GLOBAL BUSINESS AND TECHNOLOGY ASSOCIATION

TENTH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

READINGS BOOK

EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION IN THE GLOBAL KNOWLEDGE ECONOMY: ENHANCING INNOVATION AND COMPETITIVENESS WORLDWIDE

Editors:

Leonora Fuxman, Ph.D.
Nejdet Delener, Ph.D
F. Victor Lu, Ph.D.
Luis Eduardo Rivera-Solis, Ph.D.

Madrid, Spain
July 8 – 12, 2008

©Copyright 2008 by the Global Business and Technology Association. All Rights Reserved

PUBLISHED BY THE GLOBAL BUSINESS AND TECHNOLOGY ASSOCIATION

ISBN: 1-932917-04-7

The materials published in this Readings Book may be reproduced for instructional and noncommercial use. Any use for commercial purposes must have the prior approval of the president of the Global Business and Technology Association.

All full papers submitted to the Global Business and Technology Association Conferences are subject to a peer reviewing process, using subject specialists selected because of their expert knowledge in the areas.

Global Business and Technology Association (GBATA) is publishing partner with EBSCO Publishing. This allows researchers from throughout the world to access articles from the Readings Book.

Printed in the United States of America, 2008.

©Copyright 2008 by the Global Business and Technology Association, All Rights Reserved

FORWARD

The purpose of the conference is to provide a unique international forum to facilitate the exchange of cutting-edge information through multidisciplinary presentations of new challenges in global business and technology: strategies, policies and issues.

All full papers submitted to the Global Business and Technology Association Conferences are subject to a peer reviewing process, using subject specialists selected because of their expert knowledge in the areas.

Academicians, practitioners, and public policy makers at all levels throughout the world submitted original papers for conference presentation and for publication in this Readings Book. All competitive papers were refereed (subject to a peer review). The result of these efforts produced 471 empirical, conceptual and methodological papers involving all functional areas of business education with a special focus on international aspects. Of the 237 papers accepted for presentation at the conference, 145 papers are published in this Readings Book.

©Copyright 2008 by the Global Business and Technology Association. All Rights Reserved

REVIEWERS

Dr. Shaukat Ali	*University of Wolverhampton, United Kingdom*
Pro. Eleuch Amira	*Osaka University of Economics, Japan*
Dr. Tim Andrews	*University of Strathdye, Scotland*
Prof. Mihail Arandarenko	*University of Belgrade, Serbia*
Dr. Mai Anttila	*Helsinki School of Economics, Finland*
Dr. Ozlean Atalik	*Anadolu University, Turkey*
Dr. Mladenka Balaban	*Braca Karis Faculty of Management, Serbia*
Dr. James Barrese	*St. John's University, USA*
Prof. A. Berndt	*University of Johannesburg, South Africa*
Dr. Nerine C. Bresler	*University of Johannesburg, South Africa*
Dr. Lynne Butel	*University of Plymouth, UK*
Ms. Amareza Buys	*Vaal University of Technology, South Africa*
Dr. Natalia Maria Prudencio Rafael Canadas	*Polytechnic Institute of Leiria, Portugal*
Dr. Guy Callender	*Curtin Univeristy of Technology, Australia*
Dr. Chiang-nan Chao	*St. John's University, U.S.A.*
Dr. Lee Shiu Chen Chen	*Swinburne University of Technology, Australia*
Dr. Pawan Chugan	*Nirma University of Science and Technology, India*
Dr. Julio Alberto Silva Coelho	*Polytechnic Institute of Leiria, Portugal*
Dr. Julio Albert Sillva Coelho	*Polytechnic Institute of Leiria, Portugal*
Prof. Max Coulthard	*Monash University, Australia*
Prof. Goran Crovic	*University of Banja Luka, Serbia*
Dr. Soumendra Dash	*IFIM Business School, India*
Dr. Johan de Jager	*Tshwane University of Technology, South Africa*
Dr. Ben du Preez	*Vaal University of Technology, South Africa*
Dr. Elif Akagun Ergin	*Cankaya University, Turkey*
Dr. Vitor Hugo Ferreira	*Polytechnic Institute of Leiria, Portugal*
Dr. Leon de Wet Fourie	*Vaal University of Technology, South Africa*
Dr. Nejdet Delener	*State University of New York, Old Westbury, U.S.A.*
Prof. Roy Dhurup	*Vaal University of Technology, South Africa*
Dr. Tee Ding Ding	*Monash University, Malaysia*
Dr. John Dory	*Pace University, USA*
Prof. Ivo Druzic	*University of Zagreb, Croatia*
Dr. Nikolay B. Filinov	*The State Univ. Higher School of Economics, Russia*
Dr. Leonora Fuxman	*St. John's University, U.S.A.*
Dr. Andrea Garnett	*Vaal University of Technology, South Africa*
Mr. Walter Gassenferth	*IBMEC, Brazil*
Dr. Geoff A. Goldman	*University of Johannesburg, South Africca*
Dr. Emanuel Gomes	*Coventry University, United Kingdom*
Dr. Costas Hadjicharalambous	*State University of New York at Old Westbury, USA*
Dr. Marie Hardie	*Coventry University, UK*
Dr. Scott Hoenig	*Monterey Institute of International Studies, U.S.A.*
Dr. Natasja Holtzhausen	*Tshwane Univ. of Technology, South Africa*
Dr. Solomon Huang	*State University of New York at Old Westbury, USA*
Dr. Ali Kara	*Pennsylvania State Univ., York, USA*
Dr. Fahri Karakaya	*University of Massachusetts, Dartmouth, USA*
Prof. H.B. Klopper	*University of Johannesburg, South Africa*
Prof. Gordana Komazec	*Megatrend University, Serbia*
Prof. Yamen Koubaa	*Univ. of Marketing & Distribution of Sciences, Japan*
Dr. Engin Kucukkaya	*Middle East Technical University, Turkey*
Dr. Dana Lascu	*University of Richmond, U.S.A.*
Dr. Gerard Ledlow	*Georgia Southern University, U.S.A.*
Dr. Keun S. Lee	*Hofstra University, U.S.A.*
Dr. A.R. Leen	*Leiden University, The Netherlands*
Dr. Yaonan Lin	*Lunghwa Univ. of Science & Tech. Taiwan, ROC*
Prof. Ana Catarina Cadimo Lisboa	*Polytechnic Institute of Leiria, Portugal*
Prof. Peter Lok	*University of South Australia, Australia*

©Copyright 2008 by the Global Business and Technology Association. All Rights Reserved

REVIEWERS -continued

Dr. Mornay Roberts Lombard	*University of Johannesburg, South Africa*
Dr. Mary Long	*Pace University, USA*
Dr. F. Victor Lu	*St. John's University, U.S.A.*
Dr. Eugenio Pereira Lucas	*Polytechnic Institute of Leiria, Portugal*
Dr. Pierre Lucena	*Federal University of Pernambuco, Brazil*
Dr. T. Diana Macedo-Soares	*Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro*
Dr. Antanas Makstutis	*The General Jones Zemaitis Military Academy of Lithuania, Lithuania*
Prof. Sirli Mandmaa	*Tallinn University of Technology,*
Prof. Aleksandar Markovic	*University of Belgrade, Serbia*
Dr. Antanas Matstutis	*The General Jones Zemaits Military Academy*
Dr. Alexei Matveev	*City Univ. of New York, Staten Island, USA*
Dr. Ljiljana Maurovic	*University of Rijeka, Croatia*
Dr. Peter Mayer	*University of Solothurn, Switzerland*
Dr. David Mello	*Tshwane University of Technology, South Africa*
Dr. Jame L. Menzies	*Deakin University, Australia*
Dr. Samir R. Moussalli	*Huntingdon College, U.S.A.*
Dr. Juergen Muehlbacher	*Vienna Univ. of Economics & Busn. Admin., Australia*
Dr. Stanley Mukhola	*Tshwane University of Technology, South Africa*
Dr. Sio-Wang NG	*Macau Polytechnic Institute, China*
Dr. Chetsada Noknoi	*Thaksin University, Thailand*
Dr. Pat Obi	*Purdue University Calumet, U.S.A.*
Dr. Kathleen Park	*Massachusetts Institute of Technology, U.S.A.*
Dr. Sonja Petrovic-Lazarevic	*Monash University, Australia*
Dr. David Pooe	*Vaal University of Technology, South Africa*
Dr. Anna Putnova	*Brno University of Technology, Czech Republic*
Dr. Mahesh N. Rajan	*San Jose State University, USA*
Dr. Murali Raman	*Monash University, Malaysia*
Dr. Mari Ratinen	*Swedish School of Economics & Busn. Adm. Finland*
Dr. Nichola L. Robertson	*Deakin University, Australia*
Dr. Susana Rodrigues	*Polytechnic Institute of Leiria, Portugal*
Dr. Raymond Rogers	*Coventry University, UK*
Dr. Alex Settles	*State Univ. – The Higher School of Economics, Russia*
Dr. Leon Schiffman	*St. John's University, U.S.A.*
Dr. Christina Schweikert	*State University of New York at Old Westbury, USA*
Dr. Rakesh Singh	*Great Lakes Institute of Mgmt, Chennai, India*
Dr. Satyendra Singh	*University of Winnipeg, Canada*
Dr. Elena Smirnova	*State University of New York at Old Westbury, USA*
Dr. Valentian G. Smirnova	*State University of Management, Russia*
Dr. Ugur Soytas	*Middle East Technical University, Turkey*
Prof. Biljana Stosic	*University of Belgrade, Serbia*
Dr. Che-Jen Su	*Fu Jen Catholic University, Taiwan*
Dr. Oliver Su	*Fu Jen Catholic University, Taiwan*
Prof. Babs Surujlal	*Vaal University of Technology, South Africa*
Dr. J. Suksawat	*Khon Kaen University, Thailand*
Dr. Michael Szenberg	*Pace University, USA*
Prof. Madele Tait	*Nelson Mandela Metropolitan Univ., South Africa*
Dr. Uthai Tanlamai	*Chulalongkorn University, Thailand*
Dr. Joao Paulo Vieira Tinoco	*Pontifical Catholic Univ., Rio de Janeiro, Brazil*
Dr. Robert Vambery	*Pace University, U.S.A.*
Dr. Hannes van der Walt	*Central Univerisity of the Free State, South Africa*
Dr. Neels van Heerden	*University of Pretoria, South Africa*
Dr. Luni Vermeulen	*Tshwane University of Technology, South Africa*
Dr. Demetris Vrontis	*University of Nicosia, Cyprus*
Dr. A.N.M. Waheeduzzaman	*Texas A&M University Corpus Christi, U.S.A.*
Prof. Larry Wander	*St. John's University, U.S.A.*
Prof. Ken Winkelman	*State University of New York at Old Westbury, USA*
Dr. Pamela Wynn	*Bloomberg University, Pennsylvania, USA*

