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Abstract

The current study examines the effects of two major dimensions of Paternalistic Leadership, authoritarian and benevolent, on the perceived workplace ethical climate in different cultural contexts. Based on social influence and organizational justice theories, we illuminate the processes underlying the effects of these leadership styles on ethical climate by proposing perceived procedural and interactional justice as potential mediators. We test how these mediating effects vary in three different countries: Taiwan, Turkey, and the U.S. Based on a sample of 674 Taiwanese, 409 Turkish, and 479 American employees, we identified several interesting mediation and moderation results on leadership – justice – ethical climate paths. To our surprise, while procedural justice was an important mechanism linking benevolent leadership and ethical climate in all three countries, it mediated the relationship between authoritarian leadership and ethical climate only in Turkey. However, interactional justice was found to be a significant mediating mechanism only in the U.S. and for both authoritarian and benevolent leadership. In addition, cultural context moderated the paternalistic leadership-justice link such that the strongest positive benevolent leadership and interactional justice relationship, as well as the strongest negative association between authoritarian leadership and both types of justice, were observed in Turkey.
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1. Introduction

Establishing a desirable ethical climate is crucial to induce ethical behavior in organizations (Simha & Cullen 2012; Newman et al. 2017). Ethical climate refers to employee’s general perception of an organization’s operations and procedures that are designed to promote ethical behavior (Victor & Cullen 1988). Previous research has suggested that organizational leaders are the key players in creating an ethical climate (Demirtas & Akdogan 2015; Mayer et al. 2010; Nie et al. 2018; Ötken & Cenkci 2012; Schroeder 2002). In that regard, it is necessary to understand which leadership styles can produce a desired ethical climate. However, cultural differences can complicate leadership choices as well as the mechanisms they use to boost ethical climate (Brunton & Eweje 2010; Stedham & Beekun 2013). That is, how leaders influence perceptions of ethical climate depends on cultural acceptance of the leadership style since values of some national cultures may impede or promote the influence of a particular leadership style on employees’ perceptions. One such leadership style that may be controversial in some cultures is Paternalistic Leadership (PL), which includes authority and parental benevolence. As Aycan (2006) mentioned, “Paternalism remains as an issue that evokes opinions in almost opposite directions in Eastern and Western cultures” (p. 446). To this end, this study aims to address the potential controversies of PL in the cross-cultural ethics context and examine how authoritarian (AL) and benevolent leadership (BL), the two major dimensions of PL, impair or foster perceptions of workplace ethical climate across three countries: Taiwan, Turkey, and the U.S.

Leaders can influence ethical climate directly or indirectly. Most of the research based on social learning theory suggested that ethical/moral leadership would directly affect ethical climate
through role modeling and the communication of the ethical issues (e.g., Mayer et al. 2010; Neubert et al. 2009). However, leaders can also shape the climate indirectly through social influences, which has rarely been studied (McAllister et al. 2018). For example, leaders can set a social environment that promotes ethical climate, such as making the workplace a fair place (Brown et al. 2005). Since climate is often communicated and shaped through interaction with social and physical environment (Katz & Kahn 1978), the informal influence of interpersonal interactions and behaviors are potentially more penetrable than formal systems in shaping ethical climate (Tenbrunsel et al. 2003; Neubert et al. 2009). Indeed, from the perspective of social influence theory, climate perceptions are socially constructed and leaders, being the authority of social principles of justice and fairness, have a critical role in shaping ethical climate in organizations (Ashforth 1985). Specifically, leaders pose both informational and normative social influence on employees and set the boundaries for acceptable behaviors within the workplace (Ashforth 1985; Ferris et al. 2017). From this standpoint, we propose that, due to their power over employees, leaders shape employees’ justice perceptions (Brown et al., 2005). In fact, Tyler (1986) stressed the critical role leaders have on employees’ justice perceptions as “employees act as naive moral philosophers, judging the actions of leaders against abstract criteria of fairness” (p.309). By consistently conveying information and norms, leaders influence employees’ perceptions of justice and collective moral judgements for policies and practices, i.e. ethical climate. Taking the social influence perspective, this study fills in the literature gap of how leadership indirectly shapes ethical climate, and proposes justice perceptions as a mediating mechanism in this relationship (Byun et al. 2018; Hiller et al. 2019).

Hence, drawing on organizational justice theory, we propose both interactional (IJ) and procedural justice (PJ) as potential mediating mechanisms in PL-ethical climate relationships. Leaders are responsible for delivering organizational justice, namely PJ, by communicating
organizational rules and procedures (Naumann & Bennett 2000). Furthermore, leaders cultivate IJ perceptions among employees by treating them fairly and sensitively (Cohen-Charash & Spector 2001). Given that the nature of PL involves a top-down process and employees are in a reactive rather than an active role in the process, we argue that PL may act as a double-edged sword in shaping ethical climate. Specifically, while BL may foster ethical climate via increased justice perceptions, AL may impair ethical climate by harming justice perceptions (Wu et al. 2012).

Since PL has a strong cultural root, it is necessary to examine the boundary conditions of the PL-justice-ethical climate relationships. We, therefore, posit that how these leaders influence perceptions of justice and ethical climate will vary depending on the national cultural context. Paternalistic leaders who behave like merciful and controlling parents are more effective in collectivistic and high power distant Eastern-Asian countries (Aycan 2006; Aycan et al. 2013; Chan et al. 2013; Cheng et al. 2004). However, during the era of industrial paternalism, exemplary leaders in the U.S. also displayed a softer, less coercive form of paternalism, libertarian paternalism (Humphreys et al. 2015; Thaler & Sustein 2003). Pellegrini et al. (2010) also showed that paternalism may have some positive effects in the U.S. It is obvious that PL is a leadership style that should be examined with the consideration of cultural context (Mansur et al. 2017).

To address the above research gaps, drawing on social influence and organizational justice theories, the aim of this study is to explore how the bright (benevolent) and the dark (authoritarian) side of PL influence ethical climate through justice perceptions (i.e. IJ and PJ) in different cultural contexts: Taiwan, Turkey, and the U.S. (Figure 1). Taiwan and Turkey have similar national cultures (Hofstede, 2001) and are both high on paternalism. Specifically, Taiwan and Turkey are high in paternalism, power distance, and collectivism, whereas the U.S. is at the opposite end of these dimensions. Additionally, Taiwan and Turkey are the two cultural contexts in which PL dimensions were first conceptualized and developed (Aycan 2006; Cheng et al. 2000). Therefore,
the choice of these three countries enables us to not only examine the potential moderating role of national culture but also the potential differences between two seemingly similar cultures.

