THE ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE OF THE PRINCIPAL RESPONSIBILITY SYSTEM UNDER THE SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT CONCEPT RESEARCH-TAKING BAISE NO. 5 MIDDLE SCHOOL AS AN EXAMPLE
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The principal responsibility system under the leadership of the party organization is a leadership and management system that emerged during China's education reform. After many changes and developments, it has now been widely used in primary and secondary schools in China. The establishment and implementation of this system enabled China’s education to develop rapidly. However, with the development of the times and the progress of society, this system must also keep pace with the times to adapt. A conceptual model is built based on the relationship between the school's organizational structure, organizational decision-making, organizational justice, and organizational performance. Taking Baise City No. 5 Middle School as an example, it takes the four relationships between the "school management model, school decision-making, management justice, and management
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effectiveness." "Interrelationship" as the core topic, a scientific and reasonable questionnaire was set up, 163 school teachers were measured, and then statistical methods were used to analyze and verify the hypotheses proposed in this article. Finally, based on the empirical conclusions, this article provides suggestions and references for schools to implement the principal responsibility system under the leadership of the party organization to improve the system and ensure the healthy operation of this system.
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**Introduction**

In today's world, the rapid development of the world economy, science, and technology is subtly changing human production and lifestyle. Knowledge and talents, national quality, and innovation capabilities have become important indicators of a country's comprehensive national strength and have also become key factors that promote or restrict sustained economic growth and steady social development.

The quality of education is directly related to the lifeblood of a country's development. To occupy the commanding heights of science and technology in the wave of the times, all countries are committed to improving the quality of education. China has also been devoting national efforts to developing education and carrying out drastic educational reforms.

In May 2021, it issued "Opinions on Further Reducing the Burden of Homework and Off-Campus Training in Compulsory Education", which is called a "double reduction" policy. This policy achieves the three goals of releasing social vitality, improving the education model, and returning to the essence of education: freeing students from heavy academic tasks, making family economic distribution more rational, and allowing education to truly reflect the value of cultivating people.

China is not only reforming and leading in the direction of education but also reforming the leadership model of management, striving to find the management model that best suits Chinese education.

Through trial and error and the development of various leadership and management models, the leadership and management model of primary and secondary schools was finally established as the principal responsibility management model under the leadership of the party organization.

**Research problem**

With the development of the times and the progress of society, the leadership and management models of primary and secondary schools must also keep pace with the times. This urgently requires us to conduct in-depth research on the principal responsibility system and continuously innovate and improve it so that it can operate well in schools and promote the steady progress of education.

However, the current existing problems, such as standardized and detailed supporting rules, imperfect system design, inconsistent understanding of the party and government, and overlapping institutional settings, are the biggest obstacles affecting organizational performance and are also the research questions of this article.
**Research purposes**

With the growing economy and changes in people's needs, the purpose of the research is to solve the problems of the current leadership and management model, such as the lack of standardized and detailed supporting rules, imperfect system design, inconsistent understanding of the party and government, and overlapping institutional settings.

Through an in-depth study of the management model of the principal responsibility system under the leadership of the party organization, we will find out how to improve the system to further promote educational reform, implement the leadership position and role of the principal responsibility system under the leadership of the party committee in primary and secondary schools, and promote the smooth development of basic education.

It has a certain practical significance.

**Literature review**

Knudsen & Levinthal (2007) studied the relationship between organizational decision-making performance, organizational decision-maker decision-making ability, and organizational structure and concluded that organizational structure affects organizational decision-making and organizational performance, while organizational decision-making directly affects organizational performance.

Wang et al. (2023) studied the impact of individual characteristics and organizational structure on organizational decision-making performance in a dynamic environment and concluded that organizational structure, the decision-making characteristics of individual decision-makers in an organization, the organizational decision-making environment, and organizational learning do not affect the organization's decision-making process or decision-making in isolation. Performance: they interact and interrelate to jointly affect the organization's decision-making process and decision-making performance. It is a complex process with many other theories. Combining previous views, the following hypothesis is put forward:

Hypothesis H1: There is a significant relationship between the school's organizational structure, organizational decision-making, and organizational performance;

Hypothesis H1a: There is a positive relationship between school organizational structure and organizational performance;

Hypothesis H1b: There is a positive relationship between school organizational structure and organizational decision-making;

Hypothesis H1c: There is a positive relationship between school organizational decision-making and organizational performance;

Hypothesis H4: Organizational decision-making has a mediating effect between the school's organizational structure and organizational performance.

