TURKISH TYPE LEADERSHIP: SABRI ULKER EXAMPLE
TÜRK TİPİ LİDERLİK: SABRİ ÜLKER ÖRNEĞİ

Elif BAYKAL[1]

ABSTRACT

Paternalistic leadership is a unique leadership approach that creates a perfect balance between people orientedness and authoritativeness. It combines a strict authority with a fatherly benevolence. In fact, paternalism encompasses two controversial leadership attitudes simultaneously. Namely, a paternalistic leader prefers to be both a caring and authoritative leader. According to the extant literature, paternalism and paternalistic leadership are culturally bounded approaches and collectivist cultures are more prone to necessiate paternalism.

In this study, Sabri Ülker, founder of one of the most successful family owned businesses in Turkey will be taken under spotlight as an example of paternalistic leadership in Turkish culture, which is also known as T-type leadership. This work will try to explain paternalist leadership in Turkish business culture through Sabri Ülker's example. And Hofstede's cultural paradigm will be used in understanding Turkish business atmosphere, and the so called T-type leadership which is the equavalent of benevolent paternalistic leadership.

Keywords: Paternalism, Paternalistic Leadership, T-type Leadership, Hofstede's Cultural Paradigm

Öz

Paternalist liderlik, katı otoriter bir liderlik tavrını, babacanlık ve yardımseverlik ile birleştiren, insan odaklılık ve otoriterlik arasında mükemmel bir denge yaratan eşsiz bir liderlik yaklaşımıdır. Aslında, paternalist liderlik aynı anda iki tartışmalı liderlik tutumunu içerir. Yani, paternalist bir lider hem şefkatli hem de otoriter lider olmayı tercih eder. Mevcut literatüre göre, babalık ve babalık liderliği kültürel olarak sınırlandırılmış yaklaşımlardır ve kollektivist kültürler, babalık yapmayı zorunlu kılmaktadır.

Bu çalışmada, Türkiye'nin en başarılı aile şirketlerinden birinin kurucusu olan Sabri Ülker, Türk kültüründe T-tipi liderlik olarak da bilinen paternalist liderliğin bir örneği olarak ele alınacaktır. Hofstede'nin kültürel paradigması, Türk iş atmosferini ve hayırsever paternalist liderliğin eşdeğeri olan T-tipi liderliği anlamada kullanılacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Paternalizm, Paternalistik Liderlik, T-Tipi Liderlik, Hofstede Kültür Paradigması

[1] Dr. Öğr. Üye., İstanbul Medipol Üniversitesi, enarcikara@medipol.edu.tr

1. INTRODUCTION

21st century witnessed great challenges, with continuing economic liberalization, noteworthy industrialization take-off and a highly favorable geographical location. During all those developments, Turkey became a promising country for foreign investments and international trade prospects (Kabasakal and Bodur, 1998). From a cultural point of view, Turkey has a culture involving diverse elements of modernity, conservatism and Islam. In Turkey, we can talk about a rural-urban differentiation in the social life of people that results in many differences culturally. Being more conservative and carrying traditional values, rural subculture in Turkey effects the mindset of many entrepreneurs. These entrepreneurs mostly have their own family businesses and these family businesses composses the majority of firms in Turkish business environment. Furthermore, this family owned businesses serve as an important power base for their leaders. Thus, patronage relationships with followers are pervasive and contribute to promotion of paternalistic leadership style (Kabasakal and Bodur, 1998). Hence, in this study we have focused on paternalistic leadership and a sample for paternalistic leader from Turkey, one of the republican era industrialists, Sabri Ülker, in order to explain Turkish style leadership.

In leadership literature, the word 'style' refers to the methods through which a manager chooses the means to influence his followers (Giritli and Oraz, 2004). In general, there are two types of leadership in the related literature: the first one is the employee-centred leadership type, described as democratic or participative, and the second one is the task-centred leadership type, described as autocratic or authoritarian. Furthermore, leadership research generally reveals differences in terms of Western and Eastern cultures. Most of the research done in this context focuses on Western leadership styles. That is why, in this study it is suggested that we can not talk about universitality of leadership literature. Regarding eastern cultures, studies conducted to date show that eastern societies exhibit more paternalistic leadership qualities as in the case in Turkish culture (Farh and Cheng, 2000). In this study it is proposed that leadership is culturally determined. Therefore, we assumed that since leadership is socially constructed, it is inevitable to see the effects of the social and cultural environment on leadership (Fairhurst and Grandt, 2010). That is why, culture affects both leadership behaviour of leaders and perception of followers regarding their leaders' behaviours and attitudes (Shahin and Wright, 2004).

2. PATERNALISTIC LEADERSHIP

According to traditional leadership theory, leader's role is quite transactional. It simply involves managing followers by making clear their roles, goals and tasks in order to make them reach their goals (Cheng et. al., 2004). However, about eight decades ago, scholars of human relations movement insisted that when managers focus on their followers' demands and expectations rather than just on profit and production, employees can become more satisfied and more productive individuals (Pellegrini and Scandura, 2008). Similarly, in the extant literature, with a more contemporary approach, proponents of paternalistic leadership claim the same thing. It is argued that paternalism in leadership has the capacity to humanize and remoralize the business life (Erben and Güneşer, 2008).

