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Abstract
The objective of the research is to identify the impact of Paternalistic Leadership (PL) on Deviant Behavior at Menoufia University Hospitals (MUH) in Egypt. About 344 survey questionnaires were distributed. Multiple follow-ups yielded 300 statistically usable questionnaires. Survey responses were 87%.

The research discovered a number of results: (1) the dimensions of Paternalistic Leadership (benevolent leadership, moral leadership, and authoritarian leadership) play an important role in influencing the job attitudes of employees at MUH, (2) MUH suffers from the widespread phenomenon of the leader's adherence to work-related information and not disclosing it to subordinates, (3) the leader at MUH cares about the subordinates and takes care of the amount of work they do, (4) the leader of MUH is credible and honest, but does not offer the interests of subordinates on his own reconciliation, (5) benevolent leadership ranked first, moral leadership came in second place, and authoritarian leadership came in third place, (6) the leader of MUH does not provide assistance to those who are absent from work or make recommendations for the development of the hospitals, (7) the leader of MUH is characterized by not participating in decision-making with subordinates and insisting on his opinion, (8) the staff of MUH suffer from the leader’s perverted behaviors that negatively affect them, and thus their performance, (9) some employees of MUH feel that they are from the same family and have more intimate relationships than work relations, and (10) the leader interest employees at MUH and his pursuit of their goals, motivates them to do more to provide the best possible for the hospitals, increase positive behaviors, and reduce deviant behaviors at the hospitals.

The study referred to a number of recommendations, the most important of which are: (1) leaders at MUH should engage subordinates in decision-making and allow them to express their opinions and suggestions, (2) leaders in MUH should follow a differentiated behavior that is appropriate to each circumstance or situation to minimize or reduce the deviant behavior, (3) exerting pressure on subordinates at MUH and dealing with them severely generates adverse side effects that affect their job performance, (4) developing a set of regulations and laws that determine the competencies and powers of managers and staff at MUH, (5) making the employees identical with MUH by adopting different means including generating a sense of being part of the hospitals, (6) leaders at MUH should do more to improve staff positive behaviors and reduce deviant behaviors, (7) providing the principle of democracy in dealing between employees at MUH, (8) leaders at MUH should put restrictions on the practice of negative behaviors by activating a strict control system as well as applying strict rules towards those who do these behaviors, (9) leaders at MUH should increase the awareness of individuals of the importance of the role they play, through the freedom to express their views and suggestions, and (10) the need to provide justice among workers, whether fair in the procedures justice as well as distributive justice and dealings justice at MUH.

Keywords: Paternalistic Leadership, Deviant Behavior

1. Introduction
Paternalistic Leadership is one of the most common leadership styles in Chinese culture, known as Chinese paternalistic leadership as an alternative to transformational leadership (Mu et al., 2012).

The patriarchal leader is characterized by a wise role in exercising his powers with his subordinates, for possessing a philosophy of persuasion as well as avoiding unethical behaviors within the work so that he can attract the trust of his subordinates (Sheer, 2012).

Paternalistic Leadership greatly affects employee performance through a range of functional behaviors. Several previous studies have found direct relationships between paternalistic leadership and many organizational variables such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, loyalty, and organizational citizenship behaviors (Chen et al., 2012).

There is no agreement among researchers on the concept of paternalistic leadership, and most of them agreed that paternalistic leadership can be described as a type of leadership. In paternalistic leadership,
the leader is assumed to have a function such as that of the head of the household and his task begins to improve his relations with members of his community by maintaining them (Chukwudi, 2009).

Although there is disagreement among researchers on the definition of the concept of paternalistic leadership, the majority of these researchers agreed that paternalistic leadership has three main dimensions: authoritarian leadership, benevolent leadership, and moral leadership (Cicellin, et al., 2015; Chou, 2015).

Authoritarian leadership refers to the conduct of a leader who has full authority and control over subordinates and demands subordinates to complete obedience (Ozcelik & Cenkci, 2014).

Benevolent Leadership means having good relationships with employees and working to create a friendly working environment, which benefits the organization (Anwar, 2013).

