Management and Organization Review 8:1 7–24
doi: 10.1111/j.1740-8784.2012.00292.x

Indigenous Research on Chinese Management: *What* and *How*

Peter Ping Li,[1,2] Kwok Leung,[3] Chao C. Chen,[4] and Jar-Der Luo[5]

[1]*Copenhagen Business School, Denmark,* [2]*Renmin University, China,* [3]*City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong,* [4]*Rutgers University, U.S., and* [5]*Tsinghua University, China*

ABSTRACT We attempt to provide a definition and a typology of indigenous research on Chinese management as well as outline the general methodological approaches for this type of research. We also present an integrative summary of the four articles included in this special issue and show how they illustrate our definition and typology of indigenous research on Chinese management, as well as the various methodological approaches we advocate. Further, we introduce a commentary on the four articles from the perspective of engaged scholarship, and also three additional articles included in this issue. Finally, we conclude with our suggestions for future indigenous research.

KEYWORDS Chinese management, indigenous research, methodology, qualitative, theory-building

INTRODUCTION

Many authors argue that indigenous research is essential for a full understanding of local phenomena (e.g., Enriquez, 1990; Kim & Berry, 1993; Tsui, 2004; Yang, 1993, 2000). On a practical level, indigenous research should generate the most effective solutions to local problems because of the high compatibility between theory and phenomenon (Leung, 2009). Further, given that almost all extant theories of management are built upon the philosophies and values of the West (Boyacigiller & Adler, 1991; March, 2005; Porter, 1996; Tsui, 2007), indigenous research in non-Western cultures, which have different intellectual and cultural traditions, has immense potential to contribute to universal theories by modifying, enriching, or supplementing Western management concepts or theories, and by offering brand-new theories (Enriquez, 1990; Lin, 2002; March, 2005;

© 2012 The International Association for Chinese Management Research

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-8784.2012.00292.x Published online by Cambridge University Press

Morris, Leung, Ames, & Lickel, 1999; Yang, 2000; cf. Rodrigues, Duarte, & Carrieri, 2012). The Chinese context, because of its rich intellectual and cultural traditions, as well as vibrant economic growth, offers many unique management phenomena and ideas for an indigenous analysis (Fang, 2010; Hwang, 2006; Meyer, 2006; Tsui, 2004, 2006; White, 2002; Yang, 1993, 2000). This special issue on indigenous research on Chinese management calls special attention to the indigenous perspective and includes four studies that showcase its importance and utility.

We have noted the important work on Chinese psychology from both indigenous (Yang, 1993, 2000) and cross-cultural perspectives (Bond, 2010), and we have also noted more recent cross-cultural research on organizational behaviour (Gelfand, Erez, & Aycan, 2007; Tsui, Nifadkar, & Ou, 2007). However, indigenous research in the field of management is still a relatively nascent endeavour, even though significant progress has been made in the fields of paternalistic leadership (Farh & Cheng, 2000) and *guanxi* (see Chen, Chen, & Huang, in press for a review; also see Luo, Huang, & Wang, 2012 for a meta-analysis). However, there is still no widely accepted definition of indigenous research. Some authors argue that a study is indigenous if it covers an indigenous phenomenon or topic, even if Western theories or concepts are adopted (e.g., Whetten, 2009); others maintain that indigenous research requires location-specific, indigenous contextual factors, but the theoretical framework adopted can be borrowed from the West (e.g., Tsui, 2004); still others argue that only when an indigenous theoretical perspective is adopted can a study be qualified as indigenous (e.g., Yang, 1993). The objectives of indigenous research are also controversial. Is the main purpose of indigenous research simply to verify or modify Western theories? A more radical objective is to develop new theories entirely from an indigenous perspective to explain uniquely local phenomena (Yang, 1993). Finally, discussion continues as to the best method to conduct indigenous management research, although references to other disciplines can be made, such as psychology (Enriquez, 1990; Kim & Berry, 1993; van de Vijver & Leung, 1997).

In this introduction to the special issue, we attempt to provide an initial definition and typology of indigenous research as well as outline the general methodological approaches for this type of research. We choose to focus on the questions of 'what' and 'how' rather than 'why' in relation to indigenous research on Chinese management because the latter has been extensively discussed by others (e.g., Fang, 2010; Hwang, 2006; Meyer, 2006; Tsui, 2004, 2006; White, 2002; Yang, 1993, 2000). We also present an integrative summary of the four articles in this special issue in light of our proposed conceptualization of indigenous research as well as a commentary for the special issue. Further, we introduce three additional articles included in this issue. Finally, we conclude with our suggestions for future indigenous research.

© 2012 The International Association for Chinese Management Research

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-8784.2012.00292.x Published online by Cambridge University Press

TOWARD A BETTER UNDERSTANDING ABOUT INDIGENOUS RESEARCH

Definition and Typology of Indigenous Research on Chinese Management

When a local phenomenon is so unique that the extant Western theories or constructs cannot account for it effectively, indigenous research is called for. Drawing upon previous work in psychology (Kim & Berry, 1993; Yang, 1993, 2000) and management (Tsui, 2004), Li (in press) proposes a working definition of indigenous research, namely, the study of a unique local phenomenon or a unique element of any local phenomenon from a local (native as emic) perspective to explore its local relevance, and, if possible, its global relevance as well. Following this definition, a study that examines a local phenomenon entirely from the perspective of Western theories or constructs cannot qualify as indigenous due to the lack of a local perspective. If a study examines a local phenomenon with a modified or expanded Western theory informed by a local perspective, it may qualify as indigenous because the research contributes to theory development by the adoption of a local perspective. It is noteworthy that this working definition is more open than the typical definition of indigenous research in psychology, which mandates a purely local perspective (Kim & Berry, 1993; Yang, 1993). We make an explicit distinction between contextualization and indigenization, because contextualization may or may not involve any local perspective (cf. Tsui, 2004; Whetten, 2009), while local perspective is a defining element of indigenization.

