

Chinese Context and Theoretical Contributions to Management and Organization Research: A Three-decade Review

Liangding Jia,¹ Shuyang You,¹ and Yunzhou Du^{2,3}

¹Nanjing University, China, ²Anhui University of Finance & Economics, China, and ³Nanjing University, China

ABSTRACT In this study, we develop a context-emic model to evaluate articles which use the Chinese context for their theoretical contributions to management and organization research. We apply the model to 259 articles published in six leading general management and organization journals between 1981 and 2010 and 43 articles from *Management and Organization Review (MOR)* from its launch in 2005 to 2010. We found ten articles in the six leading journals and four articles in *MOR* to have some degree of Chinese contextualization in their concepts or constructs (*what*), their relationships (*how*), and the logics underlying the relationships (*why*). In particular, we discovered only three new concepts (market transition, network capitalism, and *guanxi*), and some reference to Confucianism and its related concepts. As expected, *MOR* articles have a higher level of Chinese contextualization than articles in the top six journals. Using the Colquitt and Zapata-Phelan theory-building-testing taxonomy, we found Chinese-context research to have contributed to both theory-building and theory-testing over time. We also found that empirical articles with a higher level of Chinese contextualization garner more citations. Finally, we discuss the implications of the study's results for future contextualization research related to China.

KEYWORDS Chinese context, Chinese management research, citation impact, contextualization, theoretical contributions

INTRODUCTION

As the world's largest emerging economy, China has become 'a legitimate and viable context for management and organization research' (Tsui, Schoonhoven, Meyer, Lau, & Milkovich, 2004: 136). Recently, scholars regarded as Chinese insiders, outsiders, or dual-identity researchers have debated the choice between 'taking the road well-trodden (a theory of Chinese management) and the road less travelled (a Chinese theory of management)' (Barney & Zhang, 2009; Tsui, 2009:

1). Other scholars criticized Chinese or Asian management research for showing a lack of self-confidence (Meyer, 2006), being short on theory development or relevance for management practices (White, 2002), heavily utilizing existing management theories, and rarely proposing new theories (Tsui et al., 2004). These debates and reviews led Tsui (2009: 1) to conclude: ‘over two decades, research in Chinese management has exploited existing questions, theories, constructs, and methods developed in the Western context. Lagging are exploratory studies to address questions relevant to Chinese firms and to develop theories that offer meaningful explanations of Chinese phenomena’.

However, critique of research in the Chinese context has two salient and important limitations. First, most were qualitative reviews lacking systematic empirical evidence (e.g., White, 2002). Those adopting an empirical approach were descriptive only, with basic analyses such as distribution of authors and topics (Li & Tsui, 2002; Peng, Lu, Shenkar, & Wang, 2001; Tsui et al., 2004), citation analysis (Li & Tsui, 2002), or journal location (Meyer, 2006). Second, all do not use a systematic model or framework to evaluate the contribution of the Chinese context to management and organization knowledge.^[1] Although Colquitt and Zapata-Phelan (2007) devised the theory-building-testing model to assess theoretical contributions of empirical articles, they did not consider the role of context. Instead, most management and organization studies defaulted to the Western context. Recently, some scholars in the management and organization discipline, aware that management research can suffer if it restricts itself to the Western model, have championed contextualized studies, especially context-specific research (Leung, 2007; Rousseau & Fried, 2001; Tsui, 2004, 2006, 2007; Whetten, 2009). Our review responds to this call. Using a context-emic model, we seek to answer this question: What has research in the Chinese context contributed to management and organization theory during the last three decades?

We use the term *context-emic* to evaluate a study’s theoretical contributions by focusing on the researcher’s use of context in generating propositions and placing conditions on the propositions (Whetten, 1989). Thus, high contextualization means that a study strongly considers the role of context. We used three dimensions for identifying contextualization: (i) the concepts being studied, (ii) the relationships among concepts, and (iii) the logic(s) behind the relationships.

Scientific advancement benefits from ‘a necessary tension between the development, refinement, and exploitation of existing knowledge and methods and the exploration of possible new directions’ (Kuhn, 1996; March, 2005: 8). In their attempts to extend existing knowledge to novel contexts, researchers might also explore new directions through contextualized studies, an approach that is critical for the essential advancement of scientific knowledge. Inspired by calls for research that consider contextualization, we developed a context-emic model to evaluate the theoretical contributions of studies that represent both well-trodden onto less-traveled roads (Cheng, Wang, & Huang, 2009) in Chinese management research.

This article is organized as follows. First, we develop a context-emic model drawing on the literature on theoretical contribution and contextualization. Second, we analyze the articles in the selected journals according to the dimensions in the context-emic model, perform citation analysis, and present the results of our analysis. We further analyze the study's theoretical contribution by using the Colquitt and Zapata-Phelan (2007) model to gauge the overall extent to which Chinese management studies contribute to theory. Finally, we conclude with implications for future contextualization research.

DEVELOPING A CONTEXT-EMIC MODEL

'A theory is a collection of assertions, both verbal and symbolic, that identifies what variables are important for what reasons, specifies how they are interrelated and why, and identifies the conditions under which they should be related or not related' (Campbell, 1990: 39). How can scholars contribute to theory in contextualized studies? According to Whetten (1989), a context (*who*, *when*, and *where*) can contribute theoretically by considering *what*, *how*, and *why*. *What* refers to the concepts, constructs, or variables that form the elements of a theory's construction. *How*, which is the outcome of a theorizing process, considers relationships among construction elements. *Why* represents the logic underlying the relationships to explain why the elements or constructs are related. *When*, *who*, and *where* refer to the context-illuminating conditions that display the concepts and their relationships.

A theory begins with the discussion of *what*. A theory with highly contextualized concepts can deepen understanding and change current thinking about context. Scientists contribute theoretically when they develop new concepts within contexts, reconceptualize existing concepts, or develop or improve constructs measurements within new contexts. New contexts then improve the *what* of theory. For example, Nee (1992) developed a new concept, market transition, to describe economic reform in the Chinese context.

How delineates the relationship of elements. Altering relationships among concepts or developing new relationships between new constructs can also contribute theoretically. Scientists may focus on the same concepts but decipher different relationships in novel contexts. For example, in Western contexts, structural holes benefit holders of broker positions in career networks. However, Xiao and Tsui (2007) found negative effects in the Chinese context.

Why explains 'the underlying psychological, economic, or social dynamics' to justify relationships. Whetten (1989: 491, italics added) said, '*What* and *How* describe; only *Why* explains'. Sutton and Staw (1995: 378, italics added) said, 'theory is the answer to queries of *why*'. A context can contribute to a theory by changing the *why*. Scientists develop context-emerging or context-specific logics to establish relationships. For example, Friedman, Chi, and Liu (2006) used Confucian philosophy, such as *face*, *li* (礼, behaving appropriately to one's role), *xinpinqihe*

(心平气和, being perfectly calm), and *guanxi*, to build relationships among conflict management approaches, relationships with other parties, and relationship payoff.

A theory operates within a certain context (*who*, *when*, and *where*). A context may generate certain propositions that *describe* and *explain* the phenomena, and also limit the propositions (Whetten, 1989). Scientists work on two proposition levels: the conceptual level and the operational level (observation) (Kerlinger & Lee, 2000; Schwab, 2005). ‘Observations are embedded and must be understood within a context’ (Whetten, 1989: 492), and the propositions, which consist of *what*, *how*, and *why*, must be meaningful and valid within the research context.