This study contributes to business ethics and leadership literatures in two ways: First, it advances our understanding of how leadership shapes ethical climate in different cultural contexts, which is an issue of increasing importance in today's global economy. More specifically, we contribute to the cross-cultural leadership and ethics literatures by studying AL and BL, the two major aspects of PL, for their ethical implications not only in collectivistic and power distant countries (i.e., Taiwan and Turkey), but also in an individualistic and low power distant country (i.e., the U.S.), where PL is an emerging area that has yet to be examined. Second, using the social influence theory, we extend the mechanisms through which leadership shapes the ethical climate of the workplace. In doing so, we attempt to identify the dual roles of PL in shaping ethical climate, as AL may demote ethical climate by hurting justice perceptions, whereas BL may promote ethical climate through enhanced justice perceptions. Examining the processes through which authoritarian and benevolent paternalistic leadership influence ethical climate can address the recent calls in the ethics field for a better understanding of mechanisms by which leadership fosters or harms ethical climate (Brown & Trevino 2006; Byun et al. 2018; Grojean et al. 2004; Mayer et al. 2012).

2. Literature review and hypotheses

2.1. Paternalistic leadership and ethical climate

At the core of PL is control and care. Paternalistic leaders exert authority and power with parental benevolence and expect loyalty and deference in return (Aycan 2006; Cheng et al. 2004). Accordingly, the two major aspects of PL are AL (control) and BL (care). While AL (dark side of PL) includes exerting power, and control over subordinates, BL (bright side of PL) includes showing individualized and holistic concern for subordinates’ professional and personal welfare
(Mansur et al. 2017). The third dimension of PL, moral leadership, seems to be peculiar to Asian contexts (Cheng et al. 2000) and its universality and generalizability is unclear (Aycan 2006; Hiller et al. 2019; Pellegrini & Scandura 2008). Furthermore, as mentioned before, moral leadership has an obvious and direct effect on ethical climate through social learning while both AL and BL influence subordinates in a subtle and indirect way through social influence process. Therefore, our study employs a conceptualization that captures the two major dimensions of PL: AL and BL.

Ethical climate is a type of organizational climate which represents the organizational normative systems, policies, and procedures in regards to how ethical issues are resolved (Victor & Cullen 1988). Ethical climate acts as a guide when handling and making decisions about ethical dilemmas, and it positively affects numerous workplace outcomes (Demirtas & Akdogan 2015; Demirtas et al. 2017; Jamali et al. 2017; Martin & Cullen 2006; Newman et al. 2017; Shin et al. 2015; Simha & Cullen 2012). Understanding the antecedents of ethical climate is crucial for individual and organizational effectiveness. Research has categorized antecedents of workplace ethical climate into three general classifications: external organizational context, organizational form/structure, and managerial orientations or styles (Martin & Cullen 2006; Newman et al. 2017; Simha & Cullen 2012; Victor & Cullen 1988). Among the three categories, managerial styles have the greatest impact on ethical climate. In other words, leaders have enormous power to create and maintain an ethical climate by communicating the organizational procedures to subordinates, as well as showing them fair interpersonal treatment.

According to the social influence perspective (Ashforth 1985; Ferris et al. 2017), leaders can shape their followers’ perceptions through informational and normative social influence. The informational social influence is “an influence to accept information obtained from another as evidence about reality”, whereas normative social influence is an influence to confirm the expectation of others (Deutsch & Gerard 1955: 629). Through frequent interactions with their
followers, leaders shape the ethical tone by making employees accept the reality in the workplace (information social influence), and then, followers act according to the expectations of the leaders (normative social influence). These social influences may either result in a genuine change in attitudes or at least public compliance, both of which foster ethical practices at the workplace.

But, how paternalistic leaders shape ethical climate still remains an unanswered question. We argue that AL and BL shape ethical climate through influencing employees’ justice perceptions. Since the focus of AL is to gain control, these leaders are less likely to engage in open communication with employees, and more likely to use a top-down approach in decision making. Followers may feel that authoritarian leader is manipulative and has a hidden agenda, and consequently perceive unfair treatment (Kurdoglu 2019). Under consistent interaction with authoritarian leaders, followers realize that being submissive and obedient, and not questioning the leader are the expected and preferred behaviors (Cheng et al. 2004). In contrast, benevolent leaders show genuine concern for their employees and provide them with professional and personal support. These behaviors not only increase the commitment, teamwork, and retention of the employees (Hiller et al. 2019; Karakitapoglu-Aygün & Gumusluoglu 2013b), but also set an open and caring working environment, which may promote ethical climate. According to Erben and Güneşer (2008), BL has a positive and moderate correlation with ethical climate, while AL has a negative and weak association. However, it is not clear through which mediating mechanisms AL and BL influence climate. Below, we provide PJ and IJ as potential mediating mechanisms in these relationships.

2.2. Organizational justice as a mediating mechanism

Crawshaw et al. (2013) consider organizational justice as practice and ethics as normative standards, and argue that they can “affect or be related to each other in interesting and informative ways” (p.887). Hence, recent studies started to integrate these closely related research areas (Neubert et al. 2009; Shin et al. 2015). In this study, we focus on two types of justice perceptions,
PJ and IJ, which are suggested to predict perceptions of ethical climate and provide a nice mapping to social influence processes we suggested early. PJ is about the justice in organizational procedures and processes, and is dependent on the extent to which certain types of normatively accepted principles exist (Lind & Tyler 1988). IJ, however, refers to the extent to which the communication between the actor (managers) and the recipients (employees) involves aspects such as politeness, honesty, and respect (Bies & Moag 1986). As managers are agents of an organization, they have important roles in shaping justice perceptions at all levels of the organizations (Li et al. 2018; Wu et al. 2012). Based on the social influence perspective, we suggest that employees forge their perceptions of PJ and IJ through daily interactions with their managers. These specific, event-based perceptions gradually and accumulatively form a generic, attitude-based perception of the work environment, an organizational climate perception concerning ethics.

In one study, examining the linkages between ethical leadership, procedural justice and ethical climate, Shin et al. (2015) suggested that top management ethical leadership predicts generic ethical climate in an organization, which then results in a more specific form of procedural justice climate. In our case, however, we propose that PJ and IJ are the mediators which predict the generic ethical climate. Since their study is conducted at the firm level, they found a cascading effect of top management ethical leadership on more proximal generic ethical climate. Yet, in our study, because we focus on front-line and middle-level managers (department/unit managers in all three countries) who interact with their employees on a day-to-day basis, we argue that these immediate supervisors’ behaviors will influence the more proximal justice perceptions, which then influence perceptions of the generic ethical climate. From the social influence perspective, it is plausible to expect that immediate supervisors can directly influence the justice perceptions of their employees through daily interactions, as compared to distal and generic ethical climate perceptions. Indeed, empirical studies support our argument that perceived justice acts as an antecedent of ethical climate perceptions, rather
than vice versa (Elçi et al. 2015; Luria & Yagil 2008; Neubert et al. 2009). Yet, how can benevolent and authoritarian leaders, the two types of paternalistic leaders, influence justice perceptions and the ethical climate in their organizations? For example, how do these leaders differ in treating their employees, shaping their perceptions of justice and, consequently, the ethical climate? Are they angels (have positive influences on justice and ethical climate) or devils (have negative influences on justice and ethical climate) in the eyes of their employees? How do these bright and dark sides of paternalism differ in shaping ethical climate across cultures? While addressing these questions, we provide the literature and our hypotheses below.

