

# **Authoritarian Leadership and Employees' Deviant Workplace Behaviors: Moderating role of Benevolent Leadership and Mediating Role of Trust in Leader**

Abdul Latif\*,Gulfam Khan Khalid Baghoor<sup>†</sup>, Iffat Rasool<sup>‡</sup>

## **Abstract**

*The purpose of the study is to investigate the relationship between authoritarian leadership and followers' Deviant workplace behaviors through the mediating role of trust in leader and moderating role of benevolent leadership among the employees working in private schools and colleges in Pakistan. Data were collected from teachers and administrative staff working in these institutions in district Rawalpindi, Lahore, Faisalabad and Multan, Punjab. Linear regression tests were run and the results indicated that authoritarian leadership has a significant and negative relationship with interpersonal and organizational Deviance. Further, the results indicated that benevolent leadership does not moderate the relationship between authoritarian leadership and trust in leader. The findings also suggest that trust in leader mediates between authoritarian leadership and deviance workplace behaviors.*

**Keywords:** Authoritarian Leadership, Benevolent Leadership, Deviant Workplace Behaviors

## **Introduction**

There has been a debate on the definition of effective leadership since long time (Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004). There are various definitions of effective leadership with in different cultural contexts (Drost & Von Glinow, 1998). Paternalistic leadership is one of the areas which is prospering and taking interest of the researchers. It was found eight decades earlier that employee's satisfaction and productivity may increase with the manager's focus on human relation side rather on mechanistic side. Earlier management theorists were supporting the paternalistic and nurturing nature of managers to establish worker groups who are fruitful and contented (Follett, 1933).

The paternalistic leadership style involve two roles, authoritarianism and benevolence, both are opposite to one another. Authoritarian leadership is the leader's behavior that emphasizes complete authority, possessing control over their subordinates and they insist unquestioning obedience, while benevolent leadership exhibits

---

\* Abdul Latif, Lecturer University of the Poonch, Rawalakot, AJK

<sup>†</sup> Dr. Gulfam Khan Khalid Baghoor, Associate Professor, FMS, NUML, Islamabad

<sup>‡</sup> Dr. Iffat Rasool Assistant Professor, University of Wah, Wah Cantt

those behaviors which express individualized and holistic concern of their subordinates' personal or family well being (Farh & Cheng, 2000). This behavior has commonly developed in non-western countries and to a lesser degree in the developing countries (Martinez, 2003; Pellegrini & Scandura, 2008). Due to economic growth of the Asian countries, this leadership behavior has been a focus of researchers (Erben & Güneser, 2008; Farh & Cheng, 2000). In countries like Pakistan, Paternalistic Leadership has positive effect on the employee related outcomes. Benevolent leadership has positive effects on job satisfaction, organizational commitment and innovative behavior and authoritarian leadership also positively affects the motivation in employees (Habiba, 2013). Leadership has important role in facilitating employees' work engagement, behaviorally, emotionally and cognitively (Lee and Ok, 2015).

Aycan (2006) clearly told that paternalism is influenced by culture which collectively uses benevolence and authoritarian components for decision making process. There are findings of conceptual and empirical studies about two components of paternalistic leadership in developing countries like Pakistan (Aycan et al., 2000). Benevolence dimension of the paternalistic leadership is positively associated with the in role and extra role performance of employees, while there is negative association between authoritarian leadership and these roles (Chen et al., 2014).

Authoritarian and benevolence are two different components of paternalistic leadership and may influence differently on work related attitudes and behaviors. Authoritarian leadership negatively affects subordinates positive work related behaviors, such as task performance and positively affects negative work related behaviors such as deviant workplace behavior. In this way more research is needed in paternalistic outcomes (Pellegrini & Scandura, 2008). Differences in the performance impact are different among different paternalistic leadership styles, similarly different subordinate work related behaviors will be affected differently by different paternalistic leadership component. Benevolence component have positive impact on the employee behaviors. How it will reduce the negative effect of the authoritarian leadership is still need consideration.

Paternalistic leadership affects different work related employee behaviors negatively or positively. Deviant workplace behaviors are the negative behaviors. Due to these behaviors organizations performance may decrease. There is need to identify the mechanism to minimize or overcome the deviance workplace behaviors. These behaviors have got least consideration to minimize through leadership motivation. Authoritarian leadership has positive effect on deviant workplace

behaviors. Benevolent leadership has negative effect and will reduce the deviant workplace behaviors. The mechanism of the paternalistic leadership effect on such behaviors has not been explored yet. According to social exchange theory, trust in leader will explain the mechanism of such effect on deviant workplace behaviors. Furthermore, the effect of paternalistic leadership on deviant workplace behaviors in collectivist culture has not been explored yet. In countries, like Pakistan, people used to discuss leaders traits and through word of mouth it may create an image in employee's minds.