The Context-emic Model

Table 1 introduces a context-emic model, combining *what*, *how*, and *why*, which can be used to analyze the degree of contextualization in an empirical article. We characterize the three levels of contextualization as context-insensitive, context-sensitive, and context-specific, respectively. Articles with low contextualization are context-insensitive because they borrow or adopt existing concepts and their measures (*what*), and/or replicate the existing relationships (*how*), and/or use the logics

Table 1. A context-emic model for assessing theoretical contributions of empirical articles^a

<i>The degree of contextualization</i>	<i>What (Concepts)</i>	<i>How (Relationships)</i>	<i>Why (Arguments)</i>
1 Borrow/Adopt (context-insensitive)	Using existing concepts and their measures	Testing relationships among existing constructs and reaching almost the same findings	Adopting existing arguments or logics without any contextualized roots
2 Adapt/Modify (context-sensitive)	Contextualizing the existing measures, or developing new measures	Altering existing relationships, or introducing mediators or moderators which are not unique to the context	Using rich description of context to building arguments, or adapting outside-in concepts to capture context features
3 Create/Introduce (context-specific)	Introducing new concepts, or reconceptualizing existing ones	Introducing relationships with new concepts, or introducing mediators/moderators that are unique to the context	Introducing conceptual or theoretical logics that were developed from or embedded in the context

Note:

^a We are indebted to an anonymous reviewer for suggesting actions (borrow/adopt, adapt/modify, and create/introduce) to distinguish three levels of contextualization in each content (*what*, *how*, and *why*).

without contextualized roots to establish the relationships (*why*). Articles of moderate contextualization are context-sensitive; they contextualize existing concepts in new contexts, and/or find the boundaries or mechanisms about the existing relationships in novel contexts, and/or richly describe the context phenomena or adapt outside-in concepts to capture context features. Articles of high contextualization are context-specific; they seek new concepts in the novel context, and/or find context-unique boundaries or mediations about the relationships, and/or introduce context-emerging arguments to build the relationships. We suggest that empirical articles have different degrees of contextualization in *what*, *how*, or *why* dimensions. Higher values for one or more dimensions indicate that an article contributed significantly to contextualization, and thus its context contributed meaningfully to theory.

Contextualization in what. The *what* column of Table 1 describes the level of contextualization of concepts in an empirical article and its operationalization. Rousseau and Fried (2001: 11) pointed out that ‘cultural differences may be so great as to necessitate wholly different concepts to address the same research question in different cultures’. Tsui (2007: 1359) observed, ‘the system-level characteristics are essentially etic, or culture-general, and the manifestations of them (i.e., their indicators or operationalizations) may be emic, or culture-specific’.

The first row in the *what* column represents the lowest degree of *what* contextualization. Tsui (2006: 7) found the literature to be ubiquitously low in the contextualization of *what*: ‘There is a paucity of new measures, but a loyal use of existing measures taken from the published (Western) literature’. Most articles have borrowed and translated existing concepts and measurements developed in other contexts. Important and necessary translation is used (e.g., Brislin’s, 1981, back-translation procedure), but it is insufficient for valid measurement in new contexts (Behling & Law, 2000). These articles use definitions and measurements from existing literature, translated accurately but contributing little contextually.

The second row in the *what* column indicates moderate contextualization in *what*. These articles borrowed concepts but contextualized their measures. They borrowed concepts through standard procedures or added or subtracted some indicators through exploratory and/or confirmatory factor analyses within contexts. For example, Xie, Schaubroeck, and Lam (2008) improved the measurement of the borrowed concept of *job demand* within the Chinese context. Although these studies improved contextual measurements, they did not alter the core definitions of *concept*.

The third row in the *what* column stands for the highest degree of contextualization in *what*, in two ways. The first, is the development of new concepts. For example, Boisot and Child (1996) abstracted *network capitalism*, a concept from Chinese socioeconomics (limited codification of information, communal property rights, and economic transition). *Traditionality* is another concept emerging from

Chinese contexts, although the concept is not new or context-specific (Farh, Earley, & Lin, 1997; Xie et al., 2008). The second is the reconceptualization of existing concepts. Although the literature defines social networks as resources (Lin, 2002) or structures (Burt, 1992; Granovetter, 1973), many authors (e.g., Chen, Chen, & Xin, 2004; Zhou, Wu, & Luo, 2007) have reconceptualized these interpersonal relationships to be China-specific in the form of *guanxi*. More recently, Chen, Xie, and Chang (2011), building on Chinese dialectic thinking style, developed a Chinese cooperative and competitive orientation scale treating the two as independent dimensions rather than a continuum.

Contextualization in how. The *how* column of Table 1 describes an article's contextualization by changing relationships among existing constructs within a context or by introducing new relationships of constructs with deep context meanings.

The first row in the *how* column demonstrates that an empirical article tested relationships among constructs in the context and reached almost the same results. Whetten (1989: 493) noted: 'applying an old model to a new setting and showing that it works as expected is not instructive by itself. This conclusion has theoretical merit only if something about the new setting suggests the theory shouldn't work under those conditions'. Similarly, finding the same relationship among the same variables in different settings is uninteresting (Davis, 1971), and thus shows the lowest degree of contextualization in *how*.

The second row in the *how* column represents the moderate degree of *how* contextualization. An article may find different relationships in novel contexts in two ways. First, researchers may alter existing findings (e.g., significant vs. insignificant, positive vs. negative, linear vs. nonlinear). For example, Buckley, Clegg, and Wang (2007) revealed a curvilinear relationship between foreign investment and the productivity of locally owned enterprises using data for overseas Chinese multinational enterprises (Hong Kong, Macau, and Taiwan). These results broke the prior confines of examination within linear relationships. Second, mediators or moderators can be introduced into existing relationships that may lack context meaning. For example, Wang, Law, Hackett, Wang, and Chen (2005) developed a model in which leader-member exchange mediated the relationship between transformational leadership, followers' task performance, and organizational citizenship behaviours, to theoretically integrate transformational leadership and LMX literatures. Wan and Yiu (2009) found that organizational slack accentuated the positive relationship between corporate acquisitions and firm performance during an environmental jolt and strengthened the negative acquisition-performance relationship before and after a jolt. However, these articles introduced mediators of leader-member exchange and moderators of organizational slack that are not unique to the Chinese context.

The third row in the *how* column stands for the highest degree of *how* contextualization, which includes two types. First, researchers introduced new relationships

among new concepts developed in the context and changed the phenomena of novel context. For example, Xin and Pearce (1996) introduced a China-specific concept of *guanxi* and argued for the disproportionate importance of *guanxi* among private, state-owned, and collective-hybrid companies. Luo (2011) found trust to be higher with familiar-person ties than with pseudo-familial/friendship or acquaintance ties. Both the Xin and Pearce (1996) and Luo (2011) studies revealed the influence of the Chinese context on the importance of specific relationships. A second type of high contextualization surfaced when new mediators or moderators captured deep context meaning. For example, Farh et al. (1997) introduced traditionality when testing the relationship between organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) and justice. Chinese traditionality is characterized by fatalism, respect for authority, and a sense of powerlessness. Thus Chinese employees with strong traditionality would differ from Western employees in perceiving the relationship between perceived justice and organizational citizenship behaviour. Zhou et al. (2007) employed *guanxi* networks as the mediator between internationalization and performance of globalized small to medium sized enterprises.

Contextualization in why. The *why* column of Table 1 describes the contribution of context to the logics underlying the relationships among constructs.

The first row in the *why* column represents the lowest degree, articles that borrowed logics based on existing theories to explain phenomena in a novel context. The logics have little association with the context. For example, within the Chinese context, Davies and Walters (2004) used strategic choice theory (Child, 1972) to build the relationship between marketization and strategic change, and applied resource dependence theory (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978) to performance implications of environment and strategy. A study in Taiwan (Liu, Lin, & Cheng, 2011) used existing literature and theories to hypothesize a negative relationship between family ownership/control and internationalization. These predictions are derived directly from the extant literature even though the predictions may manifest more strongly among Chinese firms.

