Management and Organization Review 5:1 107–119
doi: 10.1111/j.1740-8784.2008.00138.x

Learning by Doing: Emerging Paths of Chinese Management Research

Shuming Zhao and Chunyan Jiang
Nanjing University, China

ABSTRACT This commentary reviews Chinese management research since its beginning more than thirty years ago and considers the emerging paths that contemporary scholars may follow. Following Barney and Zhang's (2009) article as well as Whetten's article (2009) in this issue, we first clarify what the two paths (a theory of Chinese management and a Chinese theory of management) would mean for the Chinese scholar. We then discuss the possible interplay between these two paths and suggest it is time to take the road less travelled rather than to over-travel the more popular road. We conclude that practice will prove the final judge on the paths pursued and that the insights from the Barney and Zhang and Whetten articles help sharpen our understanding of the challenges.

KEYWORDS Chinese management research, Chinese theory of management, learning by doing, theory of Chinese management

Practice is the sole criterion for testing truth.

Fuming Hu, *Guangming Daily* (1978)

INTRODUCTION

Since its economic reform and opening to the outside world in 1978 and especially following its entry into the World Trade Organization (WTO) in November 2003, China has made great progress in economic development, changing not only its economic system and structures, but also reorganizing and restructuring its Chinese enterprises. Prior to 1978, no management research was conducted in China. From 1978 through the early 1990s, Chinese management research began to emerge concurrent with the transformation from a planned economy to a market economy. During that period, some scholars trained in Western countries returned to China and conducted preliminary empirical studies, especially comparison studies, on Chinese organizations. For example, Zhao published a Sino–US comparative study exploring Chinese and American universities' governance structures (Zhao, 1990) and a book about human resource management in international business (Zhao, 1992). However, at this embryonic stage of development, most Chinese management research was not comparable with the development of management research outside of China, especially in North America and Europe. Unlike Western research, which was built upon a long history and foundation of studying organizations and the individuals working in them, Chinese management research was only in its beginning stage. Even though it has been more than thirty years since China first opened its doors and undertook its extensive economic reforms, active and serious management research, especially by Chinese scholars inside China, is still a relatively recent phenomenon.

Since the dawn of the twenty-first century, scholars have given increasing attention to the study of organizations and management in China. The early efforts are giving way to an appreciation and recognition of the importance of systematic analysis and empirical testing. Researchers have realized that China's continuing period of significant social, economic, and organizational change not only provides a rich context for testing existing theories, but also offers the potential for discovering new or unique ways of organizing and managing in China.

In its infancy, the research on Chinese organizations and management systems suffered from inadequate training and skills in research methods. As a result, Chinese scholarship lacked an accumulation of papers based on sound research methods. Even though a multitude of institutions funded many research projects and Chinese journals published many papers, these works were barely recognized in international academia. Despite the high relevance of the studies, according to established management research standards, these research studies could be considered as lacking the necessary scientific rigour (see Von Glinow & Teagarden, 2009, for some discussion of rigour and relevance in current Chinese management scholarship). Most of the research studies in China during this period of development tended to rely on simple speculative methods rather than scientific methodologies such as deduction, experimentation, and other empirical approaches. The lack of scientific rigour rendered the results of these studies unconvincing and inconclusive.

An important milestone in the recent development of Chinese management research occurred in 1999 when the Hang Lung Center for Organizational Research (HLCOR) at the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology (HKUST) sponsored the first research methods workshop for Chinese management scholars. Organized on the HKUST campus in July, 1999, more than forty People's Republic of China scholars attended the workshop. Subsequently, research methods workshops were held every year thereafter. The popularity of research workshops at the International Association for Chinese Management Research (IACMR) conference is another indicator of Chinese scholars' desire to learn and embrace scientific methods. Now, there is a growing trend of Chinese management scholars choosing to travel on this scientifically rigorous road in order to better ensure the success of their scholarly studies of Chinese firms or other firms in China.

The two articles by Barney and Zhang (2009) and Whetten (2009) address the timely issue of the future of Chinese management research. Barney and Zhang's article elaborates two complementary approaches to the evolution of Chinese scholarship – a theory of Chinese management and a Chinese theory of management – and explains the respective advantages and disadvantages. The essay offers practical guidance to Chinese scholars on how to choose their own road and how to learn across roads. If knowledge creation occurs through both exploitation and exploration (March, 1991), a theory of Chinese management is equivalent to creating knowledge through exploitation because it builds on existing knowledge. A Chinese theory of management parallels exploration because it creates new knowledge.