According to the equity theory proposed by American psychologist Adams (1965), the sense of fairness that employees gain in an enterprise directly affects their work enthusiasm, which also affects the ultimate effectiveness of enterprise management.

There are many studies on justice and effectiveness, most of which focus on fair competition and effectiveness in the market.

Han (2018) used fairness-related theories to elaborate on the fairness status of my country's pension insurance before the merger from three perspectives: starting point, process, and result. On this basis, he analyzed and studied the results after the merger.
Yao et al. (2008), Zhao & Zhai (2022) studied the contemporary Iranian government’s female higher education policy and its effectiveness from the perspective of educational equity and concluded that the Iranian government needs to consider how to balance and reconcile these two contradictions to better exert the important role of women in social and national development. This also reflects the fact that fair treatment can better promote results. Therefore, justice is an important factor in management effectiveness. In summary, starting from the relationship between management justice and management effectiveness, the following hypotheses are put forward:

Hypothesis H2: There is a significant relationship between the school's organizational structure, organizational justice, and organizational performance;

Hypothesis H2a: There is a positive relationship between school organizational structure and organizational justice;

Hypothesis H2b: There is a positive relationship between organizational justice and organizational performance in schools;

Hypothesis H3: The school's organizational structure, organizational justice, and organizational decision-making have a significant impact on organizational performance at the same time;

Hypothesis H5: Organizational justice has a mediating effect between the school's organizational structure and organizational performance.

Scholars Cyert & March's (1963) hypothesis motivation theory, Rumelt's (1982) SSP structure, Knudsen & Levinthal's (2007) research on the relationship between organizational decision-making performance, organizational decision-making capabilities, and organizational structure concluded that organizational structure, decision-making characteristics of individual decision-makers of organizations, organizational decision-making environment, and organizational learning do not affect the decision-making process and decision-making performance of the organization in isolation, but they interact with each other.

It can be concluded that both organizational structure and organizational decision-making affect organizational performance, and organizational decision-making is affected by organizational structure. Combined with the organizational justice theory jointly established by Homans (1958) and Adams (2001) and the equity theory proposed by Adams, organizational structure and organizational justice affect organizational performance, and organizational justice is affected by organizational structure.

Therefore, a theoretical model of the interrelationships between organizational structure, organizational decision-making, organizational justice, and organizational performance is constructed, as shown at Fig. 1.

Research methods

This article is a quantitative study using the questionnaire survey method. The content of the questionnaire is divided into two parts. The first part is the basic situation of the respondents, and the second part is designed for variables such as organizational structure, organizational decision-making, organizational justice, and organizational performance. Scale: Items are measured using the Likert scale (1 means completely disagree, 5 means completely agree).
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The research subjects are teachers of the No. 5 Middle School in Baise City, and the teachers of this school are the parties with the most say in the operation of the school's management system, so a questionnaire was distributed to the school teachers. The survey found that a high proportion of faculty and staff who have worked at the school for more than ten years will find the questionnaires they fill out more convincing.

Table 1 - The research model of this article
(made by co-authors)

There are more than 180 teachers at Baise City No. 5 Middle School. A total of 166 questionnaires were distributed, and 163 questionnaires were returned. The distribution rate exceeded 85%, which met the requirements.

Anomaly detection analysis of the data revealed that there were three abnormal cases in the questionnaire results, two of which were measured by non-Baise No. 5 Middle School teachers, one of which had all answers to option 1. After verification by the author, the person measuring this questionnaire is filled in at will, and there are no unread questions. Therefore, these three questionnaires were classified as invalid questionnaires.

The effective sample size required for this questionnaire survey is 150. After excluding 3 invalid questionnaires, 163 valid questionnaires were recovered, with a recovery rate of 98.2%, meeting the expected effective sample requirements for this study. Therefore, the effective sample size of this study was determined to be 163.

Research results

As shown in Tab. 1, the mean is an indicator that reflects the central tendency of the data. In the measurement of organizational structure, the mean of the three items of the three indicators is between 4 and 5, and the mean is 4.50.