©Copyright 2008 by the Global Business and Technology Association. All Rights Reserved

Table of Contents

Author(s)	Title	page
Parul Acharya, Elizabeth Milmine, Eric Lewis, Sneha Patel, Shonta Chambers, Renee Hotchkiss and Gerald Ledlow	➢ The Economic Menace of Diabetes in the 21st Century	1
Slobodan Acimovic, Jelena Acimovic	➢ Complexity of Privatization in Kosovo-Serbia	12
Ozlem Kacar Akman and Ozgur Kokalan	➢ Museum Marketing - A Case Study from Turkey	21
Eleuch Amira	➢ Satisfaction with Health Care Services Experience: Japanese Patients	29
Özlem Atalık, Emin Özel	➢ Passengers' Importance and Satisfaction Level of Low Cost Airlines: A Case Study Pegasus Airlines	36
Susana Garrido Azevedo and João Ferreira	➢ The Role of an Identification Technology on Firm Performance: A Conceptual Model Proposal	44
Mladenka Balaban	➢ Prospects of Insurance Market Development in Serbia	54
Luigino Barisan	➢ Worldwide Wine Systems: Comparing Yarra Valley and Doc Conegliano Valdobbiadene Companies Organizational and Supply Structure	61
Francisco Marcelo Barone, Deborah Moraes Zouain and Fatima Bayma de Oliveira	➢ The State Function As Inducer And Formulator of A Public Policy of Credit Access as A Tool Of Combat Against Poverty and Social Inclusion	69
Sara Bassani and Daniele Toninelli	➢ Country Tourist Appeal and Country Image – The Case of Italy	79

©Copyright 2008 by the Global Business and Technology Association. All Rights Reserved

Ünal Battal	➢ Risk Management In Airlines: Financial Risks At Turkish Airlines	88
João Renato de Souza Coelho Benazzi	➢ Memories of the Past, Consumption and Consumer Behavior: Exploring the Origins and Limits of the Nostalgic Trend Trough Life Stories in Brazil	97
Cristina Bettinelli, Lal Chugh	➢ Comparative Analysis of European Board of Directors	106
Cristina Bettinelli, Lal Chugh	➢ Changing Organizational Models of Corporate Governance : An Empirical Case-Study of Italian Corporations	114
Larry W. Boone, Geno Chou and Chi Ho Cheng	➢ Littlepaw® Skateboards Case Study	122
Ana Cristina Valente Borges, Carolina Rolim, Osmar Pancera	➢ Cross Sector and Cross Organizational Coordination for Local Sustainable Development: A Study in Araçuai, Minas Gerais, Brazil	130
Nerine Bresler	➢ On Safari In Botswana; Describing the Product	139
Amanda Breytenbach and Geoff A Goldman	➢ Strategic Alignment And Management of Faculty Programme Offering to State Higher Education Regulation: A Faculty Case Study at the University of Johannesburg	147
Pawan S Budhwar, Ingmar Bjorkman, Virender Singh	➢ Human Resource Management in Foreign Firms Operating in India: Issues and Learning	158
André M. Caldeira and Helberte B. Oliveira, Walter Gassenferth and Maria Augusta Soares Machado	➢ Submitting Vehicle Claims for Auditing	167
Guy Callender	➢ Five Thousand Years of Organization Change: The Impact of Procurement	175
Dragana Camilovic	➢ A Call Detail Analysis - Getting Insight into Customer Behavior	183

©Copyright 2008 by the Global Business and Technology Association. All Rights Reserved

C. Chailan, P. Braun	➢ Marketing of Technological Projects in Their Upstream Phase	191
Chiang-nan Chao, Robert J. Mockler, Leonora Fuxman, Larry Wander, Dorothy Dologite	➢ Music Shopping Online and Offline	198
Lee Shiu Chen and Railton Hill	➢ Understanding Taiwanese Business Leadership Styles	206
Hsin-hui Chou and Judy Zolkiewski	➢ Gaining Sustainable Momentum in Marketing Technological Innovations: Insights From A Network Approach to Strategy	214
Dababrata Narayan Chowdhury and Lynne Butel	➢ Knowledge Transfer through Networks: The Case of Turkish Small and Medium Sized Enterprise (Smes) Development and Survival.	222
Mona Chung, Bruno Mascitelli	➢ The Role Of Sister City Relationships in the Enhancement of Trade: Latrobe City (Australia) and Taizhou (China)	232
Marcos Cohen and Jorge Ferreira da Silva	➢ Evaluation of Collaborative Strategies Used in the Management of Environmental Parks in Rio De Janeiro	239
Lenise Saraiva de Vasconcelos Costa, Marcos Cohen and Graziela Xavier Fortunato	➢ Valuation of Strategic Alliances through Real Options	247
Max Coulthard	➢ Increasing Service Exports: A Key Contributor in the Growth of The Global Knowledge Economy	255
Gerard Danford	➢ The Growing Level of Ict Use During Internationalization	265
Elif Dayar	➢ Excerpts From Digitally Divided Lives in Turkey	274
Zarina Denan and Noraini Ismail	➢ Absorptive Capacity and Firm Operational Performance: The Moderating Role of Strategic Planning Formality	281
Zeynep Deniz	➢ A Comparison of Irish and Indian Growth and The Role of Usa Via Fdi and Outsourcing	289

©Copyright 2008 by the Global Business and Technology Association. All Rights Reserved

Manilall Dhurup	➢ Customer Value Starts From Within: Determinants of Internal Customer Service Quality	297
Antonie Drotsky, Ben Janse van Rensburg and Johan de Jager	➢ The Branding of Cellular Telephones to Tertiary Students	307
Vildan Durmaz, Mufide Banar, Mustafa Ozen, and Hatice Kucukonal	➢ Evaluation of Environmental Effects of Airport Operations: The Case of Turkey	315
Nikolay Filinov	➢ On the Convergence of Decision-Making Style Typologies	320
Bjørn-Tore Flåten and Rotem Shneor	➢ Strategic E-Hr: Matching E-Business Value Drivers and Hr Management Tasks	328
Paulo Gustavo Fuchs, T. Diana L. van Aduard de Macedo Soares	➢ Corporate Climate Strategy: Proposal for a Formulation and Assessment Model Based on International Benchmarks	340
Leonora Fuxman	➢ Challenges of Online Advertising and Marketing in Ukraine	351
Andrea Garnett, Dylan Garnett	➢ The Verification of Customer Perceptions of Queue Management to Achieve Business Imperatives	358
Remigiusz Gawlik	➢ Preliminary Criteria Reduction for the Application of Analytic Hierarchy Process Method	366
Gbolahan Gbadamosi, Johan de Jager	➢ Measuring Service Quality in South Africa Higher Education: Developing a Multidimensional Scale	375
Anna Gogoleva	➢ Studies of Cultures and Subcultures	385
Emanuel Gomes and Marcel Cohen	➢ Acquisition Pitfalls in Developing Countries: A Case Study of The Acquisition of Congolese Wireless Networks (Cwn) by Vodacom Group	391
Patricia Grossi, Paulo C. Motta, Luis F. Hor-Meyll	➢ Risks the Poor Perceive When Shopping for Food	401

©Copyright 2008 by the Global Business and Technology Association. All Rights Reserved

Sezer Günaydın Çalışkan	➢ The Effect of Leader Member Exchange Quality on Employee's Perception of Politics And Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Moderating Role of Organiztional Justice	410
Sezer Günaydın Çalışkan, Aslı Erim	➢ The Impact of Paternalist Leadership on Resistance to Change: The Moderating Affect of Lmx And Political Skill	422
Costas Hadjicharalambous	➢ Entering Strategies for Private Label Brands In Emerging Asian Markets	428
Natasja Holtzhausen	➢ The Evolution of the Whistle Blower into a Protected Disclosurer- Public Policy and Ethical Considerations	433
Frédéric Jallat, Kathleen Park	➢ Capturing Value by Controlling Key Relationships: How Successful Companies Maintain Privileged Positions in Crucial Business Interactions	441
Pierre Joubert	➢ Developing an Effective Sexual Harassment Policy for Higher Education Institutions in South Africa	450
Jong Kun Jun, Thae Min Lee, Seong Tae Hong	➢ Dyadic Adaptation in Online Marketing Alliances of Korean Firms	457
Burhan Can Karahasan and Mehmet Hakan Sengoz	➢ Fdi and Economic Growth Nexus Evidence From Seven Emerging Economies	463
Nur Esra Kardeş & Hande Kımıloğlu	➢ Consumers' Perceptions of Technology and the Benefits of Technologically Improved Marketing Activities	470
Natalia Khutorova and Alexander Samoldin	➢ The Double Diploma in Ave as the Tool of Integration of Russia in the European Educational Space	480
Stephen Ko	➢ Thinking Styles of Entrepreneurs Matter in Innovation: A Study of Technology-Based Firms in China	484

©Copyright 2008 by the Global Business and Technology Association. All Rights Reserved