Differing from Barney and Zhang, Whetten specifically examines the interface between theory and context. His article elaborates on the use of existing theories to explain organizational phenomena in new contexts. It offers Chinese scholars practical suggestions on how to overcome the obstacles of engaging in cross-context theorizing. These suggestions include 'develop[ing] a native understanding of the borrowed theory', 'manag[ing] the perception of what readers consider familiar and unfamiliar', using graphs 'as illustrations of complex theoretical formulations', and 'participat[ing] in cross-context research teams' (Whetten, 2009: 47, 48).

In what ways do the ideas in the articles by Barney and Zhang and by Whetten describe realistic paths that Chinese scholars can take? Let us first clarify what each of these two paths would mean for the Chinese scholar. Then we will borrow Barney and Zhang's metaphor (also adapted by Cheng, Wang, & Huang, 2009) of the possible roads facing management scholars to discuss the possible interplay between these two roads and to suggest that it is high time to travel the road less taken. Finally, we conclude that practice will inform the final judgment of which paths of Chinese management research are successful.

IMPLICATIONS OF EACH ROAD FOR CHINESE SCHOLARS

A Debate Between the Two Roads

According to Barney and Zhang (2009), a Chinese theory of management includes studying Chinese phenomena, per se, developing explanations and theories that may only apply in China, and the purpose of such research is to understand management problems faced by Chinese managers. A theory of Chinese management, on the other hand, includes using established theory, testing and extending it in the Chinese context, and possibly developing important new insights that apply in settings besides China. The purpose of this research is to develop general theories of management phenomena. A Chinese theory of management and a theory of Chinese management describe different processes for management

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-8784.2008.00138.x Published online by Cambridge University Press

knowledge production, which affect the quantity, the quality, and the kind of knowledge produced.

Interestingly, there is a similar debate among Chinese scholars in Chinese language journals, which suggests that a Chinese theory of management and a theory of Chinese management are in competition (e.g., Chen, 2006; Guo, 2007; Luo, 2008; Li, Yang, & Wang, 2008). According to these debates, there are at least three concerns with pursuing either of these two roads or approaches. First, developing a Chinese theory of management may limit the development of a theory of Chinese management and vice versa. Specifically, owing to its involvement in developing deep understandings of Chinese phenomena regarding managerial and social situations in China and to avoid being influenced by existing theories or frameworks, a Chinese theory of management is likely to ignore existing literature. Instead, it might emphasize China's history, traditions and culture, studying phenomena that are largely impacted by the Chinese economy and society, and the results are likely to be published in Chinese language outlets. On the other hand, pursuing a theory of Chinese management research may limit the discovery and understanding of phenomena important in and to China. Owing to its aims of examining boundary conditions of current theories, a theory of Chinese management is likely to draw on the existing literature, to apply traditional theories and research methods, to study Chinese phenomena that are of interest to Western scholars, and to publish in Western outlets.

Second, these two approaches may compete for limited resources. A Chinese theory of management generates new knowledge with potentially high but uncertain returns because these papers are more difficult to publish due to their novelty. A theory of Chinese management generates incremental knowledge with moderate but more certain returns. It is relatively easier to publish such work because reviewers are more familiar and comfortable with it. Barney and Zhang (2009: 25) argue that pursuing both a theory of Chinese management and a Chinese theory of management 'does not seem likely to be a common choice' for a single scholar, since they involve different skills and different orientations toward knowledge creation.

Third, it is unclear what types of scholars would be in the best position to pursue either type of research. One could argue that it is difficult for young researchers to publish papers on a Chinese theory of management owing to their inexperience. Young scholars also lack legitimacy in the Chinese culture where age is respected because it is a sign of wisdom. Therefore, young Chinese scholars are generally advised to focus their efforts on contributing to a theory of Chinese management. However, young minds are often more creative, and most of the influential theories in the Western management literature were developed by scholars during their doctoral and assistant professor periods (Smith & Hitt, 2006). Similarly, some interesting Chinese works also were introduced by Chinese scholars in their early careers, and they continue to refine these works over the years. Examples include

Wei'an Li's Chinese index on corporate governance (e.g., Li, 2002), Youmin Xi's harmony management theory (e.g., Xi & Shang, 2002), and Shuming Zhao's unique Chinese characteristics of human resource management (e.g., Zhao, 2001). Of course, there may also be other distinctions in determining who, between Chinese and non-Chinese scholars or Chinese versus non-Chinese educated scholars, is best positioned to pursue either type of research.