To clarify the diverse nature of indigenous research (Yang, 2000), Li (in press) has provided a typology based on the nature of local phenomenon and the source of theoretical perspective. The basic, perhaps most common, approach involves the uncritical application of extant theories from the West in a local context (Type 1: the emic-as-etic or imposed etic approach with mostly Western content). This type of research is not indigenous in nature, but it may still inform subsequent indigenous research if the research draws attention to certain local uniqueness or perspectives. A more sophisticated approach involves a comparative perspective with the potential to discover one or more novel constructs unique to a locality, and this type of research aims to modify and revise Western theories (Type 2: the etic-to-emic approach with imbalanced Western-Eastern content). Further, an innovative approach involves the development of a novel local theory to explain a unique local phenomenon, which can complement or supersede relevant theories from the West (Type 3: the emic-as-emic approach with mostly Eastern content). Finally, the most sophisticated approach involves an integration of the above three approaches toward a *geocentric* (i.e., the integration of local and global perspectives and its application to the East-West integration as the duality of opposites-in-unity) framework (Type 4: emic-and-etic integration with well-balanced local-global or Western-Eastern content). We recognize that the above are ideal-types, so the

© 2012 The International Association for Chinese Management Research

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-8784.2012.00292.x Published online by Cambridge University Press

actual studies can be various hybrids of multiple types (see Li, in press, for details about this typology; cf. Yang, 2000).

Most research concerning China is Type 1, with little original theoretical contribution. Some Chinese management research falls into Type 2, which is rooted in the comparative perspective with a focus on an adapted use of Western theories to understand unique local phenomena. This approach is consistent with Whetten's (2009) notion of context-sensitive research, which calls for the application of Western theories that take into account local contextual factors. Research that falls into Type 3 has greater potential to make original theoretical contributions because it focuses on the development of locally derived theories. This approach is consistent with Tsui's (2004) notion of context-specific research, which calls for the inclusion of locally meaningful contextual factors in theorizing. Type 4 research attempts to develop geocentric theories with both local and global relevance. This approach is consistent with those of the dynamic synergy of emic and etic perspectives (Leung, 2009; Morris et al., 1999), leveraging the cross-cultural perspective (Chen, Leung, & Chen, 2009), the balanced global view (Yang, 2000), and the geocentric mosaic (Li, 2008, in press). Overall, Type 1 and Type 2 research approaches are primarily concerned with the application or exploitation of extant Western theories to local phenomena with a path from theory to phenomenon, but Type 3 and Type 4 research approaches are primarily concerned with the development or exploration of novel local (also global) theories derived from local (also global) phenomena with a path from phenomenon to theory (cf. March, 2005). For more detail about the debate over indigenous research in the Chinese context, please refer to the Editor's Forum on the Future of Chinese Management Research (*Management and Organization Review*, Vol. 5, Issue 1, 2009).

How to Conduct Indigenous Research on Chinese Management

Indigenous research on Chinese management is gaining momentum, and the central question has been shifting from *why* to *how* to conduct indigenous research on Chinese management. We organize our ideas and recommendations in two broad categories: 1) sources of indigenous constructs and theories; and 2) methods of conducting indigenous research.

Sources of indigenous constructs and theories. To develop novel indigenous constructs and theories, management scholars can turn to two basic sources. The first is the philosophically diverse 'schools of thought', including Chinese traditional wisdom, such as Confucianism, Taoism, Legalism, the Art of War, as well as Chinese modern thought, such as Maoism and Deng Xiaoping Thoughts (Chen & Lee, 2008; Pan, Rowney, & Peterson, 2012). From traditional Chinese wisdom many indigenous constructs and theories for Chinese management can be developed. For example, the theories and applications of the cognitive frame of yin-yang balancing

© 2012 The International Association for Chinese Management Research

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-8784.2012.00292.x Published online by Cambridge University Press

(e.g., Li, 1998, 2008, in press; also see Chen, 2002, 2008; Fang, 2012; Wu, Huang, Li, & Liu, 2012); the link between yin-yang balancing, as the epistemology for the Chinese philosophy, and *wu* (悟 as intuitive imagination), as the methodology for Chinese philosophy, to meet the challenges of complexity and ambiguity (e.g., Li, 2012; Liang, 1921/1997); *zhongyong* (中庸 as the golden rule of balanced harmony, e.g., Chen & Miller, 2011; Cheung, Chan, Chan, King, Chiu, & Yang, 2003; Li, in press); *wu wei* (无为 as active non-action, e.g., Lee, Han, Byron, & Fan, 2008; Tsui, Wang, Xin, Zhang, & Fu, 2004); the strategic options in the Art of War (e.g., Pan et al., 2012; Sun, Chen, & Zhang, 2008); and the self-cultivation of virtue (自我修养, e.g., Yang, Peng, & Lee, 2008). These, among other Chinese traditional wisdoms, can richly inform indigenous research on Chinese management. Further, Chinese modern thought, such as the Maoist strategy of 'encircling the urban area from the rural area', and Deng's policy of 'crossing the river by feeling the stones', can also contribute. The above concepts and theories are all relatively uncharted territories, wide open for both theoretical and empirical enquiry. More concepts relevant for management research are yet to be distilled from the diverse Chinese schools of thought, both traditional and modern (Jia, You, & Du, 2012; Li, in press; Pan et al., 2012). The greatest challenge facing indigenous research on Chinese management lies in deriving specific constructs from the diversity of rich philosophical thought so as to build testable mid-range theories relevant to Chinese management (Van de Ven & Jing, 2012). In this sense, there is a critical need for a Chinese-style Renaissance and Enlightenment to modernize Chinese traditional wisdom (Li, in press), which often requires open-minded learning from the West. In sum, the first source of indigenous constructs and theories is based on diverse schools of thought and is conducive to a deductive approach.

The second source of indigenous constructs and theories lies in the rich phenomena of Chinese practices, both traditional and contemporary. Examples of Chinese traditional phenomena include paternalistic leadership (e.g., Farh & Cheng, 2000; Wu et al., 2012); the circle and network of *guanxi* (e.g., Chen & Chen, 2004; Li, 1998, 2006; Luo, 2011; Luo & Yeh, 2012; Ma, 2012); interpersonal harmony (e.g., Leung & Brew, 2009; Leung, Brew, Zhang, & Zhang, 2011); 'face' (脸面, Ho, 1976); *renqing* (人情, Hwang, 1987); and traditional merchants (e.g., Shanxi merchants or 晋商), among others. Contemporary phenomena include successes and setbacks as well as opportunities and pitfalls of Chinese firms, and the aspirations and frustrations of CEOs and ordinary employees. Examples include economic and enterprise reform in the special context of China (e.g., Chen, 2007; Li, 2005); the internationalization pattern of Chinese multinational firms (e.g., Child & Rodrigues, 2005; Lu, Liu, & Wang, 2011); the so-called Chinese 'Shanzhai' phenomenon as imitative innovation (e.g., Luo, Sun, & Lu, 2011); the rampant corruption in China (Li, 2005); and many other relatively unexplored issues, such as the migrant labour force, the new generation of single child born in the 1980s and 1990s, and the gaping inequality and fragmentation in society since

© 2012 The International Association for Chinese Management Research

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-8784.2012.00292.x Published online by Cambridge University Press

the start of China's reform. The above are all important phenomena of Chinese practices in urgent need of scholarly attention, and indigenous research on Chinese management can provide practical insights for addressing pressing problems confronting Chinese employees and firms. In sum, the second source of indigenous constructs and theories is based on a rich and diverse range of practices and is conducive to an inductive approach.

