

Journal of Social Sciences and Education

The Effect of Paternalistic Leadership Perception on Employee Silence

Hamza ÖZ¹

Kırşehir Ahi Evran University, Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Educational Administration

Seniye KILIÇ²

Yozgat Bozok University, Graduate School of Education, Department of Business Administration

Murat ÇALIŞIR³

Gaziantep Provincial Directorate of National Education, Nizip District Directorate of National Education, School Principal

ABSTRACT

Research Article

In this study, information about the concepts of paternalist leadership and employee silence is presented and the perspectives of the employees of the organization on paternalist leadership, whether there is a significant relationship between employee silence and paternalist leadership in organizations where the perception of paternalist leadership is dominant, has been examined. In this direction, it is aimed to reveal whether there is a relationship between the paternalistic leadership perception of administrative personnel working in higher education institutions and employee silence. The universe of the research carried out in the relational scanning model; The personnel working in the administrative staff at Yozgat Bozok University are the sample of the research; They are the administrative staff of Yozgat Bozok University, which consists of 382 people. The data obtained in the research were collected by the survey method. In organizations managed with a paternalistic leadership perception, the behavior of the employees is examined closely and it is investigated whether there is any interaction. As a result, it is understood that, in general, the sub-dimension of creating a family atmosphere in the workplace has a low level of negative relationship with other dimensions, and a low level of positive relationship between each other in other sub-dimensions between paternalistic leadership and employee silence levels.

Key Words: Leadership, paternalism, paternalistic leadership, organizational silence, employee silence

Received: 18.02.2022

Revision received:

11.05.2022

Accepted: 30.05.2022

Published online:

30.05.2022

¹ Corresponding author:

PhD Student

hamza.oz@bozok.edu.tr

Orcid: 0000-0002-5214-428X

² Graduate Student

senive.tasar@bozok.edu.tr

Orcid: 0000-0001-5707-0171

³ School principal

m.calisir40@gmail.com

Orcid: 0000-0001-9198-8736

Introduction

People lead their lives collectively and they need people who will manage and direct large and small groups that they have formed among themselves. Managing communities with common goals and connecting people to themselves requires special skills and responsibilities (Eren, 2017). Leader; A person who influences, directs, encourages and helps the organization achieve its goals in order to achieve the goals of the organization. Leadership, on the other hand, is the art of influencing individuals in the organization by establishing dominance in the organization in order to achieve the goals of the organization (Arıkboga, 2014).

The concepts of leader and leadership have attracted a lot of attention in the field of management as well as in many other fields, and are among the most talked about topics. Therefore, although the concept of leadership is associated with management science, it is a phenomenon that is discussed and defined in many fields such as sociology, psychology, philosophy and history. When the literature on the concept of leadership is scanned, we see that many definitions of leaders and leadership are made. According to Sisman (2012); While it is defined as the ability to influence employees for a purpose, according to Eren (2017); According to Paksoy (2002), the ability to gather employees together for a common purpose; expressed with the concepts of influencing, guiding and effectiveness. Leadership; According to Celik (2007); According to Basaran (1991), to unite employees around a goal through influence and power; It is defined as removing the obstacles faced by the employees in the activities carried out for a certain purpose, allowing them to show their abilities, and leading them in order to improve themselves.

Leadership has been defined as the process of directing and influencing the followers in line with a goal by people who do research in the field of management. This process takes place through the use of the leader's abilities, legal status, authority and charisma. In the words of Bennis (2016), leadership; It's like beauty, it's hard to define, but we know it when we meet it.

When we look at the common aspects of the definitions of leadership in the literature, the ability to influence the followers first emerges. Leaders aim to increase the success and productivity of their employees and provide the necessary interaction regarding this. They play an important role in the success of employees by making suggestive interviews (Yukl, 2002). Elements such as the leader's behavior, positive approach towards employees and encouraging behavior are important indicators that affect organizational performance (Kennedy & Anderson, 2002). When examined in general, although not all of them are required to be in a leader, the characteristics of the leader; They should be individuals who are self-confident as well as self-confident, who can develop people to the extent they train them, who are brave, who can adapt to innovation, and who are paternalistic (Cetin & Beceren, 2007).

The roots of the concept of paternalism, which can also be called paternalism, date back to the first studies of Max Weber (Aslan, 2015). In our culture, paternalistic expression is used to honor and glorify individuals who are useful to society. Another name for paternalistic values, which express the combination of positive characteristics such as tolerance, maturity, reliability, good-heartedness, is paternalist values. The relationship in societies where paternalism is common is just like the relationship between family and child. This relationship situation reveals paternalist leaders (Aydınoglu, 2020) .

In this relationship established between paternalist leaders and employees, the main duty of the leader is to guide the employee and try to prevent him from being harmed. In return for all these, the employee is expected to show respect, obedience and loyalty (Aycañ & Kanungo, 2000). Most of the time, paternalism is not approved by societies that decide on their own (Aycañ, 2001). There are some behavioral styles that distinguish paternalistic

leadership from other leadership approaches. These behavior patterns are listed as follows according to Aycan (2006), Caliskan and Ozkoc (2016).

- *Creating a family atmosphere in the workplace:* Leaders see the workplace as a family environment, employees as their family and approach their subordinates like a father. He helps his subordinates with their work and private lives and gives them advice by trying to solve their problems.
- *Establishing a one-to-one relationship with his subordinates:* The leader takes care of the employees one by one and follows the employee individually.
- *Participating in the field of subordinates outside of work:* The leader stands by the employees at important moments in their life (wedding, funeral, graduation, etc.) and helps them in case of demand.
- *Expecting loyalty:* The leader asks the employees to show loyalty and devotion in response to all these paternalistic attitudes. He expects his subordinates to do their best when an urgent and very important situation arises.
- *Acceptance of authority and status:* Subordinates willingly accept the authority of the leader. At the same time, the leader wants the employees to work in accordance with the status.