The second row in the *why* column shows a moderate degree of contextualization in *why*, of two types. The first uses 'rich description' of context to build concept relationships. For example, Luo (2007) integrated the drastically changing emerging Chinese economy with transaction cost theory and information-processing theory to link environmental volatility and firm performance. Rich description of indigenous phenomena helps readers perceive novel contexts. However, theoretical contributions are limited because the theoretical nuance behind particular relationships or the theorizing process is lacking (see discussions on theory-building in Colquitt & Zapata-Phelan, 2007). The second approach is to use outside-in concepts, which capture context features but are developed from other contexts, to argue relationships in the new context. An example is Xiao and Tsui's (2007) study on the negative effect of collectivism on the brokering positions and career success of individuals.

The third row in the *why* column stands for the highest degree of contextualization in *why*, with two possible scenarios. The first is to use conceptual arguments developed from the context to capture its features and to explain the concept relationships. Although the concepts might not appear as *what* in the model being tested, the conceptual arguments link the focal concepts. For example, in a study of firm turnaround, Bruton, Ahlstrom, and Wan (2003) found the predominantly U.S. model to be inapplicable to firms in East Asian ethnic Chinese communities. They attributed this finding to the cultural role of family in business and *guanxi*, although the testing model omitted these variables. Batjargal (2007) used the concepts of *guanxi* (social network in China) and *svyazi* (social network in Russia) to argue the effects of dyadic ties and interpersonal trust on venture capitalists' referrals and investment decisions in Chinese and Russian contexts. In this case, the *guanxi* relationship in the Chinese context (or *svyazi* in the Russian context) serves as the underlying logic for linking the dyadic ties and the outcome studied. Many articles employed such concepts as *renqing* (a form of social capital), *mianzi* (face), *wulun* (five cardinal dyadic role relations), and *ren* (benevolence), grounded in Confucianism, 'the main concern of which is to establish harmony in a complex society of contentious human beings through a strong and orderly hierarchy' (Park & Luo, 2001: 456; Redding, 1990), as the argument to support the hypotheses (Farh et al., 1997; Farh, Tsui, Xin, & Cheng, 1998; Friedman et al., 2006; Lee, Yang, & Graham, 2006; Su, Yang, Zhuang, Zhou, & Dou, 2009). In the second scenario, theoretical logics developed from, or embedded in, context can be used to establish and explain the relationships. Chen (2002: 179) proposed 'paradoxical integration', that 'two opposites (such as "self" and "other") may be interdependent and together constitute a totality ("integration")', to transcend paradox and the conventional Western idea of exclusive opposites. The logic of paradoxical integration is grounded in the Chinese middle-way philosophy of 'holism and paradox' (Chen, 2002: 183). Applying this logic enables 'duality' conceptualization of the apparent polarities of competition and cooperation, globalism and localism, self-enhancement and self-transcendence (Chen, 2002). Chinese middle-way philosophy deduces the performance (e.g., growth, profit) implications of paradoxical integration as well. Leung, Koch, and Lu (2002) also argued that *balancing*, in which people share in highly valuing instrumental harmony, produces the best win-win solutions.

Our context-emic model is partially inspired by Colquitt and Zapata-Phelan's (2007) taxonomy of theoretical contributions in theory-building and theory-testing. The theory-building dimension captures 'the degree to which an empirical article clarifies or supplements existing theory or introduces relationships and constructs that serve as the foundations for new theory' (1283). The dimension of theory-testing depicts 'the degree to which existing theory is applied in an empirical study as a means of grounding a specific set of a priori hypotheses' (1284). Each dimension involves five levels. For theory-building, articles with the lowest level 'attempt

to replicate previously demonstrated effects', and articles with the highest level 'introduce a new construct' (1283). For theory-testing, the articles of the lowest level are 'inductive or ground predictions with logical speculation', while those with the highest level 'ground predictions with existing theory' (1283). Although both focus on evaluating theoretical contributions, our context-emic model assesses exclusively the role of the research context (*who, where, when*) in theoretical contributions along with the components of *what, how, and why*. Colquitt and Zapata-Phelan's taxonomy appraises empirical studies along the dimensions of theory-building and theory-testing without considering the role of the research context. Their taxonomy considers 'introducing a new mediator or moderator of an existing relationship or process' as a moderate level of theory-building, while our context-emic model differentiates whether the introduced mediator or moderator was unique to the research context when analyzing the degree of contextualization in *how*. Their taxonomy regards 'grounding predictions with existing theory' as the highest level of theory-testing, while our model codes this as the lowest degree of contextualization in *why* if the 'existing theory' has little association with the research context.

Our primary purpose is to assess theoretical contributions using our context-emic model along components of *what, how, and why* and to assess associations between article impact and contextualization. We also use Colquitt and Zapata-Phelan's taxonomy along the dimensions of theory-building and theory-testing to evaluate the overall extent of theoretical contribution without regard to context. Last, we assess the impact of contextualization by examining citations to papers with various degrees of contextualization.

METHOD

Sample

We collected data for our study from articles published in six leading journals in the management and organization research fields between 1981 and 2010 (*Administrative Science Quarterly (ASQ)*, *Academy of Management Journal (AMJ)*, *Strategic Management Journal (SMJ)*, *Journal of Applied Psychology (JAP)*, *Organization Science (OrgSci)*, and *Journal of International Business Studies (JIBS)*).^[2] To select journals and articles, first we included only top-tier, English language management and organization academic journals that have operated since 1981,^[3] which is consistent with previous reviews using similar methods (e.g., Li & Tsui, 2002; Peng et al., 2001; Tahai & Meyer, 1999), and meets the requirements for research rigour. Leung (2007) said 'a stampede for top-tier publications' (510) has improved 'the conceptual and methodological rigor of East Asian research' (511). Top-tier journals meet conceptual and methodological rigour requirements by publishing only high-quality articles. We excluded practitioner-orientated journals such as

Harvard Business Review. Second, we focused on studies dealing with Chinese contexts, considering the macro-level related to institutions or the micro-level of individual processes in organizations in mainland China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, and Macao (Li & Tsui, 2002; Peng et al., 2001; Tahai & Meyer, 1999). We checked the method sections of empirical articles to ensure that at least one sample came from the four Chinese contexts, regardless of the theoretical framework. We treated conceptual studies as having Chinese contexts when they dealt with Chinese phenomena. Third, based on our context-emic model, we used only empirical articles for our analysis.

The six journals yielded 268 articles related to Chinese contexts published during the last three decades. Of these, 259 were empirical studies that could be coded as to *what*, *how*, and *why*. The remaining nine were conceptual. Table 2 shows article distributions among journals by years. The first article related to the Chinese contexts was published in 1985. Published articles associated with the Chinese context rose 0.5 from 1981 to 1990, 5.5 from 1991 to 2000, and 20.9 from 2001 to 2010.

Management and Organization Review (MOR) is an official publication of the International Association for Chinese Management Research. Its primary goal is to 'promote scholarly studies of organization and management of firms in the Chinese context'. *MOR* has published primarily Chinese management research 'with context-rich theorizing' since it launched in 2005 (<http://www.iacmr.org>). For our context-emic model, we expected that articles in *MOR* would have higher contextualization in *what*, *how*, and *why* than would articles in the six leading journals. Using the same selection criteria we used for the six top journals, we found forty-three empirical articles in *MOR*.

Coding Procedures

We used the context-emic model of *what*, *how*, and *why* shown in Table 1 and Colquitt and Zapata-Phelan's taxonomy of theory-building and theory-testing to code the 259 empirical articles from the six leading journals and forty-three empirical articles from *MOR*.^[4]

We took several steps to ensure coding reliability. First, we randomly selected fifty articles, and two of the three authors coded them independently. Then we discussed the results and improved the coding schema. Second, from the remaining 209 articles, we randomly selected another twenty-nine, which two authors double-blind coded using the improved coding scheme. In this step, agreement reached 93.1 percent, 100 percent, and 93.1 percent in coding of the *what*, *how*, and *why* dimensions, respectively. Finally, after establishing adequate reliability, we randomly split the other 180 empirical articles almost equally between coders.

