing values problem, next item analyses and dimensional analysis and concludes with the presentation of the confirmatory factor analyses and structural equation modelling results.

4.2 Missing values

Before any analysis could take place the problem of missing data had to be addressed. Missing data is usually a result of respondents failing to answer certain questions due to a variety of reasons. This problem was dealt with by using multiple imputation. Since the percentage of missing values was very small the multiple imputation method retained all the 230 cases.
4.3 Item analysis

For this study the item analysis was executed using SPSS Reliability procedure on the dimensions used to measure the variable under investigation. The aim of conducting an item analysis was to identify items that were not adding to the internal consistency of the variables being assessed by these subscales.

4.3.1 Item analysis of the Paternalistic Leadership Questionnaire

The Paternalistic Leadership Questionnaire developed by Cheng, Chou and Farh (2002) includes 26 items measuring three dimensions (Benevolent, Moral and Authoritarian dimensions). The item analysis was performed on the three subscales separately.

4.3.1.1 Benevolent leadership

The Cronbach alpha attained for benevolence was 0.95. This was acceptable\(^1\). The item total correlation within the item total statistics should not be less than 0.30 otherwise it suggests that the item measures something completely different from the entire scale (Pallant, 2010). All the corrected item total correlations were greater than 0.30 as shown in table 4.1.

\(^1\) Acceptable Cronbach values should be greater than 0.70 (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). In all the reliability...
Table 4.1

Reliability output for the benevolent leadership subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.948</td>
<td>.949</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Squared Multiple Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PL1 36.97</td>
<td>176.798</td>
<td>.701</td>
<td>.563</td>
<td>.946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL2 37.46</td>
<td>172.739</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td>.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL3 37.44</td>
<td>173.584</td>
<td>.793</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>.943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL4 37.16</td>
<td>173.495</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL5 36.42</td>
<td>178.244</td>
<td>.769</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td>.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL6 36.88</td>
<td>178.055</td>
<td>.792</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td>.943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL7 37.10</td>
<td>171.456</td>
<td>.845</td>
<td>.754</td>
<td>.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL8 36.87</td>
<td>173.150</td>
<td>.824</td>
<td>.718</td>
<td>.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL9 38.04</td>
<td>180.771</td>
<td>.619</td>
<td>.458</td>
<td>.949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL10 37.15</td>
<td>171.681</td>
<td>.829</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL11 37.73</td>
<td>178.495</td>
<td>.674</td>
<td>.552</td>
<td>.947</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.1.2 Moral leadership

The Moral leadership scale has a reliability coefficient of 0.82 which is greater than the cut-off level of 0.70 (Foxcroft & Roodt, 2009; Nunnally & Bernstein,
The item total statistics indicated a significant increase in the reliability coefficient if item PLR14 is excluded, as the corrected item-total correlation indicated a value of .152 which was below 0.30. For this reason item PLR14 (which was a negative item) was deleted and the reliability coefficient increased from 0.77 to 0.80. All items in the revised corrected item correlation matrix are above 0.30 and no items were found to be problematic (see Table 4.2).

Table 4.2

*Reliability output for the moral leadership subscale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.818</td>
<td>.816</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Squared Multiple Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PL12</td>
<td>16.18</td>
<td>33.335</td>
<td>.600</td>
<td>.380</td>
<td>.786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL13</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>35.620</td>
<td>.475</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>.819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL15</td>
<td>16.19</td>
<td>32.249</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL16</td>
<td>15.82</td>
<td>28.543</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td>.648</td>
<td>.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL17</td>
<td>15.69</td>
<td>30.520</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td>.766</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.1.3 Authoritarian leadership

The internal consistency coefficient for authoritarian leadership is 0.77 which according to (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994) is good. Within the corrected item total correlation matrix, all the items are above 0.30 (see Table 4.3).
Table 4.3

Reliability output for the authoritarian leadership subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.769</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Squared Multiple Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PL18</td>
<td>21.14</td>
<td>46.775</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>.312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL19</td>
<td>21.57</td>
<td>45.042</td>
<td>.562</td>
<td>.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL20</td>
<td>21.87</td>
<td>41.826</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL22</td>
<td>22.89</td>
<td>46.703</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL23</td>
<td>21.78</td>
<td>47.097</td>
<td>.433</td>
<td>.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL25</td>
<td>21.54</td>
<td>46.974</td>
<td>.444</td>
<td>.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL26</td>
<td>23.18</td>
<td>46.261</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>.310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2 Item analysis of the Organisational Commitment Questionnaire

An adapted version of the Allen and Meyer (1993) version of the Organisational Commitment Scale was used to assess organisational commitment within the selected organisations. The self-report instrument had 18 items measuring 3 subscales.
4.3.2.1 Affective commitment

The reliability coefficient for affective commitment is 0.795 which is acceptable (see Table 4.4). Furthermore, the corrected item-total correlations were above 0.30 for all items indicating that the items measured the same total scale factor.

Table 4.4

*Reliability output for the affective commitment subscale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item Total Correlation</th>
<th>Squared Multiple Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.795</td>
<td>.794</td>
<td>19.98</td>
<td>30.864</td>
<td>.574</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC2</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.25</td>
<td>32.868</td>
<td>.445</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC8</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.33</td>
<td>28.109</td>
<td>.583</td>
<td>.379</td>
<td>.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCR5</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.36</td>
<td>28.134</td>
<td>.637</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCR9</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.63</td>
<td>27.160</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>.732</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2.2 Continuance commitment

The reliability statistics indicate that the Cronbach Alpha for continuance commitment is 0.81 which is good (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). The corrected
item-total correlation shows that the items for this dimension correlated above 0.30 with each other (see Table 4.5). None of the items were excluded.