Therefore, it can be explained that the central tendency of the mean is between basic agreement and complete agreement; the standard deviation is the degree of dispersion of the response data; and the standard deviation of the organizational structure is 0.686, indicating that the stability and overall situation of the independent variable are good, basically in the middle.

On the upper level, the degree of dispersion is average; from the above statistical results, it can be seen that the absolute value of the skewness of the organizational structure is 1.626, less than 3, and the absolute value of the kurtosis of the organizational structure is 3.496, less than 8, both of which are far smaller than the skewness in statistics and mathematics. Reference values for degree and kurtosis.
Table 2 - Descriptive analysis of the independent variable organizational structure (N = 163)  
(made by co-authors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Minimum value</th>
<th>Maximum value</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>After the implementation of the principal responsibility system under the leadership of the party committee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational structure</td>
<td>Breakdown of work tasks</td>
<td>-the school's work division of labor becomes more refined and professional.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.650</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>-1.539</td>
<td>2.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work task mix</td>
<td>-the work task combination will be more reasonable and complete.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.661</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>-1.417</td>
<td>2.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work coordination</td>
<td>-communication and cooperation among various departments will be smoother and more efficient.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.748</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>-1.921</td>
<td>4.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.686</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>-1.626</td>
<td>3.496</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, it can be considered that the organizational structure can be approximately regarded as a normal distribution, which meets the basic requirements for data analysis of the research hypothesis of this article.

As shown in Tab. 2, in terms of mean, in the measurement of organizational decision-making, the mean of the four items of the four indicators is between 3 and 4, and the mean is 3.93, which is greater than 3.5. This shows that the central tendency of the mean is basically the same; the standard deviation is the degree of dispersion of the response data.

Table 3 - Descriptive analysis of independent variables in organizational decision-making (N = 163)  
(made by co-authors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mediating variable</th>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Minimum value</th>
<th>Maximum value</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>After the implementation of the principal responsibility system under the leadership of the party committee, the school's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group work-decide Policy</td>
<td>decision-making structure</td>
<td>-organizational decision-making structure will be completer and more comprehensive.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.196</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>-1.156</td>
<td>0.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>decision-making process</td>
<td>-organizational decision-making process will be more scientific.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.178</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>-1.207</td>
<td>0.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>decision-making principles</td>
<td>-decision-making principles are more scientific and valuable.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.278</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>-0.997</td>
<td>-0.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>decision-making method</td>
<td>-organizational decision-making methods will be more diversified.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.302</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>-0.935</td>
<td>-0.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.239</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>-1.074</td>
<td>0.385</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The standard deviation of organizational decision-making is 1.239, which shows that the stability and overall situation of the intermediary variable are good, basically at the upper-middle level, and the degree of dispersion is average; from the above statistical results, the organization

The absolute value of the skewness of decision-making is 1.074, less than 3, and the absolute value of the kurtosis of organizational decision-making is 0.385, less than 8.

Both are far less than the reference values of skewness and kurtosis in statistics and mathematics. Therefore, it can be considered that the intermediary variable of organizational decision-making can be approximately regarded as a normal distribution, which meets the basic requirements for data analysis of the research hypothesis of this article.

Table 4 - Descriptive analysis of the mediating variable of organizational justice (N = 163)

(made by co-authors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mediating variable</th>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>minimum value</th>
<th>maximum value</th>
<th>standard deviation</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fair distribution</td>
<td>1. After the implementation of the principal responsibility system under the leadership of the party committee, the remuneration you receive is very fair.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.002</td>
<td>-1.105</td>
<td>.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organize justice</td>
<td>procedural fairness</td>
<td>2. After the implementation of the principal responsibility system under the leadership of the party committee, you feel that the process and method of resource allocation are fair.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.032</td>
<td>-1.101</td>
<td>.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interactional fairness</td>
<td>3. After implementing the principal responsibility system under the leadership of the party committee, you feel that the organization is very fair when executing procedures and making decisions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.010</td>
<td>-1.085</td>
<td>.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1. After the implementation of the principal responsibility system under the leadership of the party committee, the remuneration you receive is very fair.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.083</td>
<td>1.015</td>
<td>-1.097</td>
<td>0.786</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Tab. 3, in terms of mean value, in the measurement of organizational justice, the mean value of the three items of the three indicators is between 4 and 5. The mean value is 4.083, which is very close to 4.