Paternalist leadership involves an evident and powerful authority wherein leader shows consideration for subordinates with a moral approach. Farh and Cheng (2000) defines paternalist leadership as a leadership approach that combines high levels of discipline and managerial authority with a fatherly benevolence and moral integrity. Paternalist leadership

involves three main elements: authoritarianism, benevolence, and morality. Although scarce in numbers there are studies on paternalistic leadership and it properties. For example, in their study in Chinese context, Farh and Cheng (2000) wanted to see the effects of these three dimensions of paternalistic ladership on followers and in their model, they found that authoritarian leadership evokes feelings of dependence and compliance. Moreover, benevolent style of paternalistic leadership increases gratitude and repayment on the side of followers; and his morality gives way to respect towards the leader and more identifies employees to the organization.

As a managerial term, paternalism means managers' inclination to take an intimate personal interest in employee's off-the-job lives and their propensity to promote emloyee's personal welfare (Gelfand et al., 2007). Paternalism can be considered as a cultural characteristic, rather than just being a type of leadership behavior (Erben and Güneşer, 2008). Paternalism is handled mostly with the dichotomy of ''control'' and ''care/ nurture'' roles of parent figures in organizations or in the society (Erben and Güneşer, 2008). In fact, it can be considered as an inclination or even as a temptation to love, lead and protect subordinates in every arena of life wherein people claim power over others. For example in emotional relationships, in child rearing, in education, in friendships and even in the workplace (Gray, 1999)

Paternalism is often confused with authoritarianism but they are not exactly same. Authoritarianism explains a leadership behavior that exerts absolute authority and high levels of control over followers and demands unquestionable obedience. On the one hand, paternalism can be explained as leader's individualized, holistic concern for his followers' well- being. More over paternalism encompasses moral forms of behavior and attitude thus demonstrating superior moral virtues, self-control, and altruism (Cheng et. al., 2004). And through individualized consideration they show to their followers, paternalist leaders are considedered as respectful leaders, caring for their followers, understanding their feelings, satisfying their needs, and behaving supportively (Cheng et. al., 2004).

Releated studies on paternalistic leadership has increased in numbers within the past two decades, however Max Weber was the first one, that presented paternalistic leadership as one kind of legitimated authority (Pellegrini and Scandura; 2008). Weber (1968) suggests that there are three types of legitimate authority: traditional, charismatic, and bureaucratic. And in traditional way of ruling, followers are led by a paternal authority with a filial following (Pellegrini and Scandura; 2008). Paternalistic leaders, views leadership as an obligation to protect those people under their control and in return of that protection they expect loyalty (James et al., 1996). Paternalistic leaders give importance to personal loyalty to the leader and unquestioning obedience of the followers.

As mentioned before, in the paternalistic exchange between the leader and the followers, the leader provides a holistic concern for the employees and in return for that care expects unquestioned obedience and loyalty on the part of the followers (Erben and Güneşer, 2008). One of the most important criticism regarding paternalistic leaders is the fact that under paternalistic leadership followers are treated like a child and paternalistic leader act for the good of another person without their consent, as parents do for children. Intent is benevolent and but its means are coercive. That is to day paternalism advances one's interests at the expense of his liberty.

On the one hand, paternalistic leaders have extra social roles in their organizations. People expect them to behave like a benevolent parent as well as an authoritative leader. For example; as part of the paternalistic role, paternalistic leaders attend wedding ceremonies of

their followers, go out for dinners with employees, celebrate private occasions such as birthday or an individual success of an employee, become a member at the company tournaments, or go to holidays with their employees. Through behaving like a like a benevolent parent they fulfill many social roles and duties expected by their followers, and this give way to the situation wherein leaders diminish their social distance with their employees (Aycan, 2001). That is to say, sometimes the relationship between the leader and follower become less professional disturbing either the follower or the leader.

However, it can be problematic to view paternalistic leadership with a too simplifying perspective. In her study, Aycan (2006) emphasized that paternalistic leadership can not be considered as a unified construct. She claimed that there are four different paternalistic leadership approaches. According to her each of these approaches represent a completely distinct type of leadership. Two different leadership dimension has been taken into consideration when bulding Aycan's typology, that are leadership behavior and leader's underlying intents. In her typology four different paternalistic leadership approaches occured. These are: exploitative paternalism, authoritarian paternalism, authoritative paternalism and benevolent paternalism. In her model, she claimed that paternalism is not a unified construct and we can not view it equal to authoritarianism, as it is conceived in the Western leadership literature. As in the case with Turkish context, in benevolent paternalism, the leaders intimately concern for followers' welfare, and in return followers show loyalty and respect for their leaders (Aycan, 2006). On the one hand, in exploitative paternalism, the leader also cares for his followers, but this care aims to gain employees' loyalty and commitment in order to achieve organizational goals. Furthermore, in authoritarian paternalism, patenalistic leader exploits rewards and punishments in order to make followers comply with his ideas, rules and goals. That is to say, followers conform with the rules with the aim of receiving rewards and avoiding punishments. However, in authoritative paternalistic leadership, the leader also exercise control, but his underlying intent is a benevolent intent, namely promoting followers' welfare. Followers are aware of the fact that the rules are for their own benefit and they should respect their leader's ideas and directives (Aycan, 2006). In this study, we mainly focused on benevolent paternalism wherein the leader does perform positive attitudes towards his followers for the sake of increasing their wellbeing rather than a pragmatic aim.