Table 4.5

*Reliability output for the continuance commitment subscale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.810</td>
<td>.811</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Squared Multiple Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OC13</td>
<td>18.35</td>
<td>37.094</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC15</td>
<td>18.06</td>
<td>35.079</td>
<td>.656</td>
<td>.458</td>
<td>.756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC16</td>
<td>18.50</td>
<td>35.919</td>
<td>.568</td>
<td>.385</td>
<td>.782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC17</td>
<td>18.25</td>
<td>34.746</td>
<td>.640</td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC19</td>
<td>18.30</td>
<td>34.073</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td>.765</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2.3 Normative commitment

The reliability coefficient for normative commitment is quite good with an alpha coefficient of 0.80 (see Table 4.6). The items within this subscale correlated above 0.30 within the corrected item-total correlation.
Table 4.6

*Reliability output for the normative commitment subscale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.802</td>
<td>.799</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Squared Multiple Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OC25</td>
<td>18.48</td>
<td>30.102</td>
<td>.555</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC26</td>
<td>16.73</td>
<td>36.641</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC28</td>
<td>18.03</td>
<td>28.969</td>
<td>.632</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>.749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC29</td>
<td>17.90</td>
<td>29.386</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td>.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC30</td>
<td>17.78</td>
<td>29.036</td>
<td>.693</td>
<td>.518</td>
<td>.730</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.3.3 Item analysis of the Organisational Citizenship behaviour (OCB) Questionnaire**

The OCB questionnaire was developed by Organ (1988). Organ’s OCB questionnaire consists of 5 dimensions and 24 items. These items measure altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy and civic virtue.

**4.3.3.1 Altruism**

The reliability coefficient for Altruism is 0.79. The corrected item correlation reveals that all items are above 0.30 (see Table 4.7). Hence should any of these items be eliminated it would not considerable increase the reliability for Altruism.
Table 4.7

**Reliability output for the altruism subscale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.789</td>
<td>.793</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Squared Multiple Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCB1</td>
<td>22.25</td>
<td>16.387</td>
<td>.451</td>
<td>.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB13</td>
<td>22.63</td>
<td>13.751</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td>.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB15</td>
<td>22.16</td>
<td>15.153</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td>.501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB23</td>
<td>22.13</td>
<td>16.872</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>.252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.3.2 Conscientiousness

The internal consistency of conscientiousness is to some extent poor with a coefficient of 0.70. It is acceptable according to (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). The corrected item-total correlation was above 0.30 for all items which mean that if items were to be deleted it would not significantly enhance the reliability coefficient (see Table 4.8).
Table 4.8

Reliability output for the conscientiousness subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.703</td>
<td>.708</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item Total Correlation</th>
<th>Squared Multiple Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCB3</td>
<td>22.84</td>
<td>12.200</td>
<td>.483</td>
<td>.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB18</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>11.509</td>
<td>.496</td>
<td>.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB21</td>
<td>23.33</td>
<td>11.883</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB22</td>
<td>23.03</td>
<td>11.612</td>
<td>.515</td>
<td>.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB24</td>
<td>23.33</td>
<td>12.198</td>
<td>.449</td>
<td>.211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.3.3 Sportsmanship

The Cronbach alpha for sportsmanship is 0.67 which is slightly below the acceptable level of $\alpha = 0.70$ (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). All corrected item total correlation for the 5 items were all above 0.30.
Table 4.9

Reliability output for the sportsmanship subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.668</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Squared Multiple Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCBR5</td>
<td>20.73</td>
<td>19.723</td>
<td>.475</td>
<td>.256 .592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCBR16</td>
<td>21.90</td>
<td>19.161</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>.160 .642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCBR7</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>20.426</td>
<td>.511</td>
<td>.265 .582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCBR19</td>
<td>21.09</td>
<td>20.615</td>
<td>.415</td>
<td>.198 .619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCBR2</td>
<td>20.98</td>
<td>21.434</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>.140 .648</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.3.4 Courtesy

The reliability coefficient for Courtesy is 0.69 which is marginally less than the acceptable standard of 0.70 according to (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). The item-total correlation table shows that all items are correlated above 0.30 (see Table 4.10).

Table 4.10

Reliability output for the courtesy subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.689</td>
<td>.701</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.3.5 Civic Virtue

The internal consistency for Civic Virtue is 0.762 which is acceptable according to (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994) (see Table 4.11). The item-total correlations are above 0.30 which is indicative of acceptable levels (Pallant, 2010).

Table 4.11

Reliability output for the civic virtue subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCB6</th>
<th>15.53</th>
<th>14.354</th>
<th>.424</th>
<th>.209</th>
<th>.779</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCB9</td>
<td>15.46</td>
<td>12.456</td>
<td>.637</td>
<td>.449</td>
<td>.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB11</td>
<td>15.63</td>
<td>12.679</td>
<td>.594</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB12</td>
<td>15.17</td>
<td>13.959</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td>.686</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 Dimensionality Analysis

This section reports on the Exploratory Factor Analysis of the instruments used in this study. The main purpose is not to explore the factor structure of the questionnaires used but to check if the subscales are uni-dimensional.