It is possible to come across studies on paternalistic leadership in the literature. In a quantitative study conducted by Yıldız and Ekingen (2020) to determine the effect of paternalist leadership on service innovation and to determine the mediating role of job satisfaction, it was revealed that paternalist leadership had a positive effect on service innovation, and the paternalistic behaviors of managers increased the motivation of their employees. As a result of the research conducted by Tekin (2019) with research assistants working at universities according to the quantitative research method in order to determine the effect of those who adopt paternalist leadership on the performance and job satisfaction of their employees, it was revealed that paternalistic leadership behavior has a positive and significant relationship on the job satisfaction and performance of its employees. As a result of the research conducted by Dağlı and Agalday (2018) according to the quantitative research method to determine the paternalist leadership behaviors of school administrators according to the perceptions of secondary school teachers, the paternalist leadership perception of school administrators was found to be at the level of "very agree" in general. As a result of the research conducted by Erben and Otken (2014) with the quantitative research method on white-collar employees in order to determine the role of the balance between paternalistic leadership behavior style and work life, it was revealed that there is a relationship between paternalist leadership and business life. As a result of the quantitative research method conducted by Cerit (2012) on primary school teachers to investigate the relationship between paternalistic leadership and teachers' satisfaction with their administrators and the nature of the work, a positive and significant relationship was found between paternalistic leadership behavior and satisfaction with the administrator and the nature of the work done.

The concept of silence is used in different meanings in many different disciplines. The concept of silence, which is the subject of research in many fields of social sciences, is defined as an existential option in philosophy, together with speaking and listening (Heidegger, 1993). In addition, the meaning of silence is not only not speaking, but also not writing, not hearing and ignoring the existing (Nikmaram, Shojai, Zahmani, & Almani, 2012). Organizational silence means that the employee consciously hides the information he has from the organization and does not share it with the outside. It is seen as a negative situation that people do not share their ideas and opinions even though they have an opinion on issues, problems and questions about the organization (Cakici, 2010). In addition, uncertainty situations that arise with organizational policies will damage the employee's perception of

trust and cause employees to consciously hide their ideas and opinions (Khalid & Ahmed, 2016).

They think that employees are selfish by arguing that managers are prejudiced against employees and that they know what is good for everything. There is a perception that consensus is good and disagreement is bad in organizations (Morrison & Milliken, 2000). One of the most important factors that create an environment of silence is the common fear of receiving negative feedback among many managers. In addition, managers think that it is not beneficial to receive feedback from the bottom, and the more logical and important thing is to receive feedback from the top (Milliken, 2000).

The state of silence is actually when the employee suffers silently, being aware of the available alternatives, but is unwilling to improve the situation. On the other hand, employees are ready to change the current situation in order to break the silence (Pinder & Harlos, 2001). If they think that the policies of the organization will create an environment of injustice by the employees, they create environments that will create silence (Whiteside and Barclay, 2013). If the employees of the organization believe that there is a fair environment in the organization, they tend to explain their views and ideas more easily (Erol, 2012). On the other hand, if employees believe that the organization is managed according to reward and punishment, not policies and practices, in other words, if they perceive that an environment of injustice prevails, silence will increase.

The personality traits of the employees affect the silence behavior at least as much as the organizational policies and management policies. For example, when we consider the demographic structure of the employees, it is seen that as individuals get older, they adapt to the organizational environment at a high level based on experience. As the age of the employee progresses, it is seen that his behavior in the work environment differs and the level of adaptation increases. This differentiation tendency is towards being more silent (Taskiran, 2011). Gender factor, which is another demographic feature, is also effective in the choice of silence behavior when the actor is considered. In terms of gender type, although there is no difference between men and women in terms of intelligence, talent, leadership and learning skills, women generally cannot gain their economic independence, the dominant power in society is generally men, and women cannot step out of the role of mother as a social understanding, so the number of working women is low. It can be thought that women tend to silence more than men due to reasons such as Educational levels of working individuals can also be effective in silence behavior. The tendency of individuals to remain silent about education is manifested in the form of not being able to reveal their knowledge and express their opinions on certain issues due to their low level of education. Character traits are also very effective on the behavior of being silent. Individuals who believe that their life controls are managed by others exhibit more silence behavior. In the studies, the following points were determined as the dimensions of employee silence.

- *Accepting Silence:* In the case of accepted silence, the employee is aware that he is silent, there are already solutions, but he remains silent because he does not expect that his speech will make a difference. This situation generally arises when the employee thinks that their own views are not taken into consideration or that even if he/she offers opinions and suggestions on the subject, he/she thinks that it will not make a difference somehow, or from a lack of self-confidence (Yetim and Erigüç 2018). Employees in this type of silence, which is dominated by complete disregard and nepotism, exhibit a conscious passive behavior (Cakici & Aysen, 2014).
- *Protectionist Silence:* First emerged by Pinder and Harlos (2001), the concept of protective silence is the situation in which employees prefer to remain silent by not looking for a solution because they are afraid of negative situations that may

arise if they share their opinions and suggestions. Employees believe that they are protecting themselves against external threats in the case of defensive silence.

- *Relational Silence:* Employees keep their ideas, opinions and suggestions at the relational level in two ways. The first of these is the employee's silence for the purpose of protecting his organization, while the other is his silence with the motivation to protect his colleagues (Brinsfield, 2009).