When coding an article for the *what*, we noted whether new concepts were introduced or new measures were developed in the Chinese context. New concepts

Table 2. Management and organization research articles related to Chinese context in six leading journals, 1981–2010, and in *Management and Organization Review*, 2005–2010^{a,b,c}

	<i>AMJ</i>	<i>ASQ</i>	<i>JAP</i>	<i>JIBS</i>	<i>OrgSci</i>	<i>SMJ</i>	Subtotal of 6 journals	<i>MOR</i>
1985		1					1	
1986			1				1	
1987	1			1			2	
1989		1					1	
1991			1	1			2	
1992		1	1			1	3	
1993	1		1	2			4	
1994	1	1		1		1	4	
1995	3			1			4	
1996	2	1		3	1		7	
1997		1		2		1	4	
1998			2	5	2 (1)		9 (1)	
1999	(1)			4 (1)		2	7 (2)	
2000	5		1	4			10	
2001	1	1	2	6 (1)		3 (1)	13 (2)	
2002	3		1	9	2	4	19	
2003	2			5	2	4	13	
2004	1		2	3	10 (1)	3	19 (1)	
2005	3	1	2	5	1	4	16	15 (8)
2006			1	8	2	1	12	15 (5)
2007	7 (1)	1	7	15 (1)		3	33 (2)	14 (5)
2008	1		1	13 (1)	3	8	26 (1)	11 (4)
2009	3		4	10	3	7	27	10 (5)
2010	3	1	5	17		5	31	15 (10)
Subtotal: empirical articles	36	10	32	111	24	46	259	43
Total	38 (2)	10	32	115 (4)	26 (2)	47 (1)	268 (9)	80 (37)

Notes:

^a *ASQ*, *Administrative Science Quarterly*; *AMJ*, *Academy of Management Journal*; *SMJ*, *Strategic Management Journal*; *JAP*, *Journal of Applied Psychology*; *OrgSci*, *Organization Science*; *JIBS*, *Journal of International Business Studies*; *MOR*, *Management and Organization Review*.

^b *Administrative Science Quarterly* published the first article related to Chinese contexts in 1985.

^c The entries in parentheses are the number of conceptual articles.

were most often evident when a sentence introduced and defined a new term emerging from the Chinese context, without citations. New measurements were apparent when an article used a survey and psychometric scale-development procedure. Thus, we carefully checked the method section in assessing the contextualization in *what*.

When coding *how*, we studied article sections related to hypotheses development and analysis results. First, we broadly defined contextual relationships, including identifying different effects, exploring variations in effects over time, or introducing

mediators or moderators in the Chinese context. When studies found relationships (e.g., significant vs. insignificant, positive vs. negative, linear vs. nonlinear) that were unique to Chinese contexts, we identified that such a study could change current thinking about Chinese contexts, and coded those articles as showing moderate contextualization. Second, we read the articles to find new mediators or moderators that unlocked new mechanisms or extended boundaries. Articles that introduced mediators or moderators developed in other contexts were coded as showing moderate contextualization in *how*; articles that introduced mediators or moderators emerging from the Chinese context were coded as showing high contextualization in *how*.

When coding *why*, we focused primarily on sections about theoretical background and hypotheses development. We recorded arguments or logics that showed the whole picture or the foundations of hypotheses. We distinguished whether the study borrowed arguments or logics or whether the arguments emerged from Chinese contexts. We coded borrowed arguments as showing low contextualization, and China-emerging arguments as showing high contextualization. Articles that used Chinese-contextual phenomena to support hypotheses but lacked new theorization were coded as showing moderate contextualization.

We coded the degree of theory-building and theory-testing on a five-point scale, with one designating a low degree of theory-building or testing, and five designating a high degree, following Colquitt and Zapata-Phelan's (2007) procedure. We randomly selected fifty articles for pilot coding and then another twenty-nine articles for testing coding reliability, which two of the three authors double-blind coded. We checked interrater reliability using the ICC(1) index, which refers to the reliability of a single rating of an article. The ICC(1) for the theory-building rating was 0.38, and for the theory-testing rating was 0.80, which are higher than the value of about 0.30 suggested by Bliese (2000) and Colquitt and Zapata-Phelan (2007). Finally, we randomly split the rest almost equally between each coder. Following Colquitt and Zapata-Phelan's (2007) coding, we also allowed our coding to include half-points in addition to integers (1.5, 2.5, 3.5, 4.5); the half-points represent 'blends of different theory-building and theory-testing components' (1289).

Using the ISI Web of Knowledge Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI), we evaluated the impact of empirical articles employing citation counts from 1981, which marked the beginning of our sample period, to December 31, 2010. Citations have been used widely as a measure for assessing journal and article impact in management and social sciences (e.g., Colquitt & Zapata-Phelan, 2007; Li & Tsui, 2002; Tahai & Meyer, 1999). Of the forty-three empirical articles in *MOR*, only seventeen were included in SSCI because *MOR* entered the SSCI list in 2008. Therefore, we eliminated the coding results of the forty-three *MOR* articles in the citation-impact analysis.

RESULTS

Degree of Contextualization in *What*, *How*, and *Why* and Theoretical Contribution to Theory-building and Theory-testing

Panel A in Table 3 presents coding results of contextualization in *what*, *how*, and *why* for 259 articles from the six leading journals. Of the 259 articles, 58 percent borrowed existing concepts and their measures from other contexts to replicate the relationships, and 64.9 percent exploited incumbent logics that were developed in other contexts to extend the boundary. Only 5.8 percent introduced new concepts or measures or reconceptualized existing ones within Chinese contexts; only 15.8 percent contextualized the relationships by containing new concepts and by introducing new mediators or moderators. Fewer than 10 percent employed the conceptual arguments or theoretical logics that emerged from Chinese contexts to frame the big pictures and construct the hypotheses.

Panel A in Table 3 also presents the coding results for forty-three articles from *MOR*; 18.6 percent contextualized relationships by introducing new mediators or moderators; 23 percent reconceptualized existing ones within Chinese contexts; 58.1 percent employed 'rich description' of the Chinese context or used outside-in concepts that captured Chinese features but were developed from the outside to argue the relationships in a Chinese context; and 14 percent applied the Chinese-emerging concepts or logics to hypotheses construction. As expected, *MOR* articles have significantly higher Chinese contextualization along *what* and *why* compared with articles published in other journals ($\chi^2 = 15.47$, $p < 0.00$; $\chi^2 = 21.87$, $p < 0.00$).