Interplay Between the Two Roads

One possible explanation for the above debate and doubt is that most researchers have overlooked the dynamic interplay between a Chinese theory of management and a theory of Chinese management by regarding them as independent and mutually exclusive processes occurring at the same time. Whetten's article proffers some practical suggestions on the interplay between a theory of Chinese management and a Chinese theory of management. He offers four suggestions, and we take each of his suggestions and discuss its implications for engaging in the two types of research described by Barney and Zhang.

First, Whetten (2009: 46) suggested that the scholar should 'develop a native understanding of the borrowed theory'. In contrast to the enthusiasm for studying research methodology in great detail, Chinese management scholars tend to pay less attention to understanding borrowed theories in depth. For example, Xu and Zhou (2004) surveyed the papers on strategic management published in 2003 in two of China's top-tier journals, *Management World* (*Guan Li Shi Jie*) and *Nankai Business Review* (*Nan Kai Guan Li Ping Lun*). They found that most of the papers lack theoretical development and only weakly understand the borrowed Western theory. The researchers take the Western theory and adopt the predictions but disregard the conditions under which the theories are applicable (Xu & Zhou, 2004).

There are many possible ways to change this situation. Among them, Chinese management journals could promote theory development with the same attention they pay to research methods. They could emphasize that a paper without theoretical logic is tantamount to a body without a brain because a theory guides propositions, research methods, and even analytical tools. Management schools could set up courses on mainstream theories to help students develop a deep understanding of Western theories, such as network theory, agency theory, dynamic capability, resource-based view, learning and evolution, etc. Data describe which empirical patterns were observed, and theory explains why empirical patterns were observed or expected to be observed. Therefore, to develop a theory of Chinese management, a researcher should begin with an understanding of the existing Western theories and be familiar with their boundary conditions.

Second, Whetten (2009: 47) suggested that the scholar should 'manage the perception of what readers consider familiar and unfamiliar'. Since the 1990s,

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-8784.2008.00138.x Published online by Cambridge University Press

Chinese management scholars have become increasingly familiar with their Western counterparts, owing to the many young scholars who receive their training from Western universities, to greater familiarity with publication requirements, and to participation in an intellectual atmosphere created by academic conferences such as the biennial conference of the IACMR (http://www.iacmr.org). This growing familiarity with Western research has enabled Chinese scholars to put their studies of Chinese phenomenon in the context of familiar Western literature, making these studies more internationally accessible and shedding new insight on established ideas. For example, Lau, Lu, Makino, Chen, and Yeh (2002) adopted Western theories such as social capital, absorptive capacity, and institution theory to examine the knowledge management of Chinese high-tech firms. Similarly, Fan, Lau, and Wu (2002) pointed out that agency theory has different implications in China, such as the performance effects of the duality of CEOs/Chairpersons, independent board directors, and incentive programs of external board directors. Su, Xu, and Phan (2008) provide corroborating evidence that principal–agent conflict can lead to high agency costs by examining the level of ownership concentration across Chinese companies listed on the Shanghai and Shenzhen stock exchanges during 1999–2003. Other scholars have examined the impact of social capital and social network on organizational structure and strategy (Li & Atuahene-Gima, 2001, 2002; Park & Luo, 2001; Peng & Health, 1996), the mindsets of the entrepreneur and entrepreneurial behavior, partner selection, the positive and negative effects of *guanxi* and trust (Bian, 1997), and the influences of institutional isomorphism and culture in international business research (Chen, Peng, & Saparito, 2002; Child & Tse, 2001; Xin & Pearce, 1996). Most Chinese management scholars, particularly young scholars, are now on the road to making the familiar appear novel by adding contextual moderators or changing the existing relationships in current theories, thus, contributing directly to a theory of Chinese management.

Unfortunately, owing to the slower development of a Chinese theory of management, most of our Western counterparts are still unable to gain a deep understanding of the management model in today's China. Due to the efforts of those Chinese scholars with overseas training, our Western colleagues can piece together a fragmented picture of Chinese management practices; however, unique Chinese phenomena embedded in history, tradition, and culture cannot be explained by Western theories and still remain unfamiliar to Western management scholars. Thus, there is a clear need to resolve this asymmetry in the creation of Chinese management knowledge.