Erbasi and Akdeniz (2021) according to the quantitative research method with the employees of private banks in order to determine the effect of the perception of performance appraisal error on employee silence, it was determined that the perception of performance appraisal error did not have a statistically significant effect on employee silence. Dogan and Kır (2018) found a significant relationship between organizational silence, employee performance and burnout syndrome as a result of the research conducted with hospital employees in accordance with the quantitative research method in order to examine the relationship between burnout syndrome, organizational silence and employee performance. As a result of the research conducted by Erogluer and Erselcan (2017) with employees in manufacturing companies in accordance with the quantitative research method in order to reveal the effect of organizational justice perception and burnout levels on employee silence, it was revealed that organizational justice sub-dimensions negatively affect employee silence. As a result of the research conducted with nurses according to the quantitative research method in order to examine the relationship between the performance levels of the employees and organizational silence by Tayfun and Catir (2013), a negative relationship was found between the performance of the employees and the accepted silence and defensive silence. Sehitoglu and Zehir (2010) found a significant relationship between employee silence and organizational citizenship behaviors on employee performance, as a result of the research conducted with people working in public institutions with the quantitative research method in order to examine the performance of employees in terms of employee silence and organizational citizenship behavior.

In the literature review, researches examining the relationship between paternalist leadership behaviors and various psychological variables (Karabulut & Seymen, 2020; Ozmen, 2019; Özyılmaz & Lale, 2019; Tasliyan, Cicekoglu, & Bıyıkbeyi, 2017; Uçar, 2019) have a cultural effect on paternalistic leadership behavior. There are studies that add dimension (Cesur, Erkilet, & Taylan, 2015; Caliskan & Ozkoc, 2016; Khlaf & Tekin, 2021; Köksal, 2011; Ozgenel & Dursun, 2020). Similarly, in addition to the studies that deal with employee silence in an individual sense (Erbasi & Akdeniz, 2021; Erogluer & Erselcan, 2017; Sehitoglu & Zehir, 2010; Taskiran, 2011), it also deals with organizational silence in terms of organizational silence (Dogan & Kır, 2018; Tayfun & Catir, 2013) it is also possible to come across studies. However, no research has been found that examines and examines the effect of paternalistic leadership perception on employee silence in relation to personnel working in higher education institutions. With this study, a contribution to the literature can be made in the organizational sense, and when the determination of the relationship between the paternalistic leadership perceptions of the employees and the silence of the employees is evaluated as the institutions where democracy and freedom should be the most, the research has a special importance in this sense.

In this study, it is aimed to reveal whether there is a relationship between the paternalistic leadership perception of those who work as administrative personnel in higher education institutions and employee silence. For this purpose, answers to the following questions were sought.

1. What are the levels of employee silence with the perception of paternalistic leadership of those who work as administrative personnel in higher education institutions?

2. The relationship between paternalistic leadership perception and employee silence in higher education institutions;
 - a. Gender
 - b. Title
 - c. Unit
 - d. Age
 - e. Does the time spent in the profession differ according to the variables?
3. What is the relationship between the paternalistic leadership perception of those who work as administrative personnel in higher education institutions and employee silence?
4. Can the levels of employee silence and the paternalistic perception of the administrative staff working in higher education institutions be predicted?

Methodology

Model

This research, which was carried out in order to reveal whether there is a relationship between the paternalistic leadership perception of those who work as administrative personnel in higher education institutions and employee silence, was designed according to the relational screening model, which is one of the quantitative research methods. Relational screening model; these are the studies conducted to reveal whether there is a change between two or more variables and, if so, the degree of this change. (Karasar, 2017). In this study, it was tried to determine whether there is a relationship between the paternalistic leadership perceptions of the administrative staff working at Yozgat Bozok University and employee silence, according to the relational survey model.

Sample and Population

The participants of the research are 1128 administrative personnel working at Yozgat Bozok University. The sample of the research consists of 382 administrative personnel determined by simple random sampling method. Simple random sampling method is a sampling method in which all elements in the universe have an equal probability of being selected (Karasar, 2017). Participants in the research were recruited from the administrative staff working in the academic and administrative units of the university where the research was conducted. The study was carried out on the opinions of the administrative personnel working in this university voluntarily. Descriptive information about the participants is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. *Descriptive Information of the Participants*

Group	Subgroup	frequency(n)	Percentage(%)
Gender	Woman	114	29.8
	Boy	268	70.2
Title	Permanent Worker	100	26.2
	Officer	76	19.9
	Computer operator	82	21.5
	Chef	24	6.3
	High./Inst./Fac. secret.	36	9.4
	Branch manager	24	6.3
	head of department	12	3.1
	Other	28	7.3

Unit	Academic	120	31.4
	Administrative	262	68.6
Age	25 and below	32	8.4
	26 - 35 Ages	130	34.0
	36 – 45 Ages	180	47.1
	46 – 55 Ages	32	8.4
	56 and above	8	2.1
Professional Seniority	0-5 Years	66	17.3
	6- 10 Years	112	29.3
	11- 15 Years	112	29.3
	16- 20 Years	64	16.8
	21 Years and above	28	7.3

According to this; 29.8% (n=114) of the participants of the study were female and 70.23% (n=268) were male. The rate of the participants working as permanent workers in the research is 26.2% (n=100), the rate of the participants working as civil servants is 19.9% (n=76), the rate of the participants with the title of computer operator is 21.5% (n=82), the participants with the title of chief The rate of participants with the title of School/Institute/Faculty Secretary is 9.4% (n=36), the ratio of participants with the title of branch manager is 6.3% (n=24), the ratio of participants with the title of Head of Department 3.1% (n=12), the rate of participants in the Other category is 7.3% (n=28). 31.4% (n=120) of the participants work in academic units and 68.6% (n=262) work in administrative units. The age distribution of the participants is; The rate of 25 and below age group is 8.4% (n=32), the rate of 26-35 age group is 34.0% (n=130), the rate of 36-45 age group is 47.1% (n=180), 46- The rate of 55 age group is 8.4% (n=32), while the rate of 56 and over age group is 2.1% (n=8). The proportion of participants with a professional seniority of 0 - 5 years is 17.3% (n=66), the ratio of participants with 6 - 10 years of experience is 29.3% (n=112), the ratio of participants with 11 - 15 years of experience is 29.3%. (n=112), the rate of participants with 16-20 years is 16.8 (n=64) and the rate of participants with 21 years or more professional experience is 7.3% (n=28).