This can illustrate the central tendency of the mean value. It is basically agreed; the standard deviation is the degree of dispersion of the reflected data, and the standard deviation of organizational fairness is 1.015, which shows that the stability and overall situation of the intermediary variable are good, basically at the upper-middle level, and the degree of dispersion is average.

From the above statistical results, we can see that the absolute value of skewness of organizational justice is 1.097, less than 3, and the absolute value of kurtosis of the entrepreneurial environment is 0.786, less than 8. Both are far less than the reference values of skewness and kurtosis in statistics and mathematics.

Therefore, it can be considered that the intermediary variable of organizational justice can be approximately regarded as a normal distribution, which meets the basic requirements for data analysis of the research hypothesis of this article.
Table 5 - Descriptive analysis of dependent variable organizational performance (N = 163)

(made by co-authors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dependent variable</th>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>minimum value</th>
<th>maximum value</th>
<th>standard deviation</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>After the implementation of the principal responsibility system under the leadership of the party committee.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.990</td>
<td>-1.063</td>
<td>.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Performance</td>
<td>market share</td>
<td>-the number of students admitted to prestigious schools is higher than the average in the same region</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.951</td>
<td>-.998</td>
<td>.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>profitability</td>
<td>-the school’s performance is higher than the average level in the same region</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.944</td>
<td>-1.064</td>
<td>.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>productivity</td>
<td>-the school’s work efficiency is higher than the average level in the same region</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>-.996</td>
<td>.509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>customer satisfaction</td>
<td>-the satisfaction of parents and society with the school is higher than the average level in the same region</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.967</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
<td>.687</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Tab. 4, in terms of mean, in the measurement of organizational performance, the mean of the four items of the four indicators is between 4 and 5. The mean is 4.12, which is very close to 4. This can illustrate the central tendency of the mean.

It is basically agreed; the standard deviation is the degree of dispersion of the reflected data, and the standard deviation of organizational performance is 0.967, indicating that the stability and overall situation of the dependent variable are good, basically at the upper-middle level, and the degree of dispersion is average; from the statistical results, it can be seen that the organization the absolute value of the skewness of performance is 1.03, which is less than 3, and the absolute value of the kurtosis of organizational performance is 0.687, which is less than 8. Both are far smaller than the reference values of skewness and kurtosis in statistics and mathematics.

Therefore, it can be considered that the dependent variable of organizational performance can be approximately regarded as a normal distribution, which meets the basic requirements for data analysis of the research hypothesis of this article.

Table 6 - Reliability analysis

(made by co-authors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.958</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from Tab. 5, the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of all scales is 0.958, which is greater than 0.9, indicating that the overall scale has good reliability and the scale design used is reasonable and scientific.
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Table 7 - Validity analysis
(made by co-authors)

| KMO sampling suitability quantity | 0.925 |
| Bartlett’s test of sphericity | Approximate chi-square | 5403.136 |
| | degrees of freedom | 300 |
| | Significance | 0.000 |

As can be seen from Tab. 6, the KMO value of the questionnaire studied in this article is 0.925, which is 0.225 percentage points higher than the standard value of 0.7. In Bartlett’s test of sphericity, the approximate chi-square value is 5403.136, the degrees of freedom are 300, and the significance is 0.

All the above show that the validity of each questionnaire item in this research questionnaire is good, the data is real and valid, the relationship between each item and each variable meets the research requirements, and there is significant randomness in questionnaire collection and investigation.

Table 8 - Correlation analysis between variables
(made by co-authors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>organizational structure</th>
<th>organizational decisions</th>
<th>organizational justice</th>
<th>Organizational performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>organizational structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizational decisions</td>
<td>.431**</td>
<td>.466**</td>
<td>.581**</td>
<td>.551**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizational justice</td>
<td>.466**</td>
<td>.581**</td>
<td>.551**</td>
<td>.921**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Performance</td>
<td>.465**</td>
<td>.551**</td>
<td>.921**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed).