The study will help to understand the psychological mechanism of understanding the interactive effect of authoritarian and benevolent leadership on deviant workplace behaviors. The study will contribute in the existing literature by establishing a mechanism of effect of paternalistic leadership on such negative behavior through trust in leadership. The study will help managers to understand the mechanism of minimizing the effect of deviant workplace behaviors by focusing on leadership. If employees will have trust in their leader, they will be motivated and exhibit lower level of deviant workplace behaviors. For developing countries, it will be a guide for managers, where less formal systems of evaluations exist. Managers will be able to develop their trust and improve organizational performance.

### **Literature Review**

#### **Paternalistic Leadership**

Western leadership has got more concentration than the eastern leadership in the leadership research. Paternalistic leadership is very common in the Chinese society while cultural traditions have bounded this leadership style in China. The leadership exhibits by individually caring through maintenance of top level moral standards and exercise their authority on subordinates (Farh and Cheng, 2000). There are many mediating factors which mediate the relation between paternalistic leadership part and employees related outcomes. Dependence and compliance, respect and identification and gratitude and repay are these mediators (Farh and Cheng 2000), scholars have endeavored to examine the mediating influences of paternalistic leadership behaviors (Soylu, 2011). In a study conducted in ten countries on paternalism, Pakistan, India, China and Turkey are top scorer. Russia, Canada, USA and Romania are at middle level while Germany and Israel are the lowest scorer in paternalism (Ayca et al. 2000).

In collectivistic societies paternalism is considered positive, in these societies interdependence is more, having high traditional values and take care of others responsibilities. Contrary to this, individualistic societies having culture of independence, self-reliance and self-rule are fatefully important. Paternalistic leadership is a leadership theory within the context of China which emerged from the philosophy of Confucian (Westwood 1997). Westwood and Chan (1992) defined paternalistic leadership as a well-built influence with apprehension and thoughtfulness. Building on Silin's (1976), Redding's (1990) and Cheng's (1995) work, Farh and Cheng (2000) stated three traits of paternalistic leadership style. 1. Morality 2. Benevolence and 3. Authoritarianism. Morality of a leader reveals their individual good characteristics, strength of will and generosity. Apart from working relationship a benevolent leader always take care of not only personal matters but whole family of an individual as well. Authoritarianism of a leader means exercise of complete power and demands absolute compliance. Paternalistic leadership has significant positive effects in Asian culture and affect trust in leader explains in an excellent way the mechanism of relationship between benevolence and moral leaders and subordinate task performance (Chen, Eberly, Chiang, Farh & Cheng, 2014). Moral leadership and benevolent leadership have positive association with job performance and OCBs (Farh et al. 2006, Lin et al. 2010), while authoritarian leadership has negative association with job performance and OCBs (Aryee et al. 2007, Liang et al. 2007, Chan et al. 2010).

### **Authoritarian Leadership**

Authoritarian leadership is a typical command-based leadership style; Despotism is more in this leadership style. For emphasizing power, authoritarian leaders may have to assert the authority, authoritarian leaders may hide and maneuver important information, and they do not give any importance to subordinates' inputs which may create a sense of being not recognized, respected and appreciated by their supervisors. Authoritarian leadership is expected to stimulate negative social exchange, which causes a negative reciprocity of distrust and lessens performance of employees. Employees association with establishments depicts the identity of that employee and is related to the trust in supervisor (Tyler et al. 1996). Social identity theory elucidates the identification of the individuals as social entity (Blau 1964). A social bond is created between subordinates and supervisors. Trust in supervisor is considered as sense of indeterminate commitment that may be visible in work efforts and OCBs. Authoritarian leadership negatively

impacts the role performed by the nurses working in schools (Davis, 2017).

Although these are the common values of collectivistic and high power distance culture, like china, to obey the decision of the top leadership, there is no chance of social exchanges in such situations. Subordinates obey the rules for the sake of staying away from retribution (Aycan 2006). Negative feelings like anger and fear for the leader are also caused by authoritarianism (Farh et al. 2006). There exist a positive association between authoritarian leadership and extra role performance in countries like china possessing collectivist societies (Hongyu, et.al, 2012). Authoritarian leadership style poses the greatest risk to safe and effective work environments of the three Lewin leadership styles described (Billig, 2015; Lewin et al., 1939; Nelson & Quick, 2009). Authoritarian leadership positively affects the deviance workplace behaviors in employees through the mediating effect of psychological contract violations and organizational cynicism (Jiang, Chen, Sun & Yang, 2017). On the basis of social exchange theory (Blau 1964), negative reciprocity may generate in the subordinates as a result of authoritarian leadership which may tear down the trust in leader in minds of subordinates. This is an argument that there is negative effect of authoritarianism on trust in leader. Hence, we presume the following hypothesis.

H1: There is negative association between authoritarian leadership and trust in leader.

