
AI translation · View original & related papers at
chinaxiv.org/items/chinaxiv-202104.00085

The Relationship between Paternalistic Leadership and Employee Performance in the Chinese Context: A Meta-Analysis

Authors: Liu Doudou, Xu Yan, Li Chaoping, Li Chaoping

Date: 2021-04-20T00:00:00+00:00

Abstract

This study employs meta-analysis and criterion profile meta-analysis techniques to examine the relationship between paternalistic leadership and employee performance in the Chinese context. Through literature search and screening, a total of 139 studies comprising 400 effect sizes ($N = 44605$) were included. The meta-analytic findings indicate that: (1) Benevolent leadership and moral leadership demonstrate strong positive correlations with task performance and organizational citizenship performance, and strong negative correlations with counterproductive performance. Conversely, authoritarian leadership exhibits significant negative correlations with task performance and organizational citizenship performance, and a significant positive correlation with counterproductive performance. (2) The low authoritarian leadership profile (characterized by high levels of benevolent and moral leadership) demonstrates the strongest predictive power for task performance and organizational citizenship performance, whereas the high authoritarian leadership profile (characterized by low levels of benevolent and moral leadership) demonstrates the strongest predictive power for counterproductive performance. (3) Age moderates the strength of the relationship between certain dimensions of paternalistic leadership and performance, whereas the moderating effect of gender on the relationship between dimensions of paternalistic leadership and performance is not significant. The research findings further reveal the “truth” regarding the relationship between paternalistic leadership and individual performance in the Chinese context.

Full Text

Preamble

A Meta-Analysis of the Relationship Between Paternalistic Leadership and Employee Performance in the Chinese Context

Liu Doudou¹, Xu Yan¹, Li Chaoping^{1,2*}

(1 Institute of Organization and Human Resources, School of Public Administration and Policy, Renmin University of China, Beijing 100872, China)

(2 School of Management, Xinxiang Medical University, Xinxiang 453003, China)

Abstract

This study employs meta-analysis and meta-analytic criterion profile analysis to examine the relationship between paternalistic leadership and employee performance in the Chinese context. Through systematic literature collection and screening, 139 studies with 400 effect sizes ($N = 44,605$) were included. The meta-analysis results reveal that: (1) Benevolent leadership and moral leadership exhibit strong positive correlations with task performance and organizational citizenship behavior, and strong negative correlations with counterproductive work behavior. Conversely, authoritarian leadership shows significant negative correlations with task performance and organizational citizenship behavior, and a significant positive correlation with counterproductive work behavior. (2) The low-authoritarian leadership profile (characterized by high levels of benevolent and moral leadership) demonstrates the strongest predictive power for task performance and organizational citizenship behavior, while the high-authoritarian leadership profile (characterized by low levels of benevolent and moral leadership) shows the strongest predictive power for counterproductive work behavior. (3) Age moderates the strength of relationships between some dimensions of paternalistic leadership and performance, whereas gender does not exhibit a significant moderating effect. These findings further illuminate the “true nature” of the relationship between paternalistic leadership and individual performance in the Chinese context.

Keywords: paternalistic leadership, task performance, organizational citizenship behavior, counterproductive work behavior, meta-analysis, meta-analytic criterion profile analysis

Received: December 2, 2020

Funding: National Natural Science Foundation of China (71772171); “Central Universities’ World-Class University (Discipline) and Characteristic Development Guidance Special Fund” of Renmin University of China (2021034)

Corresponding Author: Li Chaoping, Email: lichaoping@ruc.edu.cn

1 Introduction

As leadership theory research has deepened, scholars have begun to question whether Western leadership models are ill-fitting for Chinese populations (Li Yan et al., 2013; Zheng Boxun et al., 2000). Building on this cultural perspective, Farh and Cheng (2000) proposed the concept of paternalistic leadership. Paternalistic leadership (PL) refers to a leadership style characterized by absolute authority, patriarchal care, and moral exemplariness within a context

of rule-by-man governance. As a paragon of indigenous leadership research, this leadership model has gradually become a prominent topic in organizational behavior (Lin Ziting et al., 2017; Wang Lin et al., 2020; Wu & Xu, 2012). Current research has extensively examined the effects of paternalistic leadership, investigating factors including employee attitudes (Chen et al., 2014; Wu et al., 2012), employee behaviors (Wu Shijian et al., 2020; Nazir et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2015), and employee performance (Wang et al., 2018). Performance, as a core element of organizational contexts, holds significant importance for organizations, leaders, and employees (Fang Laitan et al., 2011; Yang Mengxi et al., 2019; Griffin et al., 2007). Consequently, the relationship between paternalistic leadership and employee performance has become a focal point of scholarly attention. While empirical research on the relationship between paternalistic leadership and performance in the Chinese context has yielded fruitful results, inconsistencies remain in existing findings. For instance, conclusions regarding the relationship between authoritarian leadership and work performance are mixed: Hou Nan and Peng Jian (2019) argue that authoritarian leadership positively impacts employee performance, whereas Chan et al. (2013) demonstrate a significant negative correlation between authoritarian leadership and employee performance. Additionally, the strength of relationships between benevolent leadership, moral leadership, and performance varies across studies. Zhang Huifang (2016) found strong relationships between benevolent and moral leadership and organizational citizenship behavior, while Jia et al. (2020) and Sheer (2010) did not find such strong correlations.

Although previous meta-analyses have examined the relationship between paternalistic leadership and employee performance, they have typically combined domestic and international studies. Leadership is a culturally embedded behavior, and its connotations and processes are influenced by culture (Hofstede & Bond, 1988). Combining studies from different cultural backgrounds in a meta-analysis may yield conclusions confounded by cultural factors. Therefore, this study includes only research conducted within China on the relationship between paternalistic leadership and employee performance, maximizing the exclusion of cultural influences to reveal the true impact of paternalistic leadership on employee performance in the Chinese context (Sun Xiuli et al., 2020), thereby providing more effective guidance for future domestic research.

Second, existing meta-analyses typically analyze the three dimensions of paternalistic leadership independently or in parallel, failing to comprehensively consider their interrelationships. This study introduces meta-analytic criterion profile analysis (MACPA) to synthesize the effects of the three dimensions of paternalistic leadership on employee performance. MACPA is a method that uses published data to identify patterns (or profiles) of predictor variables that exhibit optimal relationships with criterion variables through multiple regression, and quantifies the strength of these associations (Wiernik et al., 2020). MACPA integrates the advantages of criterion profile analysis (CPA), meta-analytic structural equation modeling (MetaSEM), and meta-analysis, offering researchers a novel perspective to examine relationships between a set of predic-

tors and a criterion—specifically, identifying which predictor profile shows the strongest association with the criterion, thereby illuminating theoretical relationships between predictors and criteria (Davison et al., 2015). This study employs MACPA from a person-centered perspective to explore the relationship between profiles combining the three dimensions of paternalistic leadership and employee performance, deepening our understanding of how paternalistic leadership influences employee performance and helping managers adjust their leadership styles to enhance employee performance, thereby further guiding leadership research and practice.

Furthermore, the effectiveness of leadership styles results from the joint influence of leaders and employees. While previous research has examined the relationship between employee demographic characteristics such as age and gender and paternalistic leadership (Hiller et al., 2019), it has not investigated the moderating effects of these characteristics on the relationship between paternalistic leadership and employee performance in the Chinese context. Therefore, this study incorporates gender and age factors, using meta-analysis to examine their influence on the relationship between paternalistic leadership and performance in the Chinese context.

In summary, this study comprehensively searches for Chinese and English literature on the relationship between paternalistic leadership and performance (including three dimensions: task performance, organizational citizenship behavior, and counterproductive work behavior) conducted in the Chinese context. Using meta-analysis and MACPA, we examine the relationship between paternalistic leadership and performance while considering the influence of gender and age to clarify the boundary conditions of this relationship and derive implications for management practice.

1.1 Paternalistic Leadership

Given the cultural specificity of Chinese organizations, Farh and Cheng (2000) built upon previous work (Silin, 1976; Redding & Hsiao, 1990) to confirm the prevalence of paternalistic leadership in Chinese organizations and further proposed a triadic theory of paternalistic leadership: authoritarian leadership (AL), benevolent leadership (BL), and moral leadership (ML). Paternalistic leadership carries a strong color of rule-by-man governance, with three distinct leadership types: First, authoritarian leadership demonstrates strong autocratic style, emphasizing absolute authority and control by the leader, requiring subordinates to unconditionally accept assignments and obey leadership. Second, benevolent leadership demonstrates consideration and support, emphasizing the leader's care and concern for subordinates' work and personal lives, and securing welfare benefits for them. Third, moral leadership demonstrates noble personal character, self-discipline, and selflessness, emphasizing the leader's impartiality and leading by example.

1.2 Work Performance

Although research on work performance has yielded fruitful results, scholars have not reached consensus on the classification of work performance (Chen Xuejun & Wang Zhongming, 2001; Motowidlo & Kell, 2012). Different scholars have categorized performance into various types, primarily including two-dimensional (Wang Hui et al., 2003; Borman & Motowidlo, 1993), three-dimensional (Rotundo & Sackett, 2002; Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996), and multi-dimensional models (Han Yi et al., 2007; Welbourne et al., 1998). In meta-analytic research, scholars have adopted different approaches to classifying performance, which can be summarized into three categories: The first is a global performance perspective, typically dividing performance into subjective and objective performance based on data characteristics (Bowling et al., 2015; Morris et al., 2015), or aggregating it into overall job performance (O' Boyle et al., 2011). The second is a two-dimensional performance perspective, where scholars conduct meta-analytic research based on different two-dimensional performance frameworks, such as task performance and contextual performance (Liu Jun & Qin Chuanyan, 2019; Su Tao et al., 2017). The third approach follows Rotundo and Sackett's (2002) three-dimensional model, dividing performance into three dimensions: task performance (TP), organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), and counterproductive work behavior (CWB).

When conducting in-depth meta-analytic research on performance, more scholars adopt the three-dimensional model (Joplin et al., 2019; Smallfield et al., 2020). This study aligns with these meta-analyses by dividing performance into three dimensions to more accurately reveal the impact of paternalistic leadership on performance.