It can be seen from the correlation analysis table in Tab. 7 that there is a positive correlation between organizational structure and organizational decision-making (rs = 0.431, ps< 0.001); there is a positive correlation between organizational structure and organizational justice (rs = 0.466, ps< 0.001); organizational structure

There is a positive correlation between organizational decision-making and organizational performance; there is a positive correlation between organizational decision-making and organizational justice (rs = 0.581, ps< 0.001); there is a positive correlation between organizational decision-making and organizational performance (rs = 0.551, ps< 0.001); there is a positive correlation between organizational justice and organizational performance (rs = 0.551, ps< 0.001). rs = 0.921, ps< 0.001).

As can be seen from Tab. 8, the R square value is 0.216, indicating that "organizational structure" can explain 21.6% of the changes in "organizational performance"; the F value is 44.485, P value = 0.029<0.05, which passes the F test and indicates that "organizational structure has an impact on “organizational performance”; the model formula is: organizational performance = 1.034 + 0.703*organizational structure.

In summary, organizational structure has a significant positive impact on organizational performance (B = 0.703>0, t = 6.670, P = 0.000<0.05). The view that organizational structure has a positive impact on organizational performance has been verified; that is, hypothesis H1a is established.
Table 9 - Regression analysis of organizational structure and organizational performance
(made by co-authors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized coefficient</th>
<th>Standardized coefficient</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>collinearity statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(constant)</td>
<td>1.034</td>
<td>.468</td>
<td>2.207</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizational structure</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.465</td>
<td>6.670</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from Tab. 9, the R-squared value is 0.303, indicating that "organizational decision-making" can explain 30.3% of the changes in "organizational performance"; the F-value is 70.029, P-value = 0.000<0.05, which means that the F test is passed, which also indicates that "organizational decision-making" has an impact on "organizational performance"; the model formula is: organizational performance = 2.454 + 0.432*organizational decision-making.

In summary, organizational decision-making has a significant positive impact on organizational performance (B = 0.432>0, t = 8.368, P = 0.000<0.05). The view that
organizational decision-making has a positive impact on organizational performance has been verified; that is, hypothesis H1b is established.

As can be seen from Tab. 10, the R-squared value is 0.180, indicating that “organizational structure” can explain 18.0% of the changes in “organizational decision-making”; the F-value is 36.642, and the P-value is 0.000<0.05, which means it passes the F test and indicates that “organizational structure” has an impact on “organizational decision-making." The model formula is: organizational decision-making = 0.226+ 0.829 * organizational structure.

The research results show that organizational structure has a significant positive impact on organizational decision-making (B = 0.829>0, t = 6.053, P = 0.000<0.05). The view that organizational structure has a positive impact on organizational decision-making has been verified; that is, hypothesis H1c is established.

The results show that H1a, H1b, and H1c are all established; that is, H1 is verified, assuming H1 is established.

Table 12 - Regression analysis of organizational structure and organizational justice
(made by co-authors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>unstandardized coefficient</th>
<th>Standardized coefficient</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>collinearity statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>standard error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(constant)</td>
<td>.822</td>
<td>.492</td>
<td>1.672</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>organizational structure</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.466</td>
<td>6.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>44.782</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-W</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.041</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent variable: organizational justice

Table 13 - Regression analysis of the mediating effect of organizational decision-making on organizational structure and organizational performance
(made by co-authors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>independent variable</th>
<th>dependent variable</th>
<th>unstandardized coefficient</th>
<th>Standardized coefficient</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>collinearity statistics</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>D-W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>organizational structure</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>8.368</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational Performance</td>
<td>.829</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>6.053</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>organizational decisions</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>4.020</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td>1.228</td>
<td>0.367</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent variable: organizational performance

As can be seen from Tab. 11, the R-square value is 0.213, indicating that "organizational structure" can explain 21.3% of the changes in "organizational justice"; the F-value is 44.782, P-value=0.000<0.05, which passes the F test and indicates that
"organizational structure" has an impact on “organizational justice”; the model formula is: organizational justice = 0.822+ 0.740*organizational structure.

In summary, organizational structure has a significant positive impact on organizational justice (B = 0.740>0, t = 6.692, P = 0.000<0.05). The view that organizational structure and organizational justice have a positive impact has been verified; that is, hypothesis H2a is established.