### **Trust in Leader**

Concrete foundation of leader's effectiveness could be considered as trust in leader. A substantial proof can be found between the relationship of western leadership behavior and trust in leader from the researchers devotedly consideration of the mechanism of subordinates' performance advancement (Pillai et al. 1999). Confucianism, in which trust in leader is of main importance for the effective working relationship in china emphasizes on social relations (Farh et al. 1998). Accordig to the social exchange theory (Blau 1964) and social identity theory (Ashforth and Mael, 1989) highlights the leadership and trust relationship. Benevolence and morality of leaders may make stronger the trust and it is weaken due authoritarian style of a leader. The relationship between servant leadership and employees job satisfaction is mediated by trust in leader. For short duration subordinates have stronger positive effect of this leadership on trust in leaders and job satisfaction while long duration employees have weaker effect (Chan & Mak, 2014). Trust is considered as

an expectation or belief of depending on other persons' actions or words and that person's intention is good for others (Dirks, 1999). It has been found that trust has important consequences when two parties are vulnerable to each other (Davis, and Schoorman 1995),.

Trust is the key to get success and make the team productive in following the leaders decisions because powers lies within the leader in most of the cases (Bass, 1990), causing others to be helpless to him. Paternalistic leadership and ethical climate relationship are affected by the trust in leader. It may affect the relationship in both way (Otken and Cenkci, 2012). There is mediating role of trust between the relation of extra-role behavior and ethical leadership(LU, 2014).There is significant role of trust in leader, better organizational and team performance (McGregor ,1967). A work group can be more effective due to this factorof trust (Larson &LaFasto, 1989), integrity and trustworthiness are main features of a leader's personality (Bass, 1990). Work performance and negative behaviors are positively affected by empowering leadership through self-efficacy and psychology ownership(Kim &Beehr, 2017).

It is evident from empirical studies that there is positive relationship between trust in leadership and workplace outcomes (Rich, 1997). Many theories support the role of trust in leaderships. It is recommended trust is developed in followers by the charismatic leadership (Kirpatrick& Locke, 1996), so trust is the basis of effective leadership (Zand, 1997), and in perception of effective leadership, trust is the focal point (Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994). Trust has its unique importance in leadership development. It has varying level of significance (Peterson & Hicks, 1996). Social exchanges are based on trust that good action will have better results in future (Settoon et al., 1996). Positive behavior expected by the supervisor may influence the psychological state involving vulnerability acceptance behavior defines the trust in supervisor (Podsakoff et al. 1990, Rousseau et al. 1998). This defines the faith of the subordinates on their supervisor. Commitment is required while establishing exchanges with other party (Blau, 1964). Reciprocity demand trust while having social exchanges with others. One party can get benefit from other party by developing trust on them (Whitener et al. 1998).

Trust in leader is the source for functioning of transformational leadership (Yukl, 1998). It is empirically verified that trust play a mediating role between transformational leadership and subordinates working from the core of their heart. For leaders to be followed by subordinates in acceptance of leadership, trust is of utmost importance

(Bennis&Nanus, 1985). It can be hypothesize that these factors have importance in perceive uncertain circumstance (Waldman &Yammarino, 1999).

H2:Trust in leader mediates the relationship between authoritarian leadership and interpersonaldeviant behaviors.

H3:Trust in leader mediates the relationship between authoritarian leadership and organizational deviant behaviors.

### **Deviant Workplace Behaviors**

Workplace deviance is a deliberate behavior that disobeys important organizational rules and, in this way it threatens the organization and its member's well-being (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). Deviantworkplace behavior may cause lacking motivation for obeying rules or may break the rules, under rule expectations of the social setup (Kaplan, 1975). Organizational policies, rules and procedures define the organizational norms. Conventional and basic ethical principles are the basis of these organizational norms (Feldman, 1984). Employee engagement in deviant workplace behavior have many reasons (Robinson & Bennett, 1997), these reasons may include reactions to perceived injustice, dissatisfaction, role modeling, and thrill-seeking.

Robinson and Bennett (1997) identified different types of deviant behavior, organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance. Individuals prone to organizational level deviance are different from the individuals who are prone to deviance to other individuals. Leadership practices influence both positive and negativeextraction workplace behaviors (Perreira& Berta, 2016). There is partial mediation of procedural justice between centralization of the organization deviance workplace behaviors, higher level of centralization has significant and negative association with deviance workplace behavior (Yen&Teng, 2013).

Various behavioral constructs have classification according to their objectives (C. D. Fisher & Locke, 1992). Workplace deviance can be intended fororganization level, its members or at both organization and members(Robinson & Greenberg, 1999). There is concept of organizationalwrong doings objectively(Green, 1997, Turner & Stephenson, 1993). A similar feature has been identified regarding conceptualization of more explicitcategory of deviant behaviors. Greenberg and Scott (1996) have identified and differentiated employee theft intended for other employees and that intended at organization.

From the above example, it prohibits to refer to both behaviors as form of theft (Snyder, 1990) and trying to understand them in a similar way. In Pakistani public sector organizations deviant workplace behaviors are due to injustice and low level of job satisfaction in employees (Nasir & Bashir, 2012). In spite of resemblances between all these behaviors, a reason is to consider that these two forms of deviant behaviors have different motivation factor (Giacalone, Riordan, & Rosenfeld, 1997). Robinson and Bennett (1997) also illustrated that magnitude of deviance may change along a range of severity; it may range from minor forms of deviance to more serious forms.