Panel B in Table 3 presents the coding results using Colquitt and Zapata-Phelan's (2007) model. First, regarding theory-building coding results, of 259 articles, almost half (49.8 percent) introduced a new mediator or moderator into an existing relationship; and only sixteen articles (6.2 percent) examined a previously unexplored relationship or introduced a new construct. A similar pattern emerged for forty-three *MOR* articles. In total, as Table 6 shows, the theory-building mean was 2.49 (SD = 0.85) for 259 leading journal articles and 2.47 (SD = 0.85) for forty-three *MOR* articles, almost equal to the mean of articles published in *AMJ* from 1963 to 2007 (mean = 2.52, SD = 1.13), indicating that the typical article of our sample examined effects that were the subject of prior theorizing or introduced a new mediator or moderator of an existing relationship or process. Second, regarding theory-testing coding results, 48.2 percent of 259 leading journal articles and only 30.2 percent of forty-three *MOR* articles grounded their hypotheses with existing theories or models. In sum, the theory-testing mean of 259 leading journal articles was 3.72 (SD = 1.02), significantly higher than the mean of articles published in *MOR* (mean = 3.23, SD = 1.07; $t = 2.89$, $p < 0.00$), and in *AMJ* from 1963 to 2007 (mean = 3.10, SD = 1.19;

Table 3. Coding results

Panel A: The context-emic model												
<i>The degree of contextualization</i>												
	<i>What</i>			<i>How</i>			<i>Why</i>			<i>MOR</i>	<i>%</i>	
	<i>Six leading journals</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Six leading journals</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Six leading journals</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>			
1	151	58.3	23	53.5	218	84.2	35	81.4	168	64.9	12	27.9
2	93	35.9	10	23.3	41	15.8	8	18.6	67	25.9	25	58.1
3	15	5.8	10	23.3	259	100	43	100	24	9.2	6	14.0
Total	259	100	43	100					259	100	43	100
Comparison between groups												
$\chi^2 = 15.47, df = 2, p < 0.00$												
$\chi^2 = 0.21, df = 1, p > 0.64$												
$\chi^2 = 21.87, df = 2, p < 0.00$												
Panel B: Colquitt and Zapata-Phelan's model												
<i>The degree of theory-building or theory-testing^{a,c}</i>												
	<i>Theory-building</i>			<i>Theory-testing</i>			<i>MOR</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
	<i>Six leading journals</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Six leading journals</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>						
1 and 1.5	50	19.3	5	11.6	5	2	5	11.6	2	3	3	7
2 and 2.5	64	24.7	15	34.9	15	51	51	34.9	19.7	17	17	39.6
3 and 3.5	129	49.8	22	51.1	22	78	78	51.1	30.1	10	10	23.2
4 and 4.5	15	5.8	1	2.3	1	69	69	2.3	26.6	9	9	20.9
5	1	0.4				56	56		21.6	4	4	9.3
Total	259	100	43	100	43	259	259	100	100	43	43	100
Comparison between groups												
$\chi^2 = 6.92, df = 7, p > 0.43$												
$\chi^2 = 20.56, df = 8, p < 0.01$												

^aThe half-points represent 'blends of different theory-building and theory-testing components' (Colquitt & Zapata-Phelan, 2007: 1289).
^bTheory building: 1 = attempts to replicate previously demonstrated effects; 2 = examines effects that have been the subject of prior theorizing; 3 = introduces a new mediator or moderator of an existing relationship or process; 4 = examines a previously unexplored relationship or process; 5 = introduces a new construct (or significantly reconceptualizes an existing one).
^cTheory testing: 1 = is inductive or grounds predictions with logical speculation; 2 = grounds predictions with references to past findings; 3 = grounds predictions with existing conceptual arguments; 4 = grounds predictions with existing models, diagrams, or figures; 5 = grounds predictions with existing theory.

Table 4. Joint contextualization in *what*, *how*, and *why*^a

		<i>Six leading journals</i>		<i>MOR</i>	
		<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Lowest contextualization	Sum of <i>what</i> , <i>how</i> , and <i>why</i> = 4	87	33.6	3	7.0
Lower contextualization	Sum of <i>what</i> , <i>how</i> , and <i>why</i> = 5	106	40.9	20	46.5
Medium contextualization	Sum of <i>what</i> , <i>how</i> , and <i>why</i> = 6	38	14.7	9	20.9
Higher contextualization	Sum of <i>what</i> , <i>how</i> , and <i>why</i> = 7	18	6.9	7	16.3
Highest contextualization	Sum of <i>what</i> , <i>how</i> , and <i>why</i> ≥ 8	10	3.9	4	9.3
Total <i>N</i>		259	100	43	100
Comparison within group		$\chi^2 = 140.1, df = 4, p < 0.00$		$\chi^2 = 21.5, df = 4, p < 0.00$	
Comparison between groups		$\chi^2 = 16.2, df = 4, p < 0.00$			

Note:

^a The possible total score ranges from 3 to 9; the actual score ranges from 4 to 9.

$z = 7.91, p < 0.00$), suggesting that the typical article of our sample tended to ground predictions with existing models.

We summed the scores of each article in *what*, *how*, and *why*. Table 4 shows the joint contextualization and distribution pattern. Of 259 articles in six leading journals, 193 (74.5 percent) had low Chinese contextualization (a total score of four or five). Ten papers, 3.9 percent, took ‘the road less traveled’ with a total score of eight and nine. As expected, *MOR* articles showed higher Chinese contextualization than did articles from other journals ($\chi^2 = 16.2, p < 0.00$). Only 53.5 percent of the forty-three *MOR* articles (vs. 74.5 percent of leading journal articles) had low Chinese contextualization; nearly 10 percent (vs. 3.9 percent) had high contextualization levels in *what*, *how*, and *why*.

Table 5 presents the trends over three decades for contextualization in *what*, *how*, and *why*, and for theory-building-testing for 259 articles from the six leading journals. As shown in Panel A, although the number of publications related to the Chinese context in the six leading journals soared after 2001, the degree of contextualization in *why* actually decreased ($\chi^2 = 21.24, p < 0.00$). The pattern is identical with the negative correlation between year and *why* (see Table 6, $r = -0.30, p < 0.01$). Panel B suggests that theoretical contributions increased over the last three decades along theory-building ($\chi^2 = 46.23, p < 0.00$) and theory-testing ($\chi^2 = 36.86, p < 0.01$). The results are identical to those shown in Table 6; trends increased by year in theory-building ($r = 0.19, p < 0.01$) and

Table 5. Trends over the three decades: 259 articles from six leading journals

Panel A: The context-emic model																							
The degree of contextualization	What				How				Why														
	1980s		2000s		1980s		1990s		2000s		1980s		1990s		2000s								
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%							
1	3	60.0	26	63.4	122	57.3					1	20.0	17	41.5	150	70.4							
2	2	40.0	10	24.4	81	38.0	4	80.0	34	82.9	180	84.5	2	40.0	16	39.0	49	23.0					
3	0	0.0	5	12.2	10	4.7	1	20.0	7	17.1	33	15.5	2	40.0	8	19.5	14	6.6					
Total	5	100	41	100	213	100	5	100	41	100	213	100	5	100	41	100	213	100					
Comparison between decades												$\chi^2 = 5.66, df = 4, p > 0.22$				$\chi^2 = 0.13, df = 2, p > 0.93$				$\chi^2 = 21.24, df = 4, p < 0.00$			
Panel B: Colquitt and Zapata-Phelan's model																							
The degree of theory-building or theory-testing ^a	Theory-building				Theory-testing																		
	1980s		1990s		2000s		1980s		1990s		2000s												
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%											
1 and 1.5	3	60.0	16	39.0	31	14.6	1	20.0			4	1.8											
2 and 2.5	1	20.0	12	29.3	51	23.9	3	60.0	15	36.5	33	15.5											
3 and 3.5	1	20.0	12	29.3	116	54.5	1	20.0	11	26.9	66	31.0											
4 and 4.5					15	7.0			11	26.9	58	27.3											
5			1	2.4					4	9.8	52	24.4											
Total	5	100	41	100	213	100	5	100	41	100	213	100											
Comparison between decades												$\chi^2 = 46.23, df = 14, p < 0.00$				$\chi^2 = 36.86, df = 16, p < 0.01$							

Note:

^a The half-points represent 'blends of different theory-building and theory-testing components' (Colquitt & Zapata-Phelan, 2007: 1289).