Krisitijan Kolakovic	➢ Position of Leaders in the Process of Transition Towards Market Economy in Serbia	494
Thomas Kollars and Gerald Ledlow	➢ International Initiative in Biological Medical Supply: A Partnership in Intravenous Immunoglobulin Production	501
Yamen Koubaa, Rim Methamem Boudali, Fatiha Fort	➢ The Structure of Country And Brand Images and Their Impacts on Product Evaluation	508
Yamen Koubaa	➢ Reconsidering Country of Origin Effect	516
Engin Kucukkaya, Kursat Durmaz	➢ Credit Risk Management: A Practical Examination of Turk Eximbank	524
Pedro Reinares Lara and Luis Mª García Bobadilla	➢ From Anthropology To the Point of Sale: Toward a Marketing Concept Based on "Place / Non-Place" Principles.	532
Violet Lazarevic, Sonja Petrovic-Lazarevic	➢ Raising Brand Equity to Generation Y	538
Frank Paul Le Veness and Patrick Flanagan	➢ The Economic Future of Puerto Rico: The Need for Radical Change	546
Yun Jung Lee and JungKun Park	➢ Customer Complaints Via E-Contact Centers: The Role of Communication	565
Auke R. Leen	➢ Pushing Limits	572
Tatiana Leonova, Anna Legeeva and Natalia Malanicheva	➢ Social and Economic Development: Russian Priorities	578
LiLi Li, Zhuhai, Shaukat Ali	➢ The Determinants of Hong Kong Fdi in China: Locational Change From Pearl River Delta to Yangtze River Delta	583
Yaonan Lin, Hsueh-Chih Chen	➢ A Comparison of Information Privacy Concerns in the U.S., China, and Taiwan	595

©Copyright 2008 by the Global Business and Technology Association. All Rights Reserved

Yaonan Lin, Ching-Yi Lai	➢ The Dimensional Development of Chinese Aesthetic Preferences for Product Appearance	603
Grace T.R. Lin, Yung-Chi Shen ,Chia-Chi Sun, and Hsiao-Chen Yu	➢ Assessing National Innovation Policy: A Comparative Study	611
Ana Lisboa and Carmen Lages	➢ Relative Role Of Relationship Intensity And Contract On Firm Performance	631
Inês Lisboa, José Paulo Esperança,	➢ Does Ownership Influence Performance? Evidence From Europe	638
T. Diana L. van Aduard de Macedo-Soares, Alessandra de Carvalho Aragão, Marina Fernandes de Oliveira, Renata Céli Moreira da Silva	➢ Strategic Alliances in the Oil Upstream Sector: Case of Royal Dutch Shell Plc	649
Pauline Magee-Egan	➢ The Dilemma in Measuring Ethical Thinking Leads to A Dilemma In Management	662
Antanas Makštutis, Aleksejus Malovikas, Rasa Smaliukienė,Juozas Vijeikis and Aleksas Domarkas	➢ Harmonious Development of Lithuania Economy and Market Today: Theory and Practice	666
Sirli Mändmaa and Jaan Vainu	➢ Distributing the Increase of a Phenomenon Among Factors and Constructing of Factor Indices	673
Andrea Manzoni, Alessandra Tzannis	➢ The Company as an Integrated Marketing System: A Shared Approach of Knowledge, Competences and Goals	681
Michael J. Maran	➢ An Essay on the Challenge Of Innovation in the Software Industry	690
Giuseppe Marelli, Alan B. Flaschner and Catherine Goodwin	➢ An Exploratory Study of the Influence of Ethnocentrism, Self-Efficacy, And Involvement on Perceived Reliability of Technology	709

©Copyright 2008 by the Global Business and Technology Association. All Rights Reserved

Thomas J. Maronick	➢ The Role of the Internet in Survey Research: Guidelines for Researchers and Experts	717
Bruno Mascitelli and Simone Battiston	➢ The Challenges and Dilemmas Embedded in the Expatriate Vote: the Case Study of Italians Overseas	728
Kgomotso Masilo and Edward Rankhumishe	➢ The Capacity of City of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality in Addressing Unemployment	736
Alexei V. Matveev, Ann Bracken, Richard G. Milter	➢ Reflection in Active Learning: Does the Open Reflection Really Work?	744
Laurence Mauer, Neil D. Holden	➢ The Prospects for Optional Federal Chartering of Insurance Companies in the United States	751
Borisas Melnikas	➢ Baltic Countries in the Context of Globalization: Regional Integration And The New Form Of Transition	757
Maciej Mitręga, Sue Vaux Halliday	➢ Getting Closer to Business Customers in the Eye of Sales Staff	768
Philip Myburgh, Jan Grundling and Lizl Steynberg	➢ An Evaluation of South Africa's Ability to Host the 2010 World Cup Soccer	774
Graham Myers, Geoff Goldman	➢ Mergers in Higher Education in South Africa Through the Eyes of the Staff Involved.	784
Aslıhan Nasır and Hakan Uyanık	➢ Consumer Satisfaction, Loyalty and Switching Behavior in Airline Industry	792
Larissa Nikovskaya, Vladimir Yakimets	➢ New Approach to Studying And Measuring a Public Policy Status	801
Fatima Bayma de Oliveira, Deborah Moraes Zouain and Francisco Marcelo Barone	➢ Distance Learning and Corporate Training in Brazil: The Importance of Educational Technology	808
Aslı Gül Öncel and Ömür Süer	➢ Foreign Bank Entry And Evolution of Efficiency: Evidence from Turkish Banking Sector	815

©Copyright 2008 by the Global Business and Technology Association. All Rights Reserved

Akmal Aini Othman	➢ Marketing Resources, Supply Chain Coordination And Business Performance in the Construction Industry: A Proposed Conceptual Paper	823
Taina Paju	➢ Outsourcing Product Development Internationally – Location and Objectives	827
Kathleen Park	➢ Value Creation in Metamorphic Merging? Acquirer Returns in Transformational Mega-Deals of the 1993-2000 Merger Wave	833
Lorenzo Petretto	➢ The Relationship Between Education Business Programs and New Entrepreneurship: An Overview of the U.S. Situation	839
Kullapapruk Piewthongngam, Supachai Pathumnakul, Sakda Khamjan	➢ Managing Supply Uncertainties: A Case of Thai Shrimp Industry	847
Mario Pinto	➢ Communion Economy Project: Joining Ethics and Competitive Advantage	855
Filipe Pinto, Alzira Marques, Manuel Filipe Santos	➢ Data Mining Approach in Relationship Marketing Database	862
Andries J du Plessis, Andrew E Marx, Gregory Wilson	➢ Do Your Employees' Ideas Enhance Innovation and Competitiveness in the Global Economy? Some Empirical Evidence	869
Thérèse du Plooy, Hennie Visser	➢ Billboards Advertising in South-Africa: An Exploratory Study	877
Rudra Prakash Pradhan	➢ Trade Openness and Economic Growth: Evidence from Trivariate Causality	885
Anna Putnová, Libor Žák, Pavel Seknička and Pavel Uhlář	➢ Corporate Social Responsibility As a Tool of Corporate Governance in Global Economy	892
Kugyte Ramune, Sliburyte Laimona	➢ A Modified Model of Service Provider Selection Criteria for Different Service Types	900

©Copyright 2008 by the Global Business and Technology Association. All Rights Reserved

Peter J Ras , Claribel Muller, Walter J Vermeulen	➢ Organising a Supply Chain And Its Participants in Order To Address Long Term Sustainability: An Exploratory Study of the Table Grape Industry	908
James Reardon, Vilte Auruskeviciene, Laura Salciuviene, Denny McCorkle, Vida Skudiene	➢ The Effect of Culture on Consumer Intellectual Property Theft: An Exploratory Analysis	917
Nichola Robertson and Robin N Shaw	➢ Consumer Dissatisfaction with Self-Service Technolgies: An Empirical Exploration of Its Antecedents	923
Eduardo Peixoto Rocha, José Antônio Arantes Salles	➢ Managers' Conceptions on Organizational Strategy in A Brazilian Firm In Telecommunications	931
André L. P. da Rocha, Caio A. Grynberg and Sergio F. Campos	➢ Characteristics and Return Assessment of Sponsorship Projects: Propositions for New Approaches	942
Sandra Regina da Rocha-Pinto and Gisele Rosenda Araujo Mello Del Carpio	➢ Lessons Learned through Balanced Scorecard Implementation	957
Jorge Augusto de Sá Brito e Freitas and Ana Christina Celano Teixeira	➢ Organizational Communication, Internationalization Process, and Construction of Organizational Identity	967
Alexander Samoldin	➢ Basic Stages of Marketing Development at Russian Enterprises	976
Birgitta Sandberg and Leena Aarikka-Stenroos	➢ Network Utilisation in the Commercialisation of Radical Innovations	980
Sílvia Cavadinha Cândido dos Santos, Ilsa Maria Araújo Galvão, Gilson dos Santos, Antonio Inocêncio Lima and Fátima Bayma de Oliveira, Fundação Getúlio Vargas	➢ From The Global To the Local: The Interiorization of the Social Tourism of the Sesc in the Hinterland of State Of Pernambuco - Brazil. A Case of Social Inclusion	988

©Copyright 2008 by the Global Business and Technology Association. All Rights Reserved

Rodrigo Costa dos Santos , Walter Gassenferth and Maria Augusta Soares Machado	➢ Systems Usability Evaluation Metrics Review	996
Eduardo Guilherme Satolo, Felipe Araújo Calarge, José Antonio Arantes Salles, Luis Eugenio Carretero Díaz	➢ The Implementation of Lean Production Principles in Spanish Companies: An Exploratory Research in the Automotive Industry	1004
Leon G. Schiffman, Elaine Sherman, Deborah Y. Cohn	➢ "Looking-In" on Global Consumer-Users: To Develop Better Product Feature Sets	1012
Pinar Sener	➢ As A Misconduct Indicator: Corruption and Its Effects on Turkish Economy	1020
Sununta Siengthai, K. Joanna Zaleska, Saranya Kantabutr	➢ Closing the Performance Evaluation Gap in Smes in Thailand: What Matters?	1028
Rita Gonçalves Ferreira da Silva	➢ Some Brief Considerations about Transparency in the Financial Markets	1035
Vladimir I. Soloviev	➢ Duopoly of Linux and Microsoft As Competing Server Operating Systems	1041
Alla N. Sterligova	➢ Comparative Analysis of Results of Integrating an Activity as A Subject of Enterprise Control	1045
Sonia Swanepoel	➢ The Predictive Validity of The Discus For Academic Success of Students	1052
Vilaiwan Thiangtong	➢ Economic Impact of Cross-Cultural Marriage on The Northeast of Thailand	1062
Kaya Tokmakçıoğlu	➢ Financial Crises and Early Warning Systems: An Application for Turkish Economy	1066

©Copyright 2008 by the Global Business and Technology Association. All Rights Reserved

THE EFFECT OF LEADER MEMBER EXCHANGE QUALITY ON EMPLOYEE'S PERCEPTION OF POLITICS AND ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR: THE MODERATING ROLE OF ORGANIZTIONAL JUSTICE

Sezer Günaydın Çalışkan
Haliç University, Turkey

ABSTRACT

Within this article the affect of leader member exchange quality (LMX) on the employees' perception of politics and organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) is investigated. The moderating affect of organizational justice composing of procedural, interactional and distributive justice is also tested. Employees with poor quality relationships can create harmful affects both for themselves and their organizations. Perception of political behavior(POPS) is one of them. On the other hand good quality relationships (high LMX) can increase extra role behaviors and contextual performance of the employees. Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is one of them. Within this context regression analysis supported that LMX has a low to moderate explanatory power on employee's POPS (a negative relationship) and this explanatory power further increases with higher procedural, interactional and distributive justice perceptions of the employees in other words organizational justice has a moderating affect. However, regression analysis further support that LMX has a very powerful explanatory power on organizational justice, and organizational justice has more explanatory power on POPS comparing LMX which means that justice can have an intervening affect between LMX and POPS. LMX has also a meaningful and significant explanatory power on OCB.