It can be seen from Tab. 12 that there is a significant positive impact between organizational structure and organizational performance (B = 0.432>0, t = 8.386, P = 0.000<0.05); there is a significant positive impact between organizational structure and organizational decision-making (B = 0.829>0, t = 6.053, P = 0.000<0.05); after adding the organizational decision-making variable, the standardized coefficient value of organizational structure dropped from 0.551 to 0.280, but it still has a significant impact, indicating that organizational decision-making has a significant impact on organizational structure and organizational performance.

There is a partial mediating effect; that is, hypothesis H4 is supported.

Table 14 - Regression analysis of the mediating effect of organizational justice on organizational structure and organizational performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>independent variable</th>
<th>dependent variable</th>
<th>unstandardized coefficient</th>
<th>Standardized coefficient</th>
<th>independent variable</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>collinearity statistics</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>D-W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>organizational structure</td>
<td>Organizational Performance</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>8.386</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizational structure</td>
<td>organizational justice</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.466</td>
<td>6.692</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizational structure</td>
<td>Organizational Performance</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>1.318</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.782</td>
<td>1.278</td>
<td>.849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizational justice</td>
<td>Organizational Performance</td>
<td>.856</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.899</td>
<td>25.929</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.782</td>
<td>1.278</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent variable: organizational performance

It can be seen from Tab. 13 that there is a significant positive impact between organizational structure and organizational performance (B = 0.432>0, t = 8.368, P = 0.000<0.05); there is a significant positive impact between organizational structure and organizational justice (B = 0.740>0, t = 6.692, P = 0.000<0.05); after adding the organizational justice variable, the standardized coefficient value of the school's organizational structure dropped from 0.551 to 0.466.

The decrease was not obvious, but p=0.189>0.05, and the standardized coefficient of organizational justice The coefficient value increases from 0.466 to 0.899, and p = 0.000<0.05.

This shows that organizational justice has a complete mediating role in the impact of organizational structure on organizational performance; that is, hypothesis H5 is supported.
Conclusion and suggestion

The research results show that:

1. Organizational structure has a significant positive impact on organizational decision-making;
2. Organizational structure has a positive impact on organizational performance;
3. Organizational structure has a positive impact on organizational fairness;
4. Organizational decision-making has a positive impact on organizational performance;
5. Organizational justice has a positive impact on organizational performance;
6. Organizational decision-making has a significant mediating effect between organizational structure and organizational performance;
7. Organizational justice plays a significant role in the relationship between organizational structure and organizational performance.

Based on the research results and based on reality, this article puts forward the following suggestions:

- Improve the school management model and promote the healthy operation of the principal responsibility system: The first is to establish a real internal supervision mechanism, that is, to improve the mechanism construction of the Teachers’ Congress to ensure that the Teachers’ Congress can exercise its power. The second is to establish and improve the external supervision system. The third is to build a democratic participation mechanism inside and outside the school.

- Establish and improve the principal management system to improve the timeliness and accuracy of school decision-making. First, change the administrative appointment system to an appointment system. The second is to implement a principal qualification system. The third is to strengthen the principal training system. The fourth is to add a principal incentive system.

- Establish a democratic management system and improve management fairness; fully empower the Teachers’ Congress to participate in school management. The principal responsibility system, under the leadership of the party organization, is implemented, and all administrative powers are concentrated in the principal. The establishment of the Teachers' Congress is to have a supervisory and management role in the school's operating system and prevent the school from having exclusive power and the undesirable phenomenon of one person having the final say in all school affairs; the Teachers' Congress must be able to become the master of school management, and management authority should be added. The power of impeachment, appointment, and removal allows ordinary teachers to participate in school management. The participation of ordinary teachers in school management is also a supplement to the work of the Teachers' Congress and the follow-up development of democratically managed schools.

The principal responsibility system under the leadership of the party organization should be based on the fundamental requirements of education in our country, improve the principal's management system, and formulate matching laws and regulations.

The management of the school should be such that everyone can participate and everyone can supervise. The school management system of home, school, and community forms a trinity of mutual help.
The new era leads the new trend, and the school management system must also keep pace with the times, adapt to the changes of the times, improve the management system, improve the operating mechanism, keep up with the pace of reform, abandon bad plans, manage the school scientifically, rationally, and democratically, so that the school can change the new look, give education a new lease of life, and promote the scientific development of education.
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