4.4.1 Dimensional Analysis of the Paternalistic Leadership Questionnaire

4.4.1.1 The dimensionality analysis of the Benevolent Leadership subscale

The Benevolent Leadership Scale achieved a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy value of 0.946 and the Barlett’s Test of Sphericity test statistic value was 2095.534 ($df = 55$, $p= 0.000$). This indicates that factor analysis$^2$ can be conducted. The subscale was found to be uni-dimensional and the dominant factor accounts for approximately 67 percent of the variance. The factor loadings are all above 0.50 which indicates that the items are good items (Pallant, 2010)

---

$^2$ The extraction of factors was based on the eigenvalues greater than 1 rule.
### Table 4.12

**Factor matrix for the benevolent leadership subscale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>PL1</th>
<th>PL2</th>
<th>PL3</th>
<th>PL4</th>
<th>PL5</th>
<th>PL6</th>
<th>PL7</th>
<th>PL8</th>
<th>PL9</th>
<th>PL10</th>
<th>PL11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.721</td>
<td>.830</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td>.839</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td>.818</td>
<td>.874</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td>.632</td>
<td>.850</td>
<td>.690</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.4.1.2 The dimensionality analysis output for the moral leadership subscale

The moral leadership dimension received a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy value of 0.777 and the Barlett’s Test of Sphericity test statistic obtained a value of 443.044 (df = 10, p<0.05) indicating that factor analysis is permissible. The subscale was found to be uni-dimensional and the dominant factor accounts for approximately 58 percent of the variance. The factor loadings are all above 0.50 which indicates that the items are good items (see Table 4.13) (Pallant, 2010).
Table 4.13

Factor matrix for the moral leadership subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>PL12</th>
<th>PL13</th>
<th>PL15</th>
<th>PL16</th>
<th>PL17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.655</td>
<td>.514</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>.872</td>
<td>.769</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.1.3 The dimensionality analysis output for authoritarian leadership

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin value of the Authoritarian leadership dimension is 0.775, the Barlett’s Test of Sphericity test statistic had a value of 404.717 (df=21, p<0.05) indicating that factor analysis can be conducted. The initial round of Exploratory Factor Analysis showed that items PL21 and PL24 were complex items\(^3\) loading on two factors. However, the exclusion of these factors showed the existence of two factors in the authoritarian leadership subscale; hence it was found to be multidimensional. These two factors explain 42.408% and 17.263% of the variance respectively. The factor matrix presented in table 4.14 below shows the distribution of the two factors underlying authoritarian leadership. All the items loading considerably are above 0.30. Items loading on factor 1 (PL18, PL19, PL20, PL25, PL23) relate to the supervisors authoritarian leadership style because they are focusing on the type of leadership the supervisor exhibits. Factor 2 (PL22, PL26) relate to the subordinates’ experience of the supervisors’ authoritarian leadership style, as they centre more on the way the subordinates feel around the supervisor.

\(^3\) An item not loading >0.30 on any factor will be excluded (Field, 2005; Pallant, 2005; Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996). An item loading >0.30 on more than one factor would be excluded if the difference between the higher and the lower loading was0.25 (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994; Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996). It is therefore a complex factor.
Table 4.14

Pattern Matrix for the authoritarian leadership subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>PL18</th>
<th>.617</th>
<th>.021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PL19</td>
<td>.741</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL20</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL22</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.788</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL23</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td>-.102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL25</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL26</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.2 Dimensional Analysis of the Organisational Commitment questionnaire

4.4.2.1 The dimensionality analysis output for affective commitment

The affective commitment dimension attained a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin of 0.745 which is acceptable since it is greater than 0.50 and the Bartlett’s Test Sphericity test statistic obtained a value of 364.990 (df=10, p<0.05). Only one factor obtained an eigenvalue greater than 1. This factor explains 55 percent of the variance. The factor loadings are all above 0.50 (see Table 4.15).
Table 4.15

Factor matrix for the affective commitment subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>OC2</th>
<th>.632</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC8</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCR5</td>
<td>.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCR9</td>
<td>.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCR10</td>
<td>.756</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.2.2 The dimensionality analysis output for continuance commitment

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was 0.783 for the continuance subscale. The Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity obtained was 371.154 (\(df=10\), \(p<0.05\)) which allowed for the null hypothesis to be rejected indicating the factorisability of the scale. All the items loaded on one factor only as depicted in Table 4.16. This factor explains 57 percent of the variance.

Table 4.16

Factor matrix for the continuance commitment subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>OC13</th>
<th>.568</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC15</td>
<td>.742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC16</td>
<td>.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC17</td>
<td>.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC19</td>
<td>.717</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.2.3 The dimensionality analysis output for normative commitment

The normative commitment dimension obtained a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy of 0.804 and the Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity obtained was 369.207 ($df=10$, $p<0.05$). All items load only on one factor. All the items loaded on one factor only as depicted in Table 4.17. This factor explains 56 percent of the variance.

Table 4.17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor matrix for the normative commitment subscale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC25 .619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC26 .437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC28 .718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC29 .764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC30 .807</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.3 Dimensional Analysis of the Organisational Citizenship Behaviour Questionnaire

4.4.3.1 The dimensionality analysis output for altruism

The Altruism dimension was proven to be uni-dimensional, the exploratory factor analysis showed the existence of only one factor. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy for the altruism subscale was found to be 0.797 and the Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity 345.350 ($df=10$, $p<0.05$). All the items loaded on one
factor only as depicted in Table 4.18. This factor explains 55.2 percent of the variance.

Table 4.18

*Factor matrix for the altruism subscale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>OCB1</th>
<th>OCB10</th>
<th>OCB13</th>
<th>OCB15</th>
<th>OCB23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td>.662</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td>.553</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.3.2 The dimensionality analysis output for conscientiousness

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy for conscientiousness proved to be 0.762 and the Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity 190.061 (df=10, p<0.05). The test values indicate that exploratory factor analysis could be executed on the responses of the OCB, Conscientious dimension. All the items loaded on one factor only as depicted in Table 4.19. This factor explains 46 percent of the variance.

Table 4.19

*Factor matrix for the conscientiousness subscale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>OCB3</th>
<th>OCB18</th>
<th>OCB21</th>
<th>OCB22</th>
<th>OCB24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.615</td>
<td>.627</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>.637</td>
<td>.541</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.3.3 The dimensionality analysis output for sportsmanship

The sportsman subscale obtain a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy of 0.747 and the Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity tests statistic obtained a value of 153.560 (df=10, p<0.05). The dimension is uni-dimensional with items loading on one factor only. All the items loaded on one factor only as depicted in Table 4.20. This factor explains 44 percent of the variance.