2.3. Benevolent leadership and perceived ethical climate: The mediating roles of IJ and PJ

As the manifestation of the care aspect of PL, BL involves caring and nurturing behaviors, and has positive relationships with many subordinate outcomes such as high levels of trust and comfort (Lleo de Nalda et al. 2016). Benevolent leaders who act like parental figures support their followers personally and professionally. These leaders show genuine care, goodwill, and kind interpersonal treatment to subordinates. They get to know each employee personally and show interest in all aspects of their lives (e.g. attending their wedding ceremonies, funerals, special days, etc.). The caring and truthful intention of the benevolent leader towards the follower creates a supportive atmosphere where the leader provides the follower with support and advice on different matters, and the follower, in return, feels comfortable to voice his suggestions. The follower experiences honesty, genuine care, and respect from the leader, all of which are elements of IJ. In other words, based on the social influence perspective, by being caring, and promoting open and two-way communication with their followers in daily interactions, benevolent leaders are expected to positively influence perceptions of climate regarding ethics (Wu et al. 2012).

BL may also cultivate PJ perceptions as these leaders are more likely to clarify expectations and responsibilities with employees, and encourage them to participate in decision-making (Li et al.
By engaging in participative decision making, benevolent leaders act as climate engineers in their units, and, in-line with their focus on ‘we-ness’, are able to promote the well-being of their followers and organizations. Thus, they are likely to listen, support, and solicit ideas and decisions from their followers, as well as communicate and explain the rules, policies, and decisions which will improve individual performance and organizational effectiveness. All of the above leadership behaviors are critical contributors to PJ (Cohen-Charash & Spector 2001). It is clear that the caring behaviors of benevolent leaders not only create an open, honest, and respectful working environment, but also offer followers the opportunity to participate in decision making, which can enhance levels of both IJ and PJ. Thus, we propose that:

**H1: Interactional (H1a) and procedural justice perceptions (H1b) will mediate the positive relationship between BL and the perceived ethical climate.**

**2.4. Authoritarian leadership and perceived ethical climate: The mediating roles of IJ and PJ**

AL reflects the control aspect of PL. Authoritarian leaders are dictatorial leaders who exert power and control over tasks, and followers, expect absolute conformity and obedience, and punish them when they don’t follow the rules and instructions (Aycan 2006; Cheng et al. 2000; 2004). In this way, authoritarian leaders can have great control over the situation (Aycan 2006). Rooted in the ‘father’ figure of paternalistic culture, the major responsibility of the father is to be the ‘primary income provider’. As a result, the leader may perform manipulative behaviors that help them gain control over the employees (such as despising followers’ abilities and values, and disrespecting them to let the employees know who is the boss). Consequently, authoritarian leaders may repress employees’ psychological states, and behave in such a commanding fashion and that they show no concern for employees’ rights. This results in employees’ experiencing feelings of oppression. These leaders trigger negative emotions in their employees, such as distrust, fear, anger, anxiety,
and uncertainty (Wu et al. 2012). Since interpersonal mistreatment involves rudeness, hostility, and insensitivity, it is likely that employees under these leaders will perceive high levels of interactional injustice (Wang et al. 2012).

As the purpose of AL is to gain control over decisions and activities, AL may also decrease followers’ PJ perceptions. Authoritarian leaders are less likely to provide sufficient information, delegate authority or involve employees in decision making. As they do not provide information or clarify organizational rules and expectations, they intentionally instill a one-way communication atmosphere. They tend to be the sole decision makers, rather than listening to suggestions from their subordinates to improve decisions and processes. Since employees are required to obey these leaders’ instructions completely, they cannot challenge decisions, and keep their criticisms to themselves (Li et al. 2018). In sum, these leaders emphasize gaining power and authority by engaging in interpersonal mistreatment and being reluctant to share information and communicate openly. Based on social influence perspective, all these behaviors will lead to a decrease in IJ and PJ feelings, which will impair perceptions of ethical climate. Hence, we propose that;

\[ H2: \text{Interactional (H2a)} \text{ and procedural justice perceptions (H2b) will mediate the negative relationship between AL and the perceived ethical climate.} \]

2.5. PL-Ethical climate: The moderating role of national culture

Cross-cultural literature suggests that while it may be possible to generalize leadership styles across cultures, its effects, practices, and enactment are culture-specific (Den Hartog et al. 1999). Unique cultural characteristics such as values, beliefs, religion, and history call for distinct leadership forms and processes in different nations (Hofstede 2001). For instance, PL is recognized as an effective leadership style in cultures high on power distance and collectivism, but criticized in cultures low on these dimensions (Aycan 2006; Mansur et al. 2017). In this study, we examine how
BL and AL shape the ethical climate of the workplace across three cultural settings: Taiwan, Turkey, and the U.S. We deliberately chose these three national cultures since Taiwan and Turkey are high on both collectivism (individualism score is 17 for Taiwan and 37 for Turkey) and power distance (58 for Taiwan and 66 for Turkey), whereas the U.S. is very high on individualism (91), but low on power distance (40) (Hofstede, 2001). Similarly, in terms of PL dimensions, Mansur et al. (2017) categorized Taiwan and Turkey as similar to each other representing high authority and high benevolence, while they considered the U.S. as low in authority and mediocre in benevolence.

PL s a prevalent management style in the traditional business context of Taiwan. Familism, as well as human-oriented leadership strongly affect management practices where leaders build both directive and considerate relationships with their followers. Within the collectivistic cultural values, the family business model is quite dominant; leaders and followers maintain emotional relationships that function like that of a family. Due to high power distance between the upper and lower levels of the hierarchy, there is strong deference to authority figures. Employees demonstrate obedience and compliance, and cannot challenge the decision making authorities (Hofstede 2001). In return, managers judge followers’ worth based on their loyalty more than on their objective performance. In this vertical relationship, based on dependence and compliance, subordinates tolerate authoritarianism and perceive leaders less negatively (Wang et al. 2012).

Similarly, paternalism is an effective leadership style in the Turkish context (Berkman & Özen 2007; Erben & Güneşer 2008). Even in non-traditional professional contexts, consistent with the collectivistic and high power distant characteristics of the culture (Hofstede 2001; Kabasakal & Bodur 2002), Turkish leaders are expected to behave like parent figures, and followers desire harmonious relationships with them (Karakitapoglu-Aygün & Gumusluoglu 2013a, 2013b; Gumusluoglu et al. 2017). In the Turkish society, long-term preservation and enhancement of one’s extended family is critical when the father of the family is expected to play numerous roles (e.g.,
father of the clan, economic decision maker, arbiter of justice, and military head) (Markham 2012). Indeed, in Turkish folklore, the word Devlet Baba” (“Papa State”) refers to the father-son relationship between citizens and the state. Although Turkey is presently transitioning from a traditional to a modern society, impersonal relations still prevail (Imamoğlu & Karakitapoğlu-Aygün 2004). In addition to providing care and nurturance, Turkish leaders are still likely to make unilateral decisions and act autocratically.