1.3 The Relationship Between Paternalistic Leadership and Work Performance

Based on the triadic model of paternalistic leadership, this paper analyzes the relationships between benevolent leadership, moral leadership, and authoritarian leadership with task performance, organizational citizenship behavior, and counterproductive work behavior. Specifically:

Social exchange theory and the principle of reciprocity posit that when one party receives favors and assistance from another, they will actively reciprocate with behaviors of equal value, gradually establishing a "reciprocal interdependence" social exchange relationship (Blau, 1964; Dansereau et al., 1975). In organizational contexts, benevolent leaders often mobilize resources from work and life to provide psychological and material care for subordinates, offering them good development opportunities (Lin Ziting et al., 2014; Wang & Cheng, 2010). In return, subordinates will work harder to complete tasks as expected by the leader on time and in full (Schuh et al., 2013; Zheng, 2016). Additionally, this reciprocity spills over to the organizational level (Eisenberger et al., 2010). Employees under benevolent leadership will also actively engage in voluntary

behaviors beneficial to the organization—organizational citizenship behaviors such as altruism (Wu Shijian et al., 2020) and voice behavior (Duan Jinyun, 2012; Li & Sun, 2015)—and reduce behaviors outside job responsibilities that are detrimental to the organization—counterproductive behaviors such as workplace deviance (Zheng et al., 2020) and misconduct (Wang Shilei et al., 2013). Based on the above, we propose:

H1a: Benevolent leadership is positively related to task performance.

H1b: Benevolent leadership is positively related to organizational citizenship behavior.

H1c: Benevolent leadership is negatively related to counterproductive work behavior.

Social learning theory suggests that employees view leaders as important role models and learn their attitudes, values, and behaviors through observation, imitation, and learning (Bandura, 1971). When moral leaders demonstrate self-sacrifice, virtue-based conduct, and leading by example, subordinates perceive the leader as trustworthy and respectable, view them as a role model, and learn and imitate their behavior (Niu et al., 2009). On one hand, the exemplary demonstration of dedication and commitment by moral leaders subtly promotes employees' positive work behaviors and enhances work performance (Xu Yanni et al., 2014; Zheng Boxun et al., 2000; Brown & Trevino, 2006). On the other hand, moral leadership can effectively enhance subordinates' moral awareness and quality, thereby reducing their unethical behaviors at work and increasing behaviors beneficial to the organization or others (Lin Shengzhu & Yang Baiyin, 2014; Yang Jiping & Wang Xingchao, 2015; Cheng et al., 2004). Therefore, we propose:

H2a: Moral leadership is positively related to task performance.

H2b: Moral leadership is positively related to organizational citizenship behavior.

H2c: Moral leadership is negatively related to counterproductive work behavior.

Social exchange theory indicates that when the quality of an exchange relationship is low, the relationship remains at the level of economic exchange without providing additional resources to the other party (Blau, 1964). Unlike benevolent and moral leadership, authoritarian leadership emphasizes absolute authority and demands unconditional obedience from subordinates, limiting their subjective initiative. As times change, the social foundation of authoritarian leadership has gradually weakened, making the relationship between authoritarian leaders and subordinates more likely to remain at the economic exchange level (Wu Shijian et al., 2020; Zhang Yinpu et al., 2020; Zheng et al., 2020). In such relationships, subordinates are unwilling to spend extra time and energy on organizational citizenship behaviors outside their job responsibilities (Li & Sun, 2015). Moreover, when facing unequal exchange behaviors such as leader reprimands and monitoring, subordinates may develop rebellious psychology, become 消极怠工, respond by reducing work performance (Chan et al., 2013; Schaubroeck et al., 2017), or even engage in counterproductive behaviors (Cohen-Charash &

Spector, 2001; Chan, 2014). Therefore, we propose:

H3a: Authoritarian leadership is negatively related to task performance.

H3b: Authoritarian leadership is negatively related to organizational citizenship behavior.

H3c: Authoritarian leadership is positively related to counterproductive work behavior.

Building on this, this paper further explores which profiles of the three-dimensional combination of paternalistic leadership are most effective for employees' task performance, organizational citizenship behavior, and counterproductive work behavior, respectively. On one hand, under the care of high-level benevolent behavior, subordinates develop motivation to reciprocate the leader and organization. Under the exemplary demonstration of high-level moral behavior, subordinates view the leader as a role model and learn their dedication and organizational commitment through influence. At this point, if the leader's authoritarian behavior is low, the work atmosphere becomes more relaxed, subordinates can communicate bidirectionally with the leader, and possess greater autonomy, thus working actively to repay the leader's care and learning diligently to keep pace with the role model, further promoting work performance (Hou Nan & Peng Jian, 2019). Additionally, Chou et al. (2015) found that the combination of low authoritarianism, high benevolence, and high morality is most effective for subordinate outcomes such as organizational commitment. In short, when leaders exhibit low authoritarian, high benevolent, and high moral behaviors, subordinates demonstrate the highest task performance and organizational citizenship behavior. On the other hand, under high-level command-based authoritarian leadership, subordinates' autonomy is restricted and their needs are ignored (Zhang Yan & Huai Mingyun, 2012). If leaders simultaneously reduce care and support for subordinates and fail to lead by example in the organization, subordinates often show superficial compliance while remaining unconvinced internally (Cheng et al., 2004). Over time, subordinates may express their dissatisfaction indirectly, such as by increasing counterproductive work behavior (Wang Zhen et al., 2012; Chen et al., 2014). Moreover, Chou et al. (2015) also found that the combination of high authoritarianism, low benevolence, and low morality is least effective for positive subordinate outcomes; correspondingly, this profile should be most effective for negative outcomes. Therefore, when leaders exhibit high authoritarian, low benevolent, and low moral behaviors, subordinates demonstrate the highest counterproductive work behavior. Based on the above, we propose:

H4a: The low-authoritarian leadership profile (with high levels of benevolent and moral leadership) has the strongest relationship with task performance.

H4b: The low-authoritarian leadership profile (with high levels of benevolent and moral leadership) has the strongest relationship with organizational citizenship behavior.

H4c: The high-authoritarian leadership profile (with low levels of benevolent and moral leadership) has the strongest relationship with counterproductive

work behavior.

1.4 Moderating Effects of Gender and Age

(1) Gender. Role Congruity Theory suggests that gender differences exist in workplace demands (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Ramusack & Sievers, 1999). Compared to men, women tend to favor person-centered and relationship-oriented leadership behaviors and place greater emphasis on relational aspects of the work environment (Boatwright & Forrest, 2000). Paternalistic leadership carries a color of rule-by-man governance, with benevolent and moral leadership emphasizing care, support, and moral exemplification, creating a relaxed and pleasant work atmosphere that can meet women's needs for their work environment, thus better promoting positive work performance among female subordinates. Therefore, the relationships between benevolent leadership, moral leadership, and performance are weaker among men. Second, social gender roles indicate that men are more inclined toward competitive behavior, have stronger career ambition, and demonstrate more aggressiveness and proactivity in organizations, potentially neglecting cooperation and tolerance (Eagly et al., 2000). Characterized by an "instrumental orientation," men find it more difficult to obey authority when facing paternalistic leadership, especially authoritarian leadership, and may not complete leader instructions on time (Brandt & Henry, 2012), even engaging in counterproductive behaviors to express dissatisfaction. Moreover, in the socialization process, men are less socialized than women, making it difficult in organizational contexts for men to capture potential information conveyed behind leader behaviors through perspective-taking or empathy (Zhao Xian et al., 2012), and consequently more difficult to engage in more leader-desired behaviors. Therefore, the relationship between authoritarian leadership and performance is stronger among men. Based on the above, we propose:

H5a: Gender moderates the relationships between benevolent leadership, moral leadership, and performance. The higher the proportion of men, the weaker the relationships between benevolent leadership, moral leadership, and performance.

H5b: Gender moderates the relationship between authoritarian leadership and performance. The higher the proportion of men, the stronger the relationship between authoritarian leadership and performance.

(2) Age. As a core demographic variable, age's impact on work performance cannot be ignored (Ng & Feldman, 2008). The Life Span Theory of Development posits that individual psychological and behavioral development encompasses a continuous process across the entire lifespan, with employees of different ages having different growth experiences, work needs, and motivations (Heckhausen & Schulz, 1995; Heckhausen et al., 2010). Individuals of different ages may exhibit different behaviors in organizations (Goštautaitė & Bučiūnienė, 2015). First, age stereotypes indicate that older employees are more accepting of paternalistic leadership styles (Vale et al., 2020) and exhibit more benevolent and

moral behaviors. In organizational contexts, they better understand the intentions behind benevolent and moral leadership, and in return for the leader's care, invest more wisdom and skills into task performance and organizational citizenship behavior. Thus, the relationships between benevolent leadership, moral leadership, and performance are stronger among older employees. Second, older employees are more traditional, value collective interests, are loyal to the organization, more readily accept authoritarian leadership styles, and possess stronger emotional regulation abilities (Chapman & Hayslip, 2006; Scheibe et al., 2016), tending to use self-regulation to cope with negative leader behaviors. Therefore, the relationship between authoritarian leadership and performance is weaker among older employees. Finally, younger employees do not blindly worship authority, value self-actualization, fair communication, and self-esteem (Li Yanping & Hou Xuanfang, 2012; Shri, 2011). Command-based authoritarian leadership that demands unconditional obedience can damage younger employees' self-worth, creating perceptions of being "undervalued and poorly treated," leading them to reduce task performance and organizational citizenship behavior and engage in counterproductive work behavior to cope with authoritarian leadership. Based on the above, we propose:

H6a: Age moderates the relationships between benevolent leadership, moral leadership, and performance. The older the age, the stronger the relationships between benevolent leadership, moral leadership, and performance.

H6b: Age moderates the relationship between authoritarian leadership and performance. The older the age, the weaker the relationship between authoritarian leadership and performance.

[Figure 1: see original paper] The moderating mechanism of the relationship between paternalistic leadership and performance

2 Method

2.1 Literature Search and Screening

To comprehensively and systematically include empirical literature on the relationship between paternalistic leadership and employee performance, this study temporarily did not limit outcome variables during the literature search stage and searched all literature using terms related to paternalistic leadership and its dimensions. First, we searched Chinese databases (CNKI Journal Full-text Database, China Excellent Doctoral and Master's Theses Database, Conference Proceedings Database, VIP Journal Resource Integration Service Platform, and Wanfang Data Knowledge Service Platform) using keywords such as "paternalistic leadership," "benevolent leadership," "moral leadership," and "authoritarian leadership." Second, we searched English databases (APA PsycINFO, ProQuest (Dissertation), EBSCO-Academic Search Premier, Web of Science, SAGE, Wiley, Google Scholar) using "Paternalistic Leadership," "Benevolent Leadership," "Moral Leadership," and "Authoritarian Leadership" as topics,

combined with “China” and “Chinese” as keywords. The literature search was conducted through January 2021.