H4: There is negative association between authoritarian leadership and interpersonal deviant workplace behaviors.

H5: There is negative association between authoritarian leadership and organizational deviant workplace behaviors.

#### **Benevolent Leadership**

Benevolent leaders are the true leaders who focus on personalized and complete care for their subordinate's welfare, as a result they get sympathy from their subordinates and they persuade their subordinates through reciprocity. Employees show commitment, interest and heartiest engagement in work due to benevolent leadership (Cenkci & Özçelik, 2015). Benevolent leaders have a propensity to provide individual care to different subordinates and they don't like to dishonor their subordinates at any time (Pellegrini & Scandura, 2008). As benevolent leadership indication is helpfulness towards subordinate's betterment, it is expected that a positive reciprocity will be developed in the subordinates. Benevolent leadership will positively affect the trust in supervisor among the subordinates, because benevolence of a leaders may encourage subordinates' enthusiasm to be susceptible which is the main characteristics of trust in social exchange association. In the mean time, the obliged subordinates in reciprocation to their benevolent supervisors' kind behavior exhibit improved in-role and extra-role performance. Trust-in-leader is possibly to take into account the Psychological process underlying the reciprocal exchange between benevolent supervisors and subordinate. Hence, following hypothesis has been developed.

H6: Benevolence Leadership positively moderates the relationship between authoritarian leadership and trust in leader.

#### **Methods**

### **Sample and Procedure**

The sample included 350 teachers and administrative staff working in private schools and colleges of Rawalpindi, Lahore, Faisalabad and Multan districts of province Punjab, Pakistan. Convenience sampling was used to collect data from all the respondents. A cover letter explaining the purpose and scope of the study assured respondents of strict anonymity and that participation in the study was voluntary. Of the 350 surveys distributed, 240 returned back, hence response rate was 68%. The respondents had ages range between 20-30, are 60% and 34% lie in the age group 31-40 year. 26% of the respondents were male and 74% were female. Educational level ranged from intermediate to receiving a PhD. 83% of the respondents having completed education masters or above. Personal contacts were used for data collection through these organizations.

### **Measures**

A self-reported questionnaire was used for all these measures. A response scale anchored by 1, “strongly disagree,” and 5, “strongly agree,” was used for authoritarian, benevolent leadership and for trust in leader. For deviant workplace behaviors anchored by 1, “Never,” and 7, “Daily,” was used. Because the survey was conducted from education sector, so the questionnaire was not translated into native language as English is the medium of education.

**Authoritarian and Benevolent Leadership.** Authoritarian and benevolent leadership were measure with 17 items, 8 items for authoritarian and 9 items for benevolent leadership taken from questionnaire of (Cheng *et al.*, 2000). These are extensively validated and used measure of the paternalistic leadership (Cheng *et al.*, 2000). Examples of item include “My supervisor always behaves in a commanding fashion in front of employees,” for authoritarian; and “My supervisor ordinarily shows a kind concern for my comfort,” for benevolence leadership. Alpha reliability was low for 9 item scale of authoritarian and 10 item scale of benevolent leadership. So item number 2 was deleted from authoritarian and item number 17 was deleted from benevolent leadership due to low reliability. Alpha reliability for 8 item Authoritarian was .81 and for 9 item benevolent was .84.

**Trust in Leader.** Trust in leader was measured by 4 item scale developed by Cook and Wall’s (1980). Example of item includes “I can trust my manager to make sensible decisions for the future of the company,” Due to low reliability one item was deleted. Alpha reliability was .58.

**Deviant Workplace Behaviors.** Interpersonal Deviance was measured by 7 item scale developed by (Robinson & Bennett, 1999). Example of

item includes “Acted rudely toward someone at work,” Alpha reliability was .89. Organizational Deviance was measured by 12 item scale developed by (Robinson & Bennett, 1999) .Example of organizational deviance item include “Discussed confidential company information with an unauthorized person,” Alpha reliability was .92.

### **Results**

The inter-correlations and Cronbach’s alpha values of the study variables are given in table 1. Authoritarian leadership was significantly and positively correlated with benevolent leadership ( $r=0.44$ ,  $p<0.01$ ) and had a significant positive correlation with trust in leader ( $r = 0.51$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), it was significantly and negatively correlated with interpersonal deviance ( $r=-0.39$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). Whereas, it was significantly and negatively correlated with organizational deviance ( $r=-0.38$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). Benevolent leadership had positive significant correlation with trust in leader ( $r=0.47$ ,  $p<0.01$ ), and had a negative significant correlation with interpersonal deviance( $r= -0.28$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), and was significantly negatively correlated with organizational deviance ( $r = -0.29$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). Trust in leader was significantly and negatively correlated with interpersonal deviance( $r = -0.38$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) and significantly and negatively correlated with organizational deviance ( $r = -0.39$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). It is important to note that interpersonal deviance was found to have significant positive correlation with organizational deviance( $r = 0.85$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ).