Data Collection Tools

In the study, "Paternalist Leadership Scale" developed by Aycaan (2006) and "Employee Silence" scale developed by Taskiran (2010) were used as data collection tools. Necessary permissions were obtained for the use of the scales.

Paternalistic Leadership Scale: It is a 21-item scale developed by Aycaan (2006), consisting of five dimensions: Family Environment at Work, Individualized Relationship, Participation in Non-Work Life, Loyalty Expectation, and Hierarchy and Authority. Confirmatory factor analysis of the scale was performed and fit indices were examined. The chi-square value of the scale ($\chi^2 = 799.59$) was found to be degrees of freedom (df=176), the ratio of the chi-square value to the degrees of freedom was calculated as 4.5 and it is seen that it has an acceptable fit value. Since the RMSEA value is .01, it shows a perfect fit. The SRMR value was found to be .06 in the acceptance fit range, the NFI value was .93, the NNFI value was .93, the CFI value was .94, the GFI value was .74, and the AGFI value was .66. These results show that the scale has acceptable fit indices. The reliability analysis of the scale was conducted and it was found that the scale had Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficient of .92 in the Family Environment at Work dimension, .88 in the Individualized Relationship dimension, .90 in the Non-Work Life Participation dimension, .94 in the Loyalty Expectation dimension, .94 in the Hierarchy and Authority dimension and .92 in total seen. This shows that the scale is quite reliable.

Employee silence scale: It is a scale consisting of 15 items, which was translated into Turkish by Taskiran (2010), and consists of three dimensions: accepting silence, defensive silence and relational silence. Confirmatory factor analysis of the scale was performed and fit indices were examined. The chi-square value of the scale ($\chi^2 = 826.33$) was found to be degrees of freedom ($df=236$) and it was calculated as $\chi^2/df=3.5$ and it was found to have an acceptable fit value. RMSEA value was .01, SRMR value was .06, NFI value was .94, NNFI value was .94, CFI value was .95, GFI value was .75 and AGFI value was .68. These results show that the scale has acceptable fit indices for this study. Cronbach's Alpha value was checked in order to test the reliability of the scale used in data collection. It was found that the employee silence scale had Cronbach's Alpha values of .92 in the accepting silence dimension, .94 in the protective silence dimension, .88 in the protective silence dimension and .92 in total.

Collection of Data and Analysis

The research started by making a detailed survey about the problem. According to the findings obtained as a result of this scanning, the variables of the research were revealed. For the scales used in data collection, a scale application calendar was created for each unit and data were collected according to this calendar. During the implementation process, the necessary information was explained to the participants and their questions were answered. The data were analyzed with the SPSS package program. The distribution characteristics of the data were taken into account in the analysis.

The data were analyzed with the help of pairwise and multiple comparison techniques. Before the analysis, the distribution characteristics of the data sets were examined. Instead of checking the missing data, values at the mean level were assigned, the assumption of extreme values was checked, and it was determined that there were no extreme values. It was investigated whether the data showed normal distribution according to the variables to be compared. A number of tests were applied to determine the distribution characteristics of the data sets. The results of Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, kurtosis skewness values and histogram graphs were examined and it was decided that the data showed a normal distribution. This process was repeated separately for the dependent and independent variables, and the assumption of normality of the data was checked. After this stage, since the assumption of normality was ensured, it was decided to use parametric tests during the analysis of the data.

The paternalistic leadership and employee silence levels of the administrative personnel included in the research were determined from the standard deviation and arithmetic mean type. The averages of the variables of the unit, gender, title, age and years spent in the profession of the participants were determined. The t-test, one of the parametric tests, and the ANOVA test for multiple groups were preferred in the test of the differences between the means. The correlational relationship between paternalistic leadership and employee silence was determined by Pearson Product Moments Correlation Analysis. Regression analysis was conducted to determine whether employee silence and paternalistic leadership perception were predicted. In the statistical analyzes used in the research, the level of significance was accepted as .05 for the t-test and Anova test, and .01 for Pearson Product Moments Correlation Coefficient and regression analysis.

Findings

In this section, the results of the analyzed made regarding the sub-problems of the research are mentioned. The results of the analyzed are presented and explained in tables.

Findings Regarding the Paternalistic Leadership Perception of Administrative Staff and the Level of Employee Silence

In order to determine the paternalistic leadership perceptions and employee silence levels of the participants, the lowest, highest, average and standard deviation values of the scores obtained from the paternalist leadership scale and the employee silence scale were calculated. The result of the analysis is shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Paternalistic Leadership and Employee Silence Levels of Participants

points	N	Lowest Score	Highest Score	Average	ss	Level
Employee Silence	382	1,00	5,00	3,37	,87	I agree
Accepting	382	1,00	5,00	2,65	1,15	I'm undecided
Defender	382	1,00	5,00	2,40	1,18	I'm undecided
Relational	382	1,00	5,00	4,10	,81	Disagree
Paternalistic Leadership	382	1,00	5,00	3,05	,86	I agree
Family Environment at Work	382	1,00	5,00	3,35	1,14	I agree
Individualized Relationship	382	1,00	5,00	3,33	,90	I agree
Participation in non-work life	382	1,00	5,00	3,35	1,23	I agree
Loyalty Expectation	382	1,00	5,00	3,12	1,01	I agree
Hierarchy and Authority	382	1,00	5,00	3,57	,83	I agree

Accordingly, paternalistic leadership and employee silence levels were found at the level of "I agree", "I am undecided" in the Accepting and Defensive dimensions, which are the sub-dimensions of Employee Silence, and "I strongly agree" in the Relational dimension. All sub-dimensions of paternalistic leadership perception were found at the level of "I agree".