We screened initially retrieved literature according to the following criteria: (1) Eliminate non-empirical research such as pure theoretical studies, review articles, and case studies; (2) Following Roth et al.’s (2018) recommendations, exclude studies that did not report sample sizes and correlation coefficients between variables; (3) Include only studies examining the relationship between paternalistic leadership and individual performance, excluding those investigating team- or organizational-level performance; (4) Include only survey samples of Chinese employees or social workers in organizational contexts; (5) For duplicate publications, select only one; if a dissertation was later published as a journal article, use the published data. Ultimately, 136 useful articles were obtained, including 99 Chinese articles and 37 English articles; 85 journal articles and 51 dissertations; 139 independent studies with 400 effect sizes and a total sample size of 44,605. The literature screening process is shown in [Figure 2: see original paper].

2.2 Literature Coding

We coded key information from literature included in the meta-analysis, such as publication information (author + title + year), sample size, correlation coefficients, scale reliability coefficients, paternalistic leadership dimensions, employee performance dimensions, sample mean age, sample male proportion, measurement instruments, variable raters, and measurement time points. Based on the three-dimensional performance model (Rotundo & Sackett, 2002), we uniformly coded performance descriptions and dimensions. When literature included terms such as work performance, in-role performance, task performance, or subjective/objective performance, we coded them as task performance; when literature included terms such as organizational citizenship behavior, contextual performance, extra-role performance, we coded them as organizational citizenship behavior; when literature included terms such as counterproductive behavior, workplace deviance, or misconduct, we coded them as counterproductive work behavior. Additionally, we used independent samples as the coding unit, coding each independent sample once. If multiple independent samples existed in one article, we coded them separately. Two researchers conducted the coding process according to unified literature and coding standards (Lipsey & Wilson, 2001), achieving 98.20% coding consistency. Discrepancies were resolved by revisiting the original text and discussing to reach consensus. For studies that did not report reliability α , we used the weighted mean reliability from other studies as the reliability coefficient (Field & Gillett, 2010). For objective performance, we set the reliability coefficient to 1 (Lipsey & Wilson, 2001).

[Figure 2: see original paper] Literature screening process

2.3 Statistical Methods

This study sequentially conducted fail-safe N analysis, heterogeneity testing, sensitivity analysis, main effect testing, criterion profile effect testing, and moderator effect testing. First, we used fail-safe N to test for publication bias, estimating how many unpublished studies would be needed to render the results non-significant (Rothstein et al., 2005). When fail-safe N exceeds 5K+10, larger values indicate smaller likelihood of publication bias and more stable meta-analytic results (Zhang Jianping et al., 2020; Orwin, 1983). Second, we used heterogeneity testing to examine whether effect sizes were heterogeneous (Dong Baobao et al., 2020). Third, we used the Meta-Sen method for sensitivity analysis to explore the extent to which results were influenced by extreme values or abnormal distributions. The Meta-Sen method combines the advantages of meta-analysis and sensitivity analysis, outputting results before and after extreme value removal to determine how much extreme values or publication bias affect the robustness of meta-analytic conclusions (Field et al., 2020; Slemp et al., 2020). For main effect testing, we used the psychmeta package (Dahlke & Wiernik, 2019) in R (R Core Team, 2019) and adopted the widely used Hunter and Schmidt (2004) meta-analytic method in organizational management research to process and analyze data. For criterion profile effect testing, we used the Configural package for two-stage MACPA analysis (Wiernik et al., 2020): Stage 1 identifies the optimal profile—the profile of the three paternalistic leadership dimensions that shows the optimal relationship with the criterion variable; Stage 2 quantifies the strength of the relationship between the optimal profile and the criterion by calculating the similarity between the average profile and the optimal profile to estimate the predictive power of the optimal profile for the criterion, and uses profile level and profile scores in a new regression model to estimate the relative explanatory power of level effects (average profile) and profile effects (optimal profile). To further verify the robustness of the optimal profile, we conducted fungible profile analysis in the two-stage framework, adjusting R^2 values to 0.005 and 0.010 and comparing profile shape differences across different R^2 values. Minimal shape variation indicates a robust optimal profile. Finally, we used the psychmeta package for meta-regression analysis of mean age and male proportion (Dahlke & Wiernik, 2019) to test the moderating effects of potential moderators.

3 Results

3.1 Sensitivity Analysis and Heterogeneity Testing

This study used fail-safe N to detect publication bias in research on paternalistic leadership dimensions and employee performance, estimating how many unpublished studies would be needed to change results from significant to non-significant (Rothstein et al., 2005). When fail-safe N exceeds 5K+10, larger values indicate smaller likelihood of publication bias and more stable meta-analytic results (Zhang Jianping et al., 2020; Orwin, 1983). As shown in , the fail-safe N values for combinations of paternalistic leadership dimensions and employee

performance dimensions far exceed 5K+10, indicating that this study has minimal publication bias and that meta-analytic conclusions possess considerable stability and reliability.

Additionally, to test whether effect sizes included in the meta-analysis were heterogeneous, we conducted heterogeneity analysis (Dong Baobao et al., 2020). Results shown in indicate that Q statistics for combinations of paternalistic leadership dimensions and performance dimensions are statistically significant ($p < 0.001$), suggesting heterogeneity among effect sizes. Higgins et al. (2003) suggest that I^2 values of 25%, 50%, and 75% represent low, medium, and high heterogeneity, respectively. I^2 values for combinations of paternalistic leadership dimensions and performance dimensions all exceed 75%, indicating high heterogeneity. In summary, all effect sizes exhibit heterogeneity.

Furthermore, since extreme values and abnormal distributions can affect the robustness of meta-analytic results (Schmidt & Hunter, 2015; Viechtbauer & Cheung, 2010), this study conducted sensitivity analysis (Field et al., 2020) and found that the influence of extreme values and publication bias on meta-analytic results was negligible. The absolute difference between sample-weighted mean effect sizes after extreme value removal and corresponding original mean estimates before removal was less than 20% ($|\Delta| \leq 20\%$), indicating that extreme values had negligible impact on results in this study (Field et al., 2020). Additionally, the absolute difference in trim-and-fill (Duval & Tweedie, 2000) and PET-PEESE (Stanley & Doucouliagos, 2014) values before and after extreme value removal was less than 20%, indicating that publication bias is not severe for relationships between paternalistic leadership dimensions and employee performance outcomes. Therefore, we report original meta-analytic results below.

3.2 Main Effects of Paternalistic Leadership on Employee Performance

presents the main effect testing results for relationships between paternalistic leadership dimensions and employee performance. As shown, authoritarian leadership is significantly negatively correlated with task performance ($\beta = -0.15$, 95% CI [-0.23, -0.08]) and organizational citizenship behavior ($\beta = -0.17$, 95% CI [-0.23, -0.11]), and significantly positively correlated with counterproductive work behavior ($\beta = 0.35$, 95% CI [0.25, 0.45]). Conversely, benevolent leadership is significantly positively correlated with task performance ($\beta = 0.35$, 95% CI [0.29, 0.40]) and organizational citizenship behavior ($\beta = 0.42$, 95% CI [0.37, 0.46]), and significantly negatively correlated with counterproductive work behavior ($\beta = -0.31$, 95% CI [-0.37, -0.24]). Additionally, moral leadership is significantly positively correlated with task performance ($\beta = 0.32$, 95% CI [0.25, 0.39]) and organizational citizenship behavior ($\beta = 0.41$, 95% CI [0.37, 0.46]), and significantly negatively correlated with counterproductive work behavior ($\beta = -0.28$, 95% CI [-0.35, -0.21]). Hypotheses 1a through 3c receive preliminary support.

**** Meta-analytic results of paternalistic leadership dimensions and employee

performance

Note: BL = Benevolent Leadership; ML = Moral Leadership; AL = Authoritarian Leadership (same below). k = number of independent samples for effect sizes; N = cumulative sample size; \bar{d} = sample-weighted mean effect size; \bar{d}_{rc} = reliability-corrected sample-weighted mean effect size; SD = standard deviation of d ; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval for d ; 80% CV = 80% credibility interval for d . I^2 Q statistic and significance represent heterogeneity among effect sizes; I^2 represents the proportion of heterogeneity in total variation. Nfs-0.05 = fail-safe N at $p = 0.05$ level. * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$.

3.3 Meta-Analytic Criterion Profile Analysis Results

The criterion profile results for paternalistic leadership and task performance are shown in [Figure 3: see original paper]A. Compared to other combinations of paternalistic leadership, employee task performance is highest when leaders exhibit low authoritarianism and high benevolence and morality.

shows that both the overall profile ($r_{lev} = 0.29$) and optimal profile ($r_{pat} = 0.32$) of paternalistic leadership are related to task performance, with the optimal profile showing substantial incremental validity beyond the overall profile ($\Delta R^2 = 0.06$), indicating that the optimal and overall profiles are strongly correlated but distinct, with the optimal profile demonstrating the strongest predictive power for task performance. Additionally, due to the strong correlation between benevolent and moral leadership ($r = 0.64$), we conducted fungible profile analysis to further examine profile robustness, adjusting R^2 values to 0.005 and 0.010. [Figure 4: see original paper]A shows that the low-authoritarian (high benevolence, high morality) profile remains relatively stable across different levels, with no significant changes in peaks and valleys. Hypothesis 4a is supported: when leaders exhibit low authoritarian behavior, the work atmosphere becomes more relaxed, subordinates can communicate bidirectionally with leaders and possess greater autonomy, thus working actively to repay the leader's care and further promoting task performance.