In Western cultures, however, short-term, task-based, and democratic relationships between leaders and followers are more common where an effective leader is egalitarian, and appears to be ‘one of the boys’ (Den Hartog et al. 1999). In the U.S., a cultural context with high individualism and low power distance (Hofstede 2001), effectiveness of paternalism is controversial. AL and BL in such a context may not necessarily be perceived as effective ways to lead. For example, it could be considered a violation of privacy for a benevolent leader to be involved in their employees’ personal and family lives. In a similar vein, employees in the U.S. may not feel comfortable with the behaviors of authoritarian leaders while they are carrying out their tasks. Employees prefer participative leadership behaviors, such as asking followers’ suggestions, considering their feedback and input, and implementing plans in accordance with their expectations (Den Hartog et al. 1999). Consequently, in the U.S., authoritarianism was shown to be negatively associated with subordinate outcomes such as loyalty, trust, and commitment (Pellegrini & Scandura 2008).

In the light of this literature, we can conclude that compared with employees from individualistic cultures, people from collectivistic cultures, pay more attention to the nature, quality, and outcome of their relationships with leaders. Since in collectivistic cultures, interdependence and responsibility-taking for others at the workplace are heavily valued, people view BL more positively (Aycan, 2006). In individualistic cultures, however, because relatedness and dependency are contradictory to individualistic values of autonomy and self-determination, benevolent
paternalism is not much desirable. Therefore, people-oriented benevolent leaders in Turkey and Taiwan are expected to have stronger positive effects on workplace ethical climate through influencing their followers’ perceptions of fairness, as compared to those in the U.S.

**H3:** *National culture will moderate the strength of the mediated relationships between BL and ethical climate via interactional (H3a) and procedural justice (H3b), such that these positively mediated relationships will be stronger in Taiwan and Turkey than in the U.S.*

Moreover, as mentioned before, authoritarianism is more likely to be tolerated in high power distance countries. In these cultures, subordinates willingly accept the leader’s authority since the leader’s status is ascribed by the virtue of his/her position, age and experience (Aycan, 2006). On the contrary, in low power distance cultures, subordinates do not tolerate authority, since they view themselves as equals of their leaders and want to exercise autonomy (Mansur et al. 2017). Hence, we argue that leaders who treat employees with rudeness and insensitivity will be seen as more unfair in the U.S. than in Turkey and Taiwan. Likewise, authoritarian leaders who don’t let employees voice their concerns or take part in decision making processes, will have stronger negative effects on justice perceptions, and consequently, the ethical climate, in the U.S.

**H4:** *National culture will moderate the strength of the mediated relationships between AL and ethical climate via interactional (H4a) and procedural justice (H4b), such that these negatively mediated relationships will be stronger in the U.S. than in Taiwan and Turkey.*

3. **Method**

3.1. **Sample and procedure**

Data were collected from 383 private organizations in Taiwan. Participants were full time employees enrolled in the Executive MBA and continuous education programs at a public university. Once participants agreed to participate in the survey, we distribute the survey packages
in envelopes to assure confidentiality. Each package included a survey questionnaire, an NT 200 (about 2 USD) gift certificate from the largest convenient store chain in Taiwan, and a prepaid postage envelope to mail the completed survey directly to the researcher. The overall response rate was 90%, and the final sample consisted of 674 employees. Of the participants, 37% are male. The average age of the employees is 34.84 (SD = 8.33). The average tenure with the leader and company is 4.03 (SD = 4.45), and 6.39 years (SD = 6.33), respectively.

We collected the Turkish data from a sample of private and public organizations in Ankara (24 in total). We first contacted the managers and/or HR supervisors at the organizations to obtain their permission for the study. They provided us with the names of the employees who agreed to participate. The surveys were distributed in envelopes to assure confidentiality and respondents completed them in their offices. The overall response rate was 74.36%. The sample consisted of 409 employees. Of the participants, 60% are male, around 72% of them are from public, and 28% from private organizations. The average age of the employees is 35 (SD = 8.79). The average tenure with the leader and company is 4.25 (SD = 4.77), and 7.06 years (SD = 7.85), respectively.

In the U.S., the sample consisted of 479 full-time employees who enrolled in Executive MBA program of a southern university. The surveys were distributed in envelopes to assure confidentiality. Respondents used the prepaid postage envelope provided in the survey package to mail the survey directly to the researcher. Of the participants, 56% are male. The average age of the employees is 32 (SD = 13.53). The average tenure with the leader and company is 3.48 (SD = 5.22), and 4.41 years (SD = 6.00), respectively.

3.2. Measures

With the exception of the U.S. sample, we used the back-translation procedure to translate the English scale into Traditional Chinese and Turkish in the survey forms. Native speakers of Turkish
and Taiwanese also checked the scales for wording, accuracy, and clarity of items. All items were rated on a five-point scale ranging from 1 (“Strongly disagree”) to 5 (“Strongly agree”).

3.2.1. Benevolent and authoritarian leadership

BL and AL were measured by six items each, from Aycan (2006) and Cheng et al. (2000), respectively. Sample items for BL are “S/he attends special events of employees (e.g. weddings and funeral ceremonies, graduations etc.),” and “S/he behaves like a family member (father/mother or elder brother/sister) towards me”; for AL, the sample items are “He/She asks me to obey his/her instructions completely”, and “He/She scolds me when I can’t accomplish my tasks”. Reliability coefficients for BL were .89 (Taiwan), .77 (Turkey), and .88 (the U.S.). Reliability coefficients for AL were .86 (Taiwan), .76 (Turkey), and .75 (the U.S.).

3.2.2. Procedural justice

PJ was measured with six items from Lamertz’s scale (2002). Sample items are “My company uses procedures designed to collect accurate information necessary for making decisions”, and “My company uses procedures designed to provide opportunities to appeal or challenge the decision”. Reliability coefficients were .90 (Taiwan), .75 (Turkey), and .90 (the U.S.).

3.2.3. Interactional justice

IJ included six items from Moorman (1991) and one item from Oldham and Cummings (1996). Sample items include “My supervisor was able to suppress personal biases”, and “My supervisor provided me with timely feedback about the decisions and their implications”. Reliability coefficients were .90 (Taiwan), .96 (Turkey), and .89 (the U.S.).

3.2.4. Ethical climate

Ethical climate has been defined as “the prevailing perceptions of typical organizational practices and procedures that have ethical content” (Victor & Cullen 1988: 101). It consists of the shared perceptions which affect the perceived rightness or wrongness in an organizational setting.
We measured ethical climate by six items from Mayer et al. (2010). Sample items include “Department employees have a lot of skills in recognizing ethical issues”, and “Department employees continually strive to maintain high ethical standards”. Reliability coefficients were .79 (Taiwan), .92 (Turkey), and .89 (the U.S.).

3.2.5 Control variables

Employees’ gender, age, and tenure with leader and company were used as control variables. Leadership styles were also controlled in all analyses.