Findings Related to Differences

Findings Related to Gender Variable

In order to determine whether the perceived paternalistic leadership level of the participants changed according to the gender variable, T-Test for Independent Samples was applied. The test results are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Paternalistic Leadership Perception of the Participants

Gender	N	Average	ss	F	T	df	p
Boy	268	3,3845	,90	,739	,505	380	,614
Woman	114	3,3350	,80				

As a result of the analysis, it is seen that the perception of paternalist leadership does not show a significant difference according to the gender variable of the employees ($p > 0.05$).

T Test for Independent Samples was applied to determine whether the level of employee silence perceived by the participants changed according to the gender variable. The test results are shown in Table 4.

Table 4. *Employee Silence Levels of Participants*

Gender	N	Average	ss	F	T	df	p
Boy	268	2,9970	,85	2,270	,133	380	,049
Woman	114	3,1918	,88				

As a result of the analysis, it is seen that the silence levels of the employees between the genders show a slightly significant difference ($p < 0.05$). As a result of this analysis, it was found that women have a higher level of employee silence than men.

Findings Related to the Variable of the Unit They Served

T Test for Independent Samples was applied in order to determine whether the perceived paternalistic leadership level of the participants changed according to the unit variable they served. The test results are shown in Table 5.

Table 5. *Participants' Perception of Paternalistic Leadership*

Unit	N	Average	ss	F	T	df	p
Academic	120	3,5619	,83	3,336	,2931	380	,004
Administrative	262	3,2817	,88				

As a result of the analysis, it is seen that the perception of paternalist leadership differs significantly according to the unit ($p < 0.05$). According to this, it is seen that the administrative staff working in the academic units have a higher level of paternalistic leadership than the administrative staff working in the administrative unit.

In order to determine whether the level of employee silence perceived by the participants changes according to the variable of the unit they work in, the T Test was applied for independent samples. The test results are shown in Table 6.

Table 6. *Employee Silence Levels of Participants*

Unit	N	Average	ss	F	T	df	p
Academic	120	3,4733	,85	6,094	6,742	380	,000
Administrative	262	2,8636	,80				

As a result of the analysis, it is seen that the silence levels of the employees show a significant difference according to the variable of the unit employed ($p < 0.05$). As a result of this analysis, the administrative staffs working in the academic unit have a higher level of employee silence than the administrative staff working in the administrative unit.

Findings Related to Age Variable

Anova test was applied to determine whether the paternalistic leadership perception and employee silence levels of the participants showed a significant difference according to their age. The test results are shown in Table 7.

Table 7. *Anova Result by Age Variable of Participants*

	Groups	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	p
Paternalistic Leadership	Between Groups	23,655	5,914	8,299	0,00
	In-group	268,646	,713		
	Total	292,301			
Employee Silence	Between Groups	23,099	5,775	8,269	0,00
	In-group	263,295	,698		
	Total	286,394			

According to the results of the Anova test, it is seen that both the paternalistic leadership perception and the level of employee silence show a significant difference between the groups ($p < 0.05$). Tukey and Scheffe post-hoc analysis was performed to find out which groups differed. As a result of this analysis, the paternalistic leadership perception of the participants in the 36-45 age range and 56 and over age range differs from the participants in other age groups. However, the employee silence levels of the participants differ from the participants in the 46-55 age range compared to the participants in the other age range.

By Title Variable

Anova test was applied to determine whether the paternalistic leadership perception and employee silence levels of the participants differed significantly according to their titles. The test results are shown in Table 8.

Table 8. *Anova Result of Participants by Title Variable*

	Groups	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	p
Paternalistic Leadership	Between Groups	18,589	2,656	83,629	0,01
	In-group	273,712	,732		
	Total	292,301			
Employee Silence	Between Groups	45,656	6,522	10,133	0,00
	In-group	240,738	,644		
	Total	286,394			

According to the results of the Anova test, it is seen that both the paternalistic leadership perception and the level of employee silence show a significant difference between the groups ($p < 0.05$). Tukey and Scheffe post hoc analysis was performed to find out which groups differed. According to this analysis, the paternalist leadership perception of the participants with the title of School/Institute/Faculty secretariat differs according to the paternalist leadership perception of the participants in the other group. It was found that the employee silence levels of civil servants and computer operators differed compared to other groups.

According to Seniority Variable

Anova test was applied to determine whether the paternalistic leadership perception and employee silence levels of the participants showed a significant difference according to their seniority. The test results are shown in Table 9.

Table 9. Anova Result by Participants' Seniority Variable

	Groups	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	p
Paternalistic Leadership	Between Groups	27,717	6,929	9,873	0,01
	In-group	264,584	,702		
	Total	292,301			
Employee Silence	Between Groups	54,754	13,688	22,278	0,00
	In-group	231,640	,614		
	Total	286,394			

According to the results of the Anova test, both the perception of paternalistic leadership and the level of employee silence showed a significant difference between the groups ($p < 0.05$). Tukey and Scheffe post hoc analysis was performed to find out which groups differed. According to the results of this analysis, the paternalistic leadership perception of the participants with 16-20 years and 21 years or more seniority differs significantly compared to other seniority. It was found that the levels of employee silence differed from the other groups of participants with a seniority of 21 years and above.

Findings Regarding the Level of Relationship between Paternalistic Leadership and Employee Silence

In this part of the research, an analysis was made on the relationship between the perceived paternalistic leadership of the administrative staff working in higher education institutions and the level of employee silence. While performing this analysis, the relationships between the total scores obtained from the paternalistic leadership and employee silence scales were analyzed by calculating with the Pearson Product Moments Correlation technique, and the results are shown in Table 10.