Table 4.20

*Factor matrix for the sportsmanship subscale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>OCBR5</th>
<th>OCBR16</th>
<th>OCBR7</th>
<th>OCBR19</th>
<th>OCBR2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.623</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td>.527</td>
<td>.437</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.3.4 The dimensionality analysis output for courtesy

The courtesy subscale obtained a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy of 0.672 and the Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity attained a value of 215.225 (df=10, p<0.05). There was therefore enough evidence that the correlation matrix was factor analysable. Only one factor with an eigen value greater than one was attained. The factor matrix revealed that all items loaded on one factor (see Table 4.21). This factor explains 46 percent of the variance.
Table 4.21

Factor matrix for the courtesy subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>OCB4</th>
<th>OCB8</th>
<th>OCB14</th>
<th>OCB17</th>
<th>OCB20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.463</td>
<td>.483</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>.678</td>
<td>.658</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.3.5 The dimensionality analysis output for civic virtue

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy value obtained for the civic virtue scale was 0.733 and the Bartlett’s Test Sphericity obtained a value of 253.659 ($df=6$, $p<0.05$). This suggests that an exploratory factor analysis on the responses for civic virtue could be performed. Only one factor with an eigenvalue greater than one was attained. The factor matrix revealed that all items loaded on one factor (see Table 4.22). This factor explains 59 percent of the variance.

Table 4.22

Factor matrix for the civic virtue subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCB6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
<td>.483</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5 Evaluating the fit of the measurement models via confirmatory factor analysis in LISREL

4.5.1 Paternalistic leadership CFA

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was performed on items of the Paternalistic Leadership Questionnaire using the LISREL 8.80 programme. All the variables were defined as continuous, robust maximum likelihood estimation was used as the method for the parameter estimation. The fit indices are shown in Table 4.23.

The goodness-of-fit indices generally indicate reasonable model fit with the data. An RMSEA value of 0.0699 indicates reasonable model fit (Diamantopoulos & Siguaw, 2000). According to Diamantopoulos and Siguaw (2000), when assessing the RMSEA, values less than 0.05 are indicative of good fit, those between 0.05 and under 0.08 of reasonable fit, values between 0.08 and 0.10 indicate mediocre fit and those above 0.10 indicate poor fit.

The goodness-of-fit-index (GFI) shows how closely the model comes to perfectly reproduce the observed covariance matrix. The adjusted goodness-of-fit index (AGFI) is the GFI adjusted for the degrees of freedom in the model. The values of the GFI and AGFI should range between 0 and 1 and values greater than 0.90 are usually interpreted as reflecting acceptable fit (Diamantopoulos & Siguaw, 2000). In this case, the GFI is .83 and the AGFI is .79. Both values are below the 0.90 level indicative of acceptable fit.

The next set of fit indices to be discussed is the relative fit indices, which show how much better the model fits compared to a baseline model. The relative fit indices generally range between 0 and 1 except for the NNFI which can be greater than 1 (Diamantopoulos & Siguaw, 2000). In this case the CFI, IFI and RFI values of .97, .97, and .94 respectively are within the acceptable range.
The RMR range is estimated using the scales of each indicator, hence if the questionnaires have different levels for instance items ranging from 1-5 whilst others from 1-7 it can become quite complicated to interpret the RMR (Hooper, Couglan, Mullen, 2008). The values of RMR and standardized RMR are 0.331 and 0.114 respectively, due to the fact that these values exceed 0.05 it raises some uncertainty pertaining to the model’s fit.

Table 4.23

*Goodness of fit statistics for the paternalistic leadership model*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>186</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satorra-Bentler Scaled Chi-Square</td>
<td>393.985 (P = 0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square Corrected for Non-Normality</td>
<td>2922.622 (P = 0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA)</td>
<td>0.0699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 Percent Confidence Interval for RMSEA</td>
<td>(0.0603 ; 0.0795)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-Value for Test of Close Fit (RMSEA &lt; 0.05)</td>
<td>0.000488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normed Fit Index (NFI)</td>
<td>0.948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI)</td>
<td>0.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsimony Normed Fit Index (PNFI)</td>
<td>0.840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Fit Index (CFI)</td>
<td>0.972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Fit Index (IFI)</td>
<td>0.972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Fit Index (RFI)</td>
<td>0.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical N (CN)</td>
<td>136.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Mean Square Residual (RMR)</td>
<td>0.331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized RMR</td>
<td>0.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodness of Fit Index (GFI)</td>
<td>0.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI)</td>
<td>0.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsimony Goodness of Fit Index (PGFI)</td>
<td>0.666</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.2 Organisational commitment CFA

Steiger and Lind established the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) fit index for assessing covariance structure models (Steiger, 1998). The RMSEA reveals how good the model fit the populations covariance matrix, given the fact that
it has unidentified but optimally chosen parameter estimates (Hooper, Couglan, Mullen, 2008). The authors state that this has been deemed one of the most informative fit indices, mainly because of its sensitivity to the number of expected parameters in the model.

According to Diamantopoulos and Siguaw (2000), when evaluating RMSEA values less than 0.05 are a good fit, values between 0.05 and 0.08 indicate reasonable fit, those between 0.08 and 0.10 reveal an average fit and values above 0.10 indicate a poor fit.

In this case, the RMSEA is 0.067 which indicates a reasonable fit. The Goodness of fit Index (GFI) was developed as a substitute to the Chi-Square test and evaluates the proportion of variance that is accounted for by the anticipated population covariance (Hooper, Couglan, Mullen, 2008). Diamantopoulos and Siguaw (2000) state that the GFI is considered by researchers as absolute fit indices for the reason that they directly evaluate the covariances projected from the parameter estimates replicate the sample covariances. The values range from 0 to 1, the cut-off point for the GFI is 0.90 (Hooper, Couglan, Mullen, 2008).

