PATERNALISTIC LEADERSHIP IN A DISTINCTVE MARITIME WORK ENVIRONMENT: A STUDY AMONG MARITIME STUDENTS

ENDER ASYALI *, RICHARD ALLARD [†]

* Department of Marine Transportation
Maine Maritime Academy
1 Pleasant St., Castine, ME, 04420 USA
e-mail: ender.asyali@mma.edu, https://www.mma.edu

[†] Department of Marine Transportation
Maine Maritime Academy
1 Pleasant St., Castine, ME, 04420 USA
e-mail: richard.allard@mma.edu, https://www.mma.edu

1 INTRODUCTION

Formal and structured roles and duties, high turnover rates among crew, high level of stress, demanding and high-risk work, multinational and multicultural crew composition, limited social interaction and social isolation makes the maritime work environment distinctive. In this distinctive work environment, positive paternalistic leadership may be an option for ship captains as an effective leadership style. Traditionally leadership training had been offered in many maritime education institutions but after the introduction of the STCW 2010 amendments, leadership training has becomes a compulsory and essential part of Maritime Education and Training (MET). Appropriate leadership style will not only improve job satisfaction and morale of seafarers but also will improve safety onboard

Today one of the primary traits that make a good effective leader is his/her ability to appraise and comprehend the constantly changing but distinct nature of a maritime work environment and to adapt their leadership style this diverse environment. Leaders should have knowledge and competence about as it concerns different types of leadership styles appropriate for the given environment.

On a managerial behavior scale, the Paternalistic Leader leans more toward being an authoritarian while maintain a mild degree of benevolence. It can be theorized that all authority is assumed, and that which is real requires support from above. So it logically follows that one must assume authority first before he/she can lend it in support of others. On one end of the scale is the Autocratic Leader who delegates nothing, doing every task him/her self, and micromanaging subordinates into becoming mere scribes. On the opposite end of the

scale is the Free Reign Leader who delegates everything reserving no authority in him/her self, giving little direction to subordinates but still expecting them to stay on task while performing to at least a minimum acceptable work standard. Though there are obvious differences in manner and approach between the Autocratic and Free Feign Leader, and each may obtain some similar positive goals, they share the same higher risk of having negative impacts on productivity and morale. Each in their own ways tends to stifle motivation for the professional advancement of subordinates, closes the conduit for which institutional knowledge must flow, and limits both tacit and direct communication from leader to follower that: "But for though they may be only one, they are part of a whole family"; having an ethos of stability, standards, and safety.

One example where Paternalistic Leadership's can have a positive effect is within the professional maritime practice of Bridge Team Management, sometime referred to as Bridge Resource Management. Team Management requires that a leader understand that poor communication between watch-standers makes it difficult to recognize when an error chain is developing and how to break it. For Bridge Team Management to be effective their needs to be a voyage plan that is well understood by all watch team members that creates good situational awareness, and a management style that encourages members of the watch team to speak-up and ask questions when there is a change in the plan. The voyage plan may have errors in the many activities it purports to perform, mistakes in navigational calculations, mistaken or misread information, or cause the discovery of malfunctioning equipment in implementation. The list of elements that could create an error chain is not exhaustive within even the best voyage plan. Poor communication between crewmembers creates error chains, prevents discovering them as they are developing, and can hinder recognizing them when they are present. Paternalistic Leader ship is not authoritative to the degree of discouraging one from asking questions and identifying changes in a voyage plan. Quite the opposite is true of Paternalistic Leadership. It enhances the same professional manner of communication that motivates a watch-keeper to be part of a team that participates with the same awareness that breaks an error chain, instills professionalism, and encourages fellow watch standers in a cultural environment of safety to speak-up.

Another instance where Paternalistic Leadership may have a positive value is that it gives consideration to the multicultural differences that may make crewmembers hesitant about following a leader of a different nationality, and questioning the authority of leaders when appropriate. It is common to find crews of different nationalities, each having different cultural values, onboard the same ship. Research first conducted among workers in the same multinational corporation and then in safety-critical systems showed that individuals behaved differently in ways that could largely be explained by their particular nationality or culture [1].

Among the characteristics measured was the extent to which individuals deferred to figures in authority, referred to as "Power Distance." Speaking in generalities, Asian cultures tend to be more likely to defer to an authority figure than those of Western societies. Everyone has a father, and most were authoritative figures that had a positive influence in their life. A Paternalistic Leader does not stand so close "in parentis" to another that the familiarity breeds contempt, nor does he/she ignore the cultural diversity of others. But it is the same type of strong positive authoritative but nurturing influences of a father that are the qualities of a Paternalistic Leader.