Finally, it is feasible and beneficial to integrate the above two basic sources via a balanced approach. This balanced approach applies the schools of thought from the first source to the practices from the second source so as to build testable mid-range indigenous theories of Chinese management. We believe that the balanced approach has immense potential to build novel indigenous constructs and theories. For example, the theory of paternalistic leadership was developed via this balanced approach by applying the Chinese traditional schools of Confucianism and Legalism to the modern practices of leadership (Farh & Cheng, 2000). Further, it is possible to apply the Chinese methodology of *wu* (intuitive imagination) to the Chinese practice of paternalistic leadership because Chinese leaders tend to deliberately keep their major decisions and intentions open-ended or tacit so as to embrace complexity and ambiguity in the practice of management (Redding, 1990).

Methods of Conducting Indigenous Research

We propose three methodological recommendations for advancing indigenous research on Chinese management. First, we urge Chinese management scholars to pay more attention to qualitative research methods (Berg, 2009; Denzin & Lincoln, 1994), especially for the purpose of creating novel indigenous constructs and theories. Indigenous research on Chinese management, which is typically rooted in the cultural and historical contexts of a locality, cannot and should not blindly imitate the narrowly defined 'scientific' methods (e.g., quantitative methods, see Popper, 1959), which are commonly adopted in the social sciences (see Bandura, 1999; Kim & Park, 2005 for reviews). What is needed is an integration of positivism and constructivism because social research must involve both subjectivity and inter-subjectivity (Bandura, 1999; Cheng, Wang, & Huang, 2009; Kim & Park, 2005). Qualitative methods are particularly suitable for studying the content and process of inter-subjective social phenomena, and especially for theory-building purposes in the exploratory stage of a research program.

To the extent that the most urgent task of advancing indigenous Chinese management lies in the development of indigenous perspectives, theories, and constructs, we call on scholars to engage in qualitative research methods, such as ethnography and participant observation (Adler & Adler, 1994; Atkinson & Hammersley, 1994); action research (Argyris, Putnam, & Smith, 1985; Lewin, 1946); engaged scholarship (Van de Ven, 2007); case study (Eisenhardt, 1989; Yin, 2009);

© 2012 The International Association for Chinese Management Research

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-8784.2012.00292.x Published online by Cambridge University Press

focus group and interview (Adler & Adler, 1994); grounded theory (Charmaz, 2006; Glaser & Strauss, 1967); and content analyses (Chi, 1997). We are aware that this call may deviate from the dominant paradigm that emphasizes experiments, surveys, and statistical modelling. However, we are convinced of the unique advantages of qualitative methods in construct and theory development and the necessity of engaged scholarship (Van de Ven & Jing, 2012). We also believe that investment in developing and practising qualitative research competences is critical for the continuous advancement of Chinese management research. Chinese management scholars should consider the exemplary ethnographic work of arguably the most influential sociologist and anthropologist in China, Xiaotong Fei, especially his indigenous construct of 'differential mode of association' (Fei, 1947/1992). His work serves as a source of inspiration and an illustration of high-quality and relevant qualitative research methods for indigenous research.

Our second recommendation focuses on scale development. Once an indigenous construct is conceptualized, whether derived from the extant literature or from practical concerns, quantitative measures have to be developed and validated for empirical research to proceed. Interested readers can consult Farh, Cannella, and Lee (2006) for details about how to develop measurements that are sensitive and relevant to the Chinese context. Readers are encouraged to take note of the painstaking processes required in developing indigenous scales, and of the adoption of etic and emic perspectives and the utilization of various qualitative methods in their otherwise quantitative endeavours (e.g., Chen, Friedman, Yu, Fang, & Lu, 2009; Cheng, Chou, & Farh, 2000).

This brings us to our third and most important recommendation, namely, the use of a multi-perspective, multi-level, and multi-method approach to the study of Chinese indigenous phenomena. We understand that this approach is extremely demanding because it requires the deep appreciation of engaged scholarship to truly balance research rigour with research relevance to build indigenous theories via both qualitative and quantitative methods (Li, 2011; Van de Ven & Jing, 2012), beyond simply more rigorous quantitative methods to test extant theories (Kulik, 2011).

By multi-perspective, we not only have multiple disciplines in mind, but also both etic and emic perspectives. In this special issue, we deliberately emphasize the importance of the Chinese origin and source for indigenous Chinese management theory and research, but this does not mean that Chinese theories developed out of such an indigenizing process are only applicable in the Chinese context. For example, the Chinese indigenous frame of yin-yang balancing takes all entities at all levels as holistic and dynamic systems in which the opposite forces balance each other because they are partially conflicting but partially complementary as opposites-in-unity (Li, 1998, 2008). As one of the cardinal principles of Confucianism, rooted in the frame of yin-yang balancing, the golden rule of balanced harmony (中庸) covers how to balance holistically and dynamically the opposite

© 2012 The International Association for Chinese Management Research

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-8784.2012.00292.x Published online by Cambridge University Press

elements so as to maintain both stability and change in a complex system (Chen & Miller, 2011; Li, in press). This frame is parallel to an emerging approach to complex adaptive systems (Stacey, Griffin, & Shaw, 2000), such as the work of Granovetter (1995, 2002), who takes 'balancing, coupling, and decoupling' in a complex network as the core function of an entrepreneur. There may be a role for the Chinese notion of yin-yang balancing in any universal theory that recognizes the duality of opposites. It is instructive to note that Niels Bohr was inspired by the Chinese frame of yin-yang balancing to develop his famous *Principle of Complementarity* to explain the wave-particular duality of light in particular and quantum physics in general (see an explanation of his yin-yang symbol preceding the editorial by Kwok Leung in this special issue).