Mediation analysis results have been shown in Table 2, direct, indirect and total effects have also been shown in this table. Bootstrapping method by Preacher and Hayes (2008) was used to run the mediation analysis. 5000 bootstrap re-samples were used for this analysis and the confidence interval was 95%. In case of the interpersonal deviance total effect explains the relationship between the authoritarian leadership and trust in leader with interpersonal deviance, which turned out to be -0.53 with t value at -4.2 and  $p<0.01$ . Direct effect represents the impact of authoritarian leadership on interpersonal deviance. The direct effect turned out to be -0.36 at t value -2.5 and  $p<0.01$ . Indirect effect with mediation of variable trust in leader turned out to be -0.16 and there is no zero between ULCI (-0.03) and LLCI (-0.39). Consistent with Preacher and Hayes (2004), the existence of a non-zero value between the upper and lower boot limits shows a significant relationship. Based on these results, it is concluded that authoritarian leadership is positively associated with trust in leader and negatively associated with employees’

**Education and Information Management (EIM 2017)**

interpersonal deviance; moreover, trust in leader mediates the said relationship, leading to the rejection of H1 and acceptance of H2 and H4.

***n* = 240; alpha reliabilities are given in parentheses. \*\*. Correlation**

Table 1. Correlations and Reliabilities

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Gender	1								
Age	.283**	1							
Qualification	.117	.173	1						
Sector	-.057	.115	.086	1					
Authoritarian Leadership	-.059	.068	.069	.128 (.81)		1			
Benevolent Leadership	.010	.141	.182	.114	.441** (.84)	1			
Trust in Leader	-.091	.031	.005	.119	.512**	.472** (.58)	1		
Interpersonal Deviance	.051	.043	.014	.032	-.395**	-.281**	.381** (.89)	1	
Organizational Deviance	-.027	.064	.043	.032	-.383**	-.291**	-.392**	.852** (.92)	1

is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 2. Mediation Analysis

Effect	Interpersonal Deviance				Organizational Deviance			
	Coefficient	se	t	P LLCI ULCI	Coefficient	se	t	P LLCI ULCI
IV to Mediator	.3769	.0660	5.7075	.0000	.3769	.0660	5.7075	.0000
Mediator to DV	-.4429	.1908	2.3212	.0225	-.4755	.1900	2.5020	.0141
Total Effect	-.5346	.1250	4.2777	.0000	-.5282	.1250	4.2255	.0001
Direct Effect	-.3677	.1417	2.5939	.0110	-.3491	.1412	2.4726	.0152
Indirect Effect	-.1669	.0876		.3934	-.1792	.0933		.4561

Table 3. Moderation Analysis

R Square Change	F	Sig.
.003	-.688	.493

In organizational deviance total effect explains the relationship between the authoritarian leadership and trust in leader with organizational deviance, which turned out to be -0.52 with t value at -4.2 and  $p < 0.01$ . Direct effect represents the impact of authoritarian leadership on organizational deviance. The direct effect turned out to be -0.34 at t value -2.4 and  $p < 0.01$ . Indirect effect with mediation of variable trust in leader turned out to be -0.17 and there is no zero between ULCI (-0.04) and LLCI (-0.45). Consistent with Preacher and Hayes (2004), the existence of a non-zero value between the upper and lower boot limits shows a significant relationship. Based on these results, it is concluded that authoritarian leadership is negatively associated with employees' organizational deviance; moreover, trust in leader mediates the said relationship, leading to the acceptance of H3 and H5. Bootstrapping method by Preacher and Hayes (2008) was used to run the moderation analysis. 5000 bootstrap re-samples were used for this analysis and the confidence interval was 95%. Table 3 reports the results of the moderating variable which is benevolent leadership which has been taken between authoritarian leadership and trust in leader. The value of  $R^2$  change (0.003) is negligible with insignificant p value of 0.49. Therefore, H6 has been rejected as benevolent leadership does not positively moderate the relationship between authoritarian leadership and trust in leader.

### **Discussion**

The study was aimed at finding out the relationship between the authoritarian leadership and employees' deviant workplace behaviors, through mechanism of trust in leader and moderating effect of benevolence leader. The results are pertinent in explaining the negative effects of authoritarian leadership upon employees' negative behaviors which was conceptualized as deviance workplace behaviors in the present study. The mediating mechanism through which authoritarian leadership leads to affect in deviance workplace behaviors is also identified in the form of trust in leader. Moreover, the moderating effect of benevolent leadership between AL and trust in leader was also tested. As hypothesized, authoritarian leadership has a significant negative association with the interpersonal and organizational deviance in employees. This explain that the negative effects of authoritarian leadership go ahead of general workplace outcomes and the feeling of injustice and dissatisfaction with the style used by the leader can lead to effect employees' deviance workplace behavior. These findings are important because these establish a clear association between authoritarian leadership and deviance workplace behavior's both dimensions, interpersonal deviance and organizational deviance.