3. PATERNALISM AND CULTURE

Paternalism is a pervasive cultural property of traditional eastern communities including China, Turkey, India, and Korea (Aycan, 2001). In these societies, both the family and state are organized mostly in feudal and patriarchal structures. And state is responsible for protecting and caring for the people living in these societies (Erben and Güneşer, 2008). In parallel with this view, according to Hofstede, (1980) some cultural dimensions of nations can be considered as compatible with paternalism. Namely, it is possible to relate paternalism to assumptions such as paternalism, collectivism, high power distance, avoidance of ambiguity, masculinity / femininity in the framework of the definition and the features attributed to it in the literature (Erben, 2004).

Generally, Hofstede (1992) defines culture as the collective mental programming of a specific group of people. And he explains cultural differences as broad differences in th e mindset of this specific group in its preferences and choices when compared to other groups (Hofstede, 1994). He identifies five main dimensions clearifying the differences among national cultures (Hofstede, 2001). The first dimension he focuses is uncertainity avoidance. It is the extent a

culture trys to avoid ambigious and unclear situations. The second dimension is power distance, namely, the extent to which members in a group believe that there can be an unqequal distribution of power among members. In these cultures, people are inclined to accept authority without questioning. Hofstede's (1980) third dimension is masculinity. It refers to assertiveness, competitiveness and limited emotionality in a culture. Fourth dimension is individualism. It is the opposite of collectivism which explains the degree to which members of a culture are suppose to look after themselves or prefer to remain integrated into their groups (Hofstede and Hofstede, 2005). Collectivism is the inclination of a culture to encourage collective action (Pellegrini and Scandura, 2008). In collectivist cultures, people have high levels of identification with their groups. In these cultures, people are used to having intimate relationships with their collegues and leaders. On the other hand, individualistic cultures are often inclined to have much higher self-focus which only extends to their immediate family, whereas collectivist cultures have higher levels of group identification that extents from from cradle to grave and ensures lifetime protection in exchange for unquestioning loyalty to the group (Migliore, 2011). Fifth dimension is time orientation. It encompasses two different dimensions; short term and long term time orientation. Long term time orientation explains the extent to which members of a certain culture are inclined to accept delayed gratification of their needs. And they are not too impatient regarding long term events (Hofstede and Hofstede, 2005). And lastly, in societies that show masculine properties, men are mostly supposed to be more assertive, tough, and compelling. Being successful is very important for them. However, in these societies women are supposed to be more modest, gentle, tender, niggling and more concerned with the quality of life (Hofstede and Hofstede, 2005). However, in feministic societies gender roles overlap. In these kind of societies both men and women are supposed to be kind, compassionate, tender, and are expected to be related with the quality in all areas of life (Migliore, 2011).

High power distance in Hofstede's dimensions are closely related to paternalism. Paternalistic leader is like a father who is involved in employees' personal lives, thus in return for his benevolent acts he often claims the right to expect respect and personal intimacy from his employees (Aycan, 2006). Namely, a kind of power inequality exists between the paternalistic leader and his followers, which is accepted as normal mostly in high-power-distance cultures. In this point the study of Saufi et al., (2002) is important in explaining the positive relationship between preference for paternalistic leadership in high-power-distance societies. Without doubt, in this kind of cultures, personal relationships are highly significant and valued, and followers search for frequent contact with their leaders (Hofstede, 2001).

Under paternalistic leadership, followers are mostly glad with their benevolent and protective leader, especially in collectivist cultures wherein familial relationships are strong and parental guardianship is viewed as normal and necessary. Extant literature mostly links paternalistic leadership to employee attitudes and perceptions like satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational identification and employee loyalty (Cheng et al., 2004; Farh et al., 2006; Pellegrini and Scandura, 2008). Paternalistic leaders' has a positive impact on followers' behaviors and attitudes through the care, support, and protection they provide. They respond to employees' needs for intimate contact and close personal relationships (Pellegrini and Scandura, 2008).In paternalistic cultures, followers voluntarily depend on their leaders. Compliance with authority is perceived as something positive especially in collectivist cultures.

4. FAMILY FIRMS AND PATERNALISTIC LEADERSHIP

Weber claims that paternalistic leadership finds its origins in the patriarchal household on which it is modelled (Pellegrini and Scandura, 2008). Namely, the paternalism in non-estern world has its roots in familism which encompasses patriarchal, patrilocal, and patrilineal relationships among group or family members (Kim, 1994). As mentioned before, paternalistic leaders mainly focus on their followers' welfare. He behaves like a father figure. He is benevolent and compassionate towards the employees. His genuine care for his followers is responded by employees with loyalty, respect and appreciation. Mostly, being led by a father already, mostly owner founder of the family business, family firms especially in collectivist cultures can be given as perfect examples of paternalist cultures (Baykal, 2019a; Baykal, 2019b).

In the extant literature Dyer's typology of culture is famous in understanding culture in organizations. In this point, in order to examine this relationship, Dyer (1986) examined 40 different family firms. And results of his study showed that there are firms, paternalistic leaders are mostly considered as benevolent fatherly leaders due to their attempts to create a family-like atmosphere. However, there is a possibility in paternalistic leadership to turn into nepotism and to exclude provision of advantegous resources to just loyal followers (Kabasakal and Bodur, 2003). That is why in family firms sometimes problems between family and nonfamily members arise. Mostly nonfamily professionals think that the benevolent father figure is not as benevolent to them as he is to family members. That is to say, they feel that they are not viewed as an in group member.