The criterion profile results for paternalistic leadership and organizational citizenship behavior are shown in [Figure 3: see original paper]B. Employee organizational citizenship behavior is highest when leaders exhibit low authoritarianism and high benevolence and morality. shows that both the overall profile ($r_{lev} = 0.38$) and optimal profile ($r_{pat} = 0.37$, $\Delta R^2 = 0.07$) of paternalistic leadership are strongly related to organizational citizenship behavior, with each dimension of paternalistic leadership correlating with organizational citizenship behavior, but the low-authoritarian (high benevolence, high morality) profile combination showing the strongest relationship. Fungible profile analysis results in [Figure 4: see original paper]B also show that the optimal profile shape does not change substantially with R^2 values, indicating that the low-authoritarian (high benevolence, high morality) criterion profile is robust. Hypothesis 4b is supported: when leaders exhibit low authoritarian behavior combined with high benevolent

and moral behaviors, subordinates develop higher-quality exchange relationships with leaders, view leaders as learning models, and consequently engage in more organizational citizenship behavior.

**** Meta-analytic criterion profile analysis results

Note: PL = Paternalistic Leadership; R = multiple correlation of the total regression model; r = zero-order correlation between effect size and criterion; = square root of R^2 increment beyond other effects (i.e., semi-partial correlation); β = standardized regression coefficient for level and profile effects; $r_{lev.pat}$ = correlation between level and profile effects. Harmonic mean N_s = 11,595 (task performance), 21,222 (organizational citizenship behavior), 6,314 (counterproductive work behavior). k_s for correlations among paternalistic leadership dimensions range from 66 to 74; k_s for correlations between paternalistic leadership dimensions and task performance range from 30 to 37; k_s for correlations between paternalistic leadership dimensions and organizational citizenship behavior range from 60 to 80; k_s for correlations between paternalistic leadership dimensions and counterproductive work behavior range from 17 to 23.

The criterion profile results for paternalistic leadership and counterproductive work behavior are shown in [Figure 3: see original paper]C. Employee counterproductive work behavior is highest when leaders exhibit high authoritarianism and low benevolence and morality. shows that paternalistic leadership' s prediction of counterproductive work behavior can be attributed to both the overall profile ($r_{lev} = -0.13$) and optimal profile ($r_{pat} = 0.43$), with the optimal profile showing substantial incremental validity beyond the overall profile ($\Delta = 0.16$), indicating stronger predictive power for counterproductive work behavior. Furthermore, [Figure 4: see original paper]C shows that fungible profile analysis shapes at different R^2 levels do not differ significantly from the optimal profile shape, indicating a stable optimal profile shape. Hypothesis 4c is supported: under high-level command-based authoritarian leadership, if leaders simultaneously reduce care and support for subordinates and fail to lead by example, subordinates often engage in more counterproductive work behavior to express dissatisfaction. In summary, when examining the relationship between paternalistic leadership and employee performance, attention should be paid to profiles combining paternalistic leadership dimensions rather than paternalistic leadership as a whole.

3.4 Moderating Effects of Gender and Age

shows that gender does not significantly moderate the relationships between authoritarian leadership and task performance, organizational citizenship behavior, or counterproductive work behavior; nor does it moderate relationships between benevolent leadership and task performance, organizational citizenship behavior, or counterproductive work behavior; nor relationships between moral leadership and task performance, organizational citizenship behavior, or counterproductive work behavior. Therefore, gender does not significantly moderate

relationships between paternalistic leadership dimensions and performance. Hypotheses 5a and 5b are not supported.

**** Meta-regression of moderating variables

Note: B = unstandardized beta weight; SE = standard error; R^2 = variance explained rate. <0.05 <0.01 <0.10 k values insufficient

Additionally, shows that mean age significantly moderates the relationship between authoritarian leadership and organizational citizenship behavior ($p < 0.01$), explaining 32% of variance. Since authoritarian leadership is negatively correlated with organizational citizenship behavior (see), a positive regression coefficient indicates that this negative relationship weakens with age. Mean age also significantly moderates the relationship between moral leadership and task performance ($p < 0.05$), explaining 69% of variance, with the positive relationship strengthening with age. The moderating effect of mean age on the relationship between authoritarian leadership and counterproductive work behavior is marginally significant ($p < 0.10$), explaining 41% of variance, with the positive relationship weakening with age—age mitigates the impact of authoritarian leadership on counterproductive work behavior. Age does not significantly moderate relationships between authoritarian leadership, benevolent leadership and task performance; nor relationships between benevolent leadership and organizational citizenship behavior or counterproductive work behavior; nor the relationship between moral leadership and organizational citizenship behavior. Therefore, age significantly moderates relationships between some dimensions of paternalistic leadership and performance: the older the mean age, the stronger the relationship between moral leadership and task performance, and the weaker the relationships between authoritarian leadership and both organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. Hypotheses 6a and 6b receive partial support.

4 Discussion

4.1 The Relationship Between Paternalistic Leadership and Performance

As an important achievement of indigenous psychology research, paternalistic leadership has attracted close attention from scholars both domestically and internationally (Li Yan et al., 2013). Examining the impact of paternalistic leadership on performance in the Chinese context helps understand the effectiveness and context of paternalistic leadership, laying a foundation for subsequent research. However, leadership is a culturally embedded behavior, and its connotations and processes are influenced by culture (Hofstede & Bond, 1988). Combining domestic and Western studies in meta-analysis may yield conclusions confounded by cultural factors (Mansur et al., 2017). Based on this, this study focuses on the Chinese context, using meta-analysis and MACPA to examine the relationship between paternalistic leadership and performance, analyzing the paternalistic leadership profiles that best predict employee performance, and in-

corporating gender and age into the relationship, thereby addressing limitations in existing research and providing more precise estimates of the relationship between paternalistic leadership and individual performance in the Chinese context, guiding future leadership research.

First, to maximize the exclusion of cultural influences, this paper examines the true relationship between paternalistic leadership and performance in the Chinese context, providing more effective guidance for future domestic research. The findings show that in the Chinese context, benevolent and moral leadership are significantly positively correlated with task performance and organizational citizenship behavior, and significantly negatively correlated with counterproductive work behavior; authoritarian leadership is significantly negatively correlated with task performance and organizational citizenship behavior, and significantly positively correlated with counterproductive work behavior. These results provide a relatively precise estimate of the relationship between paternalistic leadership and individual performance in the Chinese context. Although these conclusions are consistent with previous meta-analytic results (Bedi, 2019; Hiller et al., 2019; Zorlu, 2019), the strength of relationships between paternalistic leadership and performance differs. This discrepancy may be attributed to cultural factors, suggesting that this study reveals the true impact of paternalistic leadership on employee performance in the unique Chinese context, providing more effective guidance for future domestic research.

Moreover, this study comprehensively considers all three dimensions of paternalistic leadership, using the relatively novel MACPA method to more precisely examine the profiles with the strongest predictive power for employee performance, expanding the application of MACPA and providing implications for management practice. First, existing meta-analyses typically analyze the three dimensions of paternalistic leadership independently or in parallel, failing to comprehensively consider their interrelationships (Huang Xu, 2017). This study adopts the MACPA method to comprehensively examine the effects of the three paternalistic leadership dimensions on performance. Second, from a person-centered perspective, it examines the relationship between profiles combining the three paternalistic leadership dimensions and employee performance, yielding more precise and effective conclusions. Although previous scholars have used latent profile analysis to study paternalistic leadership, their conclusions were based on a single military sample and did not examine relationships between profiles and performance, limiting profile robustness (Chou, 2015). The MACPA method integrates the advantages of meta-analysis, CPA, and MASEM, reducing the impact of human error on results based on different sample groups and sizes, yielding more precise conclusions about criterion profiles of paternalistic leadership's impact on performance. Finally, this study finds that the low-authoritarian leadership profile (with high benevolent and moral leadership) best predicts employee task performance and organizational citizenship behavior, while the high-authoritarian leadership profile (with low benevolent and moral leadership) best predicts counterproductive work behavior. Therefore, in management practice, to elicit optimal performance from subordinates, man-

agers should adjust their leadership style combinations according to different contexts.

4.2 Moderating Effects of Gender and Age

(1) Gender. Meta-regression results show that gender does not significantly moderate relationships between paternalistic leadership dimensions and employee performance. Regardless of gender, leaders' benevolent and moral behaviors promote employee task performance and organizational citizenship behavior while inhibiting counterproductive work behavior; leaders' authoritarian behaviors inhibit employee task performance and organizational citizenship behavior while promoting counterproductive work behavior. These findings do not support Role Congruity Theory, possibly due to the influence of China's unique social context. Specifically, since the founding of the People's Republic of China, numerous policies have been implemented to improve women's labor status (Long, 2016). Chinese women's roles have gradually shifted from the traditional "men work outside, women work inside" (Leung, 2003) to "women hold up half the sky." Moreover, the "reform and opening up" policy implemented in 1978 not only promoted China's economic development (Lin et al., 2003) but also provided opportunities for Chinese women to enter the workforce, increasing their participation in economic activities in the labor market (Sposato & Rumens, 2018). In this context, the role of traditional Confucian values advocating gender norms has gradually weakened (Long, 2016). Women now pursue self-actualization and equality at work, no longer bound by "breadwinner" concepts, and expect equal status and conditions with men in the labor market (Xu Chang, 2018). Consequently, gender differences in the relationship between paternalistic leadership and performance are minimal. In management practice, organizations should provide equal conditions for women in recruitment, appointment, promotion, and compensation to reduce workplace discrimination and promote gender equality.

(2) Age. Meta-regression results show that mean age moderates relationships between some paternalistic leadership dimensions and employee performance. As age increases, the negative predictive power of authoritarian leadership on organizational citizenship behavior weakens, and its positive predictive power on counterproductive work behavior weakens. On one hand, age stereotypes indicate that older employees are more traditional, more accepting of authoritarian leadership styles (Vale et al., 2020), better able to consider potential information behind authoritarian leadership from the leader's perspective (Luo Zhenbing, 2017; Zhao Xian et al., 2012), and more understanding of authoritarian leadership in organizational contexts, potentially investing time and energy in organizational citizenship behavior and reducing counterproductive behavior. On the other hand, empirical research shows that older employees focus more on positive experiences and have stronger emotional regulation abilities (Chapman & Hayslip, 2006; Scheibe et al., 2016). When facing comprehensive supervision and unconditional obedience demands from leaders, they tend

to cope through self-regulation, thus weakening the relationship between authoritarian leadership and performance with age. Additionally, meta-regression results show that the positive relationship between moral leadership and task performance strengthens with age. As individuals age, their emotional processing abilities gradually strengthen, and they tend to analyze and judge moral situations from an emotional perspective (Hannikainen et al., 2018). In organizational contexts, moral leaders, as honest and integrity-based role models, possess unique charisma and appeal that can particularly stimulate strong followership and learning desires among older subordinates, thereby influencing their work outcomes. Therefore, the relationship between moral leadership and task performance strengthens with age. In management practice, managers should value older employees by reducing age discrimination, such as focusing on age groups in HR practices (Chen Jian' an et al., 2017), and adjust their leadership behaviors according to employees' age. For example, leaders should reduce authoritarian behaviors when interacting with younger employees and increase moral behaviors when interacting with older employees.