INTRODUCTION

Empirical studies show that 77 % of the employees in USA are dissatisfied with their jobs and they are unhappy. Studies about intention to turnover of employees states that the prior reason of their turnover is the poor and bad behaviors of their managers and supervisors. On the other hand, employees with poor and bad relationships even they stay in their companies, their level of job and life satisfaction and organizational commitment decreases and they are more open to psychological distress, burnout and depression, they have more conflict between their work and families. All of these recent analyses clearly remark the necessity to search more about the antecedents and consequences of the quality relationships between leaders and members (employees).

Leader-member exchange quality (LMX) is basically is a leadership theory which based on the dyadic relationship between the leader and the employee that is different from an average leadership model (Average Leadership Style, ALS)". (Schriesm, Castro & Cosliger, 1999; Dansereau, Graen & Haga, 1975). Within the last decade LMX may be one of the most searched, criticized and developed leadership approaches in the literature. LMX has influential affects on individual, group and organizational level. LMX is generally found to be associated with positive performance related employee behaviors and attitudes. LMX has either directly or with other OB variables an influence on high employee performance, (Liden, Wayne& Stidwell, 1993), job satisfaction and satisfaction with the supervision (Duchon, Green& Taber, 1986), organizational commitment (Nystrom, 1990), career development (Graen & Scandura, 1987), decrease in turnover and intention to turnover (Veccio, 1985; Schiriesheim, Castro, Cogliser, 1999).

©Copyright 2008 by the Global Business and Technology Association

Within this theoretical need, the subject of this article is to investigate the affect of LMX on two important organizational behavior variables namely "perception of politics (POPS)" and "organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs). In the preceding parts, the operational definitions and the theoretical explanations indicating the possible relationships between variables will be discussed.

LEADER MEMBER EXCHANGE QUALITY (LMX)

As it stated before leader-member exchange quality (LMX) theory explain the leadership process as a dyadic linkage between the leader and the member (employee, follower) (Gestner & Day, 1997).According to LMX theory, the quality of the relationship between supervisors and subordinates falls into 2 categories: in-group and out-group (Graen, 1976) Due to time pressures, supervisors develop close relationships with a few key subordinates. These subordinates are referred to in-group. In-groups are characterized by high levels of interaction, support, trust and formal / informal rewards. (High quality LMX)The other category, out-group is characterized by low levels of interaction, support, trust & rewards. In managing the out group, the supervisor relies primarily on formal rules, policies and authority. (Low quality LMX).

The in group and out group exchanges are similar to the concept of "economic exchange" and "social exchange" described by Blau (1988). Economic exchange is contractual in nature. The obligations of the members are clearly defined, thus the conditions of the exchange can be enforced and do not rest on interpersonal trust (Graen & Uhl- Bien, 1995). Out group exchange as one where the supervisor relies almost exclusively upon the formal employment contract in his or her exchanges with the employee, the supervisor can fulfill the employment contract without entering into any or minimal social exchanges. In contrast, social exchange is based on trust and implicit obligations (Dansereau, Graen & Haga, 1975). Thus one member of the exchange may perform a service for the other party without a specified outcome or reward. Leaders encourage their employees to take further responsibility and provide necessary support and resources to reach their goals. (Wang, Law, Wang & Chen, 2001). This social interaction and exchange between the leader and the member increases the quality of the relationship.

In recent studies LMX is measured as a multi dimensional construct (Liden & Maslyn, 1998; Dienesch & Liden, 1986, Wang, Law, Wang & Chen, 2001). Wang et al. (2001) states that LMX is composed of four constructs:

(1) Affect: The interaction and affect between the supervisor and subordinate besides job related values.
(2) Loyalty: Commitment to the achievement of shared goals between the supervisor and the subordinate.
(3) Contribution: The amount, quality and the direction of the contribution of the parties to the achievement of shared goals.
(4) Professional Respect: The reputation of the dyad to realize their tasks and jobs successfully.

An important component of social exchange theory that is useful in understanding the relationship between LMX and subordinate behavior is "the norm of reciprocity" (Gouldner, 1960). A high quality exchange may create a sense of obligation on the part of the subordinate to reciprocate in terms of the behaviors valued by the supervisor. High quality exchanges tend to be associated with employee behavior that benefits the supervisor and goes beyond the formal job duties (Linden& Graen, 1980). In other words if an employee's perception of LMX is high he/she will reciprocate by increasing his support and performance toward his leader and his company. Therefore it isn't wrong to think that high quality LMX may increase the extra role behaviors toward the leader and the organization. One of these extra role behaviors is "organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs)" which is also in the scope of this article. In the preceding paragraphs OCB and its possible relationship with LMX will be discussed.

ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR (OCB)

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is referred as set of discretionary workplace behaviors that exceed one's basic job requirements (Bateman & Organ, 1983). They are often described as behaviors that go beyond the call of duty. Other examples of OCB are willingness to take steps to prevent problems with other employees, and obeying organization rules, regulations and procedures even when no one is watching. In the literature several dimensions of OCBs are stated such as, 'helping' behaviors by employees (e.g. supportive actions to assist others and

©Copyright 2008 by the Global Business and Technology Association

going beyond the requirements of the job); 'sportsmanship' (tolerating the work environment without excessive complaining); and 'civic duty' (constructive involvement in the processes of the organization beyond the requirement of the job). Smith, Organ & Near (1983) identified 2 dimensions of OCB: altruism & compliance. Altruism refers to behaviors aimed at helping another person such as assisting the supervisor with his/ her work, helping others who have been absent, orienting new people. Compliance refers to impersonal behaviors such as not taking undeserved breaks or time off, being punctual, giving advance notice if unable to come to work. Williams & Anderson (1991) summed these components of OCB under two major components: OCBO (citizenship behaviors benefiting the organization) and OCBI (Citizenship behaviors benefiting the individuals). OCBI component mostly match with altruism and helping behaviors and OCBO mostly match with conscientiousness and compliance (Organ & Konovsky, 1989; Smith, Organ & Near, 1983; Wayne & Green, 1993). In this paper, OCBs will be evaluated within the context of OCBI and OCBO. As Williams & Anderson (1991) stated it is important to search these two components differently since they may have different antecedents.

THE INTERACTION OF LMX AND OCB

Following social exchange theory, OCB may be related to LMX: OCB is not required or part of the formal reward system that an employee who engages in OCB isn't formally rewarded. However OCB may be informally rewarded through LMX. It seems that an employee who engages in OCB would be contributing to the department's efficiency and effectiveness and thus helping the supervisor. Thus, **OCB may be used as a way of reciprocating for support from the supervisor** (Liden & Graen, 1980). Subordinates may engage in OCB and perform at a high level to reciprocate for rewards and support provided by the supervisor, thus maintaining a balanced or equitable social exchange with the supervisor. A number of field studies have found support for the relation between LMX and OCB (Setton, Bennett & Liden, 1996; Wayne& Green, 1993; Settoon, Bennett, & Liden, 1996; Wayne & Green, 1993; Wayne, Shore & Liden, 1997). So,

H1a: LMX has a significant explanatory power on OCBs.

H1b: LMX's explanatory power on OCB can be different for OCBIs and OCBOs.

PERCEPTION OF POLITICS (POPS) AND ITS INTERACTION WITH LMX

Organizational politics refers to the actions by individuals which are directed toward the goal of furthering their own self interests without regard for the well being of others or their organization (Kacmar & Baron, 1999; Drory & Romm, 1990; Ferris, Frink, Beehr and Gilmore, 1995; Ferris & Kacmar, 1992; Ferris & Judge, 1991, Pfeffer, 1992). Examples include, bypassing chain of command to gain approval, going through improper channels to obtain special equipment, lobbying high level managers just prior to promotion decisions.(Andrews& Kacmar, 2001).Contemporary research began addressing organizational politics as perceptual phenomenon with negative consequences for those who perceive it to occur (Gandz& Murray,1980; Ferris & Kachmar, 1992)Those who perceived politics occurring within their organization experience reduced job satisfaction, organizational commitment, increased job stress and more likely to leave the organization. (Kacmar, Bateman, Carlson, Anthony, 1999).

Ferris and Kacmar (1992) in their integrated study about POPS found that the quality of the relationship that is conducted with the supervisors is one of the important determinants of POPS. POPS increases in the uncertainty and low trust environments. LMX decreases the level of uncertainty and increase the level of trust. At the same time according to the social exchange theory and the norm of reciprocity, an employee who has high level of LMX perception decreases the level of his/ her harmful or deviant behaviors toward their supervisors. They have no need to use some political tactics to increase their self interests despite their supervisors or companies' aims and interests. In a high quality relationship the employee is already secure and knows that his supervisor protects and maintains his/her interests, gives the necessary information, support and resources to his /her employee and involves him to the decision making procedures. Therefore we can hyphotize that:

H2: When the quality of the relationship between supervisor and subordinate decreases the level of perception of politics increases.