5. TURKISH CULTURE PATERNALISM AND TURKISH TYPE LEADERSHIP

In Turkey, leaders' roles and responsibilities are not bounded with their status as a manager. Both their responsibilities and their rights are wider compared to their Westerner counterparts (Erben, 2004). In Turkey, leadership roles are more akin to paternalism compared to their Westerner counterparts (Baykal, 2019b). Pasha et al. (2001: 574), in their study on paternalistic thought in Turkey, revealed that there is a significant positive relationship between collectivism and paternalism behavior. Anyway in the extant literature paternalism is an effective and pervasive leadership approach in many non-western cultures (Farh et al., 2006; Pellegrini & Scandura, 2006). But, in many Western cultures, it is equated with authoritarian authority (Uhl-Bien & Maslyn, 2005). However, in non-western world it is viewed more positively by followers.

In Turkey, organization chart of companies are mostly pyramiad-like structures limiting horizontal communication channels (Sargut, 2001). Owing to high power distance in Turkish culture, stratification of organizational members with respect to organizational power, individual prestige, status and authority is pervasive (Pellegrini and Scandura, 2008). In collectivist countries such as Turkey, emphasis on obligation and loyalty is prominent (Sullivan et al., 2003).

On the one hand, Turkey is low on masculinity. Namely, Turkish people prefer to be less individualistic, less assertive and kinder in their daily activities. And that is why Turkish leaders prefer to build more intimate relationships with their followers. In most Turkish organizations a feminine culture is predominant, thus leaders avoid conflicts and give importance to getting along well with their followers.

Moreover, in Turkish context, paternalistic leadership is seen in the form of benevolent paternalistic leadership, as explained by Aycan (2006). In Turkish companies leader mostly act with benevolent intents. He cares for his followers and wants to support and develop his followers while making the best out of them in achieving organizational goals. That is why many Turkish firms prefer to spent money on corporate social responsibility projects regarding issues that may contribute to the welfare of their own employees (Baykal, 2019b). To give an example: Ulker holding spends a considerable amount of its yearly corporate social responsibility budget for yearly bonuses delivered to the personell before religious festivals. By this way, both motivating and satisfying the employees regarding their situation as a part of the organization.

In Turkish context, dependency and submission to paternalism are voluntary; Western cultures can not understand and accept this voluntariy addiction and submission (Aycan, 2001). Paternalism is compatible with the values of collectivist societies like Turkey, because in these cultures it is desirable for both parts, the leader and the subordinate, that the leader is involved in the personal life of the employee. On the other hand, in the individualist cultures, this situation is perceived as a special life-event intervention (Pellegrini and Scandura, 2006) and fiercely disliked by both parts especially by subordinates.

In fact, the term T-type leadership or Turkish type leadership is pervasive among practitioners rather than academicians that is why in the extant literature there are almost no articles in this topic. In other words, Turkish-type leadership can be considered as a paternalistic leadership in the literature, blended with a loving and caring paternalistic but authoritarian leadership style with Turkish culture. In fact, Turkish-style leadership derives its essence from historical facts and the Ottoman's strong state-powerful monarch understanding. Turkey inherited from the Ottoman Empire in the "patrimonial state" and "weak civil society" of Turkish economic and political system which shapes its leadership understanding both in the political and managerial spheres. Historically, according to this tradition a benevolent, caring but highly authoritarian and powerful leader is a must for the sustainability and benefit of the group led. In this point, in the cross-cultural study of Aycan et al. (2000), including Turkey, organizational cultures in Pakistan, India, China, Turkey, and the United States are reported to be more paternalistic compared to organizational cultures in Canada, Germany, and Israel (Aycan et al., 2000). In fact, Turkish culture is also accepted to be high on power distance and uncertainity avoidance (Pellegrini and Scandura, 2008). Owing to cultural dynamics of the country, the traditional Turkish business culture reflects high power distance and collectivistic values motives (House et al., 2004) that makes paternalism a meaningful leadership approach. In Özcan-Canbolat et al. (2010), which is one of the few academic studies on Turkish Type Leadership, it is revealed that among politicians it is more pervasive to embrace paternalistic leadership behaviors and this inclination is often coupled with charismatic and participative leadership behaviors. They conducted their study on the three prominent political parties of Turkey and they found that all of these three parties prefer to embrace paternatlistic leadership and their leaders also tend to embrace charismatic leadership behaviors and they use a participative style especially when they are dealing with young electors. In another study, Ercan and Sığrı (2015), compared American leaders and Turkish leaders with a cultural perspective of Hofstede, they found that Turkish leaders are more conservative, they give more importance to power, they are more prone to adhere to rules and they give more importance to security. Hence, these results confirm the thesis that Turkish leadership style is a more paternalistic one as in the example of founder of Ulker Holding: Sabri Ülker.