The geocentric balance between the local and global perspectives, as well as the West and the East, will not 'naturally' or 'automatically' happen if scholars do not adopt an etic or multi-emic perspective. That is, scholars have to take into account non-Chinese perspectives, from other parts of Asia, the West, or Africa. Indigenous or emic research is by no means confined to the goal of explaining unique phenomena at the local level, as it often has global relevance. Emic constructs and theories as diverse perspectives from different cultures can be integrated to develop a more complete, mosaic-style framework with an overlapped core and diverse unique details. This is what we refer to as the ultimate goal of indigenous research.

By multi-level, we refer to individual, group, organizational, and societal levels. For example, the *guanxi* phenomenon in China has been conceptualized and examined at the individual, dyadic, organizational, and societal levels although the group level is conspicuously understudied (Chen & Chen, 2004; Li, 2006; Luo, 2011; Luo et al., 2012; Luo & Yeh, 2012). By multi-method, we advocate the synergistic combination of qualitative and quantitative methods (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). Aside from its use in scale development as in our second recommendation, it can be used throughout the process of theory development and testing. It is typical to initiate the process of theory-building via qualitative methods, such as the theory-building case study (Eisenhardt, 1989; Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007). After the initial development of a new theory or construct, one can use quantitative methods to test the newly developed theory or construct (Popper, 1959). The yin-yang method of case study discussed by Li (in press) may be an interesting approach to integrating extant controversial theories or constructs to be followed up with large-sample statistical tests.

We use the example of research on harmony to illustrate the importance of the multi-perspective, multi-level, and multi-method approach. First, consider the multi-perspective approach. Harmony is a salient concept in both traditional Chinese philosophies and current Chinese society. What do traditional and contemporary thought share and how do they differ with regard to the meanings of harmony? How is harmony related to the golden rule of balanced harmony as one of the core principles of Confucianism? How is harmony related to the frame of

© 2012 The International Association for Chinese Management Research

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-8784.2012.00292.x Published online by Cambridge University Press

yin-yang balancing? Does harmony have a parallel concept in the West, such as cohesion, solidarity, or unity? To what extent is harmony, as it is understood in China, similar to or different from these concepts in the West? How is harmony related to the constructs of complexity and ambiguity? Can we integrate the Eastern notion of harmony with the Western notion of cohesion into a geocentric duality of diversity-in-unity? The above questions would benefit from a multi-perspective approach.

With regard to the multi-level approach, Chinese government and general public concern about harmony seem to be at both the societal level (e.g., the growing disparity between rich and poor between people and regions) and the individual or interpersonal level (e.g., psychological and interpersonal harmony). However, a multilevel approach would raise the question of harmony for managers and employees at both organizational and work group levels, especially the cross-level interaction of harmony-related variables. For example, the harmony of an organization as a whole must be based on the harmony of various work groups within that organization. Further, a multi-level approach would also lead to theorizing about different antecedents and outcomes of harmony depending on the level at which harmony is conceptualized and examined, as well as the cross-level interactions involved.

Finally, a multi-method approach to harmony would generate more insights in construct and theory development and hypotheses testing. The critical review of ancient Chinese philosophies and focus groups and interviews involving Chinese academics and practitioners can be combined to initially define the content domain of harmony. These initial definitions can be compared with extant Western concepts such as cohesion and solidarity to examine potential overlap and distinctiveness. Such similarities and distinctions will be taken into account to refine the concept and to develop its measures. Scale validation would include both Chinese harmony measures and similar measures in the West to establish the convergent and discriminant validities. Testing the theoretical models of antecedents and consequences of harmony can be conducted through multiple methods, including case studies, content analyses of classic and contemporary literatures, field or lab experiments, and surveys.

Obviously, it is impossible for a single study to be multi-perspective, multi-level, and multi-method, but indigneous research as a collective needs to be comprehensive in scope for it to be successful and influential. To fully explore the notion of harmony, diverse studies, with each one focusing on a specific facet, are needed. The example using harmony also makes it clear that an indigenous perspective based on unique historical and cultural traditions, as well as contemporary social and economic conditions, is imperative for fully understanding a phenomenon. It also illustrates that knowledge with both local and global relevance is the ultimate goal of indigenous research, and that indigenous research in the East has the potential to generate novel research directions and theories with global or universal relevance.

© 2012 The International Association for Chinese Management Research

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-8784.2012.00292.x Published online by Cambridge University Press

SUMMARIES OF THE ARTICLES IN THE SPECIAL ISSUE

This special issue contains four articles covering diverse topics, ranging from: a theoretical reframing of cultural value systems from the perspective of the Chinese yin-yang frame; the development of a measure based on rich Chinese cultural traditions; an empirical study on the role of *guanxi* in vertical relationships; to an empirical study on three key influencing processes that underlie paternalistic leadership. These articles share a common feature that qualifies them as indigenous research, i.e., focusing on one or more indigenous constructs or measures (e.g., yin-yang frame, Taoism, *guanxi*, and paternalistic leadership). Together, the four articles are outstanding examples of indigenous research on management in the Chinese context.

Readers will no doubt enjoy these four articles, and here we provide a brief summary to whet the reader's appetite. In the first article, 'Yin yang: A new perspective on culture', Fang (2012) applies the Chinese frame of yin-yang balancing to a new conceptualization of culture. Culture is reframed as possessing inherently paradoxical value orientations, thereby enabling it to embrace opposite traits of any given cultural dimension. Fang posits that potential paradoxical values and behaviours coexist in any national culture; they give rise to, exist within, reinforce, and complement each other to shape the holistic, dynamic and dialectical nature of culture. Seen from the yin-yang perspective, all cultures share the same potential in value orientations, but at the same time they are also different from each other because each culture is a unique and dynamic portfolio of self-selected, globally available, value orientations as a consequence of that culture's learning over time.

In the second article, 'The structure of Chinese cultural traditions: An empirical study of business employees in China', Pan et al. (2012) develop a scale to measure the five key schools of Chinese cultural traditions that implicitly influence current management thought in China. The authors propose a four-factor Structure of Chinese Cultural Traditions (SCCT) model. A sample of 2,658 people in businesses in Beijing was used to develop the dimensions that were then cross validated in a nationwide sample of 718 business employees. The four dimensions show patterns of convergent and discriminant validity with generic domains of values represented by the Schwartz Value Survey. The authors argue that the Structure of Chinese Cultural Traditions provides a unique model of Chinese culture that complements other generic measures, thereby allowing a deep understanding of Chinese culture.