4.3 Limitations and Future Directions

This study has several limitations that warrant future improvement: (1) Limited by language, tools, and capacity, only Chinese and English literature were included, creating potential literature selection bias. Future research should include all available studies, especially unpublished research, to ensure result stability and reliability. (2) Some meta-analytic effect sizes are relatively small, potentially limiting result validity. For example, moderator analysis of the relationship between moral leadership and counterproductive work behavior lacks age-based samples, requiring more empirical research for support. (3) Most research on relationships between paternalistic leadership dimensions and performance uses single-timepoint cross-sectional data, relatively neglecting the dynamic process of paternalistic leadership' s influence on subordinates and developmental changes in performance. Future research should use longitudinal designs to examine these relationships more accurately. (4) Future research should further examine other potential moderators of the relationship between paternalistic leadership and performance in the Chinese context, such as industry, region, and position of respondents. (5) Future meta-analyses could explore cross-level relationships between paternalistic leadership and team or organizational performance in the Chinese context, analyzing the processes and contexts through which paternalistic leadership exerts its effects.

This meta-analysis found that: (1) Benevolent and moral leadership have strong positive correlations with task performance and organizational citizenship behavior, and strong negative correlations with counterproductive work behavior. Conversely, authoritarian leadership has significant negative correlations with task performance and organizational citizenship behavior, and a significant positive correlation with counterproductive work behavior. (2) The low-authoritarian leadership profile (with high benevolent and moral leadership) has

the strongest predictive power for task performance and organizational citizenship behavior, while the high-authoritarian leadership profile (with low benevolent and moral leadership) has the strongest predictive power for counterproductive work behavior. (3) Age significantly influences the strength of relationships between some paternalistic leadership dimensions and performance, while gender does not exhibit a significant moderating effect.

References

(Note: References marked with * were included in the meta-analysis.)

- Bao Huanhuan. (2014). The impact of paternalistic leadership on employee performance (Master' s thesis). Zhejiang Sci-Tech University.

Chen Xuejun, & Wang Zhongming. (2001). Recent advances in performance models. *Psychological Science*, 24(6), 737-738.

Chen Jian' an, Tao Ya, & Chen Rui. (2017). Age diversity in the workplace: Frontiers and management implications. *Management Review*, 29(7), 148-162.

- Chen Weizheng, & Liu Yuan. (2010). Analysis of the impact of paternalistic leadership style on employee silence. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 67-81.
- Cheng Min. (2015). The impact of paternalistic leadership on employee followership and performance: The moderating role of interpersonal justice (Master' s thesis). Zhejiang University.
- Chi Meina. (2020). The inverted U-shaped effect of benevolent leadership on employee voice behavior: The mediating role of responsibility perception. *Chinese Personnel Science*, (04),
- Duan Jinyun. (2012). The impact of paternalistic leadership on employee voice behavior: The mediating mechanism of psychological safety. *Management Review*, 24(10), 109-116.

Dong Baobao, Cao Qi, & Luo Junmei. (2020). A review of meta-analysis applications in domestic and international entrepreneurship research. *Chinese Journal of Management*, 17(06), 937-948.

- Deng Changsheng. (2016). Research on the relationship between moral leadership, workplace spirituality, and organizational citizenship behavior (Master' s thesis). Dongbei University of Finance and Economics.
- Deng Zhihua, Chen Weizheng, Huang Li, & Hu Dongmei. (2012). A comparative study of servant leadership and paternalistic leadership effects on employee attitudes and behaviors. *Economic and Management Research*, 7, 101-110.
- Du Ningrang. (2015). Research on the mechanism of paternalistic leadership' s impact on civil servant job performance (Doctoral dissertation).

Lanzhou University.

Farh, J. L., & Cheng, B. S. (2000). A cultural analysis of paternalistic leadership in Chinese organizations. *Indigenous Psychological Research in Chinese Societies*, 13(1), 127-180.

Fang Laitan, Shi Kan, Zhang Fenghua, & Gao Peng. (2011). Research on the relationship between employee engagement, job performance, and job satisfaction. *Management Review*, 23(12),

- Gao Zhi, & Hu Qibo. (2014). An empirical study on the relationship between paternalistic leadership and knowledge workers' counterproductive behavior: Based on the triadic theory of paternalistic leadership. *Future and Development*, (07), 92-97.
- Tong Jin. (2019). Research on the impact of paternalistic leadership on civil servant job performance (Master' s thesis). Xi' an University of Architecture and Technology.
- Gong Jian. (2013). Research on the impact of paternalistic leadership on employee voluntary work behavior (Master' s thesis). Hangzhou Dianzi University.

Huang Xu. (2017). Questions and critiques on paternalistic leadership research. *Management Quarterly*, 2(04), 33-40.

- Hou Nan, & Peng Jian. (2019). Benevolence and authority combined, active execution and job performance: Exploring the effectiveness of ambidextrous leadership in the Chinese context. *Acta Psychologica Sinica*, 51(1), 117-127.
- Hou Wenjing. (2018). Research on the relationship between paternalistic leadership, organization-based self-esteem, and employee silence (Master' s thesis). Jiangsu University.

Han Yi, Liao Jianqiao, & Long Lirong. (2007). Construction and empirical research on employee job performance structure model. *Journal of Management Sciences in China*, (05), 62-77.

- Jia Zhen. (2014). An empirical study on paternalistic leadership style, employee silence, and job performance (Master' s thesis). Nanjing University of Science and Technology.
- Jia Yang. (2014). Research on the relationship between superior paternalistic leadership and employee voice behavior (Master' s thesis). Southwest Jiaotong University.
- Jing Baofeng. (2012). An empirical study on the impact of paternalistic leadership on employee voice behavior (Doctoral dissertation). South China University of Technology.

- Kang Lele. (2012). Research on the relationship between paternalistic leadership, perceived organizational support, and employee silence (Master's thesis). Dongbei University of Finance and Economics.
- Li Rui, Ling Wenquan, & Liu Shishun. (2012). Antecedents and consequences of organization-based psychological ownership: A person-environment interaction perspective. *Acta Psychologica Sinica*, 44(9), 1202-1216.

Li Yan, Sun Jianmin, & Jiao Haitao. (2013). Differentiation and integration: The direction of paternalistic leadership research. *Advances in Psychological Science*, 21(7), 1294-1306.

- Li Rong. (2013). The impact of paternalistic leadership on organizational citizenship behavior: Person-organization fit as a moderator (Master's thesis). Nanjing University of Technology.
- Li Shuang. (2015). The impact of paternalistic leadership on employee voice behavior: The mediating effect of organizational justice (Master's thesis). Hunan Normal University.

Li Yanping, & Hou Xuanfang. (2012). The structure of new generation employees' work values and its influence mechanism on work behavior. *Economic Management*, 5(5), 77-86.

- Li Yumeng. (2016). Research on the impact of paternalistic leadership and employment security on employee voice (Master's thesis). Southwest University of Political Science and Law.
- Li Caide. (2011). Research on the impact of paternalistic leadership on organizational citizenship behavior (Master's thesis). East China University of Science and Technology.
- Li Zhuo. (2013). Research on the relationship between paternalistic leadership, psychological empowerment, and job performance (Master's thesis). Shanxi University.
- Li Guanghao. (2017). Research on the impact of paternalistic leadership on employee workplace deviance behavior (Master's thesis). Hebei University.
- Li Zhenjiang. (2016). The impact of paternalistic leadership on new generation employee voice behavior: The roles of leader-member exchange and Zhongyong thinking (Master's thesis). South China University of Technology.
- Li Xiyuan, & Wang Weiye. (2020). Research on the influence mechanism of performance pressure on workplace deception behavior. *Journal of Business Economics*, (10), 39-51.
- Li Xiaoyu, Gao Dongdong, & Zhao Shenran. (2016). The impact of benevolent leadership on township civil servants' job performance: The

roles of voice behavior and perceived organizational support. *Psychological Research*, (06), 52-59.

Lin Ziting, Zheng Boxun, & Zhou Lifang. (2014). Review and prospect of paternalistic leadership. *Indigenous Psychological Research in Chinese Societies*, (42), 3-82.

Lin Ziting, Zheng Boxun, & Zhou Lifang. (2017). Review and prospect of paternalistic leadership: Rethinking once again. *Management Quarterly*, 2(4), 1-32+158.

Lin Shengzhu, & Yang Baiyin. (2014). A comparative study of paternalistic leadership, perceived organizational support, and organizational citizenship behavior between China and South Korea. *Management World*, (3),

- Lin Yang. (2018). Research on the impact of paternalistic leadership on employee deviance behavior (Master' s thesis). Dongbei University of Finance and Economics.
- Liu Bing, Qi Lei, & Xu Lu. (2017). Does the stick produce "filial sons" ? Research on employee workplace deviance behavior. *Nankai Business Review*, (03), 182-192.
- Liu Xiaoyan. (2012). Research on the relationship between paternalistic leadership and employee voice behavior (Master' s thesis). Anhui University.
- Ling Min. (2014). Discussion on the impact of paternalistic leadership on enterprise employee voice behavior. *Modern Business*, (33), 201-202.
- Liu Yuanyuan. (2017). Research on the mechanism of paternalistic leadership' s impact on employee performance in start-ups (Master' s thesis). Nanjing University of Science and Technology.

Liu Jun, & Qin Chuanyan. (2018). The relationship between corporate social responsibility and employee performance: A meta-analysis. *Advances in Psychological Science*, 26 (07), 1152-1164.

- Luo Zhenbing. (2017). Age differences in affective and cognitive empathy: The moderating role of social motivation and age correlation (Master' s thesis). Zhejiang Normal University.
- Lai Taisi, & Liu Lihong. (2015). The impact of paternalistic leadership on job performance: The mediating role of positive stress. *Talent and Wisdom*, (04), 332+334.
- Ma Peng, & Cai Shuangling. (2018). Research on the internalization mechanism of paternalistic leadership' s effect on employee voice behavior: A cross-level analysis with Zhongyong thinking as moderator. *Finance and Economics Journal*, (07), 88-96.

