ABSTRACT
A leader may try various approaches to lead and manage an organization that helps to formulate strategy, adopt the positive direction and motivation, and above all lead to subordinate wellbeing. In the current study, an attempt is made to study whether the paternalistic leadership of the leaders is key to the subordinate wellbeing. The current study adopted survey method to test the hypotheses. Paternalistic Leadership was measured by a 15-item scale developed by Cheng, Chou, Wu, Huang & Farh, (2004). General Wellbeing was measured by a 19-item scale developed by Dupuy (1970). The data were collected from a sample of 414 respondents from the organization of Petroleum Industry. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20 was used to assist both quantitative and qualitative data analysis and maintained the transparency and credibility of the research. The results revealed the significant correlation between the paternalistic leadership of the leaders and subordinate wellbeing.
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INTRODUCTION
Paternalistic Leadership (PL) denotes as hierarchical relationship in which leader act as a fatherly figure to guide his subordinate in both professional and personal life and in returns the leader anticipate from his subordinate a great deal of loyalty and respect (Aycan, 2006; Gelfand, Erez, & Aycan, 2007) and at the same time subordinates should value his/her authority and follow the status of hierarchy. After a vigorous study it has been proved that the countries, those have strong family bonds only practiced PL, such as Asians countries, Middle-East, Latin America and Africa (Ayman & Chemers, 1991; Kim, 1994; Jackson, 2004; Kabasakal & Bodur, 2004; Martinez, 2005; Behrens, 2010). Although, leadership is recognized globally but it’s functioning is strongly dependent upon the cultural values of the respected nation (Chemers 1993). Aycan et al. (2000) evaluated ten countries in his research and concluded that India scored comparatively high than other countries China in particular.

The business practitioner of the contemporary world, emphasize on leadership importance in relation to subordinate wellbeing. Resulting, large amount spends annually in leadership development program, development of organizational culture and employee wellbeing to create a conducive environment for both employees and organization. This environment may not be achieved by leaders alone; they need people around them, subordinates in particular. The quality relationship between
leaders and subordinate can impact positively on individuals’ and organizations’ productivity and effectiveness in working condition and also for the overall functioning of an organization and subordinate personal wellbeing. Nevertheless, a number of Asian countries, including India, exhibits similar cultural characteristics particularly high power distance and low individualism than the Western countries. Pellegrini and Scandura (2008) stated that no matter subordinate belongs to the Asian or Western organization he/she carries certain values like the need for association, high regard for authority, a parent like care and may be more happy and productive under PL.

Subordinate wellbeing is a priority as decision-making concern and paternalistic leaders make sure that subordinates are treated fairly. The ultimate power lies in leader's hands, the power to rule and the legitimacy of rule relies on loyalty and trust which leaders apply on what’s best for the subordinate wellbeing. Researcher believed that subordinate who work under paternalism do not leave organization merely for better prospects such as payment or promotion opportunities. However, after evaluation of research conducted by many scholars since 1976, Farh and Cheng (2000) concluded that PL is firmly based on fatherly behavior which creates a personal atmosphere. In short, PL means subordinate wellbeing for sure.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

PATERNALISTIC LEADERSHIP

Many research talk about, the characteristics of the patriarchal style of work that mainly belongs to Chinese family enterprises and leadership with strong authoritarian power, and compassionate subordinates. Those characteristics can be seen in family oriented business, or any organization, this phenomenon is called Paternalistic Leadership (PL) (Hsu, Hu, Ling, Cheng, & Chou, 2004; Chao & Kao, 2005; Cheng, Farh & Chou, 2006). Fundamentally, PL is rooted from Eastern countries and Silin (1976) is regarded as a pioneered of this study followed by Redding (1990), Westwood (1992), Cheng (1995a, 1995b) also Cheng, Chou and Farh (2000) have persistently explored the subject. Historically, PL was a predominant style carried by management in early capitalistic businesses (Wren, 2005). Around the end of 21st century, a systematic research of paternalism is geared up (Aycan, 2006; Pellegrini & Scandura, 2008). However, in the later period, many researchers had a difference of opinion about the conceptualization of PL (Pellegrini & Scandura, 2008). Some researchers (Westwood & Chan, 1992; Aycan, 2006; Pellegrini & Scandura, 2006, 2008; Pellegrini et al., 2010) initially conceptualized PL on two main features, authority, and benevolence. Whereas, Farh and Cheng (2000) gave a different dimension to PL construct by adding moral along with authority and benevolence.

