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Abstract Though integrated existing literature research, author proposed the theoretical model that paternalistic leadership affects employee performance and selected organizational justice as an intermediary variable. Through empirical analysis tested the model. The study results show that: Benevolent leadership and moral leadership have an important beneficial impact on employee performance; Authoritative leadership has a consequential favorable impact on task performance; Authority leaders have a significant negative impact on the scene performance; Organizational justice as an intermediary variable.
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1. Introduction

Watson, the founder of IBM, once said, "You can take my plant, burn my plants, but as long as leave my employees; I can rebuild the IBM." Thus, human is the decisive resource of enterprise to have been lasting competitiveness. It should be possible to improve the performance of employees when enterprise improves the production management in order to obtain healthier and more lasting development. In the process of the operation of the enterprise, managers' leadership behaviors and leadership style has a decisive influence on the employee's performance. In recent years, Scholars at China and other country did a lot of research on manager’s leadership behaviors and styles as well as their impact on employee performance; they found that distinctive leadership style will have the distinct impact on employee performance. However, research-related influence mechanism of leadership behavior on employee performance is limited.

Paternalistic leadership stems from a three-dimensional Chinese leadership model. Evidence from our country’s enterprise group proves that paternalistic leadership behaviors are widespread in China. In the United States, the family behavior patterns and paternalistic leadership style to enhance enterprise staff's performance plays a positive role in promoting. We also found the evidence from the Asia-pacific, Middle East and Latin America and other countries.

This study will choose organizational justice as the intermediary variable. Through the empirical study, we examine the mediation role of organizational justice between paternalistic leadership and employee performance and prove the impact process, the mechanism of action. Specifically, this study, mainly to solve two problems: 1. Did the paternalistic leadership affect the employee performance? This impact is positive or negative? Whether the effect of Paternalistic leadership 'three dimensions are different? 2. If paternalistic leadership affected the employee performance, what is the mechanism of impact? So one of the main purposes of this study was to investigate paternalistic leadership behavior whether or not influence on employee performance, second purpose is to explore the effect of the mediation mechanism.

Organizational justice refers to the feeling of the process or the result fairness or comments about the organization[1]. Williams (1999) proposed a just degree is lower; the employee's performance is subordinate[2]. When employees get a proper treatment, psychological and spiritual satisfaction, but also improve their work performance. As one of the important factors that affected employee performance, whether organizational justice is intermediary variable between three dimensions of paternalistic leadership and employee performance intermediary? This paper will choose it as an intermediary variable to research the mechanism of paternalistic leadership impact on employee performance, trying to uncover the role of the relationship between them.
2. Literature Review and Put Forward the Hypothesis

2.1. Paternalistic Leadership Behavior and Employee Performance

Paternalistic leadership is a kind of "under the environment of rule of man, it has revealed by discipline and authority, fatherly benevolence and moral leadership"[3-4], paternalistic leadership refers to the leader has the characteristics of parents, a kind of similar to the patriarchal style. Paternalistic leadership includes three important dimensions: kindness, virtue and authoritarian leadership. Kindness is referred to the leader's concern for subordinates and so on. Virtue leadership means leaders take the lead role in individual behavior and morality; this requires leaders to have a highly individual self-discipline character and high virtue. While authoritarian refers to the leader to subordinate has absolute authority and control, subordinates must completely obey, emphasizes the leader to control of the organization.

Employee performance means that they help to achieve organizational goals individually. It emphasizes on the staff's contribution to the organization's goals. Motowidlo&Boman (1993) thought that it could be divided into task performance and contextual performance, namely task - situation performance two-dimensional model[5]. Paternalistic leadership kindness, virtue and authoritarian have a different impact on two dimensions of employee performance. Leader takes care of people's life, so that the employees a sense of belonging to the enterprise, and actively serving enterprise; benevolent leadership also can create a harmonious working atmosphere, increase the communication between colleagues, and thus make the enterprise employees have a good interpersonal relationship. And virtue has a consequential positive prediction function to improve work satisfaction. Altruistic behavior, quit intention of subordinates have important negative prediction function. And authoritarian leadership is asking employees absolutely to obey the managers, asking employees to complete the work in strict accordance with the arrangement of leadership, not extra work to complete the task; they lack of enough initiative to dedicate to their enterprises. And authoritarian leadership can make the employees bear large pressure, which affected employee relationships. Past research has also basically the same as the basic assumption of this article, Zhou Mingjian (2010), through multiple regression analysis showed that the authoritarian leadership type has negative influence on subordinates’ performance[6]. Zhang Xinan, etc. (2009) found that team leader's authority behavior that there was no significant influence on team performance, behavior and virtue and kindness has positive influence on team performance. The kindness of team leader behavior and moral's behavior can promote team cooperative conflict processing mode, and improve team performance by this[7]. Thus, this paper concluded the following assumptions:H1a: Benevolent leadership leads to significant positively related to task performance;