Table 10. Correlation Coefficients of the Relationships between Paternalist Leadership and Employee Silence

Points	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Accepting	1								
2. Defender	,857 **	1							
3. Relational	,262 **	,253 **	1						
4. Employee silence Total	,919 **	,918 **	,547 **	1					
5. Creating a Family Environment in the Workplace	-.120 *	,179 **	,105 *	-.102 *	1				
6. Individualized Relationships	,059	-,087	,191 **	,046	,864 **	1			
7. Participation in Non-Work Life	,066	-,034	,172 **	,068	,789 **	,810 **	1		
8. Expectation of Loyalty	,314 **	,218 **	,138 **	,283 **	,596 **	,608 **	,666 **	1	
9. Hierarchy and Authority	,183 **	,024	,165 **	,145 **	,639 **	,728 **	,662 **	,606 **	1
10. Paternalistic Leadership	,094	-,036	,177 **	,081	,907 **	,939 **	,898 **	,765 **	,834 **
Sum									

N=382, ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$

Accordingly, there is a strong positive correlation between paternalistic leadership and its sub-dimensions, as well as between employee silence and sub-dimensions. When the relations between paternalistic leadership and employee silence are examined, it is understood that the sub-dimension of creating a family atmosphere in the workplace has a low negative relationship level with other dimensions, and a low level positive relationship among other sub-dimensions.

Findings on Predicting Paternalistic Leadership Perception by Employee Silence Level

In order to test whether employee silence has a significant effect on the perception of paternalistic leadership, linear regression analysis was performed and the analysis results are presented in Table 11.

Table 11. Regression Analysis Results

	R	R ² -	Adjusted R ²	Std. Error of the Estimate	B	T	Shallow.
Paternalistic Leadership	,05	,003	,002	11,806	47,817	14,840	,00

(P>0.001 Dependent variable: Paternalistic leadership, Independent variable: Employee silence).

In the analysis, the R value was found to be ,05. The relationship is positive and weak. The R² value, which shows the effect of employee silence on the perception of paternalistic leadership, was calculated as ,003. In this case, it is seen that only 003 percent of paternalistic leadership is explained by employee silence. Considering the beta coefficient, the coefficient of 47,817 shows that there is a positive and significant association at the p<0.01 significance level, as it is a plus sign. With this result, there is a relationship between employee silence and paternalistic leadership, but the finding that employee silence is insufficient to explain the perception of paternalist leadership can be included.

Discussion, Result and Recommendations

The fact that managers in organizations exhibit paternalistic behaviors, exhibit the attitudes and behaviors expected from them, increase the productivity of employees by increasing their motivation and happiness at work (Tekin, 2019; Yıldız and Ekingen, 2020). Similarly, in the study conducted by Aslan (2015) and Tekin (2019) , it was found that paternalistic leadership behaviors had a positive effect on employee performance and job satisfaction. In this study, the fact that the perceptions of the participants were at the level of "agree" in paternalist leadership and its sub-dimensions can be considered as an indicator that the employees attach importance to paternalist leadership behaviors. As a result of the research conducted by Dagi and Agalday (2018) , teachers' perceptions of their school principals' paternalistic leadership behaviors were found to be at the "very agree" level.

According to Ayca (2006), the sub-dimensions of paternalistic leadership are to create a family atmosphere, to establish a one-to-one relationship with subordinates, to participate in the field of subordinates outside of work, to expect loyalty, and to accept authority and status. Likewise, Pellegrini and Scandura (2006) state that paternalist leadership is accepted and successful in cultures with a high power distance and pluralistic structure. In this study, the fact that all employees agree with the average values of paternalistic leadership perception reveals that there is a sufficient level of relationship between employees and leaders.

Taskiran (2010) lists the sub-dimensions of employee silence as accepting, protective and relational. There is a positive relationship between employee silence and employee performance (Sehitoglu & Zehir, 2010). Employees' perceptions of organizational justice negatively affect employee silence (Erogluer & Erselcan, 2017). Whiteside and Barclay (2013) say that the injustice felt in organizational policies creates silence in employees. In this

study, the employee silence level of the participants at the level of "agree" can be evaluated as an indicator of the presence of employee silence.

In the study, it was found that the perception of paternalistic leadership did not differ according to the gender variable. This result does not coincide with the result of the research conducted by Dađlı and Agalday (2018). Because in this study, it was concluded that male teachers see their school principals as paternalistic at a higher level than female teachers. In this study, it was concluded that women had a higher employee silence level than men. This finding does not coincide with the findings of the research conducted by Gokce (2013), Demir and Comert (2019) . Because, according to the results of the research conducted by Gokce (2013), Demir and Comert (2019), the perception of organizational silence does not differ according to the gender variable of the participants. The narrow or broad power gap dimension focuses on the relationship between the rulers and the ruled, the strong and the weak, the rich and the poor in society. In societies where narrow power gap is dominant, the distance between the ruled and the ruled, the strong and the weak, the rich and the poor are very close to each other. There is a more democratic, flexible and egalitarian relationship (Öz, 2019). Regarding the gender variable, it can be said that women have a higher level of employee silence because they have more power distance than men.

The paternalistic leadership perception and the level of employee silence of the administrative staff working in the academic units differ compared to the administrative staff working in the administrative units. This result is closely related to the sub-dimensions that Taskiran (2010) put forth regarding employee silence. Administrative staffs working in academic units have a more superficial relationship with their leaders than administrative staff working in administrative units. Because there may be a distance between them regarding accessibility. According to the findings of the study conducted by Gokce (2013), organizational silence perceptions of high school teachers do not differ according to the unit variable they work in. The findings obtained in this study and the results of the research conducted by Gokce (2013) do not overlap. Similarly, the perception of paternalistic leadership does not differ according to the unit variable in the research conducted by Dađlı and Agalday (2018) .