1.1 Paternalistic leadership

Paternalistic leadership has become an important area of research in the leadership literature and received growing interest from organizational researchers around the world in the past two decades [2,3,4,5,6]. Paternalistic leadership is a father like leadership style [7] and combines strong discipline and authority with fatherly benevolence [8]. Authoritarianism refers to leader behaviors that assert authority and control, whereas benevolence refers to an individualized concern for subordinates' personal well-being [3].

Although Paternalistic Leadership originated from traditional Chinese culture [9] and also it is a prevalent cultural characteristic of traditional eastern societies such as China, Japan, India, and Korea [10,11] recent results suggest paternalistic leadership may generalize across cultures [12]. The paternalistic leader takes care of his/her employees like a parent. He/She is involved in every aspect of employees' lives and provides guidance and counseling in professional as well as personal matters [13]. Paternalism is developed to humanize and remoralize the workplace as well as establish more flexible management system instead of rigid and contractual relationships between employers and workers [4,14]. Previous study where the questionnaire developed by Aycan was applied, concluded that paternalistic leadership is highly accepted and supported by Turkish Maritime Students [4,15].

2 OBJECTIVE

A survey tool developed by Aycan [1] was applied to students of Maine Maritime Academy, in order to determine the perceptions of about paternalistic leadership determinants. The main objective of this study is to analyze the paternalistic leadership determinants among groups of maritime students. The analysis is accomplished in three different samples of students: major, class, and gender. Three main hypotheses are developed to test the objectives built on the comparative analysis of the populations:

H_1: Paternalistic Leadership determinants are perceived different by students of different majors.

H_2: Paternalistic Leadership determinants are perceived different by students of different classes.

H_3: Paternalistic Leadership determinants are perceived different by students of different gender.

For each of the hypothesis 21 sub-hypotheses are formulated to analyze the determinants comparatively.

3 RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Data collection and sampling

To test the hypothesis of the research, a questionnaire consisting of 2 different parts is applied. The first part of the questionnaire covers totally 21 statements on paternalistic leadership which were developed by Aycan [4].

The second part covers 3 questions on the information about major, class and gender of the student for the purpose of profile establishment. Respondents were asked to rate the extent

which they agreed with the stated characteristics of ideal leadership on a 5-point Likert scale (5= "strongly agree"; 1= "strongly disagree").

The research was applied to Senior and Junior (Marine Transportation Operations) MTO and (Vessel Operations and Technology) VOT students in 2016-2017 spring and fall semesters and 2018 spring semester during their casualty analyses course and to Freshmen MTO, VOT and ME (Marine Engineering) students in March 2018. 288 questionnaires were collected, out of 341 students, 16 questionnaires were disqualified, and a total of 272 questionnaires with 80% response rate were processed.

Data processing is maintained by the SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) version 24 Program. Means for the sample sizes and the standard deviations are calculated and these are used as a basis for the comparative analysis. Hypotheses based on Likert-scale questions, ending in interval data, are comparatively analyzed using t-tests and ANOVA.

The Cronbach Alpha coefficients of the construct has the value of 0.780 which indicates the reliability/ high internal consistency of the construct.

4 FINDINGS

The profiles of the students are summarized as follows. Students completed the questionnaire, 46% (n=113) of the whole population were from MTO, 28% (n=68) are from VOT, 26% (n=63) are from ME and 10% (n=28) are missing. With respect to their classes; 156 Freshmen (57%), 14 Sophomores (5%), 37 Junior (14%), and 65 Senior (24 %) students completed the survey. Male students account for 87 % (n=221) and female students account for 13 % (n=34) of the population.

4.1 Descriptive statistics

Frequencies of responses of the whole population on PL are checked as means and standards deviations and the results are given in Table 1. In terms of the frequencies of the responses given to the Likert-type statements, [Ideal leader] Closely monitors the development and progress of his or her employees. (μ=4.0956; SD= .78622) emerge as the most important attribute.

The other most important attributes are: Places importance to establishing one-to-one relationship with every employee (μ=4.0772; SD=.84473); Asks opinions of employees about work-related issues, however, makes the last decision himself or herself (μ= 3.9705; SD=.85150).