Table 6. Descriptive statistics and zero-order correlations

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Year ^a	23.02	5.36							
2. <i>What</i>	1.47	0.61	-0.00						
3. <i>How</i>	2.16	0.37	-0.03	0.10					
4. <i>Why</i>	1.44	0.66	-0.30**	0.03	0.38**				
5. Joint ^b	5.07	1.05	-0.20**	0.60**	0.62**	0.75**			
6. Theory-building	2.49	0.85	0.19**	0.13*	0.27**	-0.00	0.16**		
7. Theory-testing	3.72	1.02	0.16**	0.08	-0.04	-0.10	-0.02	0.09	
8. Citations	34.62	48.46	-0.61**	0.22**	0.16*	0.27**	0.34**	0.04	-0.07

Notes:

^a Year ranges from 1 for 1981 to 30 for 2010.

^b As described in Table 4, 'Joint' refers to the degree of joint contextualization in *what*, *how*, and *why*. $N = 259$. * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$ (two-tailed test).

theory-testing ($r = 0.16$, $p < 0.01$). The trends are similar to Colquitt and Zapata-Phelan's (2007) finding that more recent articles require higher levels of theory.

Table 6 shows the correlations among the *what*, *how*, and *why* scores and their joint score, and Colquitt and Zapata-Phelan's (2007) theory-building and theory-testing scores. Only the correlations between numbers in *what* or *how* and in theory-building were significant ($r = 0.13$, $p < 0.05$; $r = 0.27$, $p < 0.01$). The other correlations among *what*, *how*, and *why* in theory-building and theory-testing were nonsignificant. The results demonstrate that our model is largely independent from Colquitt and Zapata-Phelan's (2007) taxonomy.

Degree of Contextualization and Article Impact

Table 7 presents the results of our regression analysis for assessing the relationship between contextualization in *what*, *how*, and *why*, and citations for the sample articles. As shown in the basic model, the effect of year, journal, and Colquitt and Zapata-Phelan's theory-building and theory-testing coding accounted for 50 percent of the variance in citations. Our analyses showed an inverted U-shaped association between year and citations. Articles published in the 1980s and 2000s (75.40 and 23.09 citations per article, respectively) were cited fewer times than those published in the 1990s (89.56 citations per article). On average, articles published in *ASQ*, *AMJ*, and *SMJ* had more citations (72.89, 29.93, and 11.73, respectively) than those published in *JAP*. Although year and journal played a key role in citation variance, our three dimensions explained an incremental 3 percent of the variance, and the degree of joint contextualization explained an additional 3 percent of the variance. Table 7 shows that a one-unit increase in

Table 7. Contextualization in *what*, *how*, and *why*, and article impact

Regression Step and Variables	Citations		
	Unstandardized Coefficient (s.e.)	Unstandardized Coefficient (s.e.)	Unstandardized Coefficient (s.e.)
1. Year ^a	-6.53 (0.58)**	-6.38 (0.58)**	-6.26 (0.57)**
Year squared	-6.62 (1.65)**	-6.58 (1.61)**	-6.70 (1.61)**
ASQ ^b	72.89 (13.23)**	62.18 (13.33)**	63.62 (13.15)**
AMJ	29.93 (8.57)**	28.59 (8.38)**	28.79 (8.37)**
JIBS	2.31 (7.07)	1.47 (6.95)	0.80 (6.91)
OrgSci	4.18 (9.67)	2.75 (9.60)	0.93 (9.46)
SMJ	11.73 (6.15) [†]	11.22 (5.98) [†]	10.58 (5.96) [†]
Theory-building	2.80 (2.77)	0.74 (2.82)	1.00 (2.74)
Theory-testing	-0.17 (2.21)	-0.33 (2.17)	-0.17 (2.17)
2. <i>What</i>		10.63 (3.67)**	
<i>How</i>		10.43 (5.65) [†]	
<i>Why</i>		4.00 (3.77)	
3. Joint ^c			7.88 (2.15)**
R ²	0.50**	0.53**	0.53**
ΔR ²		0.03**	0.03**

Notes:

^a Year ranges from 1 for 1981 to 30 for 2010.

^b JAP as referent. ASQ = *Administrative Science Quarterly*; AMJ = *Academy of Management Journal*; SMJ = *Strategic Management Journal*; JAP = *Journal of Applied Psychology*; OrgSci = *Organization Science*; JIBS = *Journal of International Business Studies*.

^c As described in Table 4, 'Joint' refers to the degree of joint contextualization in *what*, *how*, and *why*.

N = 259. [†]p < 0.10, *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01 (two-tailed test).

contextualization in *what* or *how* related to 10.5 more citations (10.63 and 10.43, respectively, per article, see the unstandardized coefficients). Additionally, a one-unit increase in joint contextualization in *what*, *how*, and *why* received about 7.88 more citations per article. Note that the articles in our sample averaged 34.62 citations (SD = 48.46).

ANOVA and *post hoc* analyses using Scheffe's test also revealed significant difference of average citations between high, low, or moderate contextualization in *what*, *how*, and *why*, but no significant difference between low and moderate contextualization. For example, an average of 98.60 citations per article was associated with high contextualization in *what*, significantly higher than an average of 30.15 or 31.57 citations with low or moderate contextualization in *what* ($F_{(2,256)} = 15.46$, $p < 0.00$). An average of 114.20 citations with highest joint contextualization in *what*, *how*, and *why* was significantly higher than those of other joint contextualization ($F_{(4,254)} = 10.60$, $p < 0.00$), which have averaged citations of 22.37, 30.73, 45.13, and 50.39, respectively, from low to high joint contextualization. The differences among those values are not statistically significant.

Theoretical Contributions in Articles with the Highest Degree of Contextualization

From the six leading journals, fifteen, forty-one, and twenty-four articles were coded as showing the highest degree of contextualization per our context-emic model in *what*, *how*, and *why*, respectively, as were ten, eight and six articles from *MOR* (see Table 3). They represented the highest levels of theoretical contributions of Chinese context in *what*, *how*, or *why* and showed the highest citation impact. See Table 8 for a summary.

Theoretical contributions of Chinese context in what. First, three new concepts came from the Chinese context. Nee's (1992) *market transition* depicted hybrid forms of Chinese organizational dynamics with plurality of property rights. Boisot and Child's (1996) *network capitalism* captured China's distinctive institutional form of limited communal property rights and information codification. Xin and Pearce (1996) introduced *guanxi* to substitute for institutional resources during the Chinese market transition. These articles garnered 282, 218, and 279 citations, respectively, and generated new research and follow-up studies (e.g., Batjargal, 2007; Chen et al., 2011; Farh et al., 1998; Friedman et al., 2006; Park & Luo, 2001; Su et al., 2009; Zhou et al., 2007).

Second, twelve studies from six leading journals and ten from *MOR* reconceptualized existing concepts and developed their measures within the Chinese context. Examples are organizational citizenship behaviour (Farh et al., 1997), emotional intelligence (Law, Wong, & Song, 2004), particularistic trust (Luo, 2005), and red hat strategy (Chen, 2007). The citation mean of these twelve articles is 69.90 (vs. 34.62 of grand mean).

Theoretical contributions of Chinese context in how. Only one study, Xin and Pearce (1996), introduced a new relationship presenting a novel concept: *guanxi*. It explored the disproportional importance of *guanxi* among private, state-owned, and collective-hybrid companies. A familiar approach to offering theoretical contributions is to introduce new mediators or moderators that can capture deep Chinese-context meaning. Examples of new mediators include social conservation (Morris et al., 1998) and *guanxi* networks (Zhou et al., 2007). New moderators were mainly culture (e.g., collectivism, traditionality, and authority), environment (e.g., institution, ownership, legal enforceability, market opportunity, competition, munificence, uncertainty, or dynamics), and *guanxi* (e.g., ties). These forty-one articles averaged 51.93 citations (vs. 34.62 of grand mean).

Theoretical contributions of Chinese context in why. As Table 6 shows, the Chinese context has enhanced existing management knowledge with Confucianism and its affiliated concepts such as *guanxi*, *manzi*, *wulun*, *renqing*, *li*, *pao* (the norm of reciprocity), and traditionality. On average, these twenty-four articles garnered 66.17 citations (vs. 34.62 of grand mean).