In the third article, 'A relational view of organizational restructuring: The case of transitional China', Ma (2012) addresses three related questions concerning authority relations (personal relations with superiors) in transitional China. First, could superiors retain an organizational unit in order to save a protégé's job? Second, has instrumental usage of particularistic relations, or *guanxi*, lost its

© 2012 The International Association for Chinese Management Research

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-8784.2012.00292.x Published online by Cambridge University Press

importance? Third, has 'principled particularism', an integration of political loyalty and authority relations, continued to impact careers? Based on first-hand survey data, this study found that state-owned enterprises whose managers had closer authority relations were less likely to be sold or discontinued, and close authority relations also reduced the likelihood of career blockage (demotion/ layoff). The significant interactive effect of party membership and authority relations revealed the rather sticky continuation of 'principled particularism'. Taken together, this study underlines institutional continuity during rapid social change, renders insights into the processes of organizational restructuring, and depicts the relational base of formal organizations.

In the fourth article, 'Perceived interactional justice and trust-in-supervisor as mediators for paternalistic leadership', Wu et al. (2012) identify several key culture-specific influencing processes that underlie the effects of the three paternalistic leadership dimensions on subordinates' work performance/ organizational citizenship behaviours. The results, based on the data collected from private firms in China, showed that perceived interactional justice mediated the effects of moral leadership and benevolent leadership on trust-in-supervisor. However, perceived interactional justice did not mediate the relationship between authoritarian leadership and trust-in-supervisor. In addition, trust-in-supervisor was found to be positively associated with work performance and organizational citizenship behaviours. It is worth noting that the article highlights the unique value of the yin-yang frame for better understanding the seemingly paradoxical dimensions of paternalistic leadership.

In sum, the four articles in the special issue share the central theme that the phenomena and issues concerning Chinese management are often unique in certain aspects as compared to similar phenomena and issues in the West, thus calling for indigenous research. They also share the core feature of indigenous research by involving at least one concept or variable unique to the local phenomenon, which calls for the adoption of local perspectives in addition to Western theories. These articles as a collective embrace the multiple-perspective approach. In addition, the research methods range from quantitative (e.g., multivariate analysis and structural equation modelling) to qualitative (e.g., grounded theory building and case illustration), showcasing the multi-method approach. Finally, even though not specifically shown in any single article, these articles as a group demonstrate the value of the multi-level approach (e.g., from the macro-cultural level to the micro-personal level). It is interesting to note that two of the four articles effectively apply the frame of yin-yang balancing (i.e., Fang on culture; Wu et al. on paternalistic leadership), and that two articles highlight the imperative of harmony for Chinese management (Fang on culture; Pan et al. on culture).

To put indigenous research on Chinese management into perspective, we invited a commentary regarding indigenous research on management in general and the four articles in the special issue in particular. This commentary, entitled

© 2012 The International Association for Chinese Management Research

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-8784.2012.00292.x Published online by Cambridge University Press

'Indigenous research on management in China from an engaged scholarship perspective', was authored by Van de Ven and Jing (2012). It begins by emphasizing the importance of indigenous research not only for understanding the specific deep knowledge of local phenomena, but also for advancing general theoretical knowledge across cultural boundaries. Further, they propose a method of engaged scholarship for conducting indigenous research. Finally, the commentary recognizes that the four papers in this special issue provide good illustrations of engaged scholarship in the context of indigenous research.

In addition to the four articles and one commentary, this issue contains two review articles related to the theme of indigenous research on Chinese management as well as one perspective article on the management research in the context of Brazil. The first article, '*Guanxi* and organizational performance: A meta-analysis', by Luo et al. (2012), provides a meta-analysis of the extant literature linking *guanxi* utilization and organizational performance. The authors found business ties to have a bigger impact on operational performance, while government ties have significant effects on economic performance. Further, this meta-analysis found the importance of government ties to be time-variant, and declining with the development of the institutional environment in China. Contrary to this finding, Ma's article in our special issue reports on the continuation of 'principled particularism' in terms of *guanxi* utilization. We call for future research to shed light on this mixed evidence. This new research can reframe *guanxi* from its mainstream, loose definition as any type of social tie toward a particularistic tie with both instrumental and sentimental elements. The new research can also reframe *guanxi* from the mainstream focus on its vertical or hierarchical type (which often involves corruption) toward its horizontal or peer type (which seldom involves corruption).

The second article is a review of the literature about contextualized research on Chinese management. In 'Chinese context and theoretical contributions to management and organization research: A three-decade review', Jia et al. (2012) develop and apply a context-emic model to management and organization articles published in six leading journals between 1981 and 2010 and articles from *Management and Organization Review* (*MOR*) since its launch in 2005 to 2010. In particular, they find that those studies based on Chinese contexts introduce only three new concepts (market transition, network capitalism, and *guanxi*), and that Chinese-context research contributes only Confucianism and its related concepts. This review shows that Chinese management research continues to use Western models, but those empirical articles using more Chinese contextualization garner a greater number of citations. We agree with the overall conclusion of this review, but emphasize that this review found no Type 3 indigenous research as defined in this article. It is worth repeating that indigenous research holds the best potential to make high-impact contributions by developing novel indigenous constructs and theories beyond contextualization.

© 2012 The International Association for Chinese Management Research

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-8784.2012.00292.x Published online by Cambridge University Press

The third article provides a perspective about the status of management research in Brazil. Entitled 'Indigenous or imported knowledge in Brazilian management studies: A quest for legitimacy?', Rodrigues et al. (2012) reflect on the evolution of Brazilian management research in light of the debate over the pros and cons of indigenous versus imported approaches to Chinese management research. In particular, this article focuses on the challenges of gaining international legitimacy for Brazilian management research and recommends an ambidextrous strategy that integrates the outside-in and inside-out approaches. We embrace the ambidextrous strategy, but suggest, from the indigenous perspective, that its primary goal should be local relevance, with international recognition as the secondary goal. We worry that too much concern with international legitimacy may hinder the healthy development of indigenous research, especially in its early stages (Li & Leung, 2010; March, 2005; Yang, 1993, 2000).