H1b: Benevolent leadership leads to significant positively related to contextual performance;

H1c: morality leadership leads to significant positively related to task performance;

H1d: morality leadership leads to significant positively related to contextual performance;

H1e: authority leadership leads to significant negatively related to task performance;

H1f: authority leadership leads to significant negatively related to contextual performance;

2.2. Paternalistic Leadership and Organizational Justice

Organizational justice is one organization or unit of organization system, policies and measures related to personal interests of fairness. At present, the general view of organizational justice included justice, procedural justice and interactional justice. Distributive justice refers to the staff allocation of organizational rewards the outcome is fair feelings. Procedural justice refers to the method used to reward employees do decision (i.e. program) is fair feelings. Interactional justice is also called interpersonal justice, as the name implies, refers to communication between people who feel the quality. How did the three dimensions of paternalistic leadership influence on employee organizational justice? Previous studies involving less paternalistic leadership on the relationship between organizational justice, mainly concentrated in the western context of leadership influence on organizational justice.[7-10]

Bryman (1992) put ahead if the leaders often put forward clear vision, and communicating with employees to discuss, give employees the chance to express themselves, can enhance staff fair feeling[5]. Mayer et al. (2008) the empirical results show that, service leadership can enhance the organizational justice[11]. Zhou Hao, Long Lirong (2007) to 428 enterprises employees as the research object, discusses the relationship between paternalistic leadership and organizational justice The results show that benevolence leadership on organizational justice has a significant positive effect of each dimension; moral leadership on organizational justice has a significant positive effect of each dimension; authoritarian leadership has[8] remarkable negative effect on leadership justice. Research by before we can find, the leader of the benevolent leadership and moral leadership on employee organizational justice, positive effect is obvious, and disciplinarian leadership emphasizes leader's personnel will, so that the employee's organizational justice decline, so we make the following assumptions:

H2a: benevolent leadership and organizational justice significantly positive correlation;

H2b: moral leadership and organizational justice significantly positive correlation;

H2c: authoritarian leadership and organizational justice significantly negative correlation;

2.3. Organizational Justice and Employee Performance
Starting from the nineteen seventies metaphase, the relationship between the researchers began to study the justice and employee's feelings and behavior, found that organizational justice and job satisfaction, organizational commitment, performance, organizational citizenship behavior variables were significantly related to. It is pointed out that the Adams theory of distributive justice, if the individual perceives input and returns, a ratio is not fair; they will reduce the input[12]. If employees feel the rewards and degree of dedication to the organization and the proportion of other employees are not equal, will produce a sense of injustice, this will lead to lower yourself to the organization staff, thereby affecting the performance of the organization. Colquitt (2001) was fully the analysis shows that the 183 articles, three dimensions of fairness have significantly positive relationship with employee performance[13]. When employees think the decision-making process of opaque enterprises, employees will feel that not enough respect and access rights, employees will reduce organizational commitment, by reducing the investment to balance their sense of injustice, which affects the performance of the organization. Ma Na, Huang Guoquan (2011) through a questionnaire survey, data analysis and job performance directly influence that organizational justice[14]. The domestic and foreign research is generally believed that organizational justice has the positive effect on employee performance, so this hypothesis:

H3a: organizational justice and task performance positively correlated
H3b: organizational justice and contextual performance positively correlated;