Table 8. Theoretical contributions of the Chinese context in *what*, *how*, and *why*

<i>What = 3: Introducing new concepts, or reconceptualizing existing ones</i>	
<i>Six leading journals</i>	<i>Management and Organization Review</i>
<p>Approach 1: Developing a new concept-based Chinese context (259.67 mean citations with range from 218 to 282)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Market transition (Nee, 1992, <i>ASQ</i>) • Network capitalism (Boisot & Child, 1996, <i>ASQ</i>) • <i>Guanxi</i> (Xin & Pearce, 1996) 	
<p>Approach 2: Reconceptualizing an existing concept in Chinese context (69.9 mean citations with range from 18 to 189)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organizational citizenship behavior (Farh et al., 1997, <i>ASQ</i>; Farh, Zhong, & Organ, 2004, <i>OrgSci</i>) • Trust in connection (Farh et al., 1998, <i>OrgSci</i>) • Business importance of <i>guanxi</i> (Farh et al., 1998, <i>OrgSci</i>) • Emotional intelligence (Law et al., 2004, <i>JAP</i>) • <i>Guanxi</i> practice and prevalence (Chen et al., 2004, <i>OrgSci</i>) • Contractual governance (Luo, 2005, <i>JIBS</i>) • Entrepreneurial career success (Lau, Shaffer, & Au, 2007, <i>JIBS</i>) • Political networking strategy (Li, & Atuahene-Gima, 2001, <i>AMJ</i>) • Marketization (Davies & Walters, 2004, <i>SMJ</i>) • Particularistic relationship (Luo & Chung, 2005, <i>ASQ</i>) • <i>Guanxi</i> networks (Zhou et al., 2007, <i>JIBS</i>) • <i>Guanxi</i> orientation (Su et al., 2009, <i>JIBS</i>) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group citizenship behavior (Chen, Lam, Naumann, & Schaubreck, 2005, <i>MOR</i>) • Particularistic trust (Luo, 2005, <i>MOR</i>) • Norm of reciprocity (Wu, Hom, Tetrick, Shore, Jia, Li, & Song, 2006, <i>MOR</i>) • Organizational culture (Tsui, Wang, & Xin, 2006, <i>MOR</i>; Cooke, 2008, <i>MOR</i>) • High commitment work systems (Xiao & Bjorkman, 2006, <i>MOR</i>) • Perceived family demands (Choi & Chen, 2006, <i>MOR</i>) • Red hat strategy (Chen, 2007, <i>MOR</i>) • Supervisor-subordinate <i>guanxi</i> (Chen, Friedman, Yu, Fang, & Lu, 2009, <i>MOR</i>) • Coworker relationship closeness (Chen & Peng, 2008, <i>MOR</i>)
<i>How = 3: Introducing relationships with new concepts, or introducing mediators/moderators that are unique to Chinese context</i>	
<i>Six leading journals (51.93 mean citations with range from 1 to 279)</i>	<i>Management and Organization Review</i>
<p>Approach 1: New relationships containing new concepts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Guanxi</i> (Xin & Pearce, 1996, <i>AMJ</i>) 	

Table 8. (cont.)

Six leading journals (51.93 mean citations with range from 1 to 279)

Management and Organization Review

Approach 2: New mediators capturing Chinese context meaning were introduced into the relationships

- Self and group efficacy (Earley, 1993, *AMJ*; Earley, 1994, *ASQ*)
- Social conservation and self-enhancement (Morris et al., 1998, *JIBS*)
- Instrumental value (Hui, Lee, & Rousseau, 2004, *JAP*)
- *Guanxi* networks (Zhou et al., 2007, *JIBS*)
- Internal attribution (Friedman, Liu, Chen, & Chi, 2007, *JAP*)
- Opportunism (Luo, 2007, *SMJ*)
- Corporate entrepreneurship (Yiu, Lau, & Bruton, 2007, *JIBS*)

- Particularistic trust (Luo, 2005, *MOR*)

Approach 3: New moderators capturing Chinese context meaning were introduced into the relationships

Culture-type moderators

- Collectivism (Earley, 1989, *ASQ*; Schaubroeck, Lam, & Xie, 2000, *JAP*; Thomas & Au, 2002, *JIBS*; Schaubroeck, Lam, & Cha, 2007, *JAP*)
- Culture (Tse, Francis, & Walls, 1994, *JIBS*; Earley, 1994, *ASQ*; Tinsley & Pillutla, 1998, *JIBS*; Yang, Chen, Choi, & Zou, 2000, *AMJ*; Chen & Li, 2005, *JIBS*; Chua, Morris, & Ingram, 2009, *JIBS*)
- Traditionality (Farh et al., 1997, *ASQ*; Hui, Lee, & Rousseau, 2004, *OrgSci*; Chen & Aryee 2007, *AMJ*; Farh, Hackett, & Liang, 2007, *AMJ*; Xie et al., 2008, *JAP*)
- Modernity (Farh et al., 1997, *ASQ*)
- Participative culture (Zhou, Tse, & Li, 2006, *IBS*)
- Power distance (Schaubroeck, Lam, & Cha, 2007, *JAP*; Farh, Hackett, & Liang, 2007, *AMJ*)
- Authority (Friedman et al., 2006, *JIBS*)

- Gender (Choi & Chen, 2006, *MOR*)
- Cultural identity (Horng & Chen, 2008, *MOR*)
- Culture (Weber, Ames, & Blais, 2005, *MOR*; Bachrach, Wang, Bendoly, & Zhang, 2007, *MOR*; Liu, Friedman, & Chi, 2005, *MOR*)

Environment-type moderators

- Institution (Giacobbe-Miller, Miller, Zhang, & Victorov, 2003, *JIBS*; Luo, 2003, *JIBS*; Lin, Peng, Yang, & Sun, 2009, *SMJ*; Li & Tang, 2010, *AMJ*)
- Ownership (Buckley, Clegg, & Wang, 2002, *JIBS*; Li & Zhang, 2007, *SMJ*; Zhang, Li, Hitt, & Cui, 2007, *JIBS*; Li, Poppo, & Zhou, 2008, *SMJ*; Li & Tang, 2010, *AMJ*)

- Environmental munificence and dynamism (Peng, Zhang, & Li, 2007, *MOR*)

Table 8. (cont.)

Six leading journals (51.93 mean citations
with range from 1 to 279)

Management and Organization Review

- FDI legitimacy (Li, Zhou, & Zajac, 2009, *SMJ*)
 - Legal enforceability (Zhou & Poppo, 2010, *JIBS*)
 - Market opportunity (Luo, 2003, *JIBS*)
 - Competition (Li & Zhang, 2007, *SMJ*; Yiu, Lau, & Bruton, 2007, *JIBS*; Li, Poppo, & Zhou, 2008, *SMJ*)
 - Perceived industry growth (Luo, 2007, *SMJ*; Zhang & Li, 2010, *SMJ*)
 - IJV market focus (Zhang, Li, Hitt, & Cui, 2007, *JIBS*)
 - Uncertainty (Li, Poppo, & Zhou, 2008, *SMJ*)
- Guanxi-type moderators
- Relationship-based strategy (Li & Atuahene-Gima, 2001, *AMJ*; Su et al., 2009, *JIBS*)
 - *Guanxi* (Luk, Yau, Sin, Tse, Chow, & Lee, 2008, *JIBS*)
 - *Guanxi* orientation (Su et al., 2009, *JIBS*)
 - Ties (Batjargal & Liu, 2004, *OrgSci*; Zhang & Li, 2010, *SMJ*)
 - Local dependence (Luo, 2007, *SMJ*)
- Prior relationship (Chen & Peng, 2008, *MOR*)