- Ma Yanru, & Zhao Baofu. (2013). Research on the influence mechanism of paternalistic leadership behavior on employee behavior. *Proceedings of the 8th Chinese Enterprise Operations Research Academic Annual Conference*, Chengdu, China.
- Mao Changguo, Fan Jingbo, & Liu Bin. (2020). The three-way interaction effect of paternalistic leadership on employee voice behavior. *Journal of Capital University of Economics and Business*, (03), 102-112.
- Pei Mingjun. (2016). An empirical study on the impact of enterprise paternalistic leadership on employee voice behavior (Master's thesis). Shenyang University of Technology.
- Qiu Yong, & Yang Xuhua. (2015). Research on the impact of paternalistic leadership on university teachers' work behavior: Based on differential perspectives of task performance and organizational citizenship behavior. *Fudan Education Forum*, (06), 62-71.
- Qiu Jiali. (2013). Research on the relationship between paternalistic leadership and employee performance in family businesses (Master's thesis). Xiangtan University.
- Ren Yingwei, Ruan Pingping, & Wang Cunfu. (2012). An empirical study on paternalistic leadership effectiveness. *Finance and Economics Science*, (12), 89-95.
- Ren Yingwei, & Li Siyu. (2016). Paternalistic leadership and employee counterproductive behavior in state-owned enterprises: The mediating effect of interactional justice. *Journal of Sichuan University (Philosophy and Social Science Edition)*, (05), 144-152.
- Shen Xiangying, & Mu Guibin. (2018). Paternalistic leadership and employee voice behavior: The mediating role of organizational identification. *Studies of Psychology and Behavior*, (06),

Su Tao, Chen Chunhua, Cui Xiaoyu, & Chen Hongzhi. (2017). Under trust, what is the effect? Evidence from Meta-analysis. *Nankai Business Review*, 20(04), 179-192.

Sun Xiuli, Wang Hui, & Zhao Shuming. (2020). A review of Chinese leadership research paths from a cultural perspective. *Chinese Journal of Management*, 17(8), 1254-1264.

- Sun Yanhua. (2014). Research on the relationship between paternalistic and servant leadership style cognition and employee deviance behavior (Master's thesis). University of South China.
- Shao Ke. (2018). Research on the impact of paternalistic leadership on employee voice behavior (Master's thesis). Shanxi University of Finance and Economics.

- Teng Xiupan, & Cheng Dejun. (2019). How can creative teams activate internal intellectual resources? The impact of leadership style and job characteristics on employee voice behavior. *Modernization of Management*, (04), 78–81.
- Tang Jing. (2011). Research on the impact of paternalistic leadership on employee voice behavior (Master' s thesis). Huazhong University of Science and Technology.
- Tian Yanhui, Liu Hui, & Bai Shengjun. (2020). The influence mechanism of moral leadership on high school teachers' knowledge sharing behavior and task performance. *Campus Psychology*, (2), 159–163.
- Tian Zailan, & Huang Peilun. (2014). The impact of paternalistic leadership on voice based on self-cognition theory. *Science Research Management*, (10), 150–160.
- Wan Xiang, & Ding Zhihui. (2018). The impact of paternalistic leadership and trust on employee knowledge avoidance. *Journal of Wuhan University of Technology (Information & Management Engineering)*, (03), 354–358.
- Wu Daoyou, Zhu Di, & Duan Jinyun. (2014). The impact of benevolent leadership on employee silence: The roles of organization-based self-esteem and face. *Chinese Journal of Applied Psychology*, (04),
- Wu Dongzhe. (2018). Research on the impact of authoritarian leadership on grassroots civil servants' satisfaction and voice (Master' s thesis). Shandong University of Finance and Economics.
- Wu Min, Huang Xu, Xu Jiuping, Yan Hong, & Shi Kan. (2007). A comparative study of transactional, transformational, and paternalistic leadership behaviors. *Science Research Management*, (03), 168–176.
- Wu Shijian, Sun Zhuanzhuan, Liu Xinmin, & Zhou Zhongbao. (2020). Does paternalistic leadership promote employee altruistic behavior? Research on multiple mediating effects based on the Chinese context. *Management Review*, 32(2), 205–217.
- Wu Lei, & Zhou Kong. (2016). Research on knowledge sharing behavior under paternalistic leadership style: The mediating effect of supervisor trust. *Science & Technology Progress and Policy*, (13),
- Wu Youlei. (2018). Research on the impact of paternalistic leadership style on employee performance (Master' s thesis). Shanghai Ocean University.
- Wu Kai, Li Yongxin, & Liu Xia. (2016). Paternalistic leadership and employee voice behavior: The mediating role of leader-member exchange. *Studies of Psychology and Behavior*, 14(03), 384–389.
- Wang Chen. (2018). The impact of benevolent leadership on subordinate work withdrawal behavior (Master' s thesis). Capital University of

Economics and Business.

- Wang Guomeng, & Zhang Yihan. (2013). Research on the mediating role of organizational identification between paternalistic leadership and employee advice-taking behavior. *Journal of Lanzhou University of Finance and Economics*, (05), 46-50+55.

Wang Hui, Li Xiaoxuan, & Luo Shengqiang. (2012). Validation of the two-factor performance model of task and contextual performance. *Chinese Journal of Management Science*, (4), 79-84.

- Wang Shilei, Peng Zhenglong, & Gao Yuan. (2013). Research on post-80s employee deviance behavior under Chinese leadership context. *Management Review*, 25(08), 142-150.

Wang Tian, Su Tao, & Chen Chunhua. (2017). The effectiveness of paternalistic leadership: Evidence from Meta-analysis. *Human Resources Development of China*, (3), 69-80.

Wang Zhen, Sun Jianmin, & Zhao Yijun. (2012). Leadership effectiveness in Chinese organizational context: A meta-analysis of transformational leadership, leader-member exchange, and destructive leadership. *Advances in Psychological Science*, 20(2), 174-190.

Wang Lin, Chu Xiaoping, Huang Jiaxin, & Chen Ge. (2010). The influence mechanism of relationship with top leaders on managers' "remonstration" in indigenous family businesses: Empirical evidence from local family enterprises. *Management World*, (05), 108-117+140.

- Wang Lin, Chu Xiaoping, Peng Caodie, & Yue Lei. (2020). Research on the spillover mechanism of daily family role interaction on paternalistic leadership development: Empirical evidence based on diary tracking of family business top management teams. *Management World*, 36(8), 98-109.
- Wang Yanyuan. (2013). Research on the impact of paternalistic leadership on enterprise employee voice behavior (Master' s thesis). Nanjing Tech University.
- Wang Jiaqi. (2019). The impact of moral leadership on job performance (Master' s thesis). Capital University of Economics and Business.

Xu Chang. (2018). Research on the relationship between new generation women' s career outlook and work attitudes and management implications (Master' s thesis). Central China Normal University.

- Xu Bowen. (2013). The impact of paternalistic leadership on subordinate job performance: The moderating role of power distance (Master' s thesis). Shanghai Jiao Tong University.
- Xu Yue, Duan Jinyun, & Li Chengyan. (2017). The impact of benevolent leadership on employee voice: Dual paths of self-prevention and

self-enhancement. *Studies of Psychology and Behavior*, (06), 839-845.

- Xu Yanni, Gu Qinxuan, & Jiang Wan. (2014). The impact of moral leadership on employee creativity and job performance: An empirical study based on LMX theory. *Management Review*, 26(02), 139-147.
- Xiao Qingle. (2013). Research on the impact of paternalistic leadership and guanxi on employee voice behavior (Master' s thesis). Southwestern University of Finance and Economics.
- Xiao Fangxin. (2014). Research on the impact of paternalistic leadership on civil servant organizational silence (Master' s thesis). Soochow University.
- Xiao Yujia. (2014). Research on the impact of paternalistic leadership on employee voice behavior (Master' s thesis). Liaoning University.
- Xiao Jianbang. (2018). Research on the impact of paternalistic leadership on new generation employees' organizational citizenship behavior: The mediating role of organizational identification and the moderating role of differential climate (Master' s thesis). Jiangxi University of Finance and Economics.
- Xue Tingting. (2014). Research on the influence mechanism of paternalistic leadership on organizational citizenship behavior (Master' s thesis). Anhui University of Finance and Economics.
- Yang Liangchen. (2009). A study on the effectiveness of transformational and paternalistic leadership (Master' s thesis). Capital University of Economics and Business.
- Yang Jiping, & Wang Xingchao. (2015). Moral leadership and employee unethical behavior and altruistic behavior: The mediating role of moral disengagement. *Journal of Psychological Science*, 38(3),

Yang Mengxi, Chen Wansi, Zhou Qingyu, & Yang Baiyin. (2019). Knowledge mapping and evolution of leadership research in the Chinese context: 1949-2018 title bibliometrics. *Nankai Business Review*, 22(4), 80-94.

- Yu Guilan, Yao Junmei, & Zhang Lange. (2017). Research on the relationship between paternalistic leadership, employee trust, and job performance. *Journal of Northeast Normal University (Philosophy and Social Sciences)*, (02), 125-129.
- Yu Guilan, Yang Shu, & Sun Yu. (2016). Research on the relationship between authoritarian leadership, employee silence, and employee performance. *Journal of Shandong University (Philosophy and Social Sciences)*, (05), 77-84.
- Yu Haibo, Guan Xiaoyu, & Zheng Xiaoming. (2014). Paternalistic leadership creates performance, servant leadership brings satisfaction: Integra-

tion of two leadership behaviors. *Science of Science and Management of S. & T.*, (06), 172-180.

Zhao Xian, Liu Li, Zhang Xiaoxiao, Xiang Zhendong, & Fu Hongling. (2012). Perspective taking: Concept, manipulation, and its impact on intergroup relations. *Advances in Psychological Science*, 20(12), 2079-2088.