Therefore, this study is consistent with the findings of Farh et al. (2006), who gave a broad view that the negative feelings like anger and fear for the leader are also caused by authoritarianism.

According to the results, the mediating effect of trust in leader between the authoritarian leadership and deviance workplace behaviors has also been substantiated. It was argued earlier that leadership behavior and trust in leader explains the mechanism of subordinates' performance related behaviors that due to authoritarian leader employees trust in their leader may weaken due to which deviance behaviors may evoke in them. Therefore authoritarian leadership has been confirmed as to have negative effect on deviance workplace behaviors via trust in leader. It can be deduced that when employees feel that their supervisor is authoritative and they are not recognized as valuable assets of organization, their commitment lowers down and they exhibit deviance workplace behaviors.

As discussed earlier that Tyler et al. (1996) explained the authoritarian leadership as a negative event and according to social exchange theory authoritarian leadership is the cause of organization's failure to reciprocate employees' contribution. Under such situations authoritarian leadership is expected to stimulate negative social exchange, which causes a negative reciprocity of distrust and lessens performance of employees. Employees association with establishments depicts the identity of that employee, is related to the trust in supervisor (Tyler et al. 1996). When employees are not considered as valuable asset and authority is used for last resort, employees may start feeling of betrayed and act negatively. The study results show that the moderating role of benevolence leadership between the authoritarian leadership and deviance workplace behaviors has not been substantiated. In Pakistani culture people are not self motivated they have to make work it common thinking that after some time of getting job, they will be part of those groups discussing about negativity of the organization. People want care for themselves from the senior management but in organizations where leadership is authoritarian, such behaviors are of least importance, which may lowers down the trust in leader and enhance deviance behaviors.

### **Implications**

The study contributes in the existing literature of authoritarian leadership with respect to deviant workplace behaviors through the mediating mechanism of trust in leader and moderating role of benevolent leadership. Empirically confirmation of the negative effects of authoritarian leadership upon deviant workplace behaviors portrays clear

light on negative side of such leadership upon overall deviance behaviors of employees including interpersonal and organizational deviance. Furthermore, this study also enlightens the way through which the authoritarian leadership leads to cause deviance in employees. Trust in leader as a mediator between the authoritarian leadership and deviant workplace behaviors is found to be a prospective variable that affects an individual's deviance negatively. The absence of benevolent leadership as a moderator between the authoritarian leadership and trust in leader suggests that benevolent leadership does not necessarily increase the negative effects of authoritarian leadership. Practically it is a guide for managers that they should focus on subordinates' expectations, so that they can timely address their lawful apprehensions. In case of managers' failure in understanding the unspoken meaning of the agreement that employee have with the organization; this could result in break of trust in leader and increase in workplace deviance.

#### **Limitations and Recommendations for Future**

In spite of successful achievement of objectives of this study, the findings need more vigilance for its interpretation. First, the convenience sampling was used as sampling technique based on the convenience for data collection; therefore, some potential participants from which we could get response in collecting data may be missed because of their non-participation. Next, there may be a problem regarding culture, because data were collected from Rawalpindi, Lahore, Faisalabad and Multan, Punjab region only. Similar study is recommended to be conducted in both public and private sectors with a large sample size throughout the country to increase its generalization. This study nature was cross-sectional. Longitudinal study is recommended in this framework for future so that causal relationship between variables may be established. Moderating variable should be incorporated between the relationship of trust in leader and deviant workplace behavior so that this relationship dynamics may be understood in better way.

### References

- Aryee, S., Chen, Z.X., Sun, L.Y. and Debrah, Y.A. (2007). Antecedents and outcomes of abusive supervisor: test of a trickle-down model. *Journal of applied psychology*, 1, 191–201.
- Aycan, Z., (2006). Paternalism: towards conceptual refinement and operationalization. In: K.S. Yang, K.K. Hwang and U. Kim eds. *Indigenous and cultural psychology: understanding people in context*. New York, NY 10013, USA: *Springer*, 445–466.
- Aycan, Z., Kanungo, R. N., Mendonca, M., Yu, K., Deller, J., Stahl, G., et al. (2000). Impact of culture on human resource management practices: A ten country comparison. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 49(1), 192-220.
- Bass, B. (1990). *Bass & Stodgill's handbook of leadership*. New York: Free Press.
- Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Billig, M. (2015). Kurt Lewin's leadership studies and his legacy to social psychology. Is there nothing as practical as a good theory? *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 45(4), 440- 460. doi:10.1111/jtsb.1204
- Blau, P., (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: Wiley.
- Cenkci, A.T., & Özçelik, G. (2015). Leadership Styles and Subordinate Work Engagement: The Moderating Impact of Leader Gender. *Global Business and Management Research: An International Journal*, 7(4), 8-20.
- Chan, S., Huang, X., Snape, E. and Lam, C., (2010). The janus face of paternalistic leadership, Paper presented in 2010 IACMR Conference, Shanghai, June 16–20.
- Chan, S.C.H, Mak ,W., (2014).The impact of servant leadership and subordinates' organizational tenure on trust in leader and attitudes. *Personnel Review*, 43, 272 – 287.
- Chang-Hua Yen & Hsiu-Yu Teng, (2013), The effect of centralization on organizational citizenship behavior and deviant workplace behavior in the hospitality industry: *Tourism Management*, 36, 401-410.
- Chen, X.P., Eberly , M.B., Chiang, T.J., Farh, J.L., & Cheng, B.S., (2014). Affective Trust in Chinese Leaders: Linking Paternalistic Leadership to Employee Performance. *Journal of Management*, 40, 796–819.
- Cheng, B.S., (1995). Authoritarian values and executive leadership: the case of Taiwanese family enterprises. Report prepared for