6. SABRI ÜLKER EXAMPLE

Ülker, is he most famous confectionary company of Turkey, whose history goes back to 1944. In earlier periods of the company, Ülker prefered to manufacture confectionary products with functional benefits. Later, luxurious confectionary products with intrinsic values widened company's product range. Today, Ülker brand has many subbrands serving consumers in a myriad of sectors including confectionary, real estate, constructions, finance and restaurant management and holding as an umbrella, Yıldız Holding, with a strong presence in the market. Ülker encompasses a shared culture on all over these subbrands. While Sabri Ülker was still a student, he founded Ülker GIDA, a company with 4 partners at the age of 24. Ülker Gıda, which was opened to the public in 1970, has started to produce chocolate since 1979 and by this way started to adopt product enrichment policies. Today, more than 25,000 employees, 65 production and marketing companies and 43 factories and a wide range of products, Ülker Gıda is managed by Murat Ülker, Sabri Ulker's successor and the eldest son.

Sabri Ülker is the founder owner of one of the most succesful and famous family businesses in Turkey and he is one of Turkish republic's first generation industrialists. He is one of Turkey's leading entrepreneurs and the honorary president of the company. Sabri Ülker was born in Crimea which is a Turkish enclave in 1920. In those years Crimea was under Soviet Union's control. Communist policies of Soviets and pressures enforced on Turks contributed to Sabri Ülker and his family's migration to Anatolia, thus triggering the events that made Sabri Ülker one of the first industrialists of republican era. His honesty, adorable personality and love for his nation made him a good model for paternalistic leadership. In his early childhood he experienced many difficulties. In Istanbul, he studied in poverty and in his early adolescence he experienced periods of time selling watermelons in order to be able to go to school. And he had to study secondary education in state-free boarding school (Turgut, 2014: 137). Hovewer, later he built a huge empire which is today an important player in competitive markets.

Sabri Ülker can be considered as an ideal model for T-type, namely the Turkish type leadership which is a quite similar leadership approach with paternalistic leadership. That is to say, his attitudes and behaviours was quiete consistent with paternalistic leadership. First of all, he was a real authoritarian leader. He was strict and very rigorous. He was aware of all the details regarding his work and employees. In his biography, there are memories regarding his detail-focused task based leadership. For example; in the years, when Sabri Ülker was the general manager of the first biscuit factory, he actually preferred to work as an industrial engineer who was interested in all kinds of technical details (Turgut, 2014: 305). He was very attentive and had all the details regarding their work. For example; in the construction of first Ulker factory, during the installation of the furnaces imported from Germany, he learned all the details from the relevant engineers, and he was able to install the machinery himself and solve the problem that might arise afterwards (Turgut, 2014: 257). As an other example; He used to taste all new kinds of oil in his first oil factory, Turyağ oil factory. He would never allow the production of products he disliked. He had a serious obsession with the quality of the products produced. In other words, he was very control-focused.

On the one hand he was really a traditional man. Anyway, generally all the Turks give importance to the "marriage institution" and view it as the foundation of order in the society, that is why home is accepted as a sacred shelter. Sabri Ülker's daughter Ahsen Özokur stated that Sabri Ulker was a very naive and compassionate husband and father in the family. He was intimately interested in his family, and he felt a deep affection for his family members, and he showed this love. Sabri was a very concerned father, and despite all his busy work, the

family always devoted a lot of time to his family members. But his interest in his children would never manifest in the form of pampering them (Turgut, 2014: 243). Namely, he had established a perfect balance between being a concerned father and an authoritative ruler. Sabri Ülker would never express his appreciation with words like *well done*! or *bravo*!. He expressed his admire only with mimics and body language. He especially avoided praising people to their faces. As many Turks believe, he had the idea that praising too much may spoil people. Sabri Bey was a conservative person. He had relationships with politicians like Turgut Özal from right politics. But infact he was never interested in politics. Turgut Özal, one of the most famous presidents of Turkish republic, revered Sabri Ülker by his words, "Sabri Ülker is not just a businessman, he is like a philosopher, he is a complete enterprise (Akyol, 2014).

In Ulker, coming early to work systematically started with Sabri Ülker. He was always coming first to the company like a tradesman who opens his shop in the morning. He was a punctual manager who paid attention to the timing. He thought that coming early to work was an important premise for success. He was also a very humble leader. One of Ulker's former general managers, Tevfik Arıkan, recalls his memories with Sabri Ülker. He states "Sabri Ülker was an extremely humble man. He always ate his food with the other staff in the lunch room of the factory. He would never order food from outside saying that he wanted to eat something different. He never liked luxurious consumption. He only went out for dinner when there were guests. Similarly, according to former state minister Ali Doğan, Sabri Bey had a very humble life and did not like luxury. He told about one of his memories regarding Sabri Ülker: 'One day Turgut Özal wanted to visit Sabri Bey at home. Sabri Bey told him that if he wanted to visit them, he was welcome but he should be aware of the fact that his home is too small that only up to five people in his house can be accommodated. He was living in a very humble house despite his wealth. He was a sample person. Despite the size of his small house, always he had quests and he served his guests with his own hands'(www.sabriulker.com.tr).

Interestingly his paternalist style was effective not only on his own company but also on his rivals in the market. For example; owner of Elit chocalate, one of Ulker's rivals, Tanıl Küçük, tells that Sabri Ülker Bey was always the leader and teacher in the market with his own knowledge and experience: 'I was both impressed and found himself as teacher for me although we were rivals. One of the things that I am most impressed with Sabri Ülker is the fact that he was always supportive to the sector. His competitiveness was gentle and authentic'. Ülker had great power and a wide range of products. If he had used his leadership and his power in the sector, he would have made the life very difficult for his rivals. Namely, he could engage in a devastating competition. On the contrary, he tried to support life of all companies in the sector' (www.sabriulker.com.tr).