According to this study, the perception of paternalistic leadership differs in administrative personnel between the ages of 36-45 and over the age of 56 compared to other age ranges. It was concluded that the level of employee silence differs between the administrative personnel in the 46-55 age range compared to the administrative personnel in the other age range. As the age progresses, we can say that both the perception of paternalistic leadership and the level of silence increase. According to the findings of the study conducted by Gokce (2013), organizational silence perceptions of high school teachers do not differ according to the age variable. Similarly, according to the findings of the research by Dincer (2017), it is seen that organizational silence does not differ according to the age variable. The findings obtained in this study do not overlap with the results of the research conducted by Gokce (2013) and Dincer (2017) . However, it is seen that it partially overlaps with the results of the research conducted by Cetindere (2019) . In the study conducted by Cetindere (2019), it was found that the perceptions of organizational silence of teachers in the 36-40 age range were higher than the participants in the other age range.

The result that the paternalistic leadership perception of the administrative staff working as the secretary of the Faculty/Institute and Higher School differs compared to the administrative personnel with other titles, shows that the administrative personnel with the title of secretary are in between themselves and are due to the uncertainty about whether they are a manager or a civil servant. At the level of employee silence, it can be thought that the fact that the administrative personnel with the title of Officer and Computer Operator have a

higher level than other titles is due to the fact that the work is carried out through the administrative personnel with this title.

According to this study, the perception of paternalistic leadership differs in administrative personnel with 16-20 years and 21 and above seniority compared to other seniority. The organizational silence perceptions of the employees do not differ according to the professional seniority variable (Demir & Comert, 2019). However, in this study, it was concluded that the level of employee silence of the employees working as administrative personnel in higher education institutions differs in administrative personnel with 21 and above seniority compared to other senior administrative personnel. As seniority progresses, we can say that both the perception of leadership and the level of silence increase.

When the relations between paternalistic leadership and employee silence levels are examined, it is seen that the sub-dimension of creating a family atmosphere in the workplace has a low negative relationship level with other dimensions, and they have a low level positive relationship among themselves in other sub-dimensions.

According to the results of the regression analysis showing the effect of employee silence on the perception of paternalist leadership, it is seen that only 007% of paternalist leadership is explained by employee silence. With this result, there is a relationship between employee silence and paternalistic leadership, but it is concluded that employee silence is insufficient to explain the perception of paternalist leadership.

This study, which aims to reveal the relationship between the perception of paternalistic leadership and employee silence, was conducted with administrative staff in higher education institutions. In addition, this study can only be carried out with academic staff, as well as with both academic staff. In addition, this quantitative research method was carried out. This study can be supported by qualitative research methods or it can be carried out with mixed research methods.

References

- Arikboga, F.S. (2014). *Management skills*, Istanbul: Der Publishing.
- Aslan, E. (2015). “*The role of work ethic in the effect of paternalist leadership on employee performance*”, (Unpublished Master's Thesis), Beykent University Institute of Social Sciences, Istanbul.
- Aycan, Z. (2001). “Human resource management in turkey: current issues and future challenges”, *International Journal of Manpower*, 22 (3).
- Aycan, Z. (2006). Paternalism: Towards conceptual refinement and operationalization, Yang, KS, Hwang, KK and Kim, U. (Eds.), *Scientific advances in industrial psychologies: empirical, scientific, and cultural contributions*, London: Cambridge University Press, 445-466.
- Aycan, Z., Kanungo, RN, Mendonca, M., Yu, K., Deller, J., Stahl, G. and Khursid, A., (2000). Impact of culture on human resource management practices: A ten country comparison, *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 49 (1).

Aydınoglu, N. (2020). *Investigation of the effects of administrators' authentic and paternalistic leadership behaviors on teachers' motivation, job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Ankara private schools example)*. (Unpublished PhD Thesis).

Basaran, I.E. (1991). *Organizational behavior - man's productive power*. Ankara: Gul Publishing House.

Bennis, W. (2016). *To be a leader* (5th Edition). Istanbul, Aura Publishing.

Brinsfield, CT (2009). *Employee silence: Investigation of dimensionality, development of measures, and examination of related factors*. Unpublished MBA Thesis. Ohio: The Ohio State University.

Cerit, Y. (2012). The relationship between paternalistic leadership and satisfaction with the manager and the nature of work. *Ondokuz Mayıs University Journal of the Faculty of Education*, 31 (2).

Cesur, DK, Erkilet, A. and Taylan, H. (2015). The relationship between paternalistic leadership and organizational culture: The case of Sakarya University. *Journal of Academic Reviews (AID)*, 14 (1), 87-116.

Cakici, A. (2010). *Why do we prefer to remain silent about the silence of those who work in organizations?*, Ankara: Detay Publishing.

Cakici, A. and Aysen, B. (2014). Is executive silence possible in organizations? An exploratory research, *Journal of Niğde University Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, 7 (1).

Caliskan, N. and Ozkoc, AG (2016). Determination of national culture types that affect the perception of paternalistic leadership in organizations. *Journal of Yasar University*, 11 (44), 240-250.

Steel, V. (2007). *Educational leadership* (4th Edition). Ankara: Pegem A Publications.

Cetin, G. and Beceren, E. (2007). Leading personality: Gandhi. *Journal of the Social Sciences Institute of Süleyman Demirel University*, 5.

Cetindere, ED (2019). *Examining the relationship between teachers' perceptions of organizational silence and their motivation*. (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Yıldız Technical University Institute of Social Sciences, Istanbul.

Dagli, A. and Agalday, B. (2018). Examination of school principals' paternalistic leadership behaviors. *Electronic Journal of Social Sciences*, 17 (66), 518-534.