On the other hand, [Ideal leader] Does not consider performance as the most important criterion while making a decision about employees (e.g., promotion, layoff) (μ=2.5519; SD=.98081); Is prepared to act as a mediator whenever an employee has problem in his or her private life (e.g., marital problems) (μ= 2.5993; SD=1.07868) and Places more importance to loyalty than performance in evaluating employees (μ=2.6066; SD=.96222) emerge as the least important attributes.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics

Statements [Ideal Leader…]	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
1.Behaves like a family member (father/mother or elder brother/sister) towards his/her employees.	271	3.2768	1.01150
2.Provides advice to employees like a senior family member.	272	3.9081	.88593
3.Creates a family environment in the workplace.	272	3.6029	.95105
4.Feels responsible for employees as if they are his or her own children.	270	3.5000	.99347
5.Protects employees from outside criticisms.	271	3.2694	1.09093
6.Places importance to establishing one-to-one relationship with every employee.	272	4.0772	.84473
7.Places importance to knowing every employee in person (e.g., personal problems, family life, etc.).	271	3.5941	1.01352
8. Shows emotional reactions, such as joy, sorrow, or anger, in his or her relationships with employees.	271	3.2952	.93568
9.Closely monitors the development and progress of his or her employees.	272	4.0956	.78622
10.Does not hesitate to take action in the name of his or her employees, whenever necessary.	272	3.9191	.90554
11.Is ready to help employees with their nonwork problems (e.g., housing, education of the children, health, etc.) whenever they need it.	270	3.0481	.97243
12.Attends special events of employees (e.g., weddings and funeral ceremonies, graduations, etc.)	272	3.0037	.94692
13.Is prepared to act as a mediator whenever an employee has problem in his or her private life (e.g., marital problems).	272	2.5993	1.07868
14. Expects loyalty and deference in exchange for his or her care and nurturance.	272	3.2426	.97569
15.Does not consider performance as the most important criterion while making a decision about employees (e.g., promotion, layoff).	270	2.5519	.98081
16.Places more importance to loyalty than performance in evaluating employees.	272	2.6066	.96222
17.Is disciplinarian and at the same time nurturant (tough and tender).	270	3.8926	.83128
18.Believes that he or she knows what is best for his or her employees.	268	3.0821	.92042
19.Asks opinions of employees about work-related issues, however, makes the last decision himself or herself.	271	3.9705	.85150
20.Wants to control or to be informed about every work-related activity.	272	3.2206	1.02868
21.Despite establishing close relationships with employees, keeps his or her distance.	271	3.7491	.86696

4.2 Results of the hypotheses tests

The supported Sub Hypothesis for H_1 regarding the perceptions of students of different majors (MTO, VOT and ME) are summarized in Table 2. Statistically significant differences between three groups are found for three statement after applying ANOVA Test. The supported sub-hypotheses are;

H15 Does not consider performance as the most important criterion while making a decision about employees (e.g., promotion, layoff). ME has the highest mean (2.8095) and MTO has the lowest mean (2.4107) scores.

H16. Places more importance to loyalty than performance in evaluating employees. ME has the highest mean (2.9524) and MTO has the lowest mean (2.4779).

H17. Is disciplinarian and at the same time nurturing (tough and tender). ME has the highest mean (4.1452) and MTO has the lowest mean (3.7946).

Table 2: Comparative results for with respect to majors

Hypothesis	Support
H115 Does not consider performance as the most important criterion while making a decision about employees (e.g., promotion, layoff).	supported F=3.437 p=.034
H116 Places more importance to loyalty than performance in evaluating employees.	supported F=6.070 p=.003
H117 Is disciplinarian and at the same time nurturant (tough and tender).	supported F=3.780 p=.024

Method of analysis is ANOVA, p<0.05

The second hypotheses of the conceptual model attempts to compare perceptions of the students regarding PL with respect to their classes. ANOVA test was used in order to test the sub-hypotheses. One statement has statistically significant differences (See Table 3). The statement that is perceived different by the sample is given below:

H216 Places more importance to loyalty than performance in evaluating employees. Sophomores (2.9286) and Freshmen (2.8077) have the higher mean scores than Juniors (2.1892) and Seniors (2.2923).

Table 3: Comparative results for with respect to classes

Hypothesis	Support
H216 Places more importance to loyalty than performance in evaluating employees.	Supported F=8.002 p=,000

Method of analysis is ANOVA, p<0.05

Results of the tests for H_3 regarding the perceptions of students of different genders are summarized in Table 4. Statistically significant differences between two groups are found for two statements after applying t-test. The supported sub-hypotheses are:

H37 Places importance to knowing every employee in person (e.g., personal problems, family life, etc.). Male students have the higher mean scores (3.6273) than female students (3.2353) for this statement.