We can also come accross some examples demonstrating his autharitarian side regarding the authoritian side of Sabri Ulker, in the memories of Kemal Şentürk, director of İzmir regional directorate. He admits that when a phone call came from Sabri Ulker, he felt excited and anxious. He tells: 'Sabri Ulker was always talking briefly, accurately and with an authoritarian tone on the phone'. According to Kemal Şentürk, Sabri Ulker would not broke any one's hearth or never become cruel but his authoritative tone and strict adherence to the rules were sufficient for people to feel hesitant and excited when talking with him (Turgut, 2014: 587). Prof. Dr. Haluk Yavuzer who has established the first Professional HR Department structure in Ulker also tells that Sabri Ulker had an authoritarian authority in the workplace; but for followers this was not a fear in the style of "Oh, my boss is coming!", rather it is a kind of respect that we call as "internal control" in psychology. That is to say,

Sabri Ulker was not an insulting supervisor, not a pressure maker, but he has created such an autonomy that the internal control mechanism in individuals was working very well. People were not disturbed with his aouthoritative style. Many employees working with him express that "It is a privilege to work in Ülker with Sabri Ülker (Turgut, 2014: 434).

When Ulker Holding, as a company, was 25 years old, it began to suffer from problems related to the shipment of products from Istanbul to Anatolia. In particular, orders from the east of Ankara could not be met. Due to these problems, a factory was established in the capital, in Ankara. During the first years of this factory, some distributors were allowed to buy shares of the factory. Sabri Ülker was not one of those leaders who hate sharing his ownership with his employees or distributors. He was benevolent in sharing his profit with his partners. He knew this would motivate people to work harder for the benefit of the company (Akyol, 2014: 335).

He was also a good role model and teacher. Ali Ülker, the younger son of Sabri Ülker, also mentions his father's attitude as a teacher and role model in his memoirs. For example: Sabri Ülker used to delegate minor roles and duties to Ali Ülker in their company since the beginning of his elementery school years, so that he could learn his family business at a young age. His aim was preparing Ali for his future roles in the company. He did not let his children wander around aimlessly. He always assigned them duties.

To sum up, Sabri Ülker can be accepted as a perfect model for understanding T-type leadership, that is the benevolent paternalistic leadership which is seen frequently in Turkish organizations. His caring and benevolent style combined with authoritative style creates the necessary environment that is proper for meeting the needs of Turkish family business environment.

7. CONCLUSION

In collectivist cultures as in the example of Turkey, the paternalist leader shows an approach similar to that of a parent showing to his child. This is seen as a cultural character of organizations that are valid in collectivist societies as Turkey. Paternalist leadership refers to a leadership style that creates a good blend of strong authority, fatherly support and high levels of morality (Hayek, Novicevic, Humphreys and Jones, 2010). Namely, they have a fatherlike leadership style in which strong authority is combined with concern and considerateness (Pellegrini and Scandura, 2008). Paternalistic leadership is willingly reciprocation of the care and protection of paternal authority by the followers with high levels of comformity (Aycan et al., 2000; Pellegrini & Scandura, 2006). Paternalism is also congruent with values encompassing high-power distance cultures as in the example of Turkey. In these cultures, paternalistic leaders' involvement in employees' personal lives is desired and expected, whereas it is perceived as a violation of privacy in individualistic cultures (Pellegrini and Scandura, 2008).

In the extant literature we can come across studies regarding paternalism in Turkey. For example; Aycan and Kanungo (2000: 50), in their study, among ten countries, showed that Turkey ranks second in the level of paternalism and community commitment. In an other study on paternalistic thought in Turkey, Pasha et al. (2001: 574) found that there is a significant positive relationship between collectivism and paternalism thoughts behavior. Anyway, according to Hofstede's latest data, Turkey ranks high in power distance and uncertainity avoidance (Hofstede, 2011). In this study, cultural framework of the study is

based on Hofstede's model of 'national culture' which proposes that organization cultures in a specific location are effected by national cultures.

According to Hofstede, countries can be categorized culturally in five main value dimensions. These dimensions are (1) individualism-collectivism, (2) uncertainty avoidance, (3) power distance, and (4) masculinity/feminity (5) long and short term orientedness. Three of these dimensions are very prominent in Turkish culture. The first of these dimensions is power distance, namely, the inequality between superiors and subordinates. High power distance often results in autocratic, controlling type of leadership as in the example of Sabri Ülker, whereas low power distance results in more democratic leadership styles. Hofstede (2001) referred that in countries with high power distance, employees prefer eaither autocratic or paternalist leadership styles. In our example; Sabri Ülker's leadership behaviors are more akin to paternalistic leadership style. An other important dimension regarding Turkey is uncertainty avoidance, namely, the extent to which a culture tolerates ambiguity and uncertainty. Uncertainity avoidance often leads to more bureaucratic structures and more control-focused leadership styles (Giritli and Oraz, 2004). Although Ulker is not a very bureaucratic company, Sabri Ülker, the founder owner, was a control focused and a very niggling personality. However, generally, in Turkey, the strongly hierarchical business aproach breed paternalistic leaders. And thirdly, in the model collectivism dimension is related to the extend members of a culture feels emotional dependence towards their groups (Hofstede, 2001) and shapes leadership styles of collectivist societies such as Turkey. Showing authority in the workplace is not considered as a negative trait and a kind of familial trust making the leader act as a father figure is dominant in business life. That is why, in Ülker, one of the most succesful family firms in Turkey, accepted Sabri Ülker's authority as normal and praiseworthy.