Moral Leadership refers to leadership that respects the rights and dignity of others and has four main dimensions: integrity, altruism, collective motivation, and collective encouragement (Resick et al., 2006).

Deviant behavior is an important issue for business. Also, deviant work behavior is a set of intentional or voluntary actions by an employee (Spector & Fox, 2005; Ramshida & Manikandan, 2013; Chiamaka et al., 2014).

Deviant behavior has a range of negative effects (Aftab & Javeed, 2012). Deviant work behavior is a deliberate set of actions by employees (Thomas, 2012). Deviant work behavior is a set of illicit and unethical behaviors (Fine et al., 2010).

This article aims to review PL and deviant behavior. It proposes a conceptual model that addresses the relationship between PL and deviant behavior at Menoufia University Hospitals in Egypt. In other words, it discusses PL and deviant behavior in order to highlight the results of previous studies. Based on these findings, it proposes a conceptual framework. Also, it concludes the importance of PL at Menoufia University Hospitals in Egypt.

This article is organized as follows (1) introduction, (2) literature review, (3) research model, (4) research questions and hypotheses, (5) the research strategy, (6) empirical results, (7) the research findings, (8) the research recommendations, and (9) future research.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Paternalistic Leadership

2.1.1. Paternalistic Leadership Concept

There are diversified views on the concept of Paternalistic Leadership. This is due to the ambiguity of this concept (Pellegrini & Scandura, 2008).

Paternalistic Leadership is a leadership style that resembles the role of the father in the family. It combines strong power with concern for subordinates and consideration. In other words, it is the pattern that takes care of workers. A leader in Paternalistic Leadership cares for and protects subordinates and carries them with respect and appreciation (Hakimian et al., 2014).

Paternalistic Leadership means the leadership of the family as the father who uses his power to promote the well-being of the family, and it combines goodness with patriarchal domination (Humphreys et al., 2014).

Paternalistic Leadership is a pattern that encompasses strict discipline and authority, patriarchal charity, and moral integrity in the prevailing climate of the organization (Chen, 2013). Paternalistic Leadership means that the leader behaves like the father with the children and is keen to help employees and solve their personal problems in every way possible, and as a result of this attention will be the loyalty of the subordinates to the leader and the organization (Anwar, 2013).

Paternalistic Leadership is a subordinate relationship between the leader and the subordinate, in which the leader exercises his or her personal and professional life in a manner similar to the father in the family, and in return expects them to be loyal and respectful (Balassiano et al., 2012). Paternalistic Leadership consists of morality, benevolence and domination. Morality refers to personal virtues, self-discipline and generosity. Charity refers to the concern for the personal and family well-being of subordinates. Authoritarianism indicates that the leader exercises absolute authority and demands unquestioned obedience (Wu et al., 2012). Paternalistic Leadership combines patriarchal authority and charity, strong discipline, and moral integrity (Wu & Tsai, 2012). Paternalistic Leadership is one of the methods of trusted leadership, which is characterized by charity as the father and the moral integrity of the leader within his authority (Hsieh & Chen, 2011).
Paternalistic Leadership is a hierarchical relationship in which a leader directs the professional and personal life of subordinates in a manner similar to the treatment of parents. Conversely, loyalty and respect are expected from subordinates (Pellegrini & Scandura, 2010). Paternalistic Leadership is a hierarchical relationship, in which the leader directs his subordinates both in their professional and personal lives. Like a parent, expect in return that loyalty and respect on their part. In other words, it is a subordinate relationship in which the leader exercises his personal and professional life for subordinates in a manner similar to the father in the family, and in return expects loyalty and respect (Gelfand et al., 2007).

Paternalistic Leadership is managing people in a framework of patriarchal charity, prestige, impartiality and altruism. In other words, it is the combination of power, charity, and moral integrity (Cheng et al., 2004).

2.1.2. Paternalistic Leadership Dimensions
The dimensions of Paternalistic Leadership are benevolent, moral, and authoritarian, (Cicellin, et al., 2015; Chou, 2015; Rajasekar & Beh, 2013; Kai, 2013; Wu et al., 2012; Wu, et al, 2011; Hou-ming & Bo, 2011; Niu, et al, 2009; Cheng, et al., 2004; Farh & Cheng, 2000). These dimensions can be illustrated as follows:

2.1.2.1. Benevolent Leadership
Benevolent Leadership is the process of creating a positive circle of encouragement and implementing positive change in organizations through (1) taking ethical decisions and actions, (2) developing spiritual awareness in the community, (3) hope and courage to promote positive action, (4) leaving a positive impact in Society (Tan, 2015).