There are two opportunities to alleviate this problematic asymmetry. The first is Western scholars' keen interest in China. Chinese management practices have attracted many Western management scholars, similar to the attention given to Japanese management practices twenty years ago. The concept of Theory Z (Ouchi, 1980) introduced Western management scholars to novel Japanese man-

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-8784.2008.00138.x Published online by Cambridge University Press

agement practices. Likewise, there are many excellent Chinese firms such as Haier, Lenovo, and Huawei that deserve systematic study. The second opportunity to alleviate asymmetry lies in the efforts of Chinese management scholars. Some argue that unique Chinese management practices can only be understood well by insiders. Recent institutional developments in China, such as the revised faculty evaluation system, rise of new management journals, increasing number of academic conferences, and research funds should make both the Chinese theory of management road and the path toward making the novel appear familiar more promising.

Whetten's (2009: 47) third suggestion is to 'use graphical models as illustrations of complex theoretical formulations'. This practical idea is especially useful for Chinese management scholars, who have strong abilities in developing complex theoretical formulations. The general Chinese mindset is complex, circular, and can tolerate dialectic thoughts and ideas (Li, 2008; Wang, Cui, & Zhou, 2005). As Western economists readily understand the mathematical models developed by their Chinese counterparts, likewise, graphic models can convey complex ideas that are difficult to write in words. Graphical models can provide structure to otherwise rambling or amorphous arguments, while figures can logically show causal relationships so that readers see the chain of causation and how a third variable intervenes in or moderates a relationship. Also useful are temporal diagrams showing how a particular process unfolds over time. Peng's (2003) figurative depiction, as a case in point, clearly demonstrated how the costs and benefits of relationship-based, personalized exchange change with time. Developing either a Chinese theory of management or a theory of Chinese management would benefit from familiarity with global research standards and from the clear, accurate presentation of complex, circular, and dialectic thoughts, ideas, and characteristics of Chinese management practices. Graphical representations can afford clarity and understanding to both insider and outsider researchers.

The fourth suggestion Whetten (2009: 48) makes is to 'participate in cross-context research teams', which may be the most common practice undertaken by both international and Chinese management scholars, with the aim of conducting higher quality research than either party could accomplish on their own. Whetten promotes participation in research teams by explaining, 'a time honoured strategy for overcoming deficiencies between one's skills and knowledge and the requirements for implementing a particular research strategy is to form partnerships with colleagues possessing complementary capabilities' (2009: 48). The development of a theory of Chinese management or of a Chinese theory of management would profit from insiders' in depth contextual knowledge emphasizing history, traditions, and cultures and from outsiders' theoretical knowledge and experience in dealing with reviewers and editors of international journals.

However, with increasing numbers of cross-context research teams, the following challenges should be borne in mind. Corresponding to the consideration that

Chinese manufacturing (Made in China) should be upgraded to Chinese innovation (Innovated in China), Chinese management scholars should consider that their participation in cross-context research teams should evolve from primarily collecting data to participating constructively in the development of intellectual ideas. Chinese scholars should be more confident about contributing to the understanding of Chinese management phenomena. They can provide complementary capabilities for the production of management knowledge. Such international collaboration research teams offer great promise for the development of a Chinese theory of management and a theory of Chinese management and for breakthroughs on global management knowledge.

The benefit of a theory of Chinese management is to make the familiar appear novel. The benefit of a Chinese theory of management is to make the novel appear familiar. A combination of the two is more likely to enhance global management knowledge than either approach alone. To succeed in these endeavors would require the support of business school leadership, management journal editors, research funding agencies, and other supportive institutional environments. The current academic environment in China has a distinct bias toward a theory of Chinese management. Before scholars can reap the benefits of a combined theoretical approach, efforts are needed to create a developmental path for Chinese management research. We outline four below.

Toward the Road Less Travelled

In creating an environment that encourages scholars to take the road less travelled, we must be clear about the main purpose of Chinese management research (see Von Glinow & Teagarden, 2009, for their emphasis on clarifying purpose). Are we aiming to build dialogues between Chinese management research scholars and their worldwide counterparts, or are we building dialogues not only between scholars, but also between Chinese management scholars and Chinese management practitioners? Chinese companies have begun to make the transition from 'manufacturing in China' to 'innovating in China'. It is timely for Chinese management scholars to focus on developing a Chinese theory of management to understand the actions of Chinese managers and the practices of Chinese companies.