The AGFI also created by Jöreskog and Sörbom (1993) the AGFI adjusts the GFI for the amount of parameters anticipated (Tabachnik & Fidell, 2001). The AGFI is inclined to increase with sample size. Similar to the GFI the cut-off for the AGFI is also between 0 to 1 and it is widely accepted that values of 0.90 and above reveal good fitted models (Hooper, Couglan, Mullen, 2008). For the organisational commitment model the GFI is 0.88, AGFI is 0.84.

The CFI, IFI and RFI values of .96, .96, and .91 respectively are within the acceptable range. The NFI and NNFI values are .93 and .95 respectively indicative of acceptable fit (see Table 4.24).
The values of RMR and standardized RMR are 0.275 and 0.089 respectively, due to the fact that these values exceed 0.05 it raises some uncertainty pertaining to the model’s fit.

Table 4.24

*Goodness of fit statistics for the organisational commitment model*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satorra-Bentler Scaled Chi-Square</td>
<td>149.985 (P = 0.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square Corrected for Non-Normality</td>
<td>245.617 (P = 0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Non-centrality Parameter (NCP)</td>
<td>75.985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 Percent Confidence Interval for NCP</td>
<td>(44.843 ; 114.905)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Fit Function Value</td>
<td>0.983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Discrepancy Function Value (F0)</td>
<td>0.332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 Percent Confidence Interval for F0</td>
<td>(0.196 ; 0.502)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA)</td>
<td>0.0670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 Percent Confidence Interval for RMSEA</td>
<td>(0.0514 ; 0.0823)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-Value for Test of Close Fit (RMSEA &lt; 0.05)</td>
<td>0.0370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normed Fit Index (NFI)</td>
<td>0.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI)</td>
<td>0.954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsimony Normed Fit Index (PNFI)</td>
<td>0.756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Fit Index (CFI)</td>
<td>0.963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Fit Index (IFI)</td>
<td>0.963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Fit Index (RFI)</td>
<td>0.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical N (CN)</td>
<td>161.627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Mean Square Residual (RMR)</td>
<td>0.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized RMR</td>
<td>0.0892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodness of Fit Index (GFI)</td>
<td>0.887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI)</td>
<td>0.840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsimony Goodness of Fit Index (PGFI)</td>
<td>0.625</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.3 Organisational citizenship behaviour CFA

The RMSEA is 0.0724 which suggests a reasonable fit. The values for the RMR and standardized RMR are 0.174 and 0.0792 respectively, due to the fact that the
standardized RMR is greater than 0.05 it raises some suspicions about the model’s fit.

The GFI and AGFI in the case are 0.792 and 0.742 which are below the acceptable level of 0.90. The CFI, IFI and RFI values of .95, .96, and .91 respectively are within the acceptable range. The NFI and NNFI values are .93 and .95 respectively indicative of acceptable fit (see Table 4.25).

Table 4.25

**Goodness of fit statistics for the organisational citizenship behaviour model**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satorra-Bentler Scaled Chi-Square</td>
<td>532.846 (P 0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA)</td>
<td>0.0724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 Percent Confidence Interval for RMSEA</td>
<td>(0.0641 ; 0.0808)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-Value for Test of Close Fit (RMSEA &lt; 0.05)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normed Fit Index (NFI)</td>
<td>0.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI)</td>
<td>0.948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsimony Normed Fit Index (PNFI)</td>
<td>0.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Fit Index (CFI)</td>
<td>0.954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Fit Index (IFI)</td>
<td>0.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Fit Index (RFI)</td>
<td>0.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical N (CN)</td>
<td>128.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Mean Square Residual (RMR)</td>
<td>0.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized RMR</td>
<td>0.0792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodness of Fit Index (GFI)</td>
<td>0.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI)</td>
<td>0.742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsimony Goodness of Fit Index (PGFI)</td>
<td>0.639</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6 The overall measurement model

Item parcels were created for the overall measurement model based on the manifest variables of each of the latent variables in the study. The assignment of the items...
was based on the achievement of uni-dimensionality in each of the scales. In terms of paternalistic leadership items were created for each of the subscales since each of the subscales was treated as an independent (exogenous) variable in the study. In the case of authoritarian that had two factors, the parcel was created based on the factors forming each of the factors. For Moral and Benevolent subscales two random parcels were created for each of the variables. For organisational commitment and OCB, the parcels were created using the items forming each of the subscales.

When looking at the RSMEA for closeness of fit the for entire measurement model the value which is 0.0613 indicates a reasonable fit. The p value $H_0: \text{RMSEA} < 0.05$ is equal to 0.129 indicative of good model fit. Table 4.26 provides a summary of the fit indices. The RMR and standardised RMR values are 0.119 and 0.0713 respectively; these values are significantly greater than .05 which creates some uncertainty as to whether or not there is a close fit.