4. Results

4.1. Test of mediation and moderation effects

Before hypothesis testing, we conducted confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) for each country to examine the construct validity of the studied variables. A five-factor model was examined for each sample. For the all three samples, the overall model fit was acceptable (Taiwan: $\chi^2_{(424)} = 1384.06, p < .01$; SRMR = .05; RMSEA = .06; NNFI = .96; CFI = .97; Turkey: $\chi^2_{(424)} = 1321.76, p < .01$; SRMR = .07; RMSEA = .08; NNFI = .96; CFI = .97; the U.S.: $\chi^2_{(424)} = 950.78, p < .01$; SRMR = .06; RMSEA = .05; NNFI = .96; CFI = .97, Hu & Bentler 1999). All factor loadings were significant and none of the confidence intervals of the correlations between latent variables included the value of 1, providing support for convergent and discriminant validities of the studied variables (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988). Because Hypotheses 3 and 4 concern comparisons of structural coefficients among three countries, a prerequisite of at least partial metric invariance between the samples to be compared is required for hypothesis testing (Steenkamp & Baumgartner 1998). The three samples showed full configural invariance, indicating that the five-factor model holds summarily well across all three samples. However, partial metric invariance was only supported between the Turkish and the U.S. samples, not in the comparison between Taiwanese
and Turkish samples or the Taiwanese and the U.S. samples. Since partial metric invariance across the samples to be compared is the necessary prerequisite for comparing structural coefficients (path coefficients), the Taiwanese sample was excluded from moderation analyses (Hypotheses 3 and 4). As a result, we tested our mediation hypotheses (Hypotheses 1 and 2) for each country separately. For the moderation hypotheses (Hypotheses 3 and 4), only the Turkish and the U.S. samples were used for hypothesis testing.

Furthermore, given the cross-sectional nature of our data, we conducted two additional CFAs, with and without an unmeasured method factor, to examine the potential impact of common method variance (CMV) on the findings (Podsakoff et al. 2003). In the constrained model, the factor loadings from the method factor to the items are constrained to be equal, whereas in the unconstrained model, all the method factor loadings are free to be estimated. Our results show that the unconstrained model failed to converge. Although the constrained model showed that adding the common factor has some impact on the factor loadings of the measured items, the changes in factor loadings were small (Taiwan: ranged from .01 to .06; Turkey ranged from .02 to .04; the U.S. ranged .03 to .18). The overall fit of the original models and the model with the unmeasured common method variance were almost identical (unmeasured model fit for Taiwan: NNFI=.97, CFI=.97, RMSEA=.06 SRMR=.04; for Turkey: NNFI=.97, CFI=.98, RMSEA=.07, SRMR=.07; and for U.S.: NNFI=.97, CFI=.97, RMSEA=.05 SRMR=.06). These results suggested that impact of CMV was not severe and should not pose a major threat to the internal validity of our study.

Tables 1 to 3 show the means, standard deviations, correlations, and reliability coefficients of the variables. The PROCESS procedure (Hayes 2015) was used for all hypothesis testing. Hypotheses 1 to 2 were tested with Model 4, and Hypotheses 3 and 4 were tested with Model 59. In all analyses, the untested effect of the other leadership style and justice perceptions were controlled. Table 4 and Figure 2 show the path coefficients of the studied relationships for each country.
Hypothesis 1a examined the positive mediating role of IJ on the BL - ethical climate link. Hypothesis 1a was supported for the U.S. sample (indirect effect = .10, \( p < .01, 95\% \text{ CI}= [.06:.15] \)), but not for the Taiwanese (indirect effect = .02, \( p = .14, 95\% \text{ CI}= [-.01:.05] \)) or the Turkish samples (indirect effect = .01, \( p = .59, 95\% \text{ CI}= [-.04:.06] \)). Hypothesis 1b examined the positive mediating role of PJ on the relationship between BL and ethical climate. It was supported for all three countries (Taiwan: indirect effect = .11, \( p < .01, 95\% \text{ CI}= [.07:.15] \); Turkey: indirect effect = .08; \( p < .01; 95\% \text{ CI}= [.01:.17] \); the U.S.: indirect effect = .08; \( p < .01; 95\% \text{ CI}= [.05:.12] \)).

Hypothesis 2a examined the negative mediating role of IJ on the relationship between AL and ethical climate. It was supported for the U.S. sample (indirect effect = -.04; \( p < .01; 95\% \text{ CI}= [-.08:.02] \)), but not for the Taiwanese (indirect effect = -.01, \( p = .15, 95\% \text{ CI}= [-.02:.00] \)) or the Turkish samples (\( \beta = -.01, p = .59; 95\% \text{ CI}= [-.06:.04] \)). Hypothesis 2b examined the negative mediating role of PJ on the relationship between AL and ethical climate. It was supported for Turkey (indirect effect = -.28, \( p < .01, 95\% \text{ CI}= [-.40:.17] \)), but not for Taiwan (indirect effect = -.00, \( p = .77, 95\% \text{ CI}= [-.04:.03] \)) or the U.S. (indirect effect = .02, \( p = .14, 95\% \text{ CI}= [.00:.04] \)).

Hypothesis 3a (tested for the Turkish and the U.S. samples) was not supported as the positive mediating effect of IJ in BL-ethical climate relationship was stronger in U.S than in Turkey (Index of Moderated Mediation = .08, \( 95\% \text{ CI}= [.01:.15] \)). Hypothesis 3b was not supported as no difference was found between Turkey and the U.S. in terms of the mediating effects of PJ in this link (Index of Moderated Mediation = -.08, \( 95\% \text{ CI}= [-.17:.01] \)).

Hypothesis 4a (tested for the Turkish and the U.S samples) was not supported since there was no difference between Turkey and the U.S. regarding the mediating effect of IJ in AL-ethical climate relationship (Index of Moderated Mediation = -.01, \( 95\% \text{ CI}= [-.07:.05] \)). Hypothesis 4b
was not supported as the negative mediating effect of PJ was stronger in Turkey than in the U.S. (Index of Moderated Mediation = .23, 95% CI= [.17: .39]).

In order to further delineate the differences between Turkey and the U.S., we conducted post-hoc moderation analyses on individual paths, namely in the leadership-justice and justice-ethical climate paths.

**4.2. Post-Hoc moderation analyses on individual paths across Turkey and the U.S.**

First, we conducted moderation analyses on the relationship between leadership dimensions and justice perceptions across Turkey and the U.S. These analyses showed that culture moderated the positive relationship between BL and IJ ($\beta = -.21; p < .01$), such that the positive relationship was stronger in Turkey ($\beta = .42; p < .01$) than in the U.S. ($\beta = .28; p < .01$), as shown in Figure 3. However, culture failed to moderate the relationship between BL and PJ ($\beta = .01; p = .85$).

------------ Insert Figure 3 here -------------

As shown in Figure 4, country moderated the negative relationship between AL and IJ ($\beta = .36; p < .01$), such that the negative relationship was stronger in Turkey ($\beta = -.42; p < .01$) than in the U.S. ($\beta = -.12; p < .01$). Culture also moderated the negative relationship between AL and PJ ($\beta = .41; p < .01$), such that the negative relationship was stronger in Turkey ($\beta = -.39; p < .01$) than in the U.S. ($\beta = .05; p = .23$) (Figure 5).