Why = 3: Using Chinese contextualized conceptual or theoretical logics

Six leading journals (66.17 mean citations
with range from 1 to 282)

Management and Organization Review

Approach 1: Using Confucianism logics

- Confucianism (Shenkar & Ronen, 1987, *AMJ*; Adler, Brahm, & Graham, 1992, *SMJ*; Ralston, Gustafson, Cheung, & Terpstra, 1993, *JIBS*; Farh et al., 1997, *ASQ*; Morris et al., 1998, *JIBS*; Ralston, Egri, Stewart, Terpstra, & Yu, 1999, *JIBS*; Chen et al., 2004, *OrgSci*; Chen & Li, 2005, *JIBS*; Friedman et al., 2006, *JIBS*; Lee et al., 2006, *JIBS*)
- Confucianism (Luo, 2005, *MOR*; Choi & Chen, 2006, *MOR*; Chen & Peng, 2008, *MOR*; Liu, Friedman, & Chi, 2005, *MOR*; Chen et al., 2009, *MOR*; Batjargal, 2007, *MOR*)

Approach 2: Using conceptual arguments that were embedded in Chinese context

Table 8. (cont.)

<i>Six leading journals (66.17 mean citations with range from 1 to 282)</i>	<i>Management and Organization Review</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Guanxi</i> (Nee, 1992, <i>ASQ</i>; Boisot & Child, 1996, <i>ASQ</i>; Farh et al., 1998, <i>OrgSci</i>; Park & Luo, 2001, <i>SMJ</i>; Bruton et al., 2003, <i>SMJ</i>; Batjargal & Liu, 2004, <i>OrgSci</i>; Chen et al., 2004, <i>OrgSci</i>; Chen & Li, 2005, <i>JIBS</i>; Friedman et al., 2006, <i>JIBS</i>; Lee et al., 2006, <i>JIBS</i>; Zhou et al., 2007, <i>JIBS</i>; Batjargal, 2007, <i>JIBS</i>; Luk, Yau, Sin, Tse, Chow, & Lee, 2008, <i>JIBS</i>; Su et al., 2009, <i>JIBS</i>; Chua, Morris, & Ingram, 2009, <i>JIBS</i>) • <i>Mianzi</i> or <i>saving face</i> (Kelley, Whatley, & Worthley, 1987, <i>JIBS</i>; Park & Luo, 2001, <i>SMJ</i>; Batjargal & Liu, 2004, <i>OrgSci</i>; Friedman et al., 2006, <i>JIBS</i>; Lee et al., 2006, <i>JIBS</i>; Su et al., 2009, <i>JIBS</i>) • <i>Wulun</i> (five cardinal dyadic role relations) (Farh et al., 1998, <i>OrgSci</i>; Hui, Lee, & Rousseau, 2004, <i>OrgSci</i>) • <i>Renqing</i> (a form of social capital) (Batjargal, 2007, <i>JIBS</i>; Su et al., 2009, <i>JIBS</i>) • <i>Li</i> (behaving appropriately to one's role) (Friedman et al., 2006, <i>JIBS</i>) • Family collectivism (Chua, Morris, & Ingram, 2009, <i>JIBS</i>) • Traditionality (Xie et al., 2008, <i>JAP</i>) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Guanxi</i> (Chen et al., 2009, <i>MOR</i>; Batjargal, 2007, <i>MOR</i>) • Face (Batjargal, 2007, <i>MOR</i>) • <i>Wulun</i> (Choi & Chen, 2006, <i>MOR</i>; Chen & Peng, 2008, <i>MOR</i>) • <i>Renqing</i> (Liu, Friedman, & Chi, 2005, <i>MOR</i>) • <i>Pao</i> (the norm of reciprocity) (Luo, 2005, <i>MOR</i>)

Fourteen Exemplars of Deep Contextualization Studies

We identified ten studies from six leading journals and four from *MOR* with high contextualization based on total scores. Tables 9 and 10 show summaries of the articles as to how these exemplars contextualized jointly in *what*, *how*, and *why*.

Three articles from the six top journals (Boisot & Child, 1996; Nee, 1992; Xin & Pearce, 1996) and four articles from *MOR* (Chen et al., 2009; Chen & Peng, 2008; Choi & Chen, 2006; Luo, 2005) are good examples of inside-out research: 'identifying the important issues that are unique or at least important to Chinese firms, managers, and employees, even if such phenomena might be foreign to scholars outside this context' (Tsui, 2006: 3). Nee (1992) integrates *guanxi* into transaction cost theory and institutional theory to explain the impetus behind China's rise of local corporatism and the move from state socialism to hybrid market economies. Boisot and Child (1996) use the concept of network, the Chinese tradition of *guanxi*, to explain China's evolution from fiefs to clans, differing from the West's evolution from fiefs to bureaucracies to markets. Xin and

Table 9. Ten exemplars of deep contextualization studies from the six leading journals

	<i>Contextualization in what</i>	<i>Contextualization in how</i>	<i>Contextualization in why</i>
Five micro studies Farh, Earley, & Lin, 1997, <i>ASQ</i> , 189 citations	<i>What</i> = 3 Developing an indigenous measure of organizational citizenship behavior.	<i>How</i> = 3 Introducing traditionality and modernity as moderators when testing the effect of OCB on justice. Testing the difference between China and U.S.	<i>Why</i> = 3 Using Confucianism logic to establish the moderating effect.
Farh, Tsui, Xin, & Cheng, 1998, <i>OrgSci</i> , 88 citations	<i>What</i> = 3 Reconceptualizing the concepts, i.e., trust in connection and business importance, and developing new measures for them.	<i>How</i> = 2 Showing different bases for similarity-attraction and social identification in the Western and the Eastern contexts.	<i>Why</i> = 3 Using the conceptual argument of <i>guanxi</i> and <i>wulun</i> to build the relationships among constructs.
Chen, Chen, & Xin, 2004, <i>OrgSci</i> , 36 citations	<i>What</i> = 3 Reconceptualizing the concepts, i.e., <i>guanxi</i> practice and <i>guanxi</i> prevalence, and developing new measures for them.	<i>How</i> = 2 Introducing the mediator of procedural justice to capture the context characteristics.	<i>Why</i> = 3 Employing the conceptual argument of <i>guanxi</i> and Confucianism to develop the negative relationship between <i>guanxi</i> HR practices and trust.
Friedman, Chi, & Liu, 2006, <i>JIBS</i> , 19 citations	<i>What</i> = 2 Scales, such as hurt relationships, relationship payoff, and concern for others, were created specifically for this study. However, they have no deep context meaning.	<i>How</i> = 3 The moderator of authority captures the difference between China and America.	<i>Why</i> = 3 Using Confucian philosophy, such as <i>fae</i> , <i>li</i> , <i>xinpinpin</i> , and <i>guanxi</i> , to build the relationships among constructs.
Xie, Schaubroeck, & Lam, 2008, <i>JAP</i> , 8 citations	<i>What</i> = 2 Improving the measurement of the borrowing concept of 'job demand.'	<i>How</i> = 3 Introducing the moderator of traditionality which captures the Chinese context characteristics.	<i>Why</i> = 3 Chinese traditionality is characterized by respect for authority, fatalism, and a sense of powerlessness. Traditionality was an indigenous instrument for studying Chinese values. Using the conceptual argument of Chinese traditionality to build its moderating effect.

Nee, 1992, <i>ASQ</i> , 282 citations	<i>What</i> = 3 Developing a new concept, market transition, to describe current Chinese context.	<i>How</i> = 2 Pointing out the departures from state socialism as likely to produce hybrid market economies.	<i>Why</i> = 3 Integrating the concept of <i>guanxi</i> into the transaction cost theory and