2.4. Relationship with the Employee Performance of Paternalistic Leadership, Organizational Justice

Paternalistic leadership is how to influence employee performance? Scholars have tried to explain the mechanism of the effect of leadership behavior and employee performance, mainly through organizational citizenship behavior, team cohesion and employee creativity and other intermediary variable to build a bridge between[15-19] leadership behavior and employee performance. However, there's no mechanism of mediating role between scholars in paternalistic leadership and employee performance. Paternalistic leaderships as leadership behaviors are common in Chinese; Study of the mechanism of influence on employee performance is very valuable in theory and practice. The relationship between the two between the paternalistic leadership, employee performance, organizational justice has been part of the study and a lot of examples to prove the relationship between them. Therefore, we choose the organizational justice as intermediary variables to investigate the influencing factors of paternalistic leadership on employee performance. Thus, make assumptions:

H4a: in the relationship between paternalistic leadership and task performance, organizational justice plays an intermediary role;
H4b: in the relationship between benevolent leadership and contextual performance, organizational justice plays an intermediary role;
H4c: in the relationship between moral leadership and task performance, organizational justice plays an intermediary role;
H4d: in the relationship between moral leadership and contextual performance, organizational justice plays an intermediary role;
H4e: in the relationship between authoritarian leadership and task performance, organizational justice plays an intermediary role;
H4f: in the relationship between authoritarian leadership and contextual performance, organizational justice plays an intermediary role;

To sum up, the research frame as shown in figure 1:

Figure 1. The theoretical model of paternalistic leadership and organizational justice Among them: AL: authoritative leadership, BL: Benevolent leadership, ML: moral leadership; OJ: organizational justice; TP: task performance CP: contextual performance
3. Research Design

3.1. Survey Tools

An empirical survey research method was used in this article. Measuring tool using the mature scale widely used in literature at China and other countries, through the relevant scholars and experts to discuss, appropriate amendments according to the research problems and research object of understanding, and from the formal questionnaire to modify. Paternalistic leadership scale to amount three-dimensional model developed by Zheng Boxun is based, a total of 15 items, including 5 items of authoritarian leadership, benevolent leadership and moral leadership of five items, five items of[3]. Organizational justice scale designed main reference Colquitt's compilation of organizational justice scale; this paper selects the[13] 5 questions. Employee performance scale used Williams and Anderson's programming task performance scale as well as Van Scotter and Motowidlo the scene performance scale[5], altogether 6 questions. All variables have the 6 Likert scale measurement, score from “very little” to "very much."

3.2. Sample Selection and Data Sources

The questionnaire used in this paper mainly distribute in the recruitment site, telephone survey of some enterprise managers, questionnaire 600, successfully recovered 240, excluding 21 invalid questionnaires, the remaining 219 efficient questionnaires, 20 copies of the telephone survey, are valid questionnaires, the productive questionnaire was 239 of the total a survey of enterprises, state-owned enterprises, private enterprises and foreign enterprises.

Samples from the structure point of view, the object being investigated from state-owned enterprises accounted for 46%, private enterprises accounted for 50%, foreign-funded enterprises accounted for 4%; the level of education, graduate and above accounted for 18%, undergraduate 36%, college 32%, high school and below accounted for 14%. The position, ordinary staff accounted for 66%, first-line managers 22%, 10% middle-level managers, 2% senior managers; the size of the company in the following 50 people accounted for 2%, 50-100 accounted for 18%, 100-500 accounted for 56%, more than 500 people accounted for 24%.

4. The Results

4.1. Analyses of Reliability and Validity

The application of SPSS19.0 software for reliability analysis, results show; paternalistic leadership precipitated three-factor structure, benevolent leadership, moral leadership; authoritarian leaderships of three factors of Cranach’s Alpha values were 0.814, 0.843 and 0.807, structure of single factors of organizational justice and employee performance precipitation of high load. Cranach’s Alpha = 0.857, 0.885. Thus, each factor of interior consistency coefficients was finer than 0.70, so the inside factors of excellent consistency. In addition, the paternalistic leadership, organizational justice, staff performances of the three sub scales of the Alpha coefficients were 0.832, 0.856, 0.791, is finer than 0.7, and the coefficient of total scale was 0.897, representing the reliability of this scale is very pleasant.