©Copyright 2008 by the Global Business and Technology Association

ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE AS A MODERATOR BETWEEN LMX AND POPS

Organizational justice in important determinant of employee behaviors and attitudes (Masterson et.al., 2000) like job and payment satisfaction (Folger & Konovsky, 1989; Mc Farlin & Sweeney, 1992), performance Cowherd & Levine, 1992), intention to turnover and absenteeism (Hulin, 1991). Organizational justice is composed of three components: distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice (Pillai, Schriesheim & Williams, 1999). Procedural justice concerns the fairness of the ways used to determine the distribution of resources among employees (Greenberg, 1990). Croponzano & Greenberg (1997) distinguished between structural and social aspects of procedural justice. Structural determinants involve formal rules & policies concerning decisions that affect employees, including adequate notice before decisions are implemented, receipts of accurate information and voice (i.e. employee input in the decision process)(Thibaut&Walker,1975) . Social aspects of procedural justice sometimes called interactional justice, involve the quality of interpersonal treatment in resource allocation. Social aspects include treating employees with dignity and respect and providing employees with information concerning how outcomes are determined (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997; Tyler & Bies, 1990). Distributive justice refers to the perceived fairness of the allocation of resources by the organization. Members make evaluations about whether the outcomes (e.g. performance ratings, pay promotions) offered by the organization are fair given to the amount of effort they have put forth (Folger & Konovsky, 1989; Mc Farlin & Sweeney, 1992).

Researches have shown that, in group members perceived a higher level of fairness (organizational justice) than do out-group members (Sias& Jablin, 1995; Vecciho & Griffeth, 1986). Those members who are in the in- group (high quality LMX), are often involved in making decisions through their increased interactions with the supervisor (Wayne et al., 1994). This involvement in decision making (voice & choice) has been proposed as a means of control, decreases the level of uncertainty. So we can hyphotize that in justice environments the level of POPS decreases. So, except the direct relation between LMX and POPS as it is stated before, "organizational justice" can moderate the relationship between LMX and POPS. And even we can say that in organizational justice climates, the level of POPS can decrease even LMX is low. Or in other words justice components can compensate the effect of LMX on POPS since both of these variables decreases the level of uncertainty and created a trusting environment.

So we can hyphotize that:

H3: Organizational justice is a moderator in the relationship between LMX and POPS.

H4: Organizational justice can compensate the effect of LMX on POPS.

The studies in literature supports that interactional justice mostly affect employee attitudes toward the supervisor or has a direct influence on satisfaction with the supervisor and OCBI (organizational citizenship behavior toward the supervisor) whereas the procedural justice mostly affect employee attitudes toward the company like organizational commitment and intention to quit (Masterson and Taylor, 1996; Maletesta and Byrne; 1997, Moorman, 1991). Within this context the preceding hypothesis can be developed:

H5: The level of moderating affect of organizational justice between LMX and POPS will be different for the different components of organizational justice.

METHOD

Sampling and Procedure

120 employees that work in banking and transportation sector in Istanbul, Turkey are participated to the study. The questionnaires are distributed anonoumously within the period of 1 month. Most of the participants work 5-10 years in their companies (%60). 40% of them are women and 60 % are men and their age average is 35. Most of the participants are single (60%) and 73 % are university graduate.

Measures

©Copyright 2008 by the Global Business and Technology Association

Leader-Member Exchange Quality (LMX): Liden & Maslyn (1998)'s 16 item multidimensional LMX questionnaire is used. *Organizational justice*: Moorman (1991)'s composed of 17 items is used. 6 of them measures distributive justice, 6 of them measures procedural justice and 5 of them measures interactional justice. *Perception of politics (POPS):* Kipnis, Schmidt and Wilkinson (1980)'s political tactics scale is used by changing items to perceptions. The questionnaire is composed of 18 items including "coalitions", "self-promotion", "ingratiation", "upward appeal" and "exchange of favors" *Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB):* Williams & Anderson (1991)'s 14 items scale is used.

FINDINGS AND RESULTS

Factor Analysis

All of the questionaires were entered to the factor analysis. The factor structure of the 18 items LMX (MDN) questionnaire (Liden& Maslynb, 1998) are the same with the original component analysis with the Turkish sample. SPSS computed four factors: Professional respect, Affect, Loyalty and Contribution. The reliability analysis applied to the factors indicates that inter item reliability of Professional respect is . 93; Affect .91; Loyalty .87 and Contribution is .83. The same analysis is made to the Moorman's 17 item "organizational justice" scale. The factor structure of the scale is again like the original one with the Turkish sample. 3 components are justified with the same items under the same components: procedural justice, interactional justice and distributive justice. The inter item reliability scores (Cronbach Alpha's) fort he distributive justice is .94, procedural justice . 91 and interactional justice . 83. POPS questionnaire scales are entered to the factor analysis and four components are computed. Among 18 items the questions which decreases the inter iten reliability and the low factor loadings are excluded from the analysis. The final factor structure analysis of the POPS scale (Kipnis, Schmidt ve Wilkonson, 1980) is stated in Table 1.

Table 1. Factor Structure and Inter item Reliability of the Perception of Politics (POPS) Questionnaire

FACTOR NAME	FACTOR LOADING	EXPLAINED VARIANCE %	CRONBACH ∝
SELF PROMOTION		%23	
			.91
Pretending to be successfull .	.91		
Exagerating the KSAs	89		
Pretending to be intellectual	85		
INGRATIATION		%20	
			.78
Waiting for the happiest time of the supervisor	.82		
Being friendly when something is wanted from the supervisor	.80 .80		
Being humble when something is wanted from the supervisor	.79		
COALITION		%17	
			.81
Taking support of the subordinates against the supervisor	.92		
Building coalition groups with coworkers against the supervisor	.90		
EXCHANGE OF FAVORS		%15	
			.74
Calling attention to the past favors while demanding something from someone	.80		
Showing dedicated efforts to make the supervisor expect his demands	.80		
While making a goodness reminding that this will be	.62		

©Copyright 2008 by the Global Business and Technology Association

CUMULATIVE VARIANCE		%77
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin	: .785	
Bartlett Test of Sphericity		
App. Chi-Square	: 538, 646	
Df	: .55	
Significance	: .000	

All of the 14 items of Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale(OCB) by Williams & Anderson (1991) were entered to factor analysis. With the Turkish sample three components were computed. The items decreasing inter item realibility and the questions that aren't computed in one of the factors are excluded from the analysis. The final factor structure is exhibited in Table 2 : OCBIs (citizenship behaviors benefiting the organization) are indicated in "courtesy" and "altruism" factors composing of of total 7 items and the OCBOs are indicated in "conscientiousness" factor composing of total 2 items.

Table 2: Factor structure and the inter item reliability of OCB questionnaire

	FACTOR NAME FACTOR LOADING	EXPLAINED VARIANCE %	CRONBACH ∝
COURTESY			
%29	.80		
Avoiding creating problems for the colleagues and supervisors	.85		
Taking the opinions of the peers before deciding	,77		
To protect the company resources	,69		
Considering the affects of actions on others	,67		
Helping the new comers to the company	.55		
CONSCIENTIOUSNESS		%22	.87
Giving advance notice if unable to come to work	.92		
Not taking undeserved breaks or time off	,86		
ALTRUISM		%21	. 88
Helping others who have been absent	, 91		
Helping others who has over workload	, 90		
CUMULATIVE VARIANCE		%73	
KMO : 72,878			
Bartlett Test of Sphericity			
App. Chi Square	: 447,276		
Df	: 36		
Significance	:,000		

Regression Analysis Explaining the Relationships between LMX and OCBs

To test the magnitude and the direction of the explanatory power of LMX on OCB dimensions, three regression models are analyzed since OCB dependents are courtesy, conscientiousness and altruism. None of the components of LMX has a meaningful explanatory power on OCB's courtesy factor. However LMX components significantly explain the "altruism (OCBI)" and "conscientiousness (OCBO)" components of OCB scale. H1 is approved. But there is no difference between the explanatory power of LMX on OCBI and OCBO components which means that LMX can both increase OCBO and OCBI levels. H1a is rejected. Table 3 and Table 4 exhibit the meaningful relations.

©Copyright 2008 by the Global Business and Technology Association

Table 3: Explanatory power of LMX components on "conscientiousness" component of OCB

Dependent variable: Conscientiousness component of OCB			
Independent variables: LMX (Contribution, Affect, Professional Respect and Loyalty)			
R Square: 13 F test: 3,680 Significance: .008			
Variables entered to the regression model:	Beta	T	Significance
Professional Respect	, 27	2,398	, 01
Affect	. 26	1.920	, 05
Contribution	, 31	2,865	, 00

Table 4: Explanatory power of LMX components on "altruism" component of OCB

Dependent variable: Altruism component of OCB			
Independent variables: LMX (Contribution, Affect, Professional Respect and Loyalty)			
R Square: 13 F test: 4,607 Significance: .005			
Variables entered to the regression model:	Beta	T	Significance
Affect	, 322	2,584	, 011
Contribution	. 242	2.265	, 026
Loyalty	, 277	2,161	, 033

Regression Analysis Explaining the Relationships between LMX, Organizational Justice and Perception of Politics

To be able to test the explanatory power of LMX on POPS, all of the components of LMX are regressed on each component of POPS namely: ingratiation, self- promotion, exchange of favors and coalition building. The results are exhibited in Table 5. As the R Square indicates models have a low explanatory power. The results approve the explanatory power of LMX on POPS with a low explanatory power so H2 is partially accepted.