8. RECOMMENDATIONS AND SOLUTIONS

It is argued that the collectivist, high power distance and feminine dimensions of Turkish social culture created the need for paternalist leaders (Erben, 2004; Aycan and Kanungo, 2000). As mentioned before in paternalistic cultures leaders behave as benevolent parents and show intimate care to their followers (Pellegrini and Scandura, 2008). In this point, we agree with Erben and Güneşer, (2008) claiming that paternalistic leadership can be considered as an intervention of creating more humanized and moralized workplace. Paternalism is a unique kind of leadership style in the point that it involves two paradoxical and controversial leadership property at the same time. That is to say, a paternalistic leader is both a caring and authoritative leader simultaneously (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2000). Under paternalism, as in the case with Sabri Ülker example, leader acts like a father and takes care of the organization and followers as a parent. But this effect is culturally bounded. That is to say, effects of paternalistic leadership may change from culture to culture. In this point, understanding Hofstede's cultural paradigm and underlining the reality that more feminine, high uncertainity avoidance, collectivist cultures are more prone enjoy from being led by paternalistic leadership will be helpful in assigning most suitable leaders to the organizations in those kind of cultures. So that both sides will be satisfied with the relationship between them.

9. FURTHER RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS

Although in Eastern cultures, paternalism is one of the most desired characteristics of people in authority, it is viewed very negatively in Western societies (Erben and Güneşer, 2008). In the extant literature empirical studies on paternalistic leadership are mostly applied in Eastern cultures such as China, Turkey, Japan and India. In that point, an empirical research design trying to explain effects of paternalistic leadership in Western context would be helpful in understanding whether there is really a difference between Eastern and Western cultures regarding their propensity to accept paternalistic leadership as a positive leadership style or not.

REFERENCES

Aycan, Z. (2001). Human resource management in Turkey-Current issues and future challenges. *International Journal of Manpower*, *22*(3), 252-260.

Aycan, Z. (2006). Paternalism: Towards conceptual refinement and operationalization. In K. S. Yang, K. K. Hwang, & U. Kim (Eds.), *Scientific advances in indigenous psychologies: Empirical, philosophical, and cultural con- tributions*: 445-466. London: Sage Ltd.

Aycan, Z. ve Kanungo, R., N. (2000). "Toplumsal Kültürün Kurumsal Kültür ve İnsan Kaynakları Uygulamaları Üzerine Etkileri", (Ed.: Zeynep Aycan), Akademisyenler ve Profesyoneller Bakış Açısıyla Türkiye'de Yönetim, Liderlik ve İnsan Kaynakları Uygulamaları, Ankara: *Türk Psikologlar Derneği Yayınları*: 25-53.

Aycan, Z., Kanungo, R. N., Mendonca, M., Yu, K., Deller, J., Stahl, G., et al. (2000). Impact of culture on human resource management practices: A 10-country comparison. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 49: 192-221.

Aycan, Z., Kanungo, R., Mendonca, M., Yu, K., Deller, J., Stahl, G., & Kurshid, A. (2000). Impact of culture on human resource management practices: A 10-country comparison. *Applied Psychology*, *49*(1), 192-221.

Baykal, E., (2019a). Sürüdürlebilir Aile İşletmeleri. Elif Baykal (Ed.), *Aile İşletmelerinde Devir Süreci ve Sürdürülebilirlik: Pozitif Liderlik Tarzlarının Etkisi* (pp. 83-122). Ankara: Gazi Kitabevi.

Baykal, E., (2019b). *Family Firms and the Effects of Organizational Culture on Their Innovation.* In Family Firms and the Effects of Organizational Culture on Their Innovation (pp. 207-226). IGI Global.

Chen, X. P., Eberly, M. B., Chiang, T. J., Farh, J. L., & Cheng, B. S. (2014). Affective trust in Chinese leaders: Linking paternalistic leadership to employee performance. *Journal of Management*, *40*(3), 796-819.

Cheng, B. S., Chou, L. F., Wu, T. Y., Huang, M. P., & Farh, J. L. (2004). Paternalistic leadership and subordinate responses: Establishing a leadership model in Chinese organizations. Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 7(1), 89-117.

Dyer, W. G. (1986). Cultural change in family firms. Jossey-Bass.

Erben, G. S., & Güneşer, A. B. (2008). The relationship between paternalistic leadership and organizational commitment: Investigating the role of climate regarding ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *82*(4), 955-968.

Erben, G., S. (2004). "Toplumsal Kültür Aile Kültürü Etkileşimi Bağlamında Paternalizm Boyutuyla İşletme Kültürü: Türkiye Örneği", 1. Aile İşletmeleri Kongresi Bildirileri, 17-18 Nisan 2004, (Ed.: Koçel, T.), *İstanbul: İstanbul Kültür Üniversitesi Yayınları:* 345-356.