CONCLUSION

With a growing recognition that research in a single cultural context is indigenous in nature, including Western research, we highlight the unique and novel value of indigenous research with the ultimate vision of emic-etic integration for the development of both locally and globally relevant theories. We share the view that there is no inherent reason why Western theories, derived from context-specific indigenous research, have an inherent monopoly over the knowledge of management (Van de Ven & Jing, 2012) and question why certain indigenous theories derived from the Chinese context cannot become globally or universally relevant theories (Leung, 2009; Yang, 2000). It is our view that indigenous research in diverse cultural contexts should be encouraged (March, 2005). We argue that local relevance should surpass global relevance as the primary goal for indigenous research. We also promote multi-perspective, multi-level, and multi-method approaches as imperative for indigenous research. The collective set of papers in this issue showcases the value of such approaches.

We hope that indigenous research in China will play a central role in the new encounter between West and East in the modern era of globalization (Chen & Miller, 2011). If this can facilitate Chinese cultural modernization – China's Renaissance and Enlightenment – it may also foster a new Renaissance and Enlightenment in the West. We believe that indigenous research is central to academic associations specifically concerned with non-Western cultural contexts, including the *International Association of Chinese Management Research*. We hope that this special issue on Chinese indigenous research on management will attract more attention to indigenous research. We also hope that indigenous research will generate theories and findings that demonstrate unequivocally the unique potency of indigenous research.

© 2012 The International Association for Chinese Management Research

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-8784.2012.00292.x Published online by Cambridge University Press

NOTES

We wish to express our gratitude to Anne Tsui and the two reviewers for their constructive comments and valuable suggestions as well as to Tina Minchella for her editorial help.

REFERENCES

Adler, P. A., & Adler, P. 1994. Observational techniques. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), ***Handbook of qualitative research:*** 377–392. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Argyris, C., Putnam, R., & Smith, D. M. 1985. ***Action science: Concepts, methods and skills for research and intervention.*** San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Atkinson, P., & Hammersley, M. 1994. Ethnography and participant observation. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), ***Handbook of qualitative research:*** 248–261. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bandura, A. 1999. Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. ***Asian Journal of Social Psychology,*** 2(1): 21–42.

Berg, B. L. 2009. ***Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*** (7th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Bond, M. 2010. ***Oxford handbook of Chinese psychology.*** New York: Oxford University Press.

Boyacigiller, N. A., & Adler, N. J. 1991. The parochial dinosaur: Organizational science in a global context. ***Academy of Management Review,*** 16(2): 262–290.

Charmaz, K. C. 2006. ***Constructive grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis.*** Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Chen, C. C., & Lee, Y. T. 2008. The diversity and dynamism of Chinese philosophies on leadership. In C. C. Chen & Y. T. Lee (Eds.), ***Leadership and management in China: Philosophies, theories, and practices:*** 1–27. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Chen, C. C., Chen, X. P., & Huang, S. S. *Guanxi* and social networking: An integrative review and future directions. ***Management and Organization Review,*** in press.

Chen, M.-J. 2002. Transcending paradox: The Chinese 'middle way' perspective. ***Asia Pacific Journal of Management,*** 19(2–3): 179–199.

Chen, M.-J. 2008. Reconceptualizing the competition-cooperation relationship: A transparadox perspective. ***Journal of Management Inquire,*** 17(4): 288–304.

Chen, M.-J., & Miller, D. 2011. The relational perspective as a business mindset: Managerial implications for East and West. ***Academy of Management Perspectives,*** 25(3): 6–18.

Chen, W. 2007. Does the colour of the cat matter? The red hat strategy in China's private enterprises. ***Management and Organization Review,*** 3(1): 55–80.

Chen, X. P., & Chen, C. C. 2004. On the intricacies of the Chinese *guanxi*: A process model of *guanxi* development. ***Asia Pacific Journal of Management,*** 21(3): 305–324.

Chen, Y., Friedman, R., Yu, E., Fang, W., & Lu, X. 2009. Supervisor–subordinate guanxi: Developing a three-dimensional model and scale. ***Management and Organization Review,*** 5(3): 375–399.

Chen, Y.-R., Leung, K., & Chen, C. C. 2009. Bringing national culture to the table: Making a difference with cross-cultural differences and perspectives. ***Academy of Management Annals,*** 3(1): 217–249.

Cheng, B. S., Chou, L. F., & Farh, J. L. 2000. A triad model of paternalistic leadership: The constructs and measurement. ***Indigenous Psychological Research in Chinese Societies (in Chinese),*** 14: 3–64.

Cheng, B. S., Wang, A. C., & Huang, M. P. 2009. The road more popular versus the road less travelled: An 'insider's' perspective of advancing Chinese management research. ***Management and Organization Review,*** 5(1): 91–105.

Cheung, T. S., Chan, H. M., Chan, K. M., King, A. Y. C., Chiu, C. Y., & Yang, C. F. 2003. On Zhongyong rationality: The Confucian doctrine of the mean as a missing link between instrumental rationality and communicative rationality. ***Asian Journal of Social Science,*** 31(1): 107–127.

Chi, M. T. H. 1997. Quantifying qualitative analyses of verbal data: A practical guide. ***Journal of the Learning Sciences,*** 6(3): 271–315.

© 2012 The International Association for Chinese Management Research

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-8784.2012.00292.x Published online by Cambridge University Press

Child, J., & Rodrigues, S. B. 2005. The internationalization of Chinese firms: A case for theoretical extension? ***Management and Organization Review,*** 1(3): 381–410.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). 1994. ***Handbook of qualitative research:*** 105–117. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Eisenhardt, K. M. 1989. Building theories from case study research. ***Academy of Management Review,*** 14(4): 532–550.

Eisenhardt, K. M., & Graebner, M. 2007. Theory building from cases: Opportunities and challenges. ***Academy of Management Journal,*** 50(1): 25–32.

Enriquez, V. G. 1990. Cross indigenous, methods and perspectives. In V. G. Enriquez (Ed.), ***Indigenous psychology: A book of readings:*** 210–230. Quezon: Philippine Psychology Research and Training House.

Fang, T. 2010. Asian management research needs more self-confidence: Reflection on Hofstede (2007) and beyond. ***Asia Pacific Journal of Management,*** 27(1): 155–170.

Fang, T. 2012. Yin Yang: A new perspective on culture. ***Management and Organization Review,*** 8(1): 25–50.

Farh, J. L., & Cheng, B.-S. 2000. A cultural analysis of paternalistic leadership in Chinese organizations. In J. T. Li, A. S. Tsui & E. Weldon (Eds.), ***Management and organizations in the Chinese context:*** 94–127. London: Macmillan.