Earlier, researchers carried their study based on observations and in-depth interviews (Silin, 1976; & Redding, 1990). Research carried by Redding’s was primarily based on Silin (1976), Deyo (1978, 1983), and Pye (1985). After 20 years of long efforts, Redding gave a different dimension to PL construct and confirmed the dominance of PL. Furthermore, Redding placed paternalism into a cultural and historical context to deeply dissect the organizational structure and management styles under Chinese organization communities. The study also introduced the related concepts of “benevolent leadership”, “hereditary succession”, and “personalism”, which gave the theoretical platform to PL contract.

Word paternalism is derived from the Latin word ‘pater’, means father. Researchers offered diverse descriptions across time and cultures to define PL as the combination of authority and benevolence based on strong discipline with fatherhood (Farh & Cheng, 2000). According to Pellegrini and Scandura (2008), PL style is practice in contemporary organizational culture and also popularized in management literature. Under the varied view, the researcher typically defines PL as “a style that combines strong discipline and authority with fatherly benevolence” (Farh & Cheng, 2000: 91). According to Farh and Cheng (2000), among the three dimensions of PL, authoritarian refers to the commanding position of the leaders over a subordinate and the subordinate follow their command with without any question. Benevolence behavior is totally based on care and concern for the subordinate
profession and personal life. Moral behavior of leader exhibits total generosity, the disciplinary behavior of leaders himself and personal virtue.

PL scores high in Indian context due to its traditional family values and other family members are bound to obey father who is also head of the family (Sinha, 1990). According to Seymour (1999), who carried ethnographic study of Indian families, Indian children are taught about fundamental traditions of Indian culture at a very early age that family unity and harmony comes first then their own needs. Organizations in India also exhibits strong norms of Indian culture which define who is expected to communicate with whom and this norm is strictly followed by junior employees and hence they do not simply approach their leaders (Zaidman & Brock, 2009). At the same time, leaders hold their authority and in returns subordinates show their loyalty and respect towards the leaders (Cheng & Jiang, 2000). In spite of urbanization and education development, Indian cultural values and male bias are maintained (Chhokar, 2007). Similar male domination can be experienced on work domain (House et al., 2004). Nagpal (2003) stated that Indians spend their life in search of ‘Guru’. Kakar (1978) also share similar views and stated further that ‘Guru’ who are intimate and authoritarian as PL. However, Indian leaders are relationship oriented, emotional, trustworthy and formal with great human touch and fatherly figure that is why The Great Leader Mahatma Gandhi is regarded as ‘Father of a Nation’.

**WELLBEING**

Cambridge Dictionary (2016) defines wellbeing as, “the state of feeling healthy and happy”. Oxford English Dictionary (2005) defines wellbeing as, “the state of being or doing well in life; happy, healthy, or prosperous condition; moral or physical welfare (of a person or community)”. Perhaps, the researchers have not yet to the conclusion to its definition or its approach towards the study. In recent decades research in a field of wellbeing has been geared up (e.g. Diener, Suh, Lucas, & Smith, 1999; Kahneman, Diener, & Schwarz, 1999; Keyes, Schmotkin, & Ryff, 2002; Stratham & Chase, 2010; Seligman, 2011). The fundamental formulation of wellbeing is quite confusing in its initial stage (Ryff & Keyes, 1995). The definition of term wellbeing or even spelled the term still remains unresolved, resulting given rise to unclear and too broad definitions of wellbeing (Forgeard, Jayawickreme, Kern, & Seligman, 2011). This deficit can be traced in Ryff’s (1989a) work, who believed that there has been overlooking in defining the essential elements of psychological wellbeing. He disapproved the Bradburn’s (1969) work for lack of his fundamental definition and the basic construct of psychological wellbeing, also stress on the positive and negative effect of the work of Diener and Suh (1997). In fact, Thomas (2009) believed that wellbeing is a perception of an individual and defers person to person also difficult to define and complex to measure. Shah and Marks (2004) define wellbeing is more than happiness as well as a state of satisfaction and happiness also means developing as a person, being content, and contributing towards the society but unfortunately, this is more narrative rather than a defining.