Benevolent Leadership is a concern for the subordinate personal and family well-being. Benevolent Leadership provides individual care and privileges, tolerates subordinates, maintains a family-friendly work environment and promotes informal personal relationships with subordinates (Rajasekar & Beh, 2013).

Benevolent Leadership means having good relationships with employees and working to create a friendly work environment, which benefits the organization (Anwar, 2013).

Benevolent Leadership suggests that leaders must use goodness with subordinates, and that subordinates in turn must give loyalty and gratitude to their leaders (Tsia, 2012).

Benevolent Leadership takes care of subordinates and encourages them to find solutions when faced with specific problems (Rehman & Afzar, 2012).

Benevolent Leadership achieves the common interest or positive results of all or most members of society (Karakas & Emine, 2011).

Benevolent Leadership is divided into two parts; either individually or collectively for subordinates (Min et al., 2011).

Benevolent Leadership focuses on achieving perceived benefits, or results for the common good (Karakas, 2009).

2.1.2.2. Moral Leadership
Research on moral leadership has proliferated since the mid-1990's, and moral leadership is characterized by a high degree of personal integrity (Hu et al, 2015).

Moral leadership takes care of subordinates and cares for them in areas that are outside the scope of official work, and concerns the material and psychological needs of followers. Interest also extends to the family of subordinates, that the relationship between the leader and the subordinate is in the long run, and that dealing with subordinates is respectful (Farh, 2014).

Moral leadership is a leading role in individual and ethical behavior; this requires leaders to have a high level of self-discipline and moral integrity (Kai, 2013).

Moral Leadership means the leader's personality with integrity and moral awareness that encourages team development and preference for organizational interests over personal interests. A moral leader plays an important role in influencing subordinates and their behaviors, so a leader who wants to achieve the goals of his organization must have good morals to gain others and the ability to achieve goals (Resick et al., 2011).

Moral leadership means doing the right thing with others and it is essential in society with different customs and traditions (Zimmerli, et al, 2007).
There are three dimensions of moral leadership: (1) the legitimate dimension of moral leadership is that moral leadership seeks to clarify the normative principles that apply to the relationship between the employer, subordinates and the manager, (2) the organizational dimension of moral leadership is that leadership is within organizational frameworks, and that ethical leadership includes implications for the ethical standards of culture in organizations, and (3) the individual dimension of moral leadership is that moral leadership defines virtues and serves the moral development of individual business leaders (Becker, 2007).

Moral leadership refers to leadership that respects the rights and dignity of others and has four main dimensions: integrity, altruism, collective motivation, and collective encouragement (Resick et al., 2006).

Moral leadership is the extent to which administrative leaders can demonstrate appropriate ethical behaviors through personal actions and relationships, and encourage subordinates to do so (Brown et al., 2005).

2.1.2.3. Authoritarian Leadership

Authoritarian leadership is the practice of controlling subordinates, and they deliberately ignore the suggestions and contributions of subordinates (Liu & Wang, 2015).

Authoritarian leadership refers to the behavior of a leader who has full authority and control over subordinates and demands subordinates to complete obedience (Ozcelik & Cenkci, 2014).

Authoritarian leadership negatively affects subordinates' attitudes and behaviors, such as employee satisfaction with their leaders, organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior (Zhang et al, 2014).

Authoritarian leadership indicates that a leader does not respect others in making decisions, as well as a leader's behaviors that emphasize absolute authority and control that requires obedience (Mussolino & Calabro, 2013).

Authoritarian leadership is that the leader is strong in his authority, has absolute authority, has strict control over subordinates, and must obey fully without reservation (Fu et al., 2013).

Autocratic leadership is less concerned with the needs of subordinates, and disciplinary measures are often used to control individual behaviors (Carr, 2013).