------------ Insert Figures 4, 5 here -------------

Second, we ran moderation analyses on justice perceptions and ethical climate linkage. The results revealed that culture moderated the positive relationship between IJ and ethical climate ($\beta = .13; p < .01$), such that the positive relationship was weaker in Turkey ($\beta = .03; p = .58$) than in the U.S. ($\beta = .36; p < .01$) (Figure 6). Culture also moderated the positive relationship between PJ
and ethical climate perceptions (\(\beta = -.18; p < .01\)), such that the positive relationship was stronger in Turkey (\(\beta = .72; p < .01\)) than in the U.S. (\(\beta = .34; p < .01\)), as can be followed in Figure 7.

5. Discussion

Our study makes two primary contributions to ethics and leadership literatures. First, using the social influence perspective, our study advances our understanding of how benevolent and authoritarian leaders indirectly influence the workplace ethical climate. We contribute to the ethics literature by showing that these leadership dimensions play important roles in shaping ethical climate through justice perceptions. We reveal that PL can act as a double-edged sword in shaping the workplace ethical climate as BL promotes ethical climate through enhanced justice perceptions, whereas AL impairs it by reduced justice perceptions. Furthermore, we show that the pattern of the above-mentioned relationships vary in the three counties. For example, our findings reveal that benevolent leaders seem to be angels in all three countries. On the other hand, authoritarian leaders seem to be devils only in the U.S. and in Turkey, although the mechanisms through which they influence ethical climate differ across these two countries. Second, we demonstrate that national culture is an important moderator when studying the effects of leadership on justice and ethics. More specifically, by comparing the effects of BL and AL on justice and ethical climate between Turkey, and the U.S., we show that while trying to understand the role leadership plays in creating justice and ethical climate, we need to take into account the unique value systems of each cultural context. Our findings concerning the mediating effects of justice in leadership-ethical climate link, and the moderating effect of national culture in these relationships are further explained below.

5.1. Mediating roles of IJ and PJ in the leadership-ethical climate relationship

5.1.1. Benevolent leadership and ethical climate
Across all three cultural contexts, PJ was a meaningful mediator for the BL-ethical climate relationship. Although BL was also positively related to IJ, to our surprise, the mediating effect of IJ was only found in the U.S. That is, IJ was not related to ethical climate in Taiwan or Turkey. These findings point to the role of the social influence process in leadership, and imply that the caring nature of benevolent leaders instills followers with the good intentions of management. In Turkey and Taiwan, benevolent leaders shape ethical climate through enhancing employees’ perceived PJ, but not IJ, which becomes the social norm that promotes ethical climate. One potential explanation for this finding may be that in collectivistic societies, there are no clear rules or ethical norms that can apply to every individual and every context as the proper way to interact with a certain target individual depends on the relationship between the actor and the target. Furthermore, it is considered disrespectful to the power holder when less powered individuals question the social norms or rules. Given that ethical practices often involve ambiguous situations, there is a need for employees to construct a sense of social norms such as procedures to be used as the guidance of ethical behavior in the workplace. On the other hand, one possible reason for IJ not being a mechanism for benevolent leaders in boosting ethical climate may be that in collectivistic societies, showing care is itself a social norm in interpersonal interactions. Hence, this finding may imply that in collectivistic cultures, it is necessary, but perhaps not sufficient, for leaders to treat employees well when building an ethical climate. Mansur et al. (2017) categorized both Taiwan and Turkey as highly benevolent societies. Therefore, in these cultural contexts, followers may take the quality treatment (i.e. IJ) shown by their leaders for granted.

In contrast, in a cultural context that has low power distance and high individualism, it is acceptable to question the power holder about the fairness of the processes. Indeed, previous leadership research has suggested that leaders in these contexts typically show task-oriented behaviors which encourage employee initiative and ignore the relational and supportive
components (Aycan et al. 2013). In such contexts that are characterized by individualism and excessive task-orientation, employees may idealize a leader’s kindness and sensitivity to their needs and aspirations, and perceive the work climate to be ethical based on this high-quality interpersonal treatment. Supporting these contentions, Pellegrini et al. (2010) reported that some of the positive effects of paternalism may generalize to individualistic cultures such as the U.S., as well. Similarly, Humphreys et al. (2015) suggest that a libertarian paternalistic leader, who provides freedom for his/her followers to make decisions, may be desirable in the U.S. Specifically, a libertarian paternalistic leader trusts his/her followers and builds quality relationships with them, similar to a benevolent leader (Cheng et al. 2004). Hence, the observed positive effect of BL on IJ and climate perceptions in the U.S. can be extended to this softer form of PL in future research.

5.1.2. Authoritarian leadership and ethical climate

The relationships between AL and ethical climate were more complicated than the BL-ethical climate linkage. Our mediation findings for AL show that, while these leaders negatively affect ethical climate in Turkey via PJ and the U.S. via IJ, they do not have any significant negative effects on ethical climate either via IJ or PJ in Taiwan. The findings for Turkey imply that PL is a double-edged sword for Turkish managers, who exercise the highest AL among the three cultural settings (Mansur et al. 2017). That is, in the Turkish context, since AL is a strongly endorsed leadership style, even more so than BL, PL may result in negative consequences at the workplace by deteriorating perceptions of both the fairness of the system and the ethical climate.

In Taiwan, similar to the case in the U.S., which will be discussed in the next section, authoritarian leaders have no effect on perceptions of PJ. This may be because Taiwan has built itself in America’s image both economically and politically (Thomas 2001). Taiwanese economic structures and processes witnessed a major change as a result of rapid ‘industrialization’ and ‘Westernization’. Supporting this view, House and colleagues illustrate that both Taiwan and the
U.S. show higher levels of performance-orientation (House et al. 2004). Leaders in these performance-oriented societies tend to stress high and objective standards to increase organizational effectiveness; this does not allow for arbitrary and subjective procedures and expectations. In other words, reconfigurations in the organizational structures and processes in Taiwanese companies may affect leadership orientations as related to ethical behavior (Martin & Cullen 2006). Leaders in Taiwanese organizations, which are moving towards more impersonal and well-established organizational systems, cannot dictate their own rules and systems.

So, given these mediation findings, are benevolent leaders angels, and authoritarian leaders devils, in creating ethical work climates in the eyes of their employees in Taiwan, Turkey, and the U.S.? In other words, do benevolent leaders positively influence justice perceptions, and in turn ethical climate (i.e., angels)? Do authoritarian leaders negatively influence justice perceptions, and in turn ethical climate (i.e., devils)? Our results illustrate that, in all three countries, benevolent leaders are akin to angels in that they boost ethical climate perceptions via PJ. Indeed, BL and PJ philosophies have a common concern for the collective welfare of the organization. When leaders question the appropriateness of the evaluative criteria used in organizational decisions, explain the reasons underlying those decisions, and enhance employee voice, they increase their employees' control over decisions and enhance group solidarity in the long run (Greenberg 1995). Since benevolent leaders intend to establish a we-ness/family spirit and therefore, communicate the decisions and rules of the organization in a way that takes the employees into account, they create a culture of justice among employees and an ethical climate at the workplace.