Farh, J. L., Cannella, A. A., & Lee, C. 2006. Approaches to scale development in Chinese management research. ***Management and Organization Review,*** 2(3): 301–318.

Fei, X. 1947/1992. ***From the soil: The foundations of Chinese society.*** Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

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

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. 1967. ***The discovery of grounded theory.*** Chicago, IL: Aldine.

Granovetter, M. 1995. The economic sociology of firms and entrepreneurs. In A. Portes (Ed.), ***The economic sociology of immigration: Essays in networks, ethnicity and entrepreneurship:*** 128–165. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Granovetter, M. 2002. A theoretical agenda for economic sociology. In M. Guillen, R. Collins, P. England & M. Meyer (Eds.), ***The new economic sociology: Developments in an emerging field:*** 35–59. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Ho, D. Y.-F. 1976. On the concept of face. ***American Journal of Sociology,*** 81(4): 867–884.

Hwang, K. K. 1987. Face and favor: The Chinese power game. ***American Journal of Sociology,*** 92(4): 944–974.

Hwang, K.-K. 2006. Constructive realism and Confucian relationalism: An epistemological strategy for the development of indigenous psychology. In U. Kim, G.-S. Yang & K.-K. Hwang (Eds.), ***International and cultural psychology: Understanding people in context:*** 73–107. New York: Springer.

Jia, L., You, S., & Du, Y. 2012. Chinese context and theoretical contributions to management and organization research: A three-decade review. ***Management and Organization Review,*** 8(1): 173–209.

Johnson, B. R., & Onwuegbuzie, A. 2004. Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. ***Educational Researcher,*** 33(7): 14–26.

Kim, U., & Berry, J. W. (Eds.). 1993. ***Indigenous psychologies: Research and experience in cultural context.*** Thousand oaks, CA: SAGE.

Kim, U., & Park, Y.-S. 2005. Integrated analysis of indigenous psychologies: Comments and extensions of ideas presented by Shams, Jackson, Hwang and Kashima. ***Asian Journal of Social Psychology,*** 8(1): 75–95.

Kulik, C. T. 2011. Climbing the higher mountain: The challenges of multilevel, multisource, and longitudinal research designs. ***Management and Organization Review,*** 7(3): 447–460.

Lee, Y. T., Han, A. G., Byron, T. K., & Fan, H. X. 2008. Daoist leadership, theory and application. In C. C. Chen & Y. T. Lee (Eds.), ***Leadership and management in China: Philosophies, theories, and practices:*** 83–107. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Leung, K. 2009. Never the twain shall meet? Integrating Chinese and Western management research. ***Management and Organization Review,*** 5(1): 121–129.

Leung, K., & Brew, F. P. 2009. A cultural analysis of harmony and conflict: Towards an integrated model of conflict styles. In R. S. Wyer Jr, C. Y. Chiu & Y. Y. Hong (Eds.), ***Understanding***

© 2012 The International Association for Chinese Management Research

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-8784.2012.00292.x Published online by Cambridge University Press

culture: Theory, research and application: 411–428. Hove, East Sussex: Psychology Press.

Leung, K., Brew, F. P., Zhang, Z. X., & Zhang, Y. 2011. Harmony and conflict: A cross-cultural investigation in China and Australia. ***Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology,*** 42(5): 795–816.

Lewin, K. 1946. Action research and minority problems. ***Journal of Social Issues,*** 2(4): 34–46.

Li, F., & Leung, K. 2010. Future directions for Chinese indigenous management research (中国本土管理研究的进路). ***Chinese Journal of Management (中国管理学报 in Chinese),*** 7(5): 642–648.

Li, P. P. 1998. Toward a geocentric framework of organizational form: A holistic, dynamic and paradoxical approach. ***Organization Studies,*** 19(5): 829–861.

Li, P. P. 2005. The puzzle of China's township village enterprises: The paradox of local corporatism in a dual tack economic transition. ***Management and Organization Review,*** 1(2): 197–224.

Li, P. P. 2006. *Guanxi* as the Chinese norm for personalized social capital: Toward an integrated duality framework of informal exchange. In H. W. Yeung (Ed.), ***Handbook of research on Asian business:*** 62–83. London: Edward Elgar.

Li, P. P. 2008. Toward a geocentric framework of trust: An application to organizational trust. ***Management and Organization Review,*** 4(3): 413–439.

Li, P. P. 2011. The rigor-relevance balance for engaged scholarship: New frame and new agenda for trust research and beyond. ***Journal of Trust Research,*** 1(1): 1–21.

Li, P. P. 2012. Exploring the unique roles of trust and play in private creativity: From the complexity-ambiguity-metaphor link to the trust-play-creativity link. ***Journal of Trust Research,*** 2(1): 71–97.

Li, P. P. in press. Toward an integrative framework of indigenous research: The geocentric implications of Yin-Yang Balance. ***Asia Pacific Journal of Management.*** DOI: 10.100/510490-011-9250-2.

Liang, S.-M. 1921/1997. ***The cultures and philosophies between the East and the West (in Chinese).*** Beijing: The Commerce Press.

Lin, N. 2002. How the East and West shall meet. ***Development and Society,*** 31(2): 211–244.

Lu, J., Liu, X., & Wang, H. 2011. Motives for outward FDI of Chinese private firms: Firm resources, industry dynamics, and government policies. ***Management and Organization Review,*** 7(2): 223–248.

Luo, J.-D. 2011. *Guanxi* revisited: An exploratory study of familiar ties in a Chinese workplace. ***Management and Organizational Review,*** 7(2): 329–351.

Luo, J.-D., & Yeh, K. 2012. Neither collectivism nor individualism: Trust in the Chinese circles. ***Journal of Trust Research,*** 2(1): 53–70.

Luo, Y., Sun, J., & Lu, S. C. 2011. Emerging economy copycats: Capability, environment and strategy. ***Academy of Management Perspective,*** 25(2): 37–56.

Luo, Y., Huang, Y., & Wang, S. L. 2012. *Guanxi* and organizational performance: A meta-analysis. ***Management and Organization Review,*** 8(1): 139–172.

Ma, D. 2012. A relational view of organizational restructuring: The case of transitional China. ***Management and Organization Review,*** 8(1): 51–75.

March, J. G. 2005. Parochialism in the evolution of a research community: The case of organization studies. ***Management and Organization Review,*** 1(1): 5–22.