Authoritarian leadership focuses on absolute power, controlling subordinates and making them feel uncomfortable, and there is tension in the interrelationships between supervisors and subordinates (Wu et al., 2012).

Authoritarian leadership refers to the conduct of a leader who emphasizes absolute authority and control over subordinates and asks them to obey without any discussion (Wu, et al, 2011).

Authoritarian leadership not only emphasizes individual authority and subordinate hegemony but also contains different types of behavior such as authoritarianism, subversion, etc. (Min et al, 2011).

Autocratic leadership is interested in making decisions without the participation of subordinates, and this leads to a cumbersome atmosphere characterized by complaints and blaming others. The level of power varies from one command pattern to another, as the authoritarian leader uses the method of sanctions against subordinates (Moskovich, 2009).

Authoritarian leadership refers to the conduct of a leader who emphasizes absolute authority and control over subordinates and demands them to be fully obedient (Cheng, et al., 2004).

2.2. Deviant Behavior

Recent years have seen great interest from researchers in deviant behavior. Researchers have made great efforts to understand this behavior and take action to limit its spread in organizations (Fox et al., 2001; Jonge & Peters, 2009; Gualandri, 2012).

Organizational behavior scientists have been interested in studying deviant behavior that is detrimental to the interests of the individual and the organization. Continued deviant behavior in organizations was a serious and costly issue for the Organization (Jensen et al., 2011; Guay et al., 2015).

Deviant behavior is an important issue for business owners because of its extensive nature (Ramshida & Manikandan, 2013).

Deviant work behavior is a set of intentional or voluntary actions by an employee who is capable of harming the organization or its members or both (Spector & Fox, 2005; Chiamaka et al., 2014).
There are three categories of job behavior that are performed by employees in the organization. They are mission behavior, organizational citizenship behavior, and deviant work behavior. Mission behaviors are behaviors that contribute to the organization's core maintenance and conversion activities such as making products, selling goods, delivering services, scheduling and others. Organizational citizenship behavior is the voluntary, non-prescriptive, positive behavior of the worker in the interest of the public organization (Smith et al., 1983; Rotundo & Sackett, 2002). Deviant work behavior is voluntary and violates important regulatory standards and thus threatens the safety of the organization or its members or both (Robinson & Bennett, 2000).

Deviant behavior has a range of negative effects, including poor productivity, increased absenteeism, reduced motivation for work, harm to the organization and individuals, and damage to the reputation of the organization, loss of clients, which has many negative financial implications for the organization, has a negative impact on the performance of the organization (Aftab & Javeed, 2012).

Deviant work behavior is a deliberate set of actions by employees intended to harm colleagues, the organization and its stakeholders (Thomas, 2012).

Deviant work behavior is a set of illicit and unethical behaviors and deviant employee behaviors such as theft from co-workers, fraud, and drug use (Fine et al., 2010).

Organizational behavior scientists have been interested in studying reverse behavior such as aggression, vandalism, conflict, theft, etc., as it is a behavior that damages organizations (Goh, 2006).

The researcher believes that although researchers differ in agreement on the definition of the behavior of deviant work, but there is a set of common characteristics of the concept of deviant work behavior, the most important of which is that these behaviors are intentional and deliberate and have a negative impact on the organization. These behaviors are similar because they violate the norms, laws and values of the organization and thus threaten the safety of the organization or its members or both. The various dimensions of deviant behavior are the most important deviant behavior towards the organization, deviant behavior towards colleagues and deviant behavior towards the direct supervisor. This study will focus on deviant behavior towards the organization.

3. Research Model

The proposed comprehensive conceptual model is presented in Figure (1). The diagram below shows that there is one independent variable for the study of PL. There is one dependent variable DB.

The research framework suggests that PL has an impact on DB at Menoufia University Hospitals in Egypt.

The present study handles PL as an independent variable. PL as measured consisted of benevolent leadership, moral leadership, and authoritarian leadership. The researcher has employed the measure
developed by Rajasekar & Beh, 2013; Kai, 2013; Fu, et al., 2013; Wu et al., 2012; Cheng, 2009 to measure PL. It is worthy of mention that this measure consists of 15 statements.