Demir, E. and Comert, M. (2019). Organizational silence perceptions of secondary school teachers. *Journal of Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Faculty of Education* (49), 148-165.

Dincer, H. (2017). *The relationship between mobbing and organizational silence in the workplace: A research on the energy sector.* (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Beykent University Institute of Social Sciences, Istanbul.

Dogan, S. and Kır, A. (2018). The relationship between organizational silence, burnout syndrome and employee performance. *Journal of Ömer Halisdemir University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, 11* (4), 1-14.

Erbasi, A. and Akdeniz, G. (2021). The effect of perception of performance appraisal errors on employee silence. *Pamukkale University Journal of Social Sciences Institute* (46), 243-253.

Erben, GS and Otken, AB (2014). The role of work-life balance in the relationship between paternalistic leadership and work-related happiness. *Journal of Management and Economics Studies, 12* (22), 103-121.

Eren, E. (2017). *Management and organization.* Istanbul: Beta Publishing House.

Erogluer, K. and Erselcan, RC (2017). The Effect of Employees' Perception of Organizational Justice and Burnout Levels on Employee Silence. *Business and Economics Research Journal, 8* (2).

Erol, G. (2012). *Relationship between leadership styles and organizational silence: a research in hotel businesses.* (Unpublished Master's Thesis), Balıkesir University Institute of Social Sciences, Balıkesir.

Gokce, N. (2013). *Organizational silence levels of high school teachers.* (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Maltepe University, Institute of Social Sciences, Istanbul.

Karabulut, A. and Seymen, O. (2020). The mediating effect of perceived managerial support in the relationship between paternalistic leadership style and organizational identification. *Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University International Journal of Social Sciences, 5* (2), 59-82.

Karasar, N. (2007). *Scientific research method.* Ankara: Nobel Publishing.

Kennedy, J. and Anderson, R. (2002). "Impact of leadership style and emotions on subordinate performance", *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13.

Khalid, J. and Ahmed, J. (2016). Perceived organizational politics and employee silence: Supervisor trust as a moderator. *Journal of the Asia Pacific Economy. 21* (2).

Khlaf, AEA and Tekin, E. (2021). The effect of national culture on the perception of paternalistic leadership: The case of Libya. *Journal of Social and Cultural Studies* (7), 44-70.

Koksal, O. (2011). A cultural leadership paradox: Paternalism. *Journal of Mustafa Kemal University Institute of Social Sciences*, 8 (15), 101-122.

Morrison EW and Milliken FJ (2000). “Organizational silence: A barrier to change and development in a pluralistic”, *The Academy Of Management Review*, 25.

Nikmaram, S., Yamchi, H. G, Shojai, S., Zahmani, MA, and Alvani, SM (2012). Study on relationship between organizational silence and commitment in Iran. *World Applied Science Journal*. 17 (10).

Oz, H. (2019). Data-based school administrator selection, training and assignment model. *Journal of Social Sciences and Education*, 2 (2), 311-334. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/josse/issue/49908/600008>

Ozgenel, M. and Dursun, İ. E. (2020). The effect of school principals' paternalistic leadership behaviors on school culture. *Journal of Social, Human and Administrative Sciences*, 3 (4), 284-302.

Ozmen, A. (2019). The Relationship Between Paternalist Leadership and Mobbing: A Research in Public Institutions. *Journal of the Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences of Süleyman Demirel University*, 24 (2), 253-262.

Ozyılmaz, B. and Lale, O. (2019). The effect of paternalistic leadership perception on employee voice: A research on food industry employees. *Management and Economics: Journal of Celal Bayar University Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, 26 (2), 397-410.

Paksoy, M. (2002). “*People and total quality management in the working environment*. Istanbul University Faculty of Business Publications, No: 282.

Pellegrini, EK and Scandura, TA (2006). “Leader–member exchange (lmx), paternalism, and delegation in the Turkish business culture: An empirical investigation”, *Journal of International Business Studies*. 37 (264).

Pinder, CC and KP Harlos. (2001). Employee silence: Quiescence and acquiescence as response to perception injustice. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*.

Sehitoğlu, Y. and Zehir, C. (2010). Investigation of employee performance in Turkish public institutions in the context of employee silence and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Public Administration*, 43 (4), 87-110.

Sisman, M. (2012). *Instructional leadership* (4th Edition). Ankara: Pegem Academy.

Taskiran, E. (2011). *Interaction between leadership and organizational silence:(Role of organizational justice)* . Istanbul: Beta Publishing.

Tashyan, M., Cicekoglu, H., and Bıyıkbeyi, T. (2017). The relationship between paternalst leadership and organizational communication: An example of a municipality in the Eastern Mediterranean region. *Assam International Refereed Journal, 4 (8), 70-87.*

Tayfun, A. and Catir, O. (2013). A research on the relationship between organizational silence and employee performance. *Journal of Business Studies, 5 (3), 114-134.*

Tekin, E. (2019). A research on the effect of paternalistic leadership on job satisfaction and employee performance. *Third Sector Social Economic Review, 54 (1), 178-204.*

Ucar, Z. (2019). Relationship between paternalistic leadership and job satisfaction from the lens of leader member interaction. *Bitlis Eren University Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences Academic Projection Journal, 4 (1), 28-49.*

Whiteside, D. and Barclay, LJ (2013). Echoes of silence: Employee silence as a mediator between overall justice and employee outcomes. *Journal of Business Ethics, 116 (2).*

Yıldız, A. and Ekingen, E. (2020). Testing the effect of paternalistic leadership on service innovation behavior and the mediating role of job satisfaction with structural equation modeling. *Journal of Business Studies, 12 (3), 2916-2926.*

Yukl, G. (2002). “ *Leadership in organization* ” (5th Edition). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall International, Inc.