What changes in the institutional environment would encourage high quality Chinese management research in general and the development of a Chinese theory of management in particular? At present, there are a variety of policies issued by all levels of governments and universities eager to bridge the large gap with global management knowledge. However, these policies have unintended consequences. They tend to encourage researchers to take one path (the theory of Chinese management path) over the other. Under the current institutional arrangements, a vicious circle is emerging in Chinese universities,

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-8784.2008.00138.x Published online by Cambridge University Press

emphasizing quantity over quality. There is almost no chance for research contributing to a Chinese theory of management to thrive because such work is time consuming, difficult to publish, and lacks the support of research funds. To break out of this vicious cycle, we suggest the following institutional changes.

Evaluation mechanism. A common Ph.D. training practice in Chinese universities is to link students' graduation with their number of publications. A typical prerequisite for a Ph.D. student to conduct his or her final oral dissertation defence is to have three to five publications in the Chinese Social Science Citation Indexed journals. How can students publish original papers within three to four years of Ph.D. training without a solid theoretical background? Unfortunately, they often don't. As Chen (2008: 342) points out, because of the publication pressure on Chinese students and professors, the 'pressure for quick publication often gives rise to less creative contributions. The researchers add one moderating variable to an existing model and write one paper, then add another mediating variable and write another paper.' The results are that Ph.D. students' curiosities on unique Chinese management phenomena die by engaging in low quality papers. A similar scenario exists with young scholars by linking publication quantity with their career advancement. We need a new evaluation mechanism that emphasizes quality over quantity and values developing locally valid theories as much as, if not more than, testing of Western theories.

Ideally, a Chinese theory of management and a theory of Chinese management mutually benefit each other. Realistically, they are in conflict with one another because they require different skills. Further, time is limited: when researchers spend more time in the development of a Chinese theory of management, they have less time for the development of a theory of Chinese management, and vice versa. Therefore, this requires us to establish different evaluation criteria for researchers pursuing the two types of studies. For researchers who prefer to pursue a theory of Chinese management, business schools should evaluate them with a mechanism that can encourage them to make further improvements on theories. For researchers who show great talent in a Chinese theory of management, business schools should evaluate them with a separate mechanism that will encourage them to develop new theories and break new grounds. Nowadays, many Chinese universities adopt their western counterparts' evaluation system, which includes a journal list. This is likely to kill a scholar's motivation to take the less travelled road. Many young scholars' motivation to publish in the top-tier journals is solely for professorship without consideration for knowledge creation or Chinese management practices. Therefore, to ensure scholars' survival on the road less travelled, the evaluation system should include such things as the development of new theories to explain management puzzles and should broaden the type of journals in which their work is published.

Academic journals. Most scholarly journals in China do not have a clear academic positioning. These journals do not have a clear mission, style or submission guidelines. At present, most of the top journals in China publish papers on a theory of Chinese management (they encourage replication and application of existing theories). Many of these papers are uncritical applications of extant theories, offering limited insight on management in China.

Another serious problem with Chinese academic journals is the reviewers. Although there is an anonymous reviewing system, fairness cannot be guaranteed because a professional reviewers' community and associated norms have not been well established and the journals often have only a small group of reviewers who the editor knows well personally. They lack norms for developmental reviews. To move forward, we need to improve reviewers' qualifications and clearly define editors' responsibilities so that we can improve contributors' papers and their research capabilities through the developmental reviewing process. The management journals should emphasize theoretical contribution as much as empirical rigour. For example, *Management World* (*Guan Li Shi Jie*) recently took the initiative to include local cases of Chinese firms (with potential to lead to a Chinese theory of management) in addition to the usual empirical papers (a theory of Chinese management).

Academic conferences. One exciting development is that there are many important international academic conferences in China, but some improvements are still needed. We should take these academic conferences as a chance to build dialogue between scholars from any location, at any rank, and between any disciplines. We should promote the work of young and prospective researchers in these academic conferences and avoid making conferences a venue only for delivering lectures by academic stars. Often, the national management research conferences are not conducive to research conversation and development. They tend to be for the gathering of friends and for sightseeing purposes. For these reasons, it is not surprising that some conference participants fail to show up to present their papers at the conferences. They do not see conference participation as an opportunity to share their work, to receive feedback, and to interact with other scholars with similar interests. From our experiences taking part in the IACMR conferences, both Western and Chinese scholars are highly engaged in discussions and intellectual exchanges. The IACMR could be one valuable platform for developing a Chinese theory of management.