Also, the present study handles DB as an dependent variable. The researcher has employed the measure developed by Bennett & Robinson, 2000 to measure DB. This measure consists of 12 statements.

4. Research Questions

Paternalistic Leadership has positive effects in society at large because of the ability to have the emotional trust of subordinates. Emotional confidence demonstrates personal ties and positive feelings towards the leader and plays an important role in explaining how a patriarchal leader can motivate his followers to meet high performance standards (Chen 2011).

Paternalistic Leadership provides care and guidance to subordinates in their professional and personal lives in a paternalistic manner and in return expects loyalty and respect from employees (Aycan et al., 2013).

There are numerous studies in Paternalistic Leadership that have focused on strengthening the role of subordinates in the organization. These studies have shown that Paternalistic Leadership significantly influenced the performance and effectiveness of subordinates and organizational outputs, including loyalty to the leader, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior and job performance (Cheng & Wang, 2014).

Paternalistic Leadership affects individual, group, and organizational outcomes in organizations, and a potential outcome of parental leadership is increased work flexibility, reduced turnover and improved commitment, loyalty and teamwork (Özer & Tinaztepe, 2014).

The researcher reached the research problem through two sources. The first source is to be found in previous studies, and it turns out that there is a lack in the number of literature review that dealt with the relationship between PL and DB at Menoufia University Hospitals in Egypt. This called for the researcher to test this relationship in the Egyptian environment.

The second source is the pilot study, which was conducted an interview with (30) employees at Menoufia University Hospitals in Egypt to identify PL and DB. The researcher found through the pilot study several indicators notably the blurred important and vital role that could be played by PL in affecting DB at Menoufia University Hospitals in Egypt. The research questions of this study are as follows:

Q1: What is the nature and extent of the relationship between PL (benevolent leadership, moral leadership, and authoritarian leadership) and DB at Menoufia University Hospitals in Egypt?
Q2: What is the extent of the relationship between PL (benevolent leadership, moral leadership, and authoritarian leadership) and DB at Menoufia University Hospitals in Egypt?
Q3: What is the nature of the relationship between PL (benevolent leadership, moral leadership, and authoritarian leadership) and DB at Menoufia University Hospitals in Egypt?

5. Research Hypotheses

The results of many previous studies confirm the relationship between PL and some other variables, not including OD, where one of the studies has been concerned with the analysis of the relationship between PL and creative behavior of employees. The results of this study indicated that there a statistically significant relationship between PL and the creative behavior of workers. It was also found that job insecurity as an intermediate variable has a significant negative impact on the relationship between PL and creative behavior of employees (Hakimian et al., 2014).

In a comprehensive study of a wide range of employees in small Chinese family businesses demonstrate the three dimensions of PL (benevolent leadership, moral leadership, and authoritarian leadership) in those companies and determining the viewpoints of employees. The majority of views were positive with high competitive correlations between those dimensions of PL (Sheer, 2012).

There have been many previous studies on the relationship between PL and JS. A study has shown that benevolent leadership has a positive impact on JS. On the other hand, the authoritarian leadership has a positive impact on the motivation level of employees at work. Also, moral leadership has no negative or positive impact on employee results. Finally, the study found that PL has a positive impact on employee outcomes (Anwar, 2013).
Accordingly, the first hypothesis of the study can be formulated in the form of imposition of nothingness as follows:

**H1:** There is no statistically significant relationship between PL (benevolent leadership) and OD at Menoufia University Hospitals in Egypt.

**H2:** PL (moral leadership) of employees has no statistically significant effect on OD at Menoufia University Hospitals in Egypt.

**H3:** There is no relationship between PL (authoritarian leadership) and OD at Menoufia University Hospitals in Egypt.

6. Population and Sample

The population of the study included all employees at Menoufia University Hospitals in Egypt. The total population is 3307 employees. The random sampling was used for collecting the primary data as it was difficult to get all of the items of the research population, because of time limitations. The stratified random sample was used while selecting items from the different categories of employees. The following equation determines the sampling size (Daniel, 1999):

\[ n = \frac{N \times (Z\alpha)^2 \times P (1-P)}{d^2 (N-1) + (Z\alpha)^2 \times P (1-P)} \]

The number of samples obtained by 344 employees at Menoufia University Hospitals in Egypt is presented in Table (1).