H321 Despite establishing close relationships with employees, keeps his or her distance. Female students have the higher mean scores (4.0588) than male students (3.7059) for this statement.

Table 4: Comparative results for with respect to gender

Hypotheses	Support	
	t	Sig. (2-tailed)
H37 Places importance to knowing every employee in person (e.g., personal problems, family life, etc.).	Supported t= -2.129 9 p=.034	.034
H321 Despite establishing close relationships with employees, keeps his or her distance.	Supported t= 2.654 p=.011	.011

Method of analysis is t-test, p<0.05

5 CONCLUSION

The main conclusion of this study despite the fact that USA workplace is ranked low on power distance values [16], paternalistic leadership can be accepted as a viable leadership style among maritime students of distinctive maritime work environment. The results of the study reveal that according to maritime students, ideal leader places importance to establishing one-to-one relationship with every employee, closely monitors the development and progress of his or her employees and also asks opinions of employees about work-related issues, however, makes the last decision himself or herself. Statistically significant differences were found in the statements between the three groups surveyed. Three found in the statements among Majors, one statement among Class, and two statements among Gender.

As a future study a cross cultural study will be performed to determine the acceptance of PL in international maritime work domain.

REFERENCES

[1] NTSB. National Transportation Safety Board. Cosco Busan Allision with San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge.305-331 / NTSB/MAR-09/01,2009

[2] Chen, X. and others. Affective trust in Chinese leaders: linking paternalistic leadership to employee performance. In: *Journal of Management*, Vol. 40 No. 3, March 2014 796–819, DOI: 10.1177/0149206311410604

[3] Pellegrini, E. K. and others. Paternalistic Leadership: A Review and Agenda for Future Research. In: *Journal of Management*. Vol.34. 2008. pp. 566-593.

[4] Aycan, Z. Paternalism: Towards conceptual refinement and operationalization, In K. S. Yang, K. K. Hwang, & U. Kim (Eds.), Indigenous and cultural psychology: understanding people in context. New York, NY: Springer. pp. 445–466, 2006

[5] Mansur, J. and others. Shades of paternalistic leadership across cultures.In: *Journal of World Business.* 2017. [viewed date 5. May 2017] Available from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2017.06.003>

[6] Jackson, T. Paternalistic leadership: The missing link in cross-cultural leadership studies. In: *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*. 2016, Vol. 16(1) 3–7.

[7] Westwood, R. and others. Headship and leadership, in R. Westwood (Ed.), Organizational behaviour: Southeast Asian perspectives. Hong Kong: Longman. pp.118-143. 1992

[8] Farh, J. L. and others. A cultural analysis of paternalistic leadership in Chinese organizations. In Li., J. T. and others (Eds.). Management and organizations in the Chinese context. London: Macmillan. pp. 84-127, 2000.

[9] Hsieh, K.C. and others. Development and significance of paternalistic leadership behavior scale. In: *Asian Social Science* Vol. 7, No. 2; February. 2011 pp.45-55.

[10] Bor-Shiuan, L. and others. Paternalistic leadership and subordinate responses: establishing a leadership model in Chinese organizations. In: *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*. Vol. 7. 2004.pp. 89–117.

[11] Aycan, Z. Impact of culture on human resources management practices: A 10 country comparision. In: *Applied Psychology: An International Review*. 49 (1). 2000. pp.192-221.

[12] Pellegrini, E. K., and others. Cross-cultural generalizability of paternalistic leadership: an expansion of leader-member exchange theory. In: *Group & Organization Management*. Vol. 35. 2010. pp. 391-420.

[13] Aycan, Z, and others. Career choices, job selection criteria, and leadership preferences in a transitional nation: The case of Turkey. In: *Journal of Career Development,* Vol. 30, No. 2, 2003

[14] Erben, G. S. and others. The Relationship between paternalistic leadership and organizational commitment: investigating the role of climate regarding ethics. In: *Journal of Business Ethics*. 2008. 82:955–968.

[15] Asyali, E. and others.   Paternalistic leadership: a preliminary study on Maritime Students. Maritime Education Summit**,** Maine Maritime Academy, USA, September, 17 – 19, 2014

[16] GLOBE study. Cultural practices and values in USA. [viewed date 13 June 2018]. Available from: < http://www.globeproject.com /results/ countries/ USA? Menú =list>