- Zhao Shenran, Kang Mengmeng, Wang Minghui, & Peng Cui. (2018). The impact of benevolent leadership on employee pro-environmental behavior: The roles of supervisor-subordinate guanxi and power distance. *Studies of Psychology and Behavior*, (06), 819-826.
- Zhang Huifang. (2016). Research on the impact of paternalistic leadership on new generation employee creativity (Master' s thesis). Southwest University.
- Zhang Yan, & Huai Mingyun. (2012). Research on the impact of authoritarian leadership behavior on subordinate organizational citizenship behavior: The moderating role of subordinate power distance. *Management Review*, 24(11), 97-105.
- Zhang Yan. (2015). The relationship between paternalistic leadership, employee silence, and employee performance (Master' s thesis). Henan University.
- Zhang Pengyu. (2014). Research on the relationship between paternalistic leadership, leader-member exchange, and employee voice behavior (Master' s thesis). South China University of Technology.
- Zhang Min. (2017). The relationship between paternalistic leadership, employment relationship, and employee work behavior (Master' s thesis). Hunan Normal University.

Zhang Jianping, Qin Chuanyan, & Liu Shanshi. (2020). Can feedback seeking improve performance? A meta-analysis of feedback seeking behavior and individual performance. *Advances in Psychological Science*, 28(4), 549-565.

- Zhang Juncheng, & Ling Wenquan. (2016). The impact of paternalistic leadership behavior on employee performance in small and micro technology enterprises. *Journal of Guangzhou University (Social Science Edition)*, (09), 49-57.

Zhang Yali, Li Sen, & Yu Guoliang. (2020). The relationship between loneliness and mobile phone addiction: A meta-analysis. *Advances in Psychological Science*, 28(11), 1836-1852.

- Zhang Yajun, Zhang Jinlong, Zhang Qianfan, & Zhang Junwei. (2015). Research on the impact of authoritarian and empowering leadership on employee tacit knowledge sharing. *Management Review*, (09), 130-139.

Zhang Yinpu, Luo Nanfeng, Shi Wei, Wan Jin, Zhang Yifang, & Yang Xiaojin. (2020). A meta-analysis of leader-member exchange and performance in the

Chinese context. *Nankai Business Review*, 23(3), 177-187.

- Zhang Luanting. (2016). Research on the impact of paternalistic leadership on subordinate organizational citizenship behavior (Master' s thesis). Capital University of Economics and Business.

Zheng Boxun, Zhou Lifang, & Farh, J. L. (2000). Paternalistic leadership scale: Construction and measurement of the triadic model. *Indigenous Psychological Research in Chinese Societies*, 14, 3-64.

Zheng Boxun, Zhou Lifang, Huang Minping, Farh, J. L., & Peng Siqing. (2003). The triadic model of paternalistic leadership: Evidence from mainland Chinese enterprises. *Indigenous Psychological Research in Chinese Societies*, 20, 209-252.

Zheng Boxun, & Huang Minping. (2000). Leadership in Chinese enterprises: A cultural value analysis. *Sun Yat-Sen Management Review*, 8(4), 583-617.

- Zhou Xinyu. (2018). Research on the impact of paternalistic leadership on employee knowledge sharing behavior (Master' s thesis). Beijing Jiaotong University.
- Zhou Hao. (2014). The impact of paternalistic leadership on subordinate remonstrance behavior: A relationship-based perspective. *Journal of Sichuan University (Philosophy and Social Science Edition)*, (04), 139-148.
- Zeng Ying. (2012). An empirical study on the relationship between paternalistic leadership, inter-employee knowledge sharing, and enterprise innovation performance (Master' s thesis). Southwestern University of Finance and Economics.
- Zhu Xiaoyu. (2016). The impact of servant leadership and paternalistic leadership on employee work behavior: The mediating role of psychological empowerment (Master' s thesis). Shandong Normal University.

Blau, P. M. (1964). *Social exchange theory*. Retrieved September, 3(2007), 62.

Bandura, A. (1971). *Social learning theory*. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.

Bedi, A. (2020). A meta-analytic review of paternalistic leadership. *Applied Psychology*, 69(3), 960-1008.

Boatwright, K. J., & Forrest, L. (2000). Leadership preferences: The influence of gender and needs for connection on workers' ideal preferences for leadership behaviors. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 7(2), 18-34.

Brown, M. E., & Treviño, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(6), 595-616.

Brandt, M. J., & Henry, P. J. (2012). Gender inequality and gender differences in authoritarianism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38(10), 1301-

1315.

Borman, W.C., & Motowidlo, S.J. (1993) Expanding the Criterion Domain to Include Elements of Contextual Performance. In: Schmitt, N. and Borman, W.C., Eds., *Personnel Selection in Organization* (pp. 71-78). Jossey Bass, San Francisco.

Bowling, N. A., Khazon, S., Meyer, R. D., & Burrus, C. J. (2015). Situational strength as a moderator of the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analytic examination. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 30(1), 89-104.

Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86(2), 278-321.

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.

- Cheng, B. S., & Jen, C. K. (2005). The contingent model of paternalistic leadership: Subordinate dependence and leader competence. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of Academy of Management, Honolulu, HI.

Chapman, B. P., & Hayslip Jr, B. (2006). Emotional intelligence in young and middle adulthood: Cross-sectional analysis of latent structure and means. *Psychology and Aging*, 21(2), 411-418.

- 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.
- Chan, S. C. (2008). Paternalistic leadership styles and follower performance: examining mediating variables in a multi-level model (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The Hong Kong Polytechnic University.
- Chan, S. C., & Mak, W. M. (2012). Benevolent leadership and follower performance: The mediating role of leader-member exchange (LMX). *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 29(2), 285-301.
- Chan, S. C. (2014). Paternalistic leadership and employee voice: Does information sharing matter?. *Human Relations*, 67(6), 667-693.
- Chan, S. C., Huang, X., Snape, E., & Lam, C. K. (2013). The Janus face of paternalistic leaders: Authoritarianism, benevolence, subordinates' organization-based self-esteem, and performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34(1), 108-128.
- Chan, S.C.H. (2017). Benevolent leadership, perceived supervisory support, and subordinates' performance: The moderating role of psychological

- empowerment. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 38(7),
- Chou, W. J., Sibley, C. G., Liu, J. H., Lin, T. T., & Cheng, B. S. (2015). Paternalistic leadership profiles: A person-centered approach. *Group & Organization Management*, 40(5), 685-710.
- Dansereau Jr, F., Graen, G., & Haga, W. J. (1975). A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership within formal organizations: A longitudinal investigation of the role making process. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 13(1), 46-78.
- Du, J., & Choi, J. N. (2013). Leadership effectiveness in China: The moderating role of change climate. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 41(9), 1571-1583.
 - Duan, J., Bao, C., Huang, C., & Brinsfield, C. T. (2018). Authoritarian leadership and employee silence in China. *Journal of Management and Organization*, 24(1), 62-80.
- Dahlke, J. A., & Wiernik, B. M. (2019). psychmeta: An R package for psychometric meta-analysis. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 43(5), 415-416.
- Duval, S., & Tweedie, R. (2000). A nonparametric “trim and fill” method of accounting for publication bias in meta-analysis. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 95(449), 89-98.
- Davison, M. L., Davenport Jr, E. C., Chang, Y. F., Vue, K., & Su, S. (2015). Criterion-related validity: Assessing the value of subscores. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 52(3), 263-279.
- Eagly, A. H., Wood, W., & Diekmann, A. B. (2000). Social role theory of sex differences and similarities: A current appraisal. *The Developmental Social Psychology of Gender*, 12, 174.
- Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review*, 109(3), 573-598.
- Eisenberger, R., Karagonlar, G., Stinglhamber, F., Neves, P., Becker, T. E., Gonzalez-Morales, M. G., & Steiger-Mueller, M. (2010). Leader-member exchange and affective organizational commitment: The contribution of supervisor’ s organizational embodiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(6), 1085-1103.
- Field, A. P., & Gillett, R. (2010). How to do a meta-analysis. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, 63(3), 665-694.
- Field, J. G., Bosco, F. A., & Kepes, S. (2020). How robust is our cumulative knowledge on turnover? *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 1-17.
- Griffin, M. A., Neal, A., & Parker, S. K. (2007). A new model of work role performance: Positive behavior in uncertain and interdependent contexts. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(2), 327-347.

- Goštautaitė, B., & Bučiūnienė, I. (2015). Work engagement during life-span: The role of interaction outside the organization and task significance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 89, 109–119.
- Hofstede, G., & Bond, M. H. (1988). The Confucius connection: From cultural roots to economic growth. *Organizational Dynamics*, 16(4), 5–21.
- Heckhausen, J., & Schulz, R. (1995). A life-span theory of control. *Psychological Review*, 102(2), 284–304.
- Heckhausen, J., Wrosch, C., & Schulz, R. (2010). A motivational theory of life-span development. *Psychological Review*, 117(1), 32–60.
- Hunter, J. E., & Schmidt, F. L. (2004). *Methods of meta-analysis: Correcting error and bias in research findings*. Sage.
- Higgins, J. P., Thompson, S. G., Deeks, J. J., & Altman, D. G. (2003). Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ*, 327(7414), 557–560.
- Hiller, N. J., Sin, H. P., Ponnappalli, A. R., & Ozgen, S. (2019). Benevolence and authority as WEIRDly unfamiliar: A multi-language meta-analysis of paternalistic leadership behaviors from 152 studies. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 30(1), 165–184.
- Hongyu, N., Mingjian, Z., Qiang, L., & Liqun, W. (2012). Exploring relationship between authority leadership and organizational citizenship behavior in China: the role of collectivism. *Chinese Management Studies*, 6(2),
- Hannikainen, I. R., Machery, E., & Cushman, F. A. (2018). Is utilitarian sacrifice becoming more morally permissible?. *Cognition*, 170, 95–101.
- Joplin, T., Greenbaum, R. L., Wallace, J. C., & Edwards, B. D. (2019). Employee Entitlement, Engagement, and Performance: The Moderating Effect of Ethical Leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 1–14.
- Jia, J., Zhou, S., Zhang, L., & Jiang, X. (2020). Exploring the influence of paternalistic leadership on voice behavior. *Employee Relations: The International Journal*, 42(2), 542–560.
 - Jiang, H., Chen, Y., Sun, P., & Yang, J. (2017). The relationship between authoritarian leadership and employees' deviant workplace behaviors: The mediating effects of psychological contract violation and organizational cynicism. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 732.
- Leung, A. S. (2003). Feminism in transition: Chinese culture, ideology and the development of the women's movement in China. *Asia Pacific journal of management*, 20(3), 359–374.
- Lin, J. Y., Cai, F., & Li, Z. (2003). *The China miracle: Development strategy and economic reform*. Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press.