**Table (1): Distribution of the Sample Size on the Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Size of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physicians</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>344 X 15% = 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>2141</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>344 X 65% = 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Staff</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>344 X 20% = 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3307</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>344 X 100% = 344</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Personnel Department at Menoufia University, 2017*

By using the lists of employees at the Staff Affairs Department, MUH random choice of categories was attained. Table (2) illustrates the features of sample units MUH in Egypt.

**Table (2): Characteristics of Items of the Sample**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variables</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Job Title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physicians</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Staff</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 30 to 45</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 45</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- Educational Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- Period of Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 5 to 10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. The Survey Structure

The survey used to measure PL and DB at Menoufia University Hospitals in Egypt. This survey consists of three parts. The first described the objectives of the research. The second asked for the demographic variables of employees. The third questions related to PL and DB at Menoufia University
8. Research Variables and Methods of Measuring

The 15-item scale of PL is based on Rajasekar & Beh, 2013; Kai, 2013; Fu, et al., 2013; Wu et al., 2012; Cheng, 2009. There were five items measuring benevolent leadership, five items measuring moral leadership, and five items measuring authoritarian leadership. The survey form has been used as a key tool to collect data to measure organizational success at Menoufia University Hospitals in Egypt.

The 12-item scale of DB is based on Bennett & Robinson, 2000. The survey form has been used as a key tool to collect data to measure DB at Menoufia University Hospitals in Egypt.

Responses to all items scales were anchored on a five (5) point Likert scale for each statement which ranges from (5) “full agreement,” (4) for “agree,” (3) for “neutral,” (2) for “disagree,” and (1) for “full disagreement”.

9. Data Analysis and Hypotheses Testing

9.1. Coding of Variables

The research consists of two main variables. The first is PL (independent variable). The second is JA (dependent variable). Each variable consists of sub-variables. The main variables, sub-variables, number of statement, and methods of measuring variables can be explained in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Variables</th>
<th>Sub-Variables</th>
<th>Number of Statement</th>
<th>Methods of Measuring Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variable PL</td>
<td>Benevolent Leadership</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rajasekar &amp; Beh, 2013; Kai, 2013; Fu, et al., 2013; Wu et al., 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moral Leadership</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authoritarian Leadership</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable DB</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Bennett &amp; Robinson, 2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.2. Descriptive Analysis

Before testing the hypotheses and research questions, descriptive statistics were performed to find out means and standard deviations of PL and DB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>The Dimension</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Benevolent Leadership</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moral Leadership</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authoritarian Leadership</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Measurement</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB</td>
<td>Total Measurement</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.447</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (4), presented the various facets of PL and DB. Most of the respondents identified the presence of PL (M=3.12, SD=0.513), DB (M=1.72, SD=0.447).

9.3. Evaluating Reliability

Data analysis was conducted. All scales were first subjected to reliability analysis. ACC was used to assess the reliability of the scales. Item analysis indicated that dropping any item from the scales would not significantly raise the alphas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Number of Statement</th>
<th>ACC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Benevolent Leadership</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moral Leadership</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authoritarian Leadership</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Measurement</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB</td>
<td>Total Measurement</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.844</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SPSS, V.23, 2015
Table (5) presents the reliability of PL and DB. The 15-items of PL are reliable because the ACC is 0.910. The 12-items of DB is reliable because the ACC is 0.844. Thus, the internal consistency of PL and DB can be acceptable.

9.4. The Means, St. Deviations and Correlation among Variables

| Table (6): Means, St. Deviations and Intercorrelations among Variables |
|-----------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| Variables                  | Mean   | Std. Deviation | PL    | DB    |
| PL                         | 3.24   | 0.623            | 1     |       |
| DB                         | 1.72   | 0.447            | 0.257*| 1     |

Source: SPSS, V.23, 2015

Regarding Table (6), the level of PL is high (Mean=3.24; SD=0.623), while DB is (Mean=1.72; SD=0.447). The correlation between PL and DB is 0.257.