Historically, the concept of wellbeing is debatable. The traditions based on philosophy offers various theories as to what wellbeing is and how does it matter to human being (cf., Sumner, 1996; Tiberius & Hall, 2010). Aristotle uniquely described wellbeing through his writing “Nicomachean Ethics” (1999), according to him, only a virtuous life considered to be happy life or eudaimonic life (eudaimonia is the Greek term for a good life). The notion of wellbeing is fundamentally derived from positive psychology. Positive psychology has appeared from the crisis of the West and its main focus is to study the enhancement in the lives of individuals. ‘Wellbeing’ is being used to describe good lifestyle under physical and mental positive state, which is also enjoyable (Singh & Shyam, 2007). The term wellbeing is regarded as the ‘Good living conditions’ by sociologists; whereas, ecologists and biologists and politicians and social reformers refer the ‘livability’ to notions of what a good living environment is like, such as good lifestyle and social equality (Veenhoven, 2004).

However, wellbeing is complex to define and vague concept and its perception varies to person to person and situation (Wilcock et al., 1998). It is measurable by using various wellbeing scales. In a current materialistic world, people are much concerned and also conscious about the concept of
wellbeing in their life than anything else. Therefore, attention has been given to the concept of wellbeing and numerous researchers carried out and also carrying on their research on different aspects of wellbeing. Truly, the concept of wellbeing makes people’s life happy and healthy by all means. Wellbeing is symbolized as an immense satisfaction of one’s urge and ultimate goals of life (Checola, 1975). Maybe, for this reason, achieving wellbeing in the true sense is the World Health Organization goal of “healthy mind in a healthy body in a healthy environment” (Shri, 2007).

Based on the above discussion, the current study aims to achieve the following objectives:

1. To know the relationship between PL Style of the leaders and subordinate wellbeing.
2. To investigate if and how PL Style of the leaders enhances subordinate wellbeing.

Based on this discussion it was hypothesized that:

$H_0$: There is no relationship between PL style of a leader and subordinate wellbeing.

$H_1$: PL style of a leader affects the subordinates’ wellbeing positively.

**METHODOLOGY**

**RESEARCH DESIGN**

Data was collected through the Web-based survey, as well as through the hard copy. The Web-based survey link (https://goo.gl/forms/eTf6eGDskM3HXCK2) was created in ‘Google’ and the link was emailed to all respondents with a brief description of the research background and purpose of the study. A total of 414 responses were gathered to report on their leader’s PL style and self-administered General Wellbeing (GWB) scale. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), version 20 was used to analyze the raw scores for the current study. The respondents were between assistant-manager and chief-manager levels.

PL scale (Cheng, Chou, Wu, Huang & Farh, 2004) was used to measure PL style of leaders. It consisted of fifteen items with three dimensions: authoritarianism, benevolence and moral character using a five-point Likert scale, varying from ‘1= rarely’ to ‘5= always’. General Wellbeing Schedule (Dupuy, 1970) was used to measure subordinate wellbeing. The scale consisted nineteen items with six sub-scales: anxiety, depressed-mood, general-health, positive-wellbeing, self-control, and vitality.

**Figure 1. Research model showing the relationship between PL and GWB**
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**RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

**Table 1: Demographic Sample description**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>81.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>&lt; 30</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RELIABILITY AND CORRELATION ANALYSIS AMONG VARIABLES

The reliability analysis (Cronbach’s alpha) (table 2) shows acceptable level for the scales, PL and GWB. Table 3 shows correlation results between the variables and their dimensions under study. There is significant correlation association observed between the variables and their dimensions under study but some dimensions are exceptional. PL dimensions authoritarianism and benevolence was not significant correlation association observed between them. PL dimension benevolence was not significantly correlated with GWB dimension general-health. Finally, Total PL was not correlated significantly with GWB dimension general-health.