Table 5: Regression Analysis Explaining the effect of LMX on POPS

Dependent variable: "Self promotion" component of POPS			
Independent variables: LMX (Contribution, Affect, Professional Respect and Loyalty)			
R Square: .08 F Test: 9, 1809 Significance: 003			
Variables entered to the regression model:	Beta	T	Significance
Professional Respect	-, 29	-3,030	.003
Dependent Variable: "Ingratiation" component of POPS			
Independent variables: LMX (Contribution, Affect, Professional Respect and Loyalty)			
R Square: .04 F test: 4,142 Significance: .004			
Variables entered to the regression model:	Beta	T	Significance
Professional Respect	-, 20	-2,035	. 04
Dependent variable: "Upward Appeal" component of POPS			
Independent variable: LMX (Contribution, Affect, Professional Respect and Loyalty)			
R Square: .08 F test: 8,486 Significance: .004			
Variables entered to the regression model:	Beta	T	Significance
Professional respect	-, 28	-2,913	, 004

©Copyright 2008 by the Global Business and Technology Association

In the second step of the regression analysis, the explanatory power of LMX components are regressed on organizational justice variables composed of procedural justice, distributive justice and interact ional justice. As it is shown from the Table 6, LMX has a significant explanatory power on all of the justice variables with high Beta scores. The Adjusted R Square scores indicate a moderate to high explanatory power of LMX on organizational justice. The highest Beta score is computed between LMX and "interactional justice" variable.

Table 6: Explanatory power of LMX on Procedural, Distributive and Interact ional Justice

Independent variable: LMX
Dependent variables: Procedural, Distributive and Interact ional Justice

	Beta	t	Significance	Adjusted R Square
Distributive Justice	, 46	5,219	, 000	.20
Procedural Justice	, 61	7,836	, 000	.37
Interact ional Justice	, 73	10,873	, 000	, 23

In the third step of the regression analysis, to test the moderating affect of organizational justice between LMX and POPS all of the LMX and organizational justice components are entered as independents into the regression model. The meaningful results are exhibited in Table 7 and 8. Within the interaction model, procedural justice has the only variable that entered to the regression model explaining " ingratiation"; interact ional justice is the only variable entered to the regression model explaining "upward appeal" and "ingratiation". These results indicates that procedural justice and interact ional justice has more explanatory power ob POPS components comparing to LMX variables within the same interact ional regression model which means that justice perceptions can compensate the affect of LMX on POPS and organizational justice is a powerful moderator (H3 and H4 is accepted). On the other hand as Table 8 indicates LMX has a powerful explanatory power on organizational justice which means that LMX explain justice and justice explain POPS. These relationships enforce the argument that LMX influences POPS via organizational justice. Procedural and interact ional justice has more explanatory power comparing to distributive justice which means that the level of moderating affect of organizational justice between LMX and POPS will be different for the different components of organizational justice (H5 is accepted).

Table 7: Explanatory power of LMX and Organizational Justice Components in interaction on "Self-Promotion"

Dependent Variable: Self promotion component of POPS
Independent Variables: LMX (Contribution, Affect, Professional Respect and Loyalty); Organizational Justice (Procedural, Interact ional and Distributive Justice)
R: .322 R Square: .10 F test: 11.466 Significance: .001

Variables entered to the regression model:	Beta	T	Significance
Procedural justice	-, 32	-3,386	, 001

Table 8: Explanatory power of LMX and Organizational Justice Components in interaction on "Upward Appeal"

Dependent variable: Upward Appeal component of POPS
Independent variables: LMX (Contribution, Affect, Professional Respect and Loyalty); Organizational Justice (Procedural, Interact ional and Distributive Justice)
R: .302 R Square: 09 F testi: 9.858 Significance: .002

Variables entered to the regression model:	Beta	T	Significance
Interact ional justice	-, 30	-3.140	, 002

DISCUSSION AND MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

The important finding of this article is that the positive relationship between LMX and OCBs are approved. As Organ (1988) noted that OCB is held to be vital to the survival of an organization. Organ further elaborated that

©Copyright 2008 by the Global Business and Technology Association

organizational citizenship behavior can maximize the efficiency and productivity of both the subordinates and the organization that ultimately contribute to the effective functioning of an organization. OCB is desirable from the organizational point of view because such behavior is thought to increase the available resources and decrease the need for costly mechanism of control (Organ, 1988). As the results indicate, LMX not only increases the OCB behaviors toward the individuals namely the managers but it also has an equal affect on the OCBs toward the company. So to increase contextual performance and extra role behaviors of the employees, developing high quality relationships with the employees is crucially important. Managers have to give attention to build and maintain high quality relationships to increase the efficiency and productivity of the company.

The findings of this research also approve that LMX and organizational justice can compensate each other in the explanation of the employees' perception of political behavior. So managers have to give importance to increasing the level of procedural and justice perceptions of employees to detect the negative affects of POPS on the company. They have to behave in respect and dignity to their employees, at the same time they have to give a chance to "voice" and "choice" to their employees about the decisions related to employees. Even tough LMX has a low explanatory power on LMX comparing to justice perceptions, the results show that developing high quality relationships also prevent employees from harmful and destructive behaviors of the company. So developing a trustful and qualified relationship is in the hands on managers. The most important limitation of the research is to use convenience sampling due to time constraints, but the same model can be generalized by using a larger sample and with the different sectors and the companies.

REFERENCES

Allen, R.W., Madison, D.L, Porter, L.W., Renwick, P.A & Mayes, B.T. (1980). Organizational Polities: Tactiets and characteristics of its actors. *California Management Review*, 22: 77-83.

Andrews, M.C., & Kacmar, K.M. (2001).Discriminating among organizational politics, justice, and support. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 22: 347-376.

Bateman, T.S., & Organ, D.W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier. The relationship between affect and employee citizenship. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26.587-595

Blau, G. (1988). An investigation of the apprenticeship organizational socialization strategy. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 32: 176-195.

Cowherd, D.M., Levine, D.I., (1992). Product quality and pay equity between lower level employees and top management: an investigation of distributive justice theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 37. 302- 320.
Cropanzano, R. & Greenberg, J., (1997). Progress in organizational justice: Tunneling through the maze. C.L. Cooper & T. Robertson (Ed.), *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*: 317-372. New York: John Willey & Sons.

Cropanzano, R., Howes J.C., Grandey A.A., Toth P. (1997). The relationship of organizational politics and support to work behaviors, attitudes and stress. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 18: 15-180.

Dansereau, F., Graen G., & Haga, W.J. (1975). A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership within formal organizations: A longitudinal investigation of the role making process. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance*, 13: 46-48.

Dienesh, R.M., & Liden, R.C. (1986). Leader-member exchange model of leadership: A critique and further development. *Academy of Management Review*, 11: 618- 634.

Drory, A., &Romm, T. (1990). The definition of organizational politics: A review. *Human Relations*, 43. 1133-1145.

Duchon, D., Green, S.G., & Taber, T.D. (1986). Vertical dyad linkage: A longitudinal assessment of antecedents, measures, and consequences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 71: 56-60.

©Copyright 2008 by the Global Business and Technology Association

Ferris, G.R., Frink, D.D., Beehr, T.A., & Gilmore, D.C. (1995). Political fairness and fair politics: The conceptual integration of divergent constructs. R. Cropanzano, & M.K. Kacmar, (Ed.). *Organizational Politics, Justice & Support: Managing the Social Climate of Workplace*, Quaroom Books, Westpor. s. 21-36.

Ferris, G.R. & Judge, T.A. (1991). Personnel/ human resources management: A political influence perspective. *Journal of Management*, 18. 93-116.

Ferris, G.R., & Kacmar, K.M. (1992). Perceptions of organizational Politics. *Journal of Management*. 18 (1): 93-116.
Folger, R., & Konovsky, M. (1989). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reaction to pay raise decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32: 115-130.

Gandz, J. & Murray, V.V. (1980). The experience of work politics. *Academy of Management Journal*. *23*(2): 237-251.
Gerstner, C.R., & Day, D.V. (1997). Meta- analytic review of leader- member exchange theory: correlated and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. *82* (6). 827.

Gilliand, S.W. (1993). The perceived fairness of selection systems. An organizational justice perspective. *Academy of Management Review*. *18* (4): 694-734.

Gouldner, A.W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. . *American Sociological Review*, 25, 161-178.
Graen, G.B. (1976). Role–making processes within complex organizations.M.D. Dunette(Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial & Organizational Psychology*, 1201- 1245. Chicago, Rand Mc Nally.
Graen, G.B., & Scandura, T.A. (1987). Toward a psychology of dyadic organizing. L.L.Cumings & B.M. Staw (Ed.), *Research in organizational behavior*, Vol. 9, 175-208. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Graen, G.B., & Cahsman, J. (1975). A role making model of leadership in formal organizations: A development approach. J.G. Hunt & L.L. Larson (Ed.), *Leadership frontiers*, 143-165. Kent, OH: Kent State University.

Graen, G.B., & Uhl- Bien, M. (1995). Relationship- based approach to leadership: Development of Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years. Applying a multilevel multi-domain perspective. *Leadership Quarterly*. *6*, 219-247.

Greenberg, L. (1990). Organizational Justice: Yesterday, today, tomorrow. *Journal of Management, 16*: 399-432.
Hulin, C. (1991). Adaptation, persistence, and commitment in organizations. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 32: 176-195.

Kacmar, K.M., & Baron, R.A. (1999).Organizational Politics: The state of the field links to related processes, and an agenda of future research.G.R. Ferris (Ed.), *Research in personnel and human resources management, 15*,47-119. Greenwich, CT. JAI Press.

Kacmar, K.M., Bozeman, D.P., Carlson, D.S., & Anthony, W.P. (1999). An examination of the perceptions of organizational politics model: Replication and extension. *Human Relations*. 52, 383-416.

Kipnis, D., Schmidt, S.M. & Wilkinson, I. (1980). Intraorganizational influence tactics: exploration's in getting one's way. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 65: 440-452.
Liden, R.C., & Maslyn, J.M. (1998). Multidimensionality of leader- member exchange: An empirical assessment through scale development. *Journal of Management*. *24*. 43-72.

Liden, R.C., Sparrow, R.T., & Wayne, S.J. (1997). Leader – Member Exchange Theory: The past and potential for the future. G. Ferris (Ed.), *Research in Personnel And Human Resources Management*. 15, 47-119, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

©Copyright 2008 by the Global Business and Technology Association

Liden, R.C., Wayne, S.J., & Stidwell, D. (1993). A longitudinal study on the early development of leader-member exchanges, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78. 662- 674.