9.5. The Correlation between PL and DB

The relationship between PL and DB at Menoufia University Hospitals in Egypt is presented in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table (7) Correlation Matrix between PL and DB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolent Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian Leadership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ** Correlation is significant at 0.01 level.
Source: The researcher based on the outputs of SPSS, V.23, 2015

Based on the Table (7), correlation between PL (benevolent leadership) and DB is 0.164. For PL (moral leadership) and DB, the value is 0.104 whereas PL (authoritarian leadership) and DB shows correlation value of 0.208. The overall correlation between PL and DB is 0.257.

9.5.1. Paternalistic Leadership (Benevolent Leadership) and DB

The relationship between PL (Benevolent Leadership) and DB is determined. The first hypothesis to be tested is:

**H1: There is no statistically significant relationship between PL (Benevolent Leadership) and DB at Menoufia University Hospitals in Egypt.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table (8) MRA Results for PL (Benevolent Leadership) and DB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Variables of PL (Benevolent Leadership)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. My boss often cares and worries about the lives of his subordinates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My boss often inquires about my health and living conditions in everyday life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My boss gives me helping when I have trouble to reduce work pressure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My boss often provides care for me and my family as if we were his sons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My boss often seeks any well-being of subordinates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The researcher based on the outputs of SPSS, V.23, 2015
As Table (8) proves, the MRA resulted in the R of 0.821 demonstrating that the 5 independent variables of PL (Benevolent Leadership) construe DB significantly. Furthermore, the value of R square, PL (Benevolent Leadership) can explain 0.67% of the total factors in DB. Hence, 33% are explained by the other factors. Therefore, there is enough empirical evidence to reject the null hypothesis.

9.5.2. Paternalistic Leadership (Moral Leadership) and DB

The relationship between PL (Moral Leadership) and DB is determined. The second hypothesis to be tested is:

**H2: PL (Moral Leadership) of employees has no statistically significant effect on DB at Menoufia University Hospitals in Egypt.**

Table (9) MRA Results for PL (Moral Leadership) and DB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Variables of PL (Moral Leadership)</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My boss enjoys credibility and integrity at work.</td>
<td>0.135*</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My boss treats subordinates impartially at work.</td>
<td>0.802*</td>
<td>0.799</td>
<td>0.638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My boss offers the interest of subordinates on his own interests.</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My boss is a good example for subordinates.</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My boss is concerned with the specialization and professional controls at work.</td>
<td>0.079*</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table (9) proves, the MRA resulted in the R of 0.808. This means that DB has been significantly explained by the 5 independent variables of PL (Moral Leadership). As a result of the value of R², the four independent variables of PL (Moral Leadership) justified only 65% of the total factors in DB level. Hence, 35% are explained by the other factors. Therefore, there is enough empirical evidence to reject the null hypothesis.

9.5.3. Paternalistic Leadership (Authoritarian Leadership) and DB

The relationship between PL (Authoritarian Leadership) and DB is determined. The third hypothesis to be tested is:

**H3: There is no relationship between PL (Authoritarian Leadership) and DB at Menoufia University Hospitals in Egypt.**

Table (10) MRA Results for PL (Authoritarian Leadership) and DB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Variables of PL (Authoritarian Leadership)</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My boss is not transparent at work.</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My boss makes management decisions independently.</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My boss brings a lot of pressure when I work with him.</td>
<td>0.229*</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>0.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My boss reprimands if he does not do his job.</td>
<td>0.192*</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My boss shall be made the final decision of work independently.</td>
<td>0.205*</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table (10) proves, the MRA resulted in the R of 0.504 demonstrating that the 5 independent variables of PL (Authoritarian Leadership) construe DB significantly. Furthermore, the value of R square, 5 independent variables of PL (Authoritarian Leadership) can explain 0.10% of the total factors in DB level. Hence, 90% are explained by the other factors. Therefore, there is enough empirical evidence to reject the null hypothesis.

10. Research Results
1. The current research has shown that the dimensions of Paternalistic Leadership (benevolent leadership, moral leadership, and authoritarian leadership) play an important role in influencing the job attitudes of employees at MUH. 

2. MUH suffers from the widespread phenomenon of the leader's adherence to work-related information and not disclosing it to subordinates, which leads to dissatisfaction of its employees.