- Taiwan's National Science Council. Taiwan: *National Taiwan University*.
- Davis R.C.(2017). Administrator Leadership Styles and Their Impact on School Nursing,  
<http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>.DOI:  
10.1177/1942602X17714202.
- Dirks, K. T. (1999). The effects of interpersonal trust on work group performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84, 445-455.
- Farh, J.L. & Cheng, B.S., (2000).A cultural analysis of paternalistic leadership in Chinese Organizations. In: J.T. Li, A.S. Tsui and E. Weldon eds. Management and organizations in the Chinese context. *London: Macmillan*, 94–127.
- Farh, J.L., Cheng, B.S., Chou, L.F. and Chu, X.P., (2006). Authority and benevolence: employees' responses to paternalistic leadership in China. In: A.S. Tsui, Y. Bian and L. Cheng eds. China's domestic private firms: multidisciplinary perspectives on management and performance. *New York: Sharpe*, 230–260.
- Farh, J.L., Leung, F.T.L. and Law, K.S., (1998). Cross-cultural validity of Holland's model in Hong Kong.*Journal of vocational behavior*, 52 (3), 425–440.
- Feldman, D. C. (1984).The development and enforcement of group norms.*Academy of Management Review*, 9, 47-53.
- Fisher, C. D., & Locke, E. A. (1992). The new look in job satisfaction research and theory. In C. J.Cranny, P. C. Smith, & E. F. Stone (Eds.), *Job satisfaction* (pp. 165-194). New York: Lexington Books.
- Green, G. S. (1997). *Occupational crime* (2nd ed.). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Greenberg, J., & Scott, K. S. (1996). Why do workers bite the hands that feed them? Employee theft as a social exchange process.In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 18, pp. 111-156). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Hogan, R., Curphy, G., & Hogan, J. (1994). What we know about leadership: Effectiveness and personality. *American Psychologist*, 49, 493- 504.
- Hongyu,N., Mingjian, Z., Qiang, L., and Liquan, W.,(2012).Exploring relationship between authority leadership and organizational citizenship behavior in China. The role of collectivism. *Chinese Management Studies*, 6, 231-244.
- Jiang, H., Chen, Y.,Sun, P., & Yan, J.( 2017). The Relationship between Authoritarian Leadership and Employees' Deviant Workplace Behaviors: The Mediating Effects of Psychological Contract

- Violation and Organizational Cynicism, *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8-21. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00732.
- Kaplan, H. B. (1975). *Self-attitudes and deviant behavior*. Pacific Palisades, CA: Goodyear.
- Kim, M. & Beehr, A. T. (2017). Self-Efficacy and Psychological Ownership Mediate the Effects of Empowering Leadership on Both Good and Bad Employee Behaviors, *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies* 1–13. DOI: 10.1177/1548051817702078.
- Kirkpatrick, S., & Locke, E. (1996). Direct and indirect effects of three core charismatic leadership components on performance and attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 36-51.
- Larson, C., & LaFasto, F. (1989). *Teamwork*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Lee, J., & Ok, C. (2015), “Hotel employee work engagement and its consequences”, *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, (in press).
- Liang, S.K., Ling, H.C. and Hsieh, S.Y., (2007). The mediating effects of leader-member exchange quality to influence the relationships between paternalistic leadership and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of American academy of business*, 10 (2), 127–137.
- Lin, T.T., Cheng, B.S., Wang, A.C., Chou, L.F. and Huang, M.P., (2010). Trust in leader and perceived organizational support as the mediators of the relationship between benevolent leadership and subordinate outcomes, Paper presented in 2010 IACMR Conference, Shanghai, June 16–20.
- LU, X. J., (2014). Ethical Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Mediating Role of Cognitive and Affective Trust. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 42, 379-390.
- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 20, 709-734.
- McGregor, D. (1967). *The professional manager*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Motowidlo, S. J., Borman, W. C., & Schmit, M. J. (1997). A theory of individual differences in task and contextual performance. *Human Performance*, 10, 71-83.
- Nasir, M., and Bashir, A., (2012). Examining workplace deviance in public sector organizations of Pakistan. *International Journal of Social Economics*. 39, 240-253.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