Linden, R., & Graen, G. (1980). Generalizability of the vertical dyad linkage model of leadership. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 656- 669.

Maletesta, R.M., & Byrne, Z.S. (1997). The impact of formal and interact ional justice on outcomes. *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the society for Industrial & Organizational Psychology*. St. Louis.

Masterson, S.S. & Taylor, M.S. (1996). The broadening of procedural justice: Should interact ional and procedural components be separate theories? *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy Management*, Cincinati.

Masterson, S.S., Lewis, K., Goldman, B.M., Taylor, M.S. (2000). Integrating justice and social exchange: the differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on work relationships. *Academy of Management Journal, 43* (4). p. 738.

Mayes, B.T & Allen, R.W. (1997). Toward a definition of organizational politics. *Academy of Management Review, 2,* 672-678.

Mc Farlin, D.B., & Sweeney, P.D. (1992). Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35. 626-637.

Moorman (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviour. Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 848-855.

Nystrom, P.C. (1990). Vertical exchanges and organizational commitments of American business managers. *Group & Organization Studies*, 15. 296-312.

Organ, D.W. (1988). *Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington Books, Lexington.

Organ, D.W., & Konovsky, M. (1989). Cognitive versus affective determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74: 157-164.

Pillai, R., Schriesheim, C.A., & Williams E.W. (1999). Fairness perceptions and trust as mediators for transformational and transactional leadership: A two sample study. *Journal of Management*, 25(6), 897- 933.

Pfeffer, J. (1992). *Managing with Power: Politics and Influence in Organizations*. Harward Business School Press. USA.

Schiriesheim, C.A., Castro, S.L., Cogliser, C.C. (1999). Leader – Member Exchange (LMX) research: A comprehensive review of theory, measurement, and data- analytic practices. *Leadership Quarterly, 10*(1), 63-113.

Settoon, R.P., Bennett, N., Liden, R.C. (1996). Social exchange in organizations. Perceived organizational support, leader- member exchange and employee reciprocity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*. 219-227.

Sias, P.M. & Jablin, F.M. (1995). Differential superior and subordinate relations, perceptions of fairness, and co-worker communication. *Human Communication Research, 22*. 5-38.

Smith, C.A., Organ, D.W. & Near, J.P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 68*, 653-663.

Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural Justice: A Psychological Analysis*. Hillsdale, NS: Erlbaum Associates.

©Copyright 2008 by the Global Business and Technology Association

Tyler, T.R., & Bies, R.J. (1990). Beyond formal procedures: Interpersonal context of procedural justice. J.S. Caroll (Ed.) *Applied Social Psychology and Organizational Settings*. 77- 98. NJ. Lawrence Erlbaoum Associates.

Vecciho, R.P., Griffeth, R.W. (1986).The predictive utility of vertical dyad linkage approach. *Journal of Social Psychology, 126*, 617-625.

Vecciho, R.P. (1985). Predicting employee turnover from leader- member exchange: A failure to replicate. *Academy of Management Journal, 28*, 478-485.

Wang, H., Law, K.S., Wang, D.X. & Chen, Z.X. (2001). The linkage role of LMX: A mediating effect of LMX on the relationship between transformational leadership and followers' performance and OCB. *The Hong Kong University of Science & Technology*. Wanghui. ust.hk.

Wayne, S.J. & Green, S.A. (1993). The effects of leader-member exchange on employee citizenship and impression management behavior. *Human Relations. 46*(12), 1431-1441.

Wayne, S.J. & Shore, L.M., Liden, R.C. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *Academy of Management Journal, 40*, 82-111.

Williams, L.J. & Anderson, S.E. (1991). Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment as Predictors of Organizational Citizenship and In- Role Behaviors. *Journal of Management*. 17(3), p.601.

©Copyright 2008 by the Global Business and Technology Association

THE IMPACT OF PATERNALIST LEADERSHIP ON RESISTANCE TO CHANGE: THE MODERATING AFFECT OF LMX AND POLITICAL SKILL

Sezer Günaydın Çalışkan
Haliç University, Istanbul
Aslı Erim
Istanbul Commerce University, Istanbul

ABSTRACT

Within this research model the impact of a culturally specific model of leadership namely "benevolent leadership" on resistance to change will be investigated. Two levels of moderators are also included into the model. One is about the context of the relationship namely: leader member exchange quality and the other is an individual level variable namely: political skill. The impact of these moderators on resistance to change seems to be a new research idea when we review the resistance to change literature.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Resistance to Change and Leadership

Organizational change is an empirical observation in an organizational entity of variations in shape, quality or state over time (Van de Ven and Poole, 1995), after the deliberate introduction of new ways of thinking, acting, operating (Schalk et al., 1998). Organizations in today's business environment have to implement numerous regulatory, economic, competitive and technological organizational changes to survive in order to improve in performance or compete better. Every change brings potential benefits and risks.

It has been argued that employee reactions to change e.g., resistance to change and support for change have critical implications for the outcomes of organizational change (Kotter, 1995). The reasons for the failure of many change initiative can be found in resistance to change. The term resistance to change is used on organizational change, usually as an explanation for why efforts to introduce large-scale changes in technology, production methods, management practices or, compensation systems fall short of expectations, or fail altogether (Oreg, 2006). Resistance to change introduces costs and delays into the change process (Ansoff, 1990) that are difficult to anticipate (Del Val, Fuentes, 2003).

The context-specific antecedents of resistance have been addressed in many researches. Whereas some antecedents have to do with the outcomes of change such as losing or gaining power. According to Dent and Goldberg (1999), organizational members resist negative consequences (e.g., losing one's job) and not necessarily change in itself. Others focus on the way in which change is implemented such as the amount of information about the change is given to employees (Oreg, 2006). Therefore, the belief that people resist change hinders organizations' changes of understanding and dealing with real organizational problems. *At this point we believe that leadership plays an important and critical role on managing resistance to change*. With the right strategies and tactics, leaders can minimize the resistance to change in their organizations. Nult (1987) has examined the tactics used by leaders to implement change. Research on overcoming resistance to change centers

©Copyright 2008 by the Global Business and Technology Association

on the effects of subordinate participation in decisions about the change. Thus, for Nult (1987) participation is an implantation tactic designed to reduce resistance. Lawler (1986) and Lawrence (1969) show that participation can lead to significant reductions in resistance.

Leaders can demonstrate organizational support by effecting and communicating efforts that go well beyond what is required. The higher level of mistrust in the organization's leaders, the lower the likelihood that changes will survive. These factors contribute to an environment that more readily accepts and promotes change (Krause, 2008). Leaders' behaviors that influence perceptions of trustworthiness include consistency, integrity, sharing control in decision making and through delegation, communication and benevolence, therefore, in this research, benevolent leadership on resistance to change will be investigated.

A culturally Specific Leadership Model: Paternalist Leadership

Paternalist leadership consists of 3 elements: Authoritarian leadership, benevolent leadership and moral leadership.

Authoritarian leaders stress their unquestionable and absolute authority and they will take rigorous control over their subordinates and demand complete obedience from them. The concrete behaviors that characterize authoritarian leadership are control and domination underestimating the ability of subordinates, building a lofty image of the leader and instructing subordinates in a didactic style (Cheng, 1995). As distinct from the supervisory power coming from the position in the West, the power of authoritarian leadership reflects familism, paternalistic control and submission to the authority.

Benevolent leader is a leader who displays personal, overall and long term concern for the well being of subordinates. It differs from leader consideration (Stodgill, 1974) and supportive leadership. Benevolent leadership goes beyond the work domain and it is also applied to personal issues, is long term oriented, involves the granting of grace and protection to subordinates, and is exercised in the context of strong authority so that the subordinate don't forget who is the boss.

Moral leadership is characterized of a high degree of personal integrity, self-cultivation and selflessness. A moral leader should demonstrate behavior that their authority isn't only for personal benefit but also for the public good. The actual behavior includes unselfishness, being upright and responsible, leading by example, and not mixing with business interests with personal interests (Cheng, Chou, Fang, 2000).

In paternalistic cultures the employees voluntarily accept the authority of their managers and leaders. Managers are like "father figures". They give help, assistance and support to their employees in return for an unquestioned commitment and loyalty to the leader and his objectives. Paternalist leaders take decisions in the name of their employees because they have an assumption that "I know better than you" against their employees. Within that theoretical explanation we can assume that paternalistic leadership can reduce the employee's uncertainty perceptions, in such a relationship followers believe that the leader will protect him against the uncertainties that the change brings and he will take the right decisions in the name of themselves. A family culture can prevail in paternalistic leadership environments. So as a culturally specific model paternalistic leadership can facilitate change and reduce the negative reactions of the followers to change especially in a paternalist culture like Turkey.

Leader Member Exchange Quality (LMX) and Resistance to Change

Leader-member exchange quality (LMX) theory explain the leadership process as a dyadic linkage between the leader and the member (employee, follower) (Gestner & Day, 1997).According to LMX theory, the quality of the relationship between supervisors and subordinates falls into 2 categories: in-group and out-group (Graen,1976) Due to time pressures, supervisors develop close relationships with a few key subordinates. These subordinates are referred to in-group. In-groups are characterized by high levels of interaction, support, trust and formal / informal rewards. (High quality LMX)The other category, out-group is characterized by low levels of interaction, support, trust & rewards. In managing the out group, the supervisor relies primarily on formal rules, policies and authority. (Low quality LMX).When the LMX quality is high,

©Copyright 2008 by the Global Business and Technology Association

resistance to change will decrease since a high LMX context reduces the level of uncertainty. The employees in the in-group will have much more access to information channels, they will be more participated and included to the decision processes and they take more respect, consideration, help and support from their managers. In a changing environment with high level of uncertainty employees perceiving a high LMX level, by perceiving a trusting environment will be able to cope with this uncertain situation (Farr Watton & Brunetto, 2007). Therefore it can be assumed that resistance to change will decrease in a high quality leader-member exchange relationship. Paternalistic leadership decreases resistance to change and a high LMX context can further increases this affect so LMX can be considered a moderator between paternalistic leadership and resistance to change.