While benevolent leaders resemble angels in all three cultures, authoritarian leaders seem to be perceived as devils only in the U.S. and Turkey. In these countries, authoritarian leaders represent the dark side of leadership in terms of impairing ethical work climates. However, they impair ethical climates through different mechanisms in each of these societies; through harming IJ
perceptions in the U.S., whereas through harming PJ perceptions in Turkey. In other words, it seems that authoritarian leaders who are dominating and undermining their followers’ abilities resemble devils or ‘bosses from Hell’ in the U.S. because they pose negative social influences on their followers: mistreat them, show no caring of their rights, and engage in punitive behavior towards them. These actions impair perceptions of IJ. In Turkey, however, these ‘devils’ damage employees’ perceptions about the fairness of the system that is PJ; we will elaborate further on these differences between Turkey and the U.S., in the discussion of our moderation findings below.

In Taiwan, authoritarian leaders do not negatively affect ethical climate either through IJ or PJ. These leaders cannot be considered devils in this cultural context. Perhaps it is because these leaders do not use power for their personal interests and benefits, but rather to serve their followers, implying the ‘socialized power’ of McClelland (1975). Taiwan is a society under the influence of Confucianism, which emphasizes the importance of family and social harmony. Authority figures are expected to act as moral exemplars. Therefore, Taiwanese people have a strict view about ethics, where means and ends should be based on good virtues to be considered ethical. Moral integrity, personal virtues, and unselfishness are rooted in the Confucian emphasis on moral principles in governance where leaders are expected have high moral standards (Wang et al. 2018). This emphasis on Confucian ideology and the notion of collective welfare in Asian countries seems to neutralize the potentially detrimental impacts of authoritarian leaders. As suggested by Martin and Cullen (2006), a context that underscores social welfare can foster the perception of a more caring climate within an organization. One other noteworthy finding of our study is that BL is directly related to ethical climate only in the Taiwanese sample. This finding also supports the notion of moral character in Asian societies where moral leadership was developed as a third dimension of PL by Taiwanese scholars (Cheng et al. 2000).

5.2. Moderating effects of national culture on leadership-justice and justice-ethical climate links
As mentioned in the results section, partial metric invariance was only supported in the comparison between the Turkish and the U.S. samples, therefore, we were only able to run moderation analyses with these two samples. Our cross-cultural comparisons between the Turkish and the U.S. samples address two important questions: To what extent do benevolent and authoritarian leaders influence justice perceptions across these two different cultural contexts? And to what extent do IJ and PJ affect ethical climate across Turkey and the U.S.?

Consistent with our prediction, our moderation findings on leadership and justice paths illustrated that, Turkish employees reported more positive effects of BL on fair interpersonal treatment as compared to American employees. Surprisingly, we also found stronger negative effects of authoritarian leaders on both justice perceptions in Turkey than in the U.S. This finding is contrary to our expectations and the previous literature, which suggests that followers in high power distant cultures perceive such leaders less negatively (Wang et al. 2012). These stronger negative perceptions of authoritarian leader behaviors, as well as the stronger positive perceptions of benevolent leader behaviors in Turkey, as compared to those in the U.S., may be explained by the emotional attachment of Turkish followers to their leaders which is often polarized across the spectrum of love and hate (Özbilgin 2011). Özbilgin claims that “While the leaders, who are currently worshipped are loved and elevated to a super-human status, leaders who fall from grace also receive strong emotional reactions as they are often metaphorically cannibalised, their past achievements and failures were tarred with the same broad brush” (2011: 280). Hence, our results imply that Turkish professional and white-collar employees, which indeed constituted the sample of this study, love benevolent leaders who treat them with kindness and sensitivity, while they hate authoritarian leaders who mistreat them and are not concerned with the fairness of the system. One explanation for this hate towards authoritarian leaders may be that these leaders use their power only for personal goals and vision, and set standards that suit their self-interest, reminding
personalized power of McClelland (1975). Such leaders may especially earn the hatred of educated and professional employees who emphasize autonomy and discretion. Supporting these contentions, previous research indicated that educated groups of Turkish society have more modern values in contrast to uneducated groups who are characterized by traditionalism representing a dual set of values in the Turkish context (Imamoğlu & Karakitapoğlu-Aygün, 2004). This embodies ‘the duality between east and west, tradition and modernity, religious and secular’ (Kabasakal & Bodur 2002: 51) in a changing society like Turkey. Hence, the professional employees in our study seem to be more uncomfortable working with authoritarian leaders as compared to the less educated group in Turkey, who may have more positive perceptions of authoritarianism. Future research that incorporate cultural orientations at the individual level may provide answers to this issue.

Why do authoritarian leaders have no effect on employees’ perceptions of PJ in the U.S.? This may be because participative workplace climate and well-developed legal system in American organizations may partially neutralize leaders’ defectiveness and substitute the role of leaders (Kerr & Jermier, 1978; Resick et al. 2011). Compared to Taiwan and Turkey, unions and employment laws are well-developed in the U.S., where the rules are clear, publicly disclosed, fairly enforced, and widely respected by individuals and organizations. Consequently, in the U.S., companies have effective formalized systems where the roles and relationships are specified independently of the personal characteristics of the people in power. Hence, an authoritarian leader may mistreat his/her followers, but cannot establish his/her own evaluation, or impersonalize the rules and procedures. This may explain our finding that in the U.S., AL may affect IJ, but not PJ, which is related to fairness of the regulations and system.

Our moderation findings on the justice - ethical climate paths showed that PJ-ethical climate link was stronger in Turkey than in the U.S. This significant difference between the two countries may be explained by the differences in business contexts and institutional factors that the
organizations operating in these countries face (Cullen et al. 2004). Turkey is an emerging country and has a volatile economy. This volatility forces businesses to act and respond to changes rapidly. Many Turkish organizations, the majority of which are family-owned, see institutionalization as an obstacle in rapid decision making. Although Turkish businesses are in the process of institutionalization, many of them still have centralized structures in which decisions are made at the top of hierarchy, and there is limited delegation of authority (Berkman & Ozen 2007; Öner 2012). Turkey has the typical institutional challenges of emerging economies, such as economic and political instability, less structured and less formalized organizational systems, and inconsistencies in legal frameworks and practices (Alpay et al. 2008). Hence, the significant effect of fairness of the system (i.e. PJ) on ethical climate that is evident in our study may be interpreted as an idealized situation on the part of Turkish employees. It may reflect their preferences and dearth for formalized and transparent procedures instead of personalized and informal decision-making and evaluation systems.