The GFI and AGFI show acceptable fit as the values are .92 and .87 respectively. In this instance the NFI, NNFI, CFI, RFI and IFI values are .93, .95, .96, .90 and .964 respectively (see Table 4.26). These indices indicate a reasonable fit over the independence model.
### Goodness of fit statistics for the overall measurement model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satorra-Bentler Scaled Chi-Square</td>
<td>124.676 (P = 0.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square corrected for Non-Normality</td>
<td>153.058 (P = 0.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA)</td>
<td>0.0613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 Percent Confidence Interval for RMSEA</td>
<td>(0.0443 ; 0.0779)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-Value for Test of Close Fit (RMSEA &lt; 0.05)</td>
<td>0.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normed Fit Index (NFI)</td>
<td>0.926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI)</td>
<td>0.951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsimony Normed Fit Index (PNFI)</td>
<td>0.682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Fit Index (CFI)</td>
<td>0.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Fit Index (IFI)</td>
<td>0.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Fit Index (RFI)</td>
<td>0.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical N (CN)</td>
<td>178.852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Mean Square Residual (RMR)</td>
<td>0.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized RMR</td>
<td>0.0713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodness of Fit Index (GFI)</td>
<td>0.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI)</td>
<td>0.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsimony Goodness of Fit Index (PGFI)</td>
<td>0.585</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.7 Goodness of fit for structural model

The RMSEA for the structural model is 0.0607 which reveals that reasonable fit exists. The p value for test of close fit was also assessed. The P-Value for Test of Close Fit (RMSEA < 0.05) is 0.129 which is acceptable. The RMR and standardised RMR values are 0.117 and 0.0698 respectively which are above 0.05 which creates some alarm about the closeness of fit. The goodness of fit and adjusted goodness of fit indices are 0.92 and 0.870 which are within (GFI) or closer (AGFI) to the acceptable fit.
The values for Normed Fit Index (NFI) = 0.93, Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI) = 0.95, Comparative Fit Index (CFI) = 0.97, Incremental Fit Index (IFI) = 0.97 and Relative Fit Index (RFI) = 0.90 (see Table 4.27).

Table 4.27

*Goodness of fit statistics for the structural model*

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satorra-Bentler Scaled Chi-Square</td>
<td>125.365 (P 0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square corrected for Non-Normality</td>
<td>159.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA)</td>
<td>0.0607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 Percent Confidence Interval for RMSEA</td>
<td>(0.0437 ; 0.0772)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-Value for Test of Close Fit (RMSEA &lt; 0.05)</td>
<td>0.0141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normed Fit Index (NFI)</td>
<td>0.926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI)</td>
<td>0.952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsimony Normed Fit Index (PNFI)</td>
<td>0.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Fit Index (CFI)</td>
<td>0.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Fit Index (IFI)</td>
<td>0.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Fit Index (RFI)</td>
<td>0.901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical N (CN)</td>
<td>180.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Mean Square Residual (RMR)</td>
<td>0.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized RMR</td>
<td>0.0698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodness of Fit Index (GFI)</td>
<td>0.916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI)</td>
<td>0.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsimony Goodness of Fit Index (PGFI)</td>
<td>0.593</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7.1 Parameter estimates

The purpose of assessing the structural model is to find out whether the theoretical relationships stated at the conceptualisation stage are supported by the data. The relationships between the different endogenous and exogenous variables are highlighted at this stage. The process of assessing the structural model involves an in-depth analysis of the freed elements of the gamma (γ) and beta (β) matrices.
Table 4.28

The gamma matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Benv</th>
<th>Moral</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMMIT</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td>0.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.143)</td>
<td>(0.119)</td>
<td>(0.101)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.797</td>
<td>-0.419</td>
<td>3.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.120)</td>
<td>(0.112)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>2.401</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis one:

There is a statistically significant relationship between benevolent leadership and organisational commitment ($t = 2.797, p < 0.05$) (see Table 4.28). Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected.

Hypothesis two:

There is a statistically significant relationship between moral leadership and organisational commitment ($t = -0.419, p > 0.05$) (see Table 4.28). This finding is not significant.

Hypothesis three:

There is a significant relationship between authoritarian leadership and organisational commitment ($t = 3.367, p < 0.05$) (see Table 4.28). Therefore the null hypothesis is rejected.
Hypothesis four

The null hypothesis stating that there is a statistically significant relationship between benevolent leadership and organisational citizenship behaviour is rejected ($t = 0.194$, $p < 0.05$), resulting in the null hypothesis to be accepted. Benevolent leadership does not correlate with OCB.

Hypothesis five

There is a positive relationship between moral leadership and organisational citizenship behaviour ($t = 2.401$, $p<0.05$), hence the null hypothesis is rejected.

Hypothesis six

The null hypothesis is rejected, supporting the alternate hypothesis which dictates that there is a relationship between organisational commitment and organisational citizenship behaviour ($t = 2.019$, $p < 0.05$). See table 4.29.

Table 4.29

*The beta matrix*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BETA</th>
<th>COMMIT</th>
<th>OCB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMIT</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.107)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.8 Conclusion

The aim of this chapter was to provide a presentation of the results of the statistical analyses achieved by making use of SPSS. The missing values were addressed through the multiple imputation method. Item and dimensional analyses were performed on the data to identify poor items. Confirmatory factor analyses were performed on the paternalistic leadership questionnaire, organisational commitment and OCB scales. The overall measurement model was tested using item parcels. It was found that both the measurement and structural models fitted the data reasonably well. The results indicated positive relationships between benevolent leadership and organisational commitment; authoritarian leadership and organisational commitment; moral leadership and OCB; and organisational commitment and OCB. There was, however, no significant relationship between moral leadership and organisational commitment; benevolent and OCB.
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

5.1 Introduction

The previous chapters provided the overview of the research problem, the literature on paternalistic leadership that affects organisational commitment and organisational citizenship behaviour. As the literature was reviewed in chapter two, it was discovered that paternalistic leadership is manifested through the latent variables benevolent, moral and authoritarian leadership. In chapter three the methodology and results were reported on and chapter four provides a presentation of the results. The purpose of the present chapter is to discuss the findings presented in chapter four.