Ercan, Ü., & Sığrı, Ü. (2015). Kültürel Değerlerin Liderlik Özelliklerine Etkisi: Türk ve Amerikalı Yöneticiler Üzerine Bir Araştırma. Amme İdaresi Dergisi, 48(3).

Fairhurst, G. T., & Grant, D. (2010). The social construction of leadership: A sailing guide. *Management Communication Quarterly,* 24(2), 171-210.

Farh, J. L., Cheng, B. S., Chou, L. F., & Chu, X. P. (2006). Authority and benevolence: Employees' responses to pater- nalistic leadership in China. In A. S. Tsui, Y. Bian, & L. Cheng (Eds.), *China's domestic private firms: Multidisciplinary perspectives on management and performance*: 230-260. New York: Sharpe.

Farh, J., L. ve Cheng, B., S. (2000). "A Cultural Analysis of Paternalist Leadership in Chinese Organizations", (Ed.: J., T., Li; A., S., Tsui ve E., Weldon), *Management and Organizations in the Chinese Context*, London: Macmillan: 84-127.

Gelfand, M. J., Erez, M., & Aycan, Z. (2007). Cross-cultural organizational behavior. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58: 479-514.

Giritli, H., & Oraz, G. T. (2004). Leadership styles: some evidence from the Turkish construction industry. *Construction Management and Economics*, *22*(3), 253-262.

Hayek, M.; Novicevic, M., M.; Humphreys, J., H. ve Jones, N. (2010). "Ending the Denial of Slavery in Management History: Paternalist Leadership of Joseph Emory Davis", *Journal of Management History*, 16/3: 367-379.

Hofstede, G. (1980). Motivation, leadership, and organization: do American theories apply abroad?. *Organizational Dynamics*, 9(1), 42-63.

Hofstede, G. (1992). Cultural dimensions in people management: The socialization perspective. *Globalizing Management–Creating and Leading the Competitive Organization, Wiley & Sons, New York, NY*.

Hofstede, G. (1994). Management scientists are human. *Management Science*, *40*(1), 4-13.

Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context. Online Readings in Psychology and Culture, 2(1). h p://dx.doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1014

Hofstede, G. and Hofstede, G.J. (2005), *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY (revised and expanded, 2nd ed.)

James, K., Chen, D. L., & Cropanzano, R. (1996). Culture and leadership among Taiwanese and U.S. workers: Do values influence leadership ideals? In M. N. Ruderman, M. W. Hughes-James, & S. E. Jackson (Eds.), *Selected research on work team diversity*: 33-52. Washington DC: American Psychological Association.

Kabasakal, H. and M. Bodur: 2003. *'Leadership and Culture in Turkey: A Multi-Faceted Phenomenon'*, in C. J. Brodbeck (in progress), Managerial Cultures of the World: A

Globe Report of In-Depth Studies of the Cultures of 25 Countries (Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA).

Kagitcibasi, C. (2005). Autonomy and relatedness in cultural context: Implications for self and family. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology*, *36*(4), 403-422.

Kim, U. M.: 1994, '*Significance of Paternalism and Communalism in the Occupational Welfare System of Korean Firms: A National Survey*', in U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. Choi and G. Yoon (eds.), Individualism and Collectivism: Theory, Method, and Applications (Sage Publications, London), pp. 251–266.

Lu, L., Li, F., Leung, K., Savani, K., & Morris, M. W. (2018). When can culturally diverse teams be more creative? The role of leaders' benevolent paternalism. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *39*(4), 402-415.

Migliore, L. A. (2011). Relation between big five personality traits and Hofstede's cultural dimensions: Samples from the USA and India. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, *18*(1), 38-54.

Özkan-Canbolat, E., Beraha, A., Çeliksoy, E., & Türker, Y. (2010). Türk Liderlik Profili: Türk Siyasi Liderleri Üzerine Niteliksel Bir Çalışma. Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Dergisi, 2(2), 37-45.

Pellegrini, E. K., & Scandura, T. A. (2006). Leader-member exchange (LMX), paternalism and delegation in the Turkish business culture: An empirical investigation. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37(2): 264-279.

Pellegrini, E. K., & Scandura, T. A. (2008). Paternalistic leadership: A review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Management*, 34(3), 566-593.

Sargut, S. (2001). Kulturler arasi farklilasma ve yonetim. *Ankara: Verso Yayincilik*.

Shahin, A. I., & Wright, P. L. (2004). Leadership in the context of culture: An Egyptian perspective. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 25(6), 499-511.

Sorenson, M. D., & Franzosa, E. A. (1999). *TreeRot, version 2*. Boston University, Boston, MA.

Sullivan, D., Mitchell, M., & Uhl-Bien, M. (2003). The new conduct of business: How LMX can help capitalize on cultural diversity. In G. Graen (Ed.), *Dealing with diversity*: 183-218. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Turgut, H. (2014), *Sabri Ülker'in Anıları,* Doğan Kitap, İstanbul.

Uhl-Bien, M., & Maslyn, M. (2005). *Paternalism as a form of leadership: Differentiating paternalism from leader- member exchange*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Academy of Management, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Weber, M. (1968). The types of legitimate domination. In G. Roth & C. Wittich (Eds.), *Economy and society* (Vol. 3): 212-216. New York: Bedminster.