**Table 2: Reliability and Correlation Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paternalistic Leadership</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Wellbeing</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3: Correlation Matrix Between Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</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>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PL_A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL_B</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL_M</td>
<td>-0.13’’ 0.75’’</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL_TOT</td>
<td>0.39’’ 0.84’’ 0.81’’</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWB_A</td>
<td>-0.21’’ 0.24’’ 0.32’’ 0.18’’</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWB_DM</td>
<td>-0.2’’ 0.25’’ 0.35’’ 0.20’’ 0.82’’</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWB_GH</td>
<td>-0.13’ 0.08 0.17’ 0.06 0.58 0.55’</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWB_PW</td>
<td>-0.12’ 0.27’ 0.35’ 0.25’ 0.7’ 0.7’ 0.4’</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWB_SC</td>
<td>-0.19’ 0.28’ 0.33 0.21 0.75 0.81’ 0.5’ 0.63’ 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWB_V</td>
<td>-0.13’ 0.21’ 0.27’ 0.18 0.79 0.77’ 0.58’ 0.7’ 0.72’ 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWB_TOT</td>
<td>-0.2’’ 0.26’ 0.35’ 0.21’ 0.92’ 0.93’ 0.67’ 0.80’ 0.87’ 0.9’ 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=414, *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001
MULTIPLE REGRESSIONS

Table 4 shows multiple regression results between PL as the predictor variable and total General Wellbeing as the criterion variable. Specifically, these analyses were concerned with:

1. To what extent overall total PL predict total General Wellbeing in the composite sample.
2. To what extent dimensions of PL predict total General Wellbeing in the composite sample.

The analysis of first equation of the multiple regressions (Table-4) showed that total PL predicts 4% of total GWB of the composite sample. The PL significantly contributed to GWB in the composite sample. This proved that leaders PL style contributes to subordinate wellbeing. This means that overall PL contributes in creating subordinate wellbeing. The analysis of second regression equation showed that the dimensions of authoritarianism of the PL significantly contributed in explaining subordinate wellbeing in the composite sample. The dimensions of moral of the PL significantly contributed in explaining subordinate wellbeing in the composite sample. All the three predictors (authoritarianism, benevolence, & moral) predicted 14% in the composite sample. This means that leaders, who practice PL style, enhance subordinate wellbeing. This enables leaders to groom the subordinate as a future leader. PL style of leaders, enhance subordinate wellbeing by all means. Thus, based on the findings of the current study, the role of PL was revealed to be very important to the Petroleum Industry, particularly for subordinate wellbeing. The relation between the PL and its dimensions and subordinate Wellbeing was significant in a total sample. Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

Ha: Paternalistic Leadership Style of a leader affects the subordinates’ wellbeing positively.

**Table 4: Multiple Regression with General Wellbeing as Predictor Variable, with Dimensions of Paternalistic Leadership as Criterion Variable**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion Variable</th>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>General Wellbeing_Total</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paternalistic Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>4.28***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R²= 0.04***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarianism</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-3.26***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>4.60***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R²=0.14***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=414, *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001

THE FINDINGS OF THIS RESEARCH ARE AS FOLLOWS

The research results strongly support the PL of leaders its impact on subordinate wellbeing, suggesting that the subordinate wellbeing is taken care in the petroleum organization by their paternalistic leaders.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Future researchers should conduct a wider study to explore PL style of the leaders in the petroleum organization and how it impacts on subordinate wellbeing in a varied manner. PL has been still regarded as a fundamental leadership style in Chinese organization by many scholars (e.g., Cheng et
al., 2004; Zhou & Long, 2005). Generally, higher-level managers are much familiar with PL style, yet the respondents in the current study were restricted to assistant-manager to chief manager category from the Petroleum organization. Their respondents are subordinates, who measures PL for their leaders. Thus, potential researchers should include non-management employees as well as higher-level managers (GM and above) from the Petroleum organization as respondent. The potential researchers should conduct a wider study on subordinate wellbeing in the petroleum organization in a varied manner. Fundamentally, general wellbeing scale self-reporting surveys are the most effective method of capturing the subjective nature of the leader-subordinate relationships and subordinate wellbeing. It would not be sensible to employ alternative sources such as leaders to evaluate these constructs, as they are generally subjective, and based on individual experiences. In the current study, subordinates evaluate their own wellbeing keeping their leaders/bosses in mind. In future research, the scholars should consider leaders themselves to evaluate their own wellbeing as well as subordinate wellbeing.

LIMITATIONS

1. The respondents were from one organization of Petroleum Industry was included. Hence, there was the lack of diversity in the sample group.
2. Respondents were restricted to subordinates category. The leaders’ category was not a part of the research.
3. Subordinates were restricted to the job group of assistant manager to chief manager grades, which consist of lower and middle management. Thus the findings obtained in this study did not represent top management leadership.

An electronic survey prevented some respondent from participating due to outdated or incorrect email addresses.
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