3. The leader at MUH cares about the subordinates and takes care of the amount of work they do, but does not care about their social matters.

4. The leader of MUH is credible and honest, but does not offer the interests of subordinates on his own reconciliation. They try to resolve differences between individuals by encouraging cooperation and informally.

5. (Benevolent leadership) ranked first, moral leadership came in second place, and authoritarian leadership came in third place. However, benevolent leadership plays an important role in achieving employee satisfaction and hence greatly influencing their behavior and achieving the objectives of MUH.

6. The leader of MUH does not provide assistance to those who are absent from work or make recommendations for the development of the hospitals.

7. The leader of MUH is characterized by not participating in decision-making with subordinates and insisting on his opinion.

8. The staff of MUH suffer from the leader's perverted behaviors that negatively affect them, and thus their performance.

9. Some employees of MUH feel that they are from the same family and have more intimate relationships than work relations, which increases their morale and strengthens their trust and makes them more connected to the hospitals.

10. The leader interest employees at MUH and his pursuit of their goals, motivates them to do more to provide the best possible for the hospitals, increase positive behaviors, and reduce deviant behaviors at the hospitals.

11. Recommendations

1. Leaders at MUH should engage subordinates in decision-making and allow them to express their opinions and suggestions. In other words, the need to pay attention to the participation of workers in MUH in decision-making because of its impact on the quality of work life within the hospitals.

2. Leaders in MUH should follow a differentiated behavior that is appropriate to each circumstance or situation to minimize or reduce the deviant behavior.

3. Exerting pressure on subordinates at MUH and dealing with them severely generates adverse side effects that affect their job performance.

4. Developing a set of regulations and laws that determine the competencies and powers of managers and staff at MUH in order to avoid tyrannical leadership because of its negative impact on work within the hospitals.

5. Making employees identical with MUH by adopting different means including generating a sense of being part of the hospitals and involving it in decision-making. Ensuring the availability of justice in all its aspects, which contributes significantly to reducing the deviant behavior.

6. Leaders at MUH should do more to improve staff positive behaviors and reduce deviant behaviors. This has a positive impact on organizational outputs and the reputation of the hospitals.

7. Providing the principle of democracy in dealing between employees at MUH with the necessity of the director of ethical aspects when dealing with his subordinates because of its moral impact within the work at the Hospitals.

8. Leaders at MUH should put restrictions on the practice of negative behaviors by activating a strict control system as well as applying strict rules towards those who do these behaviors.

9. Leaders at MUH should increase the awareness of individuals of the importance of the role they play, through the freedom to express their views and suggestions.

10. The need to provide justice among workers, whether fair in the procedures justice as well as distributive justice and dealings justice at MUH.
11. The administration of MUH and all higher education institutions should urge researchers to study the causes that lead to the spread of deviant behavior and the means of reducing it. This behavior has become widespread in most organizations, both in the public and private sectors.

12. Leaders at MUH should set an example for others, and follow the best means to win staff and take care of their interests.

13. Leaders at MUH should balance the interests of subordinates with their own and not favor their own interests over those of others.

14. Leaders at MUH should try to raise the level of awareness of staff towards the importance of cooperation among them, and work in a team spirit, which contributes to achieve the objectives of the hospitals.

15. Leaders at MUH should listen to the complaints of staff and deal with them impartially and do not differentiate among them, which increases their respect for their leaders.

16. The existence of deviant behaviors in MUH is clear evidence of the adoption of false methods in the management of the hospitals, which negatively affects the productivity of its employees. Thus, its impact on the conduct of the educational process in general, and on the colleges affiliated to the hospitals, in particular is negative.

12. Future Researches

1. In order to generalize the results of the research must be studied in other organizations or sectors.

2. In this study, the deviant work behavior was treated as a one-dimensional variable which is the deviant behavior towards the organization, but there are studies that dealt with it as a multidimensional variable. The deviant behavior included the direction of colleagues or the direction of direct supervisor.

3. Study the impact of administrative control in reducing the behavior of deviant work.

4. Study the role played by distributive justice in reducing the behavior of delinquent work.
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