The validity of the scale, this paper uses factor analysis to examine the scale projects, attempts to verify the rationality of scale dimension. Before the factor analysis, the need for KM0 sample measure and Bartlett's test of sphericity, to determine if the samples meet to do factor analysis. The paternalistic leadership scale for a sample of KM0 measure and Bartlett's test of sphericity, KMO value is 0.810, the value of ideal, and the Bartlett's test of sphericity results $\chi^2 = 839.586, \text{Sig}=0.000$, indicates that the data, it is suitable for factor analysis. Explain the total variance is 56.083%, through principal component analysis, and using the vari max orthogonal rotation, extracting three factors, benevolent leadership, moral leadership, and authoritarian leadership. On organizational justice scale was used to test, KM0 test and Bartlett's sphericity results show that, the KMO value is 0.904, the value of ideal, and the Bartlett's test of sphericity results $\chi^2 = 1202.536, \text{Sig}=0.000$, indicates that the data is very appropriate for factor analysis. On employee performance scale was used to test, KMO test and Bartlett's sphericity results show that, the KMO value is 0.851, the value of ideal, and the Bartlett's test of sphericity results $\chi^2 = 886.868, \text{Sig}=0.000$, indicates that the data is very suitable for a factor analyst.

Application of LISREL8.70 software for CFA test, the results also show that the first three factors model, paternalistic leadership, a single-factor model of organizational justice, goodness of fit indices of staff performance of the first-order double factor model and the ideal sample data (as shown in Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\chi^2/\text{df}$</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>NFI</th>
<th>NNFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>IFI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paternalistic leadership (first three factor model)</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational justice (first-order factor model)</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee performance (first-order double factor model)</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.054</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2. Verification and Correction of Structural Equation Model

In this paper, we chose LISREL8.70 software to examine the hypothesis with the method of the structural equation model, this figure 1 provides the basic framework of M1 model; the model reflects the paternalistic leadership in three dimensions of a direct impact on employee performance and organizational justice through indirect influence on employee performance. In order to test the hypothesis that the M1 is modified, get some intermediary model of M2, M3 and M4 complete mediation model. The M2 canceled a sense of a fairness intermediary role between authoritarian leadership and employee performance in M1 group, M3 in M2 to cancel the direct effect of moral leadership on contextual performance; M4 will canceled the benevolent leadership and authority leadership directly impact on the performance of M1 - M4 model, the fitting effect as shown in Table 2 in this paper, selected four kinds of evaluation index to test the overall fit of the model: 1, chi-square test, $\chi^2/df$ value; 2, for the index, NFI, NNFI; 3, index CFI, IFI, RMSEA; 4, the residual index, SRMR. Comparison of four model fit indices, which can be found on M1, M2, similar to M3 indexes, and are mostly located in the ideal numerical interval, the three assumptions of the model and the sample data is consistent. This paper selects the partial mediation model M2 for final interpretation mode.

Table 2. fit index hypothesis model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEM</th>
<th>$\chi^2/df$</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>NFI</th>
<th>NNFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>IFI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1: BL-TP, ML-TP, AL-TP; BL-CP, ML-CP, AL-CP; BL-OJ, ML-OJ, AL-OJ, OJ-TP, OJ-CP.</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2: BL-TP, ML-TP, AL-TP; BL-CP, ML-CP, AL-CP; BL-OJ, ML-OJ, OJ-TP, OJ-CP.</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3: BL-TP, ML-TP, AL-TP; BL-CP, AL-CP; BL-OJ, ML-OJ, OJ-TP, OJ-CP.</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4: BL-OJ, ML-OJ, OJ-TP, OJ-CP.</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.084</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3. The Analysis Results of Hypothesis Test

(1) through the study of paternalistic leadership on the relationship between three dimensions of employee performance show: the validity of benevolent leadership and task performance is related ($\beta=0.53, P < 0.01$), benevolent leadership effectiveness and contextual performance positively correlated ($\beta=0.35, P < 0.01$), the effectiveness of moral leadership and task performance positive correlation ($\beta=0.60, P < 0.01$), authoritative leadership on task performance effectiveness of positive correlation ($\beta=0.25, P < 0.05$), authoritative leadership positively related to contextual performance effectiveness ($\beta=-0.56, P < 0.05$), consistent with this hypothesis. H1a, H1b, H1c, H1f was verified. H1d, H1e has not been verified.