- Ötken, A.B. & Ceneci, T., (2012). The Impact of Paternalistic Leadership on Ethical Climate: The Moderating Role of Trust in Leader. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 108:525-536.
- Pellegrini, E.K., Scandura, T.A. and Jayaraman, V., (2010). Cross-cultural generalizability of paternalistic leadership: an expansion of leader-member exchange theory (LMX). *Group and organization management*, 35, 391-420.
- Perreira, T.A. & Berta, W. (2016). The object of your affection: how commitment, leadership and justice influence workplace behaviours in health care, *Journal of Nursing Management* 24, 146-154.
- Pillai, R., Schriesheim, C.A. and Williams, E.S., (1999). Fairness perceptions and trust as mediators for transformational and transactional leadership: a two-sample study. *Journal of management*, 25, 897-933.
- Podsakoff, P., MacKenzie, S., Moorman, R., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1, 107-142.
- Puffer, S. (1987). Prosocial behavior, noncompliant behavior, and work performance among commission salespeople. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72, 615-621.
- Redding, S.G., (1990). The spirit of Chinese capitalism. *New York: Walter de Gruyter*.
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: a review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 698-714.
- Rich, G. (1997). The sales manager as a role model: Effects of trust, job satisfaction, and performance of salespeople. *Journal of Academy of Marketing Science*, 25, 319-328.
- Robinson, S., & Bennett, R. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multi-dimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 555-572.
- Robinson, S., & Bennett, R. (1997). Workplace deviance: Its definition, its manifestations, and its causes. *Research on Negotiations in Organizations*, 6, 3-27.
- Robinson, S., & Greenberg, J. (1999). Employees behaving badly: Dimensions, determinants and dilemmas in the study of workplace deviance. In D. M. Rousseau & C. Cooper (Eds.), *Trends in organizational behavior* (Vol. 5, pp. 1-23). New York: Wiley.

- Rousseau, D. M., & Parks, J. M. (1993). *The contracts of individuals and organizations*. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (pp.1-47). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Rousseau, D.M., Stikin, S.B., Burt, R.S. and Camerer, C., (1998). Not so different after all: a cross discipline view of trust. *Academy of management review*, 23 (3), 393–404.
- Settoon, R.P., Bennett, N. and Liden, R., (1996). Social exchange in organizations: perceived organizational support, leader-member exchange, and employee reciprocity. *Journal of applied psychology*, 81, 219–227.
- Silin, RH, (1976). Leadership and value: the organization of large-scale Taiwan enterprises. Cambridge, MA: *Harvard University Press*.
- Simon C.H. Chan, Wai-ming Mak , (2014), The impact of servant leadership and subordinates' organizational tenure on trust in leader and attitudes, *Personnel Review*, Vol. 43, 272 – 287.
- Snyder, N. H., Blair, K. E., & Arndt, T. (1990). Breaking the bad habits behind time theft. *Business*, 40(4), 31-33.
- Soylu, S., (2011). Creating a family or loyalty-based framework: the effects of paternalistic leadership on workplace bullying. *Journal of business ethics*, 99, 217–231.
- Turner, D. L., & Stephenson. R. G. (1993, February). The lure of white-collar crime. *Security Management*, pp. 57-58.
- Tyler, T.R., Degoe, P. and Smith, H., (1996). Understanding why the justice of group procedures Matters: a test of the psychological dynamics of the group-value model. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 70 (5), 913–930.
- Waldman, D., & Yammarino.F. (1999). CEO charismatic leadership: Levels-of-management and levels-of-analysis effects. *Academy of Management Review*, 24, 266-285.
- Westwood, R.I. and Chan, A., (1992). Headship and leadership. In: R. Westwood, ed. *Organizational behavior: Southeast Asian perspectives*. Hong Kong: Longman, 118–143.
- Westwood, R.I., (1997). Harmony and patriarchy: then cultural basis for “paternalistic headship” among the overseas Chinese. *Organization studies*, 18, 445–480.
- Whitener, E.M., Brodt, S.E., Korsgaard, M.A. and Werner, J.M., (1998). Managers as initiators of trust: an exchange relationship framework for understanding managerial trustworthy behavior. *Academy of management review*, 23 (3), 513–530.

- Xiao-Ping Chen, Marion B. Eberly, Ting-Ju Chiang, Jiing-Lih Farh & Bor-Shiuan Cheng, (2014), Affective Trust in Chinese Leaders: Linking Paternalistic Leadership to Employee Performance: *Journal of Management* Vol. 40, 796–819.
- Yen, C.H., & Teng, H. Y., (2013). The effect of centralization on organizational citizenship behavior and deviant workplace behavior in the hospitality industry. *Tourism Management*, 36, 401-410.
- Yukl, G. (1998). *Leadership in organizations* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Zand, D. (1997). *The leadership triad: Knowledge, trust, and power*. New York: Oxford University Press.