In summary, several themes emerged from this cross-cultural study. First, benevolent leaders are angels in shaping ethical climate in all three cultural contexts, whereas authoritarian leaders are devils in Turkey and the U.S. Second, PJ is the critical mechanism through which BL shapes ethical climate in all three cultural contexts, more so for Taiwan and Turkey, which are high in power distance and collectivism. Finally, underlying mechanisms linking AL to ethical climate are more complicated than those for BL.

5.3. Limitations and future research directions

Several limitations of our study should be noted. First, the current study used a cross-sectional design. Although the results suggest the impact of CMV may not be severe, future studies using a longitudinal design will be able to provide a more robust test of the causal relationships. Second, this study was conducted with well-educated, urban professionals who represent higher
socio-economic groups in all three countries. Hence, the findings cannot be generalized to blue-collar, less educated, and lower socio-economic groups, where authoritarian leaders are more likely to be perceived in a more positive light (Napier & Jost 2008). Third, we focused on BL and AL, but not moral leadership since its generalizability is unclear. Future research can compare the relative importance of these three leadership styles on ethical climate while including justice as a mediator. By doing so, the distinct effects of social influence and social learning processes on PL-ethical climate link can be revealed.

Some other future research directions can be derived from our study. We used the Turkish and Taiwanese business contexts to represent collectivistic, high power distance countries, while the U.S. represents an individualistic, low power distance country. Future research can examine the effectiveness of benevolent and authoritarian leaders in other countries which score high or low in other cultural dimensions such as uncertainty avoidance or masculinity-femininity (Den Hartog et al. 1999; Mansur et al. 2017). Studies using qualitative methodologies can also provide more enriched data regarding these relationships (Langley et al. 2013). Furthermore, since ethical values, and leadership practices may differ across public and private sectors (Van der Wal et al. 2008), future research should investigate these relationships across different sectors.

5.4. Managerial implications

Despite these limitations, the findings of this study suggest some practical implications for international companies operating or planning to operate in Taiwan, Turkey, and the U.S. Management training and development programs in these countries should include the bright and dark sides of paternalism. Such programs may help leaders show personal care, support, and guidance in both work and non-work domains, while avoiding oppressive and restrictive behaviors. More specifically, we suggest that benevolent leaders can create an ethical climate through communicating organizational policies and procedures. Hence, the emphasis on PJ should be part
of these ethics-related training programs. Such programs in the U.S. should also emphasize that leaders’ interpersonal treatment of employees is an important component of ethics trainings. Having concern for followers’ personal and professional well-being, as well as maintaining high quality interactions with followers, may be especially critical in highly impersonal and competitive environments. Therefore, organizations in the U.S. should encourage leaders at all levels to frequently reflect on the quality of their relationships with subordinates. By the same token, managers in Turkey and Taiwan, should be aware that showing fair interpersonal treatment is not sufficient to build a culture of justice, but they do need to enhance procedural fairness perceptions among their followers to create an ethical climate at the workplace. Followers in these countries desire formalized and transparent procedures, and are more sensitive to organizational systems that help them manage uncertainties, especially when dealing with ethical issues. In Turkey in particular, authoritarian leaders are perceived very negatively by professional employees when they impair the fairness of the system. Therefore, managers should pay attention to building impersonal systems in which the rules are clear, transparent, and enforced fairly.

6. Conclusion

Organizations with a reputation for being ethical have an advantage in terms of hiring and motivating employees, partnering, and building strong relationships with stakeholders. Taking a cross-cultural approach, this study extends leadership and ethics literatures by suggesting organizational justice as an important mechanism; it sheds light on the effectiveness of benevolent and authoritarian leaders in three different countries. We hope that the findings of the study stimulate future research on the bright and dark sides of paternalism and their ethical consequences at the workplace, and provide some insight into the leadership behaviors and skills that are necessary to create ethical organizations.
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TABLE 1. Means, standard deviations, and correlations of the study variables (Taiwan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sex</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age</td>
<td>34.89</td>
<td>8.32</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Company tenure</td>
<td>77.23</td>
<td>76.23</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Length of relationship</td>
<td>48.72</td>
<td>53.70</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Benevolent leadership</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>-.10**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>(.89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Authoritarian leadership</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>-.11**</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>(.86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Procedural justice</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>(.90)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Interactional justice</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>-.08*</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>(.90)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Ethical climate</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>(.79)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Sex: 1 = male, 2 = female; Cronbach alphas are reported in the parentheses. N=670

*p < .05, **p < .01
### TABLE 2. Means, standard deviations, and correlations of the study variables (Turkey)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sex</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age</td>
<td>34.93</td>
<td>19.24</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Company tenure</td>
<td>80.17</td>
<td>87.03</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Length of relationship</td>
<td>49.66</td>
<td>53.17</td>
<td>-0.18**</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>0.57**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Benevolent leadership</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.19**</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Authoritarian leadership</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.38**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Procedural justice</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>-0.14*</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.19**</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.57**</td>
<td>-0.50**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Interactional justice</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>-0.17**</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.15*</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>-0.39**</td>
<td>0.64**</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Ethical climate</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-0.21**</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>-0.35**</td>
<td>0.57**</td>
<td>0.81**</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Sex: 1 = male, 2 = female; Cronbach alphas are reported in the parentheses. N=297*

*p < .05, **p < .01
TABLE 3. Means, standard deviations, and correlations of the study variables (U.S.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sex</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age</td>
<td>32.05</td>
<td>13.24</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Company tenure</td>
<td>52.66</td>
<td>72.94</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Length of relationship</td>
<td>42.27</td>
<td>63.25</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.86**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Benevolent leadership</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>(.88)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Authoritarian leadership</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>(.75)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Procedural justice</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>(.89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Interactional justice</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>(.90)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Ethical climate</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>(.89)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Sex: 1 = male, 2 = female; Cronbach alphas are reported in the parentheses. N=479

*p < .05, **p < .01
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Taiwan</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Turkey</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>The U.S.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IJ</td>
<td>PJ</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>IJ</td>
<td>PJ</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>IJ</td>
<td>PJ</td>
<td>EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company tenure</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of relationship</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolent leadership</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.08**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian leadership</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.42**</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional justice</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural justice</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 )</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( F )</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>12.13</td>
<td>40.20</td>
<td>38.93</td>
<td>12.66</td>
<td>74.05</td>
<td>25.35</td>
<td>10.64</td>
<td>29.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. IJ= Interactional Justice, PJ=Procedural Justice, EC=Ethical Climate

*p < .05, **p < .01
Figure Captions

Figure 1: Research framework

Figure 2: Summary of Mediation Findings Across Countries (The first coefficient refers to Taiwan, the second refers to Turkey and the last one refers to the U.S.)

Figure 3: The moderating effect of national culture on the relationship between benevolent leadership and interactional justice

Figure 4: The moderating effect of national culture on the relationship between authoritarian leadership and interactional justice

Figure 5: The moderating effect of national culture on the relationship between authoritarian leadership and procedural justice

Figure 6: The moderating effect of national culture on the relationship between interactional justice and ethical climate

Figure 7: The moderating effect of national culture on the relationship between procedural justice and ethical climate
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