(2) Benevolent leadership and organizational justice are
positively related to effectiveness ($\beta = 0.61, P < 0.05$), $H2a$ has been verified. Benevolent leadership and organizational justice are positively related to effectiveness ($\beta = 0.14, P < 0.05$), $H2b$ has been verified. The authority of leadership and organizational justice is not significant; $H2c$ has not been verified.

(3) Organizational justice and task performance effectiveness of positive correlation ($\beta = 0.56, P < 0.05$), organizational justice and task performance effectiveness of positive correlation ($\beta = 0.46, P < 0.05$), $H3a$, $H3b$ was verified.

(4) Organizational justice played an intermediary role in the relations between the benevolent leadership and task performance; $H4a$ has been verified. Organizational justice played an intermediary role between benevolent leadership and contextual performance; $H4b$ has been verified. Organizational justice plays an intermediary role between moral leadership and task performance; $H4c$ has been verified. Organizational justice plays an intermediary role between moral leadership and task performance; $H4d$ has been verified. Organizational justice between authoritarian leadership and task performance did not play an intermediary role. $H4e$ has not been verified. Organizational justice between authoritarian leadership and task performance did not play an intermediary role. $H4f$ has not been verified.

4.4. Discussion and Summary

In this paper, by using the structural equation model of the mechanism of the effect of paternalistic leadership on employee performance were studied; the results mainly have two aspects: first, the three dimensions of paternalistic leadership have the direct impact on employee's performance, the benevolent leadership and moral leadership have a positive effect, while the authoritarian leadership and employee performance has a negative effect. The leader is more concerned about the staff, make oneself an example, selfless; employees more can play my enthusiasm, the initiative to make contributions to the enterprises, improve the company's performance. Only the leader sees staff as one family, employee to the enterprise as a big family, and they will dedicate to his own value. However, the leader if too much emphasis on their subjective wills, requiring employees to obey but make employees lose confidence, thereby affecting the performance of the organization.

Secondly, the relationship between paternalistic leadership and employee performance, organizational justice plays a mediating role; benevolent leadership through organizational justice has a positive effect on employee performance; authoritarian leadership through organizational justice had a negative effect on employee performance; this shows that if the leader can take the initiative to care for subordinates, timely solve the difficulties encountered by the staff, staff organizational justice will increase, which will have a positive effect on employee performance, and authoritarian leadership too much emphasis on the subordinate control weakened the organizational justice, resulting in adverse effects on employee performance. From the results, we can find that the moral leadership and not through organizational justice affect employee performance, this may be because the staff made oneself an example, set an example for the behavior and not allocation of employee justice, procedural justice and interactional justice function, moral leadership leaders should cooperate with benevolent leadership can play a more effective leadership the role of.

At present, the paternalistic leadership is widely used in our country, although there are some problems, but the paternalistic leadership has certain reference to enterprise management in China. At present, our country centralized management of many enterprises is more serious. Do not be denied to take centralized management mode in the initial stage of the small and medium-sized enterprise has a positive role in improving corporate performance, but if the employee's control degree is high, is easy to ignore the humanized staff management measures, resulting in employee does not maximize the performance. So on the one hand the enterprise should take reasonable rewards and punishment system in the production of enterprises, improve employee performance, on the other hand, also pay attention to other staffs, improve staff welfare, staff took the initiative to solve the facing problem in life, shaping the corporate "home" culture, so that employees take the initiative to do a contribution for enterprise. From the results of this study can be seen that the organizational justice and job performance of employee performance has a positive effect, so the enterprise leaders should focus on employee's organizational justice, shall establish and improve the scientific salary system to ensure that the enterprise scientific and equitable distribution, in the practice of management of convincing; establish efficient channels of communication, to ensure that employees can query and comments on the relevant resolutions, leadership should be strengthened and the communication between employees, enhance staff's sense of fairness, play to their potential to maximize; decision-making open, transparent, to ensure that employees are more familiar with the understanding and grasp of the decision-making process leading to reduce the leadership decision-making, misunderstanding, to better understand the meaning and purpose of leadership decision.

There are also shortcomings in this paper, the intermediary variable research has only considered the organizational justice, other factors such as leadership, trust, organizational commitment, organizational culture and other intermediary variable is not considered. It can be used as the future direction of the research, in addition to focus on the study of paternalistic leadership on the impact of the distinctive phases of the enterprise, the study of paternalistic leadership had what effect for distinct types of enterprises.
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