The present study purported to answer the question, how does paternalistic leadership affect organisational commitment organisational citizenship behaviour? The particular objectives of the study subsequently were to (1) develop and test a model that explains the manner in which paternalistic leadership influences organisational commitment and the engagement in OCB, (2) evaluate the significance of the hypothesised paths in the model, (3) assess the goodness of fit of the theoretical model. Preceding the evaluation of the fit of the measurement and structural models, item and exploratory factor analyses were done on the measuring instruments used in this research study. The primary aim for performing item analysis on the measuring instruments was to assess the reliability coefficients of the model and also to identify items that do not fit well with other items in the scale before merging items into linear composites in order to represent the latent variables when fitting the suggested model to the data. SPSS version 23 was used to conduct item analysis, items that correlated below 0.30 (total score) (Pallant, 2010) along with items that
caused a considerate increase in the reliability coefficient were excluded from the study. This was done for benevolent, moral and authoritarian leadership as well as for organisational commitment and organisational citizenship behaviour. All scales had reliability coefficients of greater than 0.70 with the exception of sportsmanship and courtesy in the OCB scale that had coefficients less than 0.70.

The following step after conducting item analysis was performing exploratory analysis to ensure that the scales or subscales were uni-dimensional. One dimension was not uni-dimensional namely authoritarian leadership that showed two factors. Furthermore dimensionality analyses and confirmatory factor analysis was done to evaluate the factor structure of the paternalistic leadership questionnaire and the organisational commitment and organisational citizenship behaviour instruments.

Chapter five gives a concluding view on what the findings are; with reference to the impact paternalistic leadership has on organisational commitment and Organisational citizenship. Limitations of the study will be looked at and some recommendations will be provided and direction for future research will be reported on. On the whole

5.2 Assessment of the model fit
5.2.1 Measurement model

In terms of the measurement model fit, the RMSEA for closeness of fit for the overall measurement model value of 0.0613 indicates a reasonable fit. The p value \( H_0: \text{RMSEA} < 0.05 \) is equal to 0.129 indicative of good model fit. Table 4.26 provides a summary of the fit indices. The RMR and standardised RMR values are 0.119 and 0.0713 respectively; these values are significantly greater than .05 indicating lack of close fit.
The GFI and AGFI show acceptable fit as the values are .92 and .87 respectively. In this instance the NFI, NNFI, CFI, RFI and IFI values are .93, .95, .96, .90 and .964 respectively (see Table 4.26). These indices indicate a reasonable fit over the independence model.

5.2.2 Structural model

The structural part of the model explains the casual and relational links among the latent variable (Kenny, 2011). The p-value relating to the Satorra-Bentler scaled Chi-Square provided a value of 125.365 (p=0.000) meaning that the exact fit null hypothesis of the structural model was rejected. The RMSEA for the structural model is 0.0607 which reveals that reasonable fit exists. The p value for test of close fit (0.129) is acceptable. The RMR and standardised RMR values are 0.117 and 0.0698 respectively which are above 0.05 which raises some questions about the closeness of fit. The goodness of fit and adjusted goodness of fit indices are 0.92 and 0.870 which are within (GFI) or closer (AGFI) to the acceptable fit. The values for Normed Fit Index (NFI) = 0.93, Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI) = 0.95, Comparative Fit Index (CFI) = 0.97, Incremental Fit Index (IFI) = 0.97 and Relative Fit Index (RFI) = 0.90 (see Table 4.27).

5.3 Assessment of model Hypotheses

The results regarding the six hypotheses will now be discussed.

Hypothesis one: Benevolent leadership affects organisational commitment

There is a statistically significant relationship between benevolent leadership and organisational commitment (t=2.797, p<0.05). Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected which suggests that a proposed relationship between these two variables exist.
This is consistent with the results obtained by Asfar (2014) who collected data from 340 participants at various SMEs in Pakistan and found that benevolent leadership correlates strongly with organisational commitment. Additionally information received from 142 observers presented results that that show benevolent paternalistic leadership positively affects organisational commitment in a study done by Erben and Güneser (2008).

Furthermore a study done by Saher et al., (2013), revealed that there is a significant relationship between benevolent leadership and organisational commitment in a study conducted in 11 private firms. The research results obtained by Rehman and Afsar (2012) agree with the results in this study that concludes that there is a statistically significant relationship between paternalistic leadership and organisational commitment. Pellegrini, Scandura and Jayaraman (2010) did a study on paternalism in a Western business context with a sample of 215 participants and found that benevolent leadership does lead to the commitment of employees.

**Hypothesis two: Moral leadership affects organisational commitment**

The t-value of the link between moral leadership and organisational commitment is less than 1.96 leading to the observation that there is no significant relationship between moral leadership and organisational commitment.

This is consistent with a study done by Saher et al., (2013) the findings demonstrate that there is no relationship between moral leadership and organisational commitment. The authors propose that the reason for this is the high degree of corruption that occurs in Pakistan. This possibly hints at the prevalence of corruption in the South Africa context. In contrast a study done by Afsar (2014) indicates that a statistically significant relationship between moral leadership and organisational commitment does exist.
**Hypothesis three: Authoritarian leadership affects organisational commitment**

The t value for the connection between authoritarian leadership and organisational commitment is 3.367 which is greater than 1.96 resulting in the rejection of the null hypothesis which states there is no relationship between authoritarian leadership and organisational commitment.

Afsar (2014) conducted a study on moral and authoritarian leadership for faculty members, 798 data was obtained from the faculty members by means of a questionnaire. In the research by Pellegrini, Scandura and Jayaraman (2010) the authors correspondingly found a relationship between authoritarian leadership and organisational commitment. The study concluded that there is a negative relationship between authoritarian leadership and organisational commitment. In the study by Saher et al., (2013) no relationship existed between authoritative leadership and organisational commitment.

**Hypothesis four: Benevolent leadership affects OCB**

The relationship between benevolent leadership and OCB was not supported due to the fact that the t value is less than 1.96. The null hypothesis is therefore accepted.