Research funds. Compared with developed countries, national grants in management research are still very limited in China. Despite a fast-growing economy and the great need for management knowledge, funding for management research lags far behind the funding for other sciences. In addition to grants from the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC) and the National Social Science

Foundation of China, other local governments and corporations should develop grants. Moreover, funding agencies such as the NSFC should balance the support between research pursuing a theory of Chinese management and a Chinese theory of management. In fact, given the NSFC's mission for creating basic knowledge, perhaps it should devote more funds to projects that pursue a Chinese theory of management.

CONCLUSION

How is Chinese management research likely to evolve in future years? How can we shape this process of knowledge creation by researchers in China and around the world? We can draw some hints from modern Chinese history. At the crossroads of the Chinese revolution, China first followed the Russian model, which involved revolution from the cities, but failed. Then, the Chinese revolution started in the countryside from peasant movements organized by Mao Zedong and succeeded. Again, at the crossroads of Chinese economic development, China looked to the former Soviet Union's radical economic reform but instead found great developmental success in Deng Xiaoping's incremental approach of learning by doing, or cross the river by touching the stone (Deng, 1993). China has witnessed great achievements through economic reform, from the rural economic reform to the subsequent urban company reform. The core principle underlying these two milestones is that practice is the sole criterion for testing and determining which roads to take. It is certain that Chinese management practices can enrich global management knowledge by providing a Chinese theory of management alongside a theory of Chinese management.

NOTES

This commentary was an invited article for this special issue and was originally presented in the '*MOR* special symposium – Exploitation or exploration: The future of Chinese management research' session at the third biennial IACMR conference, held in Guangzhou, China, June 19–21, 2008.

The authors wish to acknowledge and thank Anne Tsui, John Child, Eric Tsang, Kwok Leung, and other participants of the session. Thanks also to Betty Coffey for her comments. We remain responsible for any errors in the commentary.

This is part of the research supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (project nos. 70732002 and 70602010).

REFERENCES

Barney, J. B., & Zhang, S. 2009. The future of Chinese management research: A theory of Chinese management versus a Chinese theory of management. ***Management and Organization Review,*** 5(1): 15–28.

Bian, Y. 1997. Bringing strong ties back in: Indirect ties, network bridges, and job searches in China. ***American Sociological Review,*** 62(3): 366–385.

Chen, C., Peng, M. W., & Saparito, P. 2002. Individualism, collectivism, and opportunism: A cultural perspective on transaction cost economics. ***Journal of Management,*** 28(4): 567–583.

Chen, S. 2006. ***The exploration of Chinese management research.*** Shanghai: Speech at Fudan University, August 2006. (In Chinese). 成思危（2006-08-18），中国管理科学发展探索[R]，上海复旦大学演讲。

Chen, X.-P. 2008. Independent thinking: A path to outstanding scholarship. ***Management and Organization Review,*** 4(3): 337–348.

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.

Child, J., & Tse, D. 2001. China's transition and its implications for international business. ***Journal of International Business Studies,*** 32(1): 5–21.

Deng, X. P. 1993. ***An anthology of Deng Xiaoping,*** issue 3. Beijing: People's Publishing House. (In Chinese). 邓小平（1993），《邓小平文选（第三卷）》，人民出版社。

Fan, K. K., Lau, C., & Wu, S. 2002. Corporate governance mechanisms. In A. S. Tsui & C. M. Lau (Eds.), ***The management of enterprises in the People's Republic of China:*** 211–239. Boston: Kluwer Academic Press.

Guo, C. 2007. The social responsibility and historical mission of Chinese management scholars. ***Research on Policy and Management,*** 2(2): 133–134. (In Chinese.) 郭重庆（2007），中国管理学界的社会责任与历史使命[J]，政策与管理研究，2:133–134.

Hu, F. 1978. Practice is the sole criterion for testing truth. ***Guangming Daily.*** May 11.

Lau, C. M., Lu, Y., Makino, S., Chen, X., & Yeh, R. 2002. Knowledge management of high-tech firms. In A. S. Tsui & C. M. Lau (Eds.), ***The management of enterprises in the People's Republic of China:*** 183–210. Boston: Kluwer Academic Press.

Li, H., & Atuahene-Gima, K. 2001. Production innovation strategy and performance of new technology ventures in China. ***Academy of Management Journal,*** 44(6): 1123–1134.