- Lee, J. Y., Jang, S. H., & Lee, S. Y. (2018). Paternalistic leadership and knowledge sharing with outsiders in emerging economies. *Personnel Review*, 47(5), 1094-1115.
- Lipsey, M. W., & Wilson, D. B. (2001). *Practical meta-analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Li, Y., & Sun, J. M. (2015). Traditional Chinese leadership and employee voice behavior: A cross-level examination. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 26(2), 172-189.
- Long, Z. (2016). A Feminist Ventriloquial Analysis of Hao Gongzuo (“Good Work”): Politicizing Chinese Post-1980s Women’ s Meanings of Work. *Women’ s Studies in Communication*, 39(4), 422-441.
- Motowidlo, S. J., & Kell, H. J. (2012). Job performance. In N. W. Schmitt, S. Highhouse, & I. B. Weiner (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology: Industrial and organizational psychology* (Second Edition, pp. 82-104). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Morris, S. B., Daisley, R. L., Wheeler, M., & Boyer, P. (2015). A meta-analysis of the relationship between individual assessments and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(1), 5-20.
- Mansur, J., Sobral, F., & Goldszmidt, R. (2017). Shades of paternalistic leadership across cultures. *Journal of World Business*, 52(5), 702-713.
- Niu, C. P., Wang, A. C., & Cheng, B. S. (2009). Effectiveness of a moral and benevolent leader: Probing the interactions of the dimensions of paternalistic leadership. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 12(1), 32-39.
- Ng, T. W., & Feldman, D. C. (2008). The relationship of age to ten dimensions of job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(2), 392-423.
- Nazir, S., Shafi, A., Asadullah, M. A., Qun, W., & Khadim, S. (2020). Linking paternalistic leadership to follower’ s innovative work behavior: the influence of leader-member exchange and employee voice. *European Journal of Innovation Management*. Advance online publication.
- O’ Boyle Jr, E. H., Humphrey, R. H., Pollack, J. M., Hawver, T. H., & Story, P. A. (2011). The relation between emotional intelligence and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(5),
- Orwin, R. G. (1983). A fail-safe N for effect size in meta-analysis. *Journal of Educational Statistics*, 8(2),
- Ping, W. A. N. G., CHANG, L., & Shao-Qi, W. A. N. G. (2018). Employee Voice Behavior and Innovative Behavior: Comparison of the Influence of Benevolent Leadership and Authoritative Leadership. Paper presented at the DEStech Transactions on Social Science, Education and Human Science, Wuhan, China.

R Core Team (2019). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. [Computer software, version 3.6. 2]. URL <https://www.R-project.org/>.

Ramusack, B. N., Sievers, S., & Sievers, S. L. (1999). *Women in Asia: restoring women to history*. Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Rothstein, H. R., Sutton, A. J., & Borenstein, M. (2005). *Publication bias in meta-analysis: Prevention, Assessment and Adjustments*, 1-7.

- Rui, J., & Xinqi, L. (2020). Trickle-down effect of benevolent leadership on unethical employee behavior: a cross-level moderated mediation model. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 41(6), 721-740.

Roth, P. L., Le, H., Oh, I. S., Van Iddekinge, C. H., & Bobko, P. (2018). Using beta coefficients to impute missing correlations in meta-analysis research: Reasons for caution. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 103(6), 644-658.

Redding, S. G., & Hsiao, M. (1990). An empirical study of overseas Chinese managerial ideology. *International Journal of Psychology*, 25(3-6), 629-641.

Rotundo, M., & Sackett, P. R. (2002). The relative importance of task, citizenship, and counterproductive performance to global ratings of job performance: A policy-capturing approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 66-80.

Shri, C. (2011). Developing the next generation of leaders: How to engage millennial in the workplace. *Leadership Advance Online*, 1, 1-6.

Sposato, M., & Rumens, N. (2018). Advancing international human resource management scholarship on paternalistic leadership and gender: the contribution of postcolonial feminism. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 32(6), 1201-1221.

Silin, R. H. (1976). *Leadership and values: The organization of large-scale Taiwanese enterprises* (No. 62). Cambridge, Massachusetts; London, England: Harvard University Asia Center.

Slemp, G. R., Field, J. G., & Cho, A. S. (2020). A meta-analysis of autonomous and controlled forms of teacher motivation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 121, 103459.

- Sheer, V. C. (2010). Transformational and paternalistic leaderships in Chinese organizations: Construct, predictive, and ecological validities compared in a Hong Kong sample. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 19(1), 121-140.

Schuh, S. C., Zhang, X. A., & Tian, P. (2013). For the good or the bad? Interactive effects of transformational leadership with moral and authoritarian leadership behaviors. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 116(3), 629-640.

Scheibe, S., Spieler, I., & Kuba, K. (2016). An older-age advantage? Emotion regulation and emotional experience after a day of work. *Work, Aging and*

Retirement, 2(3), 307-320.

Stanley, T. D., & Doucouliagos, H. (2014). Meta-regression approximations to reduce publication selection bias. *Research Synthesis Methods*, 5(1), 60-78.

- Schaubroeck, J. M., Shen, Y., & Chong, S. (2017). A dual-stage moderated mediation model linking authoritarian leadership to follower outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(2), 203-214.

Smallfield, J., Hoobler, J. M., & Kluemper, D. H. (2020). How team helping influences abusive and empowering leadership: The roles of team affective tone and performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 41(8),

Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. E. (2015). *Methods of meta-analysis: Correcting error and bias in research findings* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

- Shen, Y., Chou, W. J., & Schaubroeck, J. M. (2019). The roles of relational identification and workgroup cultural values in linking authoritarian leadership to employee performance. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 28(4), 498-509.
- Tang, C., & Naumann, S. E. (2015). Paternalistic leadership, subordinate perceived leader-member exchange and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 21(3), 291-306.
- Tian, Q., & Sanchez, J. I. (2017). Does paternalistic leadership promote innovative behavior? The interaction between authoritarianism and benevolence. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 47(5), 235-246.

Van Scotter, J. R., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1996). Interpersonal facilitation and job dedication as separate facets of contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(5), 525-531.

Vale, M. T., & Bisconti, T. L. (2020). Age Differences in Sexual Minority Stress and the Importance of Friendship in Later Life. *Clinical Gerontologist*, 1-14.

Viechtbauer, W., & Cheung, M. W. L. (2010). Outlier and influence diagnostics for meta-analysis. *Research Synthesis Methods*, 1(2), 112-125.

- Wang, A. C., Chiang, J. T. J., Tsai, C. Y., Lin, T. T., & Cheng, B. S. (2013). Gender makes the difference: The moderating role of leader gender on the relationship between leadership styles and subordinate performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 122(2), 101-113.
- Wang, A. C., Tsai, C. Y., Dionne, S. D., Yammarino, F. J., Spain, S. M., Ling, H. C., ...& Cheng, B. S. (2018). Benevolence-dominant, authoritarianism-dominant, and classical paternalistic leadership: Testing their relationships with subordinate performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 29(6), 686-697.

Wang, A., & Cheng, B. (2010). When does benevolent leadership lead to creativity? The moderating role of creative role identity and job autonomy. *Journal*

of *Organizational Behavior*, 31(1), 106-121.

Wiernik, B. M., Wilmot, M. P., Davison, M. L., & Ones, D. S. (2020). Meta-analytic criterion profile analysis. *Psychological Methods*. Advance online publication.

- Wang, H., & Guan, B. (2018). The positive effect of authoritarian leadership on employee performance: The moderating role of power distance. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 357.
- Wang, L., Huang, J., Chu, X., & Wang, X. (2010). A multilevel study on antecedents of manager voice in Chinese context. *Chinese Management Studies*, 4(3), 212-230.

Welbourne, T. M., Johnson, D. E., & Erez, A. (1998). The role-based performance scale: Validity analysis of a theory-based measure. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(5), 540-555.

- Wu, M. (2012). Moral leadership and work performance: Testing the mediating and interaction effects in China. *Chinese Management Studies*, 6, 284-299.

Wu, M., & Xu, E. (2012). Paternalistic leadership: from here to where?. In Huang, X., & Bond, M. H. (Eds.), *Handbook of Chinese organizational behavior: Integrating Theory, Research and Practice* (pp. 449-466). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.

- Wu, M., Huang, X., Li, C., & Liu, W. (2012). Perceived interactional justice and trust-in-supervisor as mediators for paternalistic leadership. *Management and Organization Review*, 8(1), 97-121.
- Wu, M., Huang, X., & Chan, S. C. (2012). The influencing mechanisms of paternalistic leadership in Mainland China. *Asia Pacific Business Review*, 18(4), 631-648.
- Wu, T. Y., Liu, Y. F., Hua, C. Y., Lo, H. C., & Yeh, Y. J. (2020). Too unsafe to voice? Authoritarian leadership and employee voice in Chinese organizations. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 58(4), 527-554.
- Wang, Z., Liu, Y., & Liu, S. (2019). Authoritarian leadership and task performance: the effects of leader-member exchange and dependence on leader. *Frontiers of Business Research in China*, 13(1), 1-15.

Zheng, X., Shi, X., & Liu, Y. (2020). Leading Teachers' Emotions Like Parents: Relationships Between Paternalistic Leadership, Emotional Labor and Teacher Commitment in China. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11.

- Zhang, Y., Huai, M. Y., & Xie, Y. H. (2015). Paternalistic leadership and employee voice in China: A dual process model. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 26(1), 25-36.

- Zheng, Y. (2016). Fear and compliance: A study of antecedents, mediators and benefits of paternalistic leadership in China (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Durham University.
- Zheng, Y., Huang, X., Graham, L., Redman, T., & Hu, S. (2020). Deterrence effects: The role of authoritarian leadership in controlling employee workplace deviance. *Management and Organization Review*, 16(2),

Zorlu, R. X. (2019). *Paternalistic Leadership and Follower Work Outcomes: A Meta-analysis* (Unpublished master' s thesis). Utrecht University.

(Corresponding Author: Li Chaoping, Email: lichaoping@ruc.edu.cn)

Author Contribution Statement:

Liu Doudou: Drafting, data acquisition;

Xu Yan: Data checking and analysis;

Li Chaoping: Research conceptualization, design, final version revision.

Note: Figure translations are in progress. See original paper for figures.

Source: ChinaXiv –Machine translation. Verify with original.