Meyer, K. E. 2006. Asian management research needs more self-confidence. ***Asia Pacific Journal of Management,*** 23(2): 119–137.

Morris, M. W., Leung, K., Ames, D., & Lickel, B. 1999. Views from inside and outside: Integrating emic and etic insights about culture and justice judgment. ***Academy of Management Review,*** 24(4): 781–796.

Pan, Y., Rowney, J. A., & Peterson, M. F. 2012. The structure of Chinese cultural traditions: An empirical study of business employees in China. ***Management and Organization Review,*** 8(1): 77–95.

Popper, K. 1959. ***The logic of scientific discovery.*** London: Routledge.

Porter, L. W. 1996. Forty years of organization studies: Reflections from a micro perspective. ***Administrative Science Quarterly,*** 41(2): 262–269.

Redding, S. G. 1990. ***The spirit of Chinese capitalism.*** Berlin: de Gruyter.

Rodrigues, S. B., Duarte, R. D., & Carrieri, A. P. 2012. Indigenous or imported knowledge in Brazilian management studies: A quest for legitimacy? ***Management and Organization Review,*** 8(1): 211–232.

© 2012 The International Association for Chinese Management Research

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-8784.2012.00292.x Published online by Cambridge University Press

Stacey, R. D., Griffin, D., & Shaw, P. 2000. ***Complexity and management: Fad or radical challenge to systems thinking.*** New York: Routledge.

Sun, H., Chen, C. C., & Zhang, S.-H. 2008. Strategic leadership of Sunzi in *The Art of War.* In C. C. Chen & Y. T. Lee (Eds.), ***Leadership and management in China: Philosophies, theories, and practices:*** 143–168. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Tsui, A. S. 2004. Contributing to global management knowledge: A case for high quality indigenous research. ***Asia Pacific Journal of Management,*** 21(4): 491–513.

Tsui, A. S. 2006. Contextualization in Chinese management research. ***Management and Organization Review,*** 2(1): 1–13.

Tsui, A. S. 2007. From homogenization to pluralism: International management research in the Academy and beyond. ***Academy of Management Journal,*** 50(6): 1353–1364.

Tsui, A. S., Wang, H., Xin, K. R., Zhang, L. H., & Fu, P. P. 2004. Let a thousand flowers bloom: Variation of leadership styles in Chinese firms. ***Organization Dynamics,*** 3: 5–20.

Tsui, A. S., Nifadkar, S. S., & Ou, A. Y. 2007. Cross-national, cross-cultural organizational behavior research: Advances, gaps, and recommendations. ***Journal of Management,*** 33(3): 426–478.

Van de Ven, A., & Jing, R. 2012. Indigenous management research in China from an Engaged Scholarship Perspective. ***Management and Organization Review,*** 8(1): 123–137.

Van de Ven, A. H. 2007. ***Engaged scholarship: A guide for organizational and social research.*** Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Leung, K. 1997. ***Methods and data analysis for cross-cultural research.*** Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Whetten, D. A. 2009. An examination of the interface between context and theory applied to the study of Chinese organizations. ***Management and Organization Review,*** 5(1): 29–55.

White, S. 2002. Rigor and relevance in Asian management research: Where are we and where can we go? ***Asia Pacific Journal of Management,*** 19(2–3): 287–352.

Wu, M., Huang, X., Li, C., & Liu, W. 2012. Interactional justice and trust-in-supervisor as mediators for paternalistic leadership. ***Management and Organization Review,*** 8(1): 97–121.

Yang, K. S. 1993. Why do we need to develop a Chinese indigenous psychology? ***Indigenous Psychological Research in Chinese Societies (in Chinese),*** 1(1): 6–88.

Yang, K. S. 2000. Monocultural and cross-cultural indigenous approaches: The royal road to the development of a balanced global psychology. ***Asian Journal of Social Psychology,*** 3(3): 241–263.

Yang, X. H., Peng, Y. Q. & Lee, Y. T. 2008. The Confucian and Mencian philosophy of benevolent leadership. In C. C. Chen & Y. T. Lee (Eds.), ***Leadership and management in China: Philosophies, theories, and practices***: 31–50. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Yin, R. K. 2009. ***Case study research: Design and methods*** (4th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

© 2012 The International Association for Chinese Management Research

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-8784.2012.00292.x Published online by Cambridge University Press

Peter Ping Li (pli.int@cbs.dk) is Professor of Chinese Business Studies at Copenhagen Business School, in Denmark, and also visiting professor of management at Renmin University in China. He earned his Ph.D. from George Washington University. Adopting the Chinese frame of yin-yang balancing, his research focuses on integrating the Western theories with the indigenous perspectives of the East. He is the editor-in-chief of *Journal of Trust Research* and on the editorial boards of *Journal of Management Studies*, *Global Strategy Journal*, *Management and Organization Review*, and *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*.

Kwok Leung (mgkleung@cityu.edu.hk) is Chair Professor of Management at City University of Hong Kong. His research areas include justice and conflict, creativity, international management, and cross-cultural psychology.He is the deputy editor-in-chief of *Management and Organization Review*, and formerly deputy editor-in-chief of *Journal of International Business Studies*, associate editor of *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, Editor of *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, and associate editor of *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*. He is the president of the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology, and formerly president of the Asian Association of Social Psychology and Chair of the Research Methods Division of Academy of Management. He is a fellow of Academy of International Business, Association for Psychological Sciences, and International Academy of Intercultural Research.

Chao C. Chen (chaochen@business.rutgers.edu) is Professor of Management and Global Business at the Rutgers University. He earned his Ph.D. from the State University of New York at Buffalo. His current research interests include organizational justice, ethical leadership, trust, and *guanxi* and social networking. He has published in leading management journals including *Academy of Management Journal*, *Academy of Management Review*, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, and *Organization Science*.

Jar-Der Luo (jdluo@mail.tsinghua.edu.cn) is Professor of Sociology at Tsinghua University in Beijing, and Chairman of the Chinese Network for Social Network Studies. He earned his Ph.D. in Sociology from the State University of New York at Stony Brook. His research interests include social network studies, including social capital, trust, and social network structure and Chinese indigenous management research, such as *guanxi*, small circle, and favour exchange.

Manuscript received: January 6, 2012
Final version accepted: February 19, 2012
Accepted by: Anne S. Tsui

© 2012 The International Association for Chinese Management Research

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-8784.2012.00292.x Published online by Cambridge University Press