Li, H., & Atuahene-Gima, K. 2002. The adoption of agency business activity, product innovation, and performance in Chinese technology ventures. ***Strategic Management Journal,*** 23(6): 469–490.

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

Li, W. 2002. ***Research on modern corporate governance: Capital structure, corporate governance and reform on state enterprise share system.*** Beijing: China Renmin University Press. (In Chinese.) 李维安（2002），《现代公司治理研究：资本结构、公司治理与国有企业股份制改造》，中国人民大学出版社。

Li, Y., Yang, Z., & Wang, L. 2008. Developing theory from the context of Chinese management practice: An integrative perspective. ***Chinese Journal of Management,*** 5(4): 469–472. (In Chinese.) 李垣，杨知评，王龙伟 （2008），从中国管理实践的情境中 发展理论—基于整合的观点[J]，管理学报，5(4): 469–472.

Luo, M. 2008. Reflection and future way of Chinese management research. ***Chinese Journal of Management,*** 5(4): 478–482. (In Chinese.) 罗珉 （2008），中国管理学反思与发展思路[J]，管理学报，5(4): 478–482.

March, J. G. 1991. Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. ***Organization Science,*** 2(1): 71–87.

Ouchi, W. G. 1980. Markets, hierarchies, clans. ***Administrative Science Quarterly,*** 25(1): 129–141.

Park, S. H., & Luo, Y. 2001. Guanxi and organizational dynamics: Organizational networking in Chinese firms. ***Strategic Management Journal,*** 22(5): 455–477.

Peng, M. W. 2003. Institution changes and strategic choices. ***Academy of Management Review,*** 28(2): 275–296.

Peng, M. W., & Health, P. S. 1996. The growth of the firm in planned economies in transition: Institutions, organizations, and strategic choice. ***Academy of Management Review,*** 21(2): 492–528.

Smith, K. G., & Hitt, M. A. 2006. ***Great minds in management.*** New York: Oxford.

Su, Y., Xu, D., & Phan, P. 2008. Principle-principle conflict in the governance of Chinese public corporations. ***Management and Organization Review,*** 4(1): 1–38.

Von Glinow, M. A., & Teagarden, M. B. 2009. The future of Chinese management research: Rigour and relevance redux. ***Management and Organization Review,*** 5(1): 75–89.

Wang, D., Cui, H., & Zhou, F. 2005. Measuring the personality of Chinese: QZPS versus NEO PI-R. ***Asian Journal of Social Psychology,*** 8(1): 97–122.

Whetten, D. 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.

Xi, Y. M., & Shang, Y. F. 2002. ***Theory of harmony management.*** Beijing: China Renmin University Press. (In Chinese.) 席酉民，尚玉钒 （2002），《和谐管理理论》，中国人民大学出版社。

Xin, K. R., & Pearce, J. L. 1996. Guanxi: Connections as substitutes for formal institutional support. ***Academy of Management Journal,*** 39: 1641–1658.

Xu, D., & Zhou, C. 2004. The current status of strategic management research in China. ***Management World,*** 5: 76–87. (In Chinese.) 许德音，周长辉（2004），中国战略管理学研究现状评估，管理世界，5:76–87.

Zhao, S. M. 1990. A comparative study on the governance structure of Chinese and American universities. ***Lock Haven International Review*** (annually), 4: 3–12. PA: Lock Haven University.

Zhao, S. M. 1992. ***International business: Human resource management.*** Nanjing: Nanjing University Press. (In Chinese.) 赵曙明 （1992），《国际企业：人力资源管理》，南京大学出版社。

Zhao, S. M. 2001. ***Research on human resource management.*** Beijing: China Renmin University Press. (In Chinese). 赵曙明 （2001），《人力资源管理研究》，中国人民大学出版社。

Shuming Zhao (zhaosm@nju.edu.cn) is a professor and the dean of the School of Business, Nanjing University. He received his Ph.D. in management from Claremont Graduate University in California, USA. His research interests include human resource management, manager's competence, and multinational business management.

Chunyan Jiang (cyjiang@nju.edu.cn) is an associate professor in the Department of Human Resource Management at the School of Business, Nanjing University. She holds a Ph.D. in management from the Chinese University of Hong Kong. Her research interests include organizational learning in new Chinese ventures, top management teams, and human resource management.

Manuscript received:	August 27, 2008
Final version accepted:	December 10, 2008
Accepted by:	Anne S. Tsui