Political Skill and Resistance to Change

Political skill of the employees can have a similar uncertainty reducing affect on resistance to change. Political skill is the ability to effectively understand others at work, and to use such knowledge to influence others to act in ways that enhance one's personal or organizational objectives (Douglas & Ammeter, 2004). Politically skilled individuals convey a sense of personal security and calm self-confidence that attracts others and gives them a feeling of comfort. People high in political skill not only know what to do in different social situations at work but how to do it in a manner that disguises any ulterior, self- serving motives and appears to be sincere.

There are 4 key dimensions under political skill construct (Ferris, Treadway, Kolodinsky, Hochwater, Kacmar, Douglas and Frink (2005): Social astuteness: People high in this dimension have an accurate understanding of social situations as well as the interpersonal interactions that take place in these settings. Interpersonal influence: Politically skilled individuals have a subtle and convincing personal style that exerts a powerful influence on those around them. Individuals high on this dimension are capable of adapting and calibrating their behavior to each situation in order to elicit particular responses from others. Indeed interpersonal influence dimension capture what Pfeffer (1992) referred to as "flexibility" which involves adopting one's behavior situational to different targets to influence different contextual conditions in order to achieve one's goal. Networking ability: Politically skilled individuals easily develop friendships and build strong, beneficial alliances and coalitions. Apparent sincerity: Politically skilled individuals appear to others as possessing high levels of integrity, sincerity and geniuses. Because their actions are not interpreted as manipulative and coercive, individuals high in apparent sincerity inspire trust and confidence in and from those around them.

So we can hyphotize that as an individual variable political skill can be a moderator between paternalistic leadership and resistance to change. Politically skilled individuals can successfully tolerate and cope with organizational changes. Paternalistic leadership decreases resistance to change and political skill further increases the magnitude of this relationship. At the same time we can say that LMX and political skill can compensate each other in such a model. Because those employees who experience low quality relationships with their supervisors are not likely to experience the same outcomes (e.g. network formation, promotions etc.) as those high quality relationships with their supervisors, they need some way of acquiring those desired outcomes their own. Political skill is the mechanism for which can be accomplished. So even tough a politically skilled employee has a poor quality relationship with his leader can cope with organizational change and his resistance level decreases comparing to a low politically skilled individual.

METHOD

Sampling and Procedure

Participants: The sample for the survey study consisted of 80 Executive MBA students at a large university working full time in an array of industries including, computer services, accounting and, customer relations.

Procedures: Questionnaires are distributed to those volunteered to participate in this study in classrooms and collected within 2 hours period of time. The surveys were also accompanied by a letter

©Copyright 2008 by the Global Business and Technology Association

explaining the focus of the study. It was reminded the participants that their responses were completely confidential.

Measures

Paternalist Leadership scale: Paternalism was measured with 13 items based upon Aycan's initial item pool from the preliminary stages of her scale development (Aycan, 2005). LMX was measured with LMX7 developed by Graen & Scandura (1987). Political skill was measured by Ferris, Treadway, Kolodinsky, Hochwater, Kacmar, Douglas and Frink (2005)'s political skill inventory. Resistance to change (RCT) was measured by Shaul Oreg's 17 items Resistance to Change Scale (2006).

FINDINGS AND RESULTS

To be able to test the relationships between model variables factors are computed and the reliability analysis were done to all of the factors. When we look at the factor structure of paternalist leadership scale SPSS 13.0 version computed two factors. From 13 items of the original scale, items decreasing reliabilities are excluded. One factor is about the father figure of the manager the other one is about the managerial concern of the managers. The Cronbach Alpha scores of the factors are .85 and .89. The sample items of the factors for being a father figure is like: "My manager behaves his/her employees as if a father", "My manager created a family climate in the workplace". Sample items of the managerial concern figures are: "My manager concerns with the every aspect of his employee's lives", "My manager participates the very special days of his/her employees (wedding, funeral etc...). The result of the factor analysis of two moderating variables namely LMX and political skill: LMX is a one factor variable and for the political skill again SPSS computed four reliable components namely: social astuteness, interpersonal influence, analyzing ability of the people and apparent sincerity. The reliability score of LMX7 is .85. And the inter item reliability scores of political skill factors are .83 for social astuteness, .71 for interpersonal influence,. 83 for apparent sincerity and .72 for analyzing people. For the RCT scale with 17 items SPSS computed 2 main factors. One is "dislike change" the other one is "being stressed under change". 7 questions were excluded from the analysis since their scores decreases reliability co-efficient.

To be able to test the explanatory power of independent variables on RCT, multiple regression analysis were made. In the first step the paternalist leadership style factors are entered to the model and regressed on RCT factors. However no meaningful explanatory power can be measured between being father like figure and managerial concern on "disliking change" and "being stressed under change" contrary to our theoretical framework explanations which means that benevolent or paternalist leadership has no a direct influence on the change perceptions and resistance to change reactions of the employees. In the second step first LMX and later political skill factors are entered to the analysis. However LMX doesn't change the explanatory power whereas the only meaningful variable that have an explanatory power on RCT factors are "analyzing skill" component of the political skill variable. The Beta and R Square scores are given in Table1.

Table 1: Explanatory power of political skill on RCT (Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis)

Dependent variable: Resistance to change factors: "dislike change" and "being stressed under change".
Independent variables: LMX, Paternalist leadership factors (being a father like figure and managerial concern), Political skill components (social astuteness, interpersonal influence, analyzing people and apparent sincerity)

The variable entered to the analysis: Analyzing ability component of the political skill

		Being stressed under change	Dislike change
Analyzing people	R	.29	.28
	R Square	.10	.10
	F test	5.030	4.459
	F test significance	.02	.02

©Copyright 2008 by the Global Business and Technology Association

Beta coefficient	-.29	-.28
Significance	.02	.03

All of these analyses indicate that when an individual has political skill he/she can more easily tolerate the change process. As it is explained in the literature review part, political skill decreases the level of uncertainty of the individual which in turn can decrease the level of fear from change or being stressed during change periods. Most of the previous studies in the RCT literature give importance to the context of the change and they state that change process has to be carefully managed. But the relationship between political skill of the employees and resistance to change provides an important cue for the change management which is even the leadership or LMX has no influence on RCT political skill can compensate their non effect. So if a manager has to cope with resistance to change he/she has to be aware that politically skilled individuals who have an analyzing power of the different people will less resist to change. He/she can use these people as catalyst in the change process. At the same time if a company is in the change process, in personnel selection, HRM department can give importance to this personality trait in the selection of new employees. As it is shown, personality of the employees can be an important determining factor of RCT. The up coming studies may concentrate on the affect of different personality traits and variables together with political skill on RCT of the employees.

The most important limitation of this study is the time limitation and the low number of participants to the questionnaires. These are an impediment to the generalization of the study result. So we can assume that this study a pilot and generalize the study results with the new factors and different samples.

REFERENCES

Ansoff, I. A. (1990). *Implanting Strategic Management.* Prentice Hall International Ltd, London.

Aycan, Z. (2005) 'Paternalism: Towards Conceptual Refinement and Operationalization', in K.S. Yang, K.K. Hwang and U. Kim (eds.) *Scientific Advances in Indigenous Psychologies: Empirical, Philosophical, and Cultural Contributions*, Sage: London, pp: 445–466.

Cheng, B.S. (1995). "The relationship between parent's authority and leadership behaviors: A case study of president of a Taiwanese enterprise." Taipei: Collection of Articles, Institute of Ethnology, Sinica, Vol. 79, pp.119-173.

Cheng, B.S., Chou, L.F., Fang, J.L. (2000). "Paternalistic leadership scale: construction and measure of a triple model," *Indigenous Psychology Journal*, 14,pp.3-64.

Del Val, M. P., Fuentes, C. M. (2003). Resistance to change: A literature review and empirical study. *Management Decision*; 41, 1/2 Academic Research Library, pg. 148.

Dent, E. B., & Goldberg, S.G. (1999). Challenging 'resistance to change'. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Sciences*, 35(1): 25-41.

Douglas, C. & Ammeter, A.P. (2004). An examination of leader political skill and its effect on ratings of leader effectiveness , *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(4). P.537-550.

Farr Watton, R. & Brunetto,Y. (2007. Organizational relationship quality and service employee acceptance of change in SMEs: A social exchange perspective. *Journal of Management & Organization*. 13: 114–125.

Ferris, G.R , Treadway, D.C, Kolodinsky, R.W, Hochwater, W.A., Kacmar, C.J., Kacmar, Douglas, C., Frink, B.D., (2005) Development and validation of the political skill inventory. *Journal of Management*; 31,126.

Gerstner, C.R. and Day, D.V. (1997) 'Meta-analytic review of leader–member exchange theory: correlates and construct Issues', *Journal of Applied Psychology* 82(6): 827–844.

©Copyright 2008 by the Global Business and Technology Association

Graen, G.B.(1976). "Role making process within complex organizations". In M.D.Dunette (Ed.), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology (pp.1201-1245).Chicago. Rand McNally.

Graen, G.B. and Scandura, T.A. (1987) '*Towards a Psychology of Dyadic Organizing*', in L.L. Cummings, B.M. Staw, (eds.) Research on Organizational Behavior, Vol. 9. JAI Press: Greenwich, CT, pp: 175–208.

Kotter, J. (1995). Leading Change: Why transformation efforts fail. *Harvard Business Review, 73*, 59-67.

Krause, T. (2008). Leadership. *Occupational Hazards.*

Lawler, E. E. (1986). *High-involvement management.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lawrence, P. R. (1969). How to deal with resistance to change. *Harvard Business Review, 47*. 4-176.

Nult, P. C. (1987). Identifying and appraising how managers install strategy: *Strategic Management Journal, 8*, 1-14.

Oreg, S. (2006). Personality, context and resistance to organizational change. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 15 (1) 73-101.

Pfeffer, J. 1992. *Managing with power: Politics and influence in organizations*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Schalk, R., Campbell, J. W. And Freese, C. (1998). Change and employee behavior, *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 19 No. 3, pp. 157-63.

Stogdill, R. M. (1974). *Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York: Free Press.

Van de Ven, A. H., Poole, M. S. (1995). Explaining development and change in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 20 No. 3, pp. 510-40.

©Copyright 2008 by the Global Business and Technology Association