This is in contradiction to a study done by Chen, Eberly, Chiang, Farh and Cheng (2011) on 601 participants across 27 firms in Taiwan which showed that there is a correlation between benevolent leadership and OCB. However, Poaching (2009) conducted a study on the relationship between paternalistic leadership and organisational citizenship behaviour, the mediating effect of upward communication in which the author found a significant relationship between benevolent leadership and OCB.
Hypothesis five: Moral leadership affects OCB

The alternative hypothesis stating that there is a statistically significant relationship between moral leadership and organisational citizenship behaviour is accepted (t= 2.401, p<0.05), resulting in the rejection of the null hypothesis. Moral leadership correlates strongly with OCB.

Similar findings are reported in by Afsar (2014) as it has been statistically proven that moral leadership affects OCB. In addition, the results in a study performed by Research by Chen, Eberly, Chiang, Farh and Cheng (2011) are consistent with the findings of Afsar (2014) that also shows a positive relationship between the morality dimension and OCB. Likewise Rehman, Afsar (2012) reached the same conclusion when collecting data from 350 individuals working in diverse SMEs in Pakistan.

Hypothesis six: Organisational commitment affects OCB

The null hypothesis is rejected, supporting the alternate hypothesis which indicates that there is a relationship between organisational commitment and organisational citizenship behaviour (t=2.019, p<0.05).

This is consistent with the findings in a research study conducted on the relationship among organisational commitment and organisational citizenship behaviour on 251 call center employees and the results displayed a strong positive relation between organisational commitment and OCB (Kiliç, 2013). A study done in the banking industry where 200 employees completed questionnaires indicated that there organisational commitment positively affects organisational citizenship behaviour (Asiedu, Sarfo, Adjei, 2014). Furthermore a study done by Chang, Tsai and Tsai (2011) at 12 companies concluded that organisational citizenship behaviour is influenced positively by organisational commitment.
5.4 Limitations of the study

First and foremost the sample size was too small hence the study cannot be generalised to the entire population of employees without further replication. In addition only three organisations were used in the Western Cape Province meaning that a heterogeneous sample was not made use of which is important especially in a multicultural country like South Africa. Non probability sampling was made use of which means that biasness played a role and the sample is not representative of the entire population.

Language could have also been a barrier as many of the respondents did not indicate English as their first language. This may be one of the reasons for obtaining missing values. The questionnaire was also a bit lengthy and participants may have thought it to be time consuming hence it was not completed.

The measuring instruments also caused a drawback in some regard. The measuring instruments used were questionnaires which have quite a few disadvantages. The first being the issue of social desirability that refers to participants answering questions in a certain way because they believe those questions to be more socially favourable (Bryman, Bell, Hirschsohn, Dos Santos, Du Toit, Masenge, Van Aardt & Wagner 2014). In instances where this occurs researchers end up with a distorted interpretation of the results. Further pertaining to the measuring instruments the coefficients for the subscales sportsmanship and courtesy in the OCB scale obtained low reliability coefficients of 0.668 and 0.689 respectively. These Cronbach alpha coefficients are lower than the acceptable standard which is 0.70 (Foxcroft & Roodt, 2009).

5.5 Suggestions for future research

Future research can incorporate latent variables such as the values held by both employer and employee and trust. Using a bigger sample size would definitely be
beneficial, the research should just ensure that after dealing with missing values the sample size is not less than 200 which is the least you can make use of when doing structural equation modeling.

Researchers should also consider conducting qualitative interviews to draw more accurate subjective experiences from the participants. Furthermore, administering the instruments in a language that the participants are most comfortable with would be a huge advantage, as failure to understand questions cause individuals to answer incorrectly or not at all.

Due to the fact that paternalistic leadership works on the father – child principle it could be meaningful to do a study on family based firms to see whether this type of leadership is more effective.

5.6 Practical implications

Based on the results obtained in this study, it can be concluded that a very weak but positive relationship exists between benevolent leadership and organisational commitment, and authoritarian and organisational commitment. This can be due to the individualistic culture of people in South Africa, paternalism is more about the individual and what is best for them, despite the benevolence of others. The fact that there is a positive relationship could mean that these individuals may come from a collectivist background where loyalty to family and friends are regarded important. With regards to moral leadership and organisational commitment, no relationship exists. This may be that employees have lost hope in the ethical behaviour of their leaders of because they just simply do not care whether or not the leader behaves morally, as long as they are treated well in terms of remuneration and other benefits. Furthermore it was found that there is no relationship between benevolence and OCB, in contrast results reveal that there is a link between morality and OCB. It has also been proven that organisational commitment positively affects organisational citizenship behaviour. The positive relationships are of great value to future researchers, however, they should not neglect the negative relationships as this can help
improve or possibly find solutions to problems faced in businesses. Culture also has a significant impact on the effectiveness of paternalistic leadership in organisations.

This study will mainly be of value to the human resource function specifically when it comes to psychological explanations of the behaviour or employees within the organisations and the implementation of interventions to ensure the effectiveness and efficiency and equitability of the firm. The outcomes of this study highlights the impact leadership has on the commitment the citizenship behaviour of employees. Even though paternalistic leadership has not been extensively studies in western cultures it based on the results one can see that there is a possibility of it being beneficial to organisations hence it should be further explored to evaluate the value it can add to the success of organisations.

5.7 Conclusion

Paternalism is really a leadership style that should be researched more especially because of the positive traits morality and benevolence. The hypotheses have been discussed and interpreted. The results indicated positive relationships between benevolent leadership and organisational commitment; authoritarian leadership and organisational commitment; moral leadership and OCB; and organisational commitment and OCB. There was, however, no significant relationship between moral leadership and organisational commitment; benevolent and OCB. The limitations and suggestions for future research have been underlined. The results gained from this study provides important information for organisations on what type of leadership they should employ in their organisations, the type that will lead to committed employees willing to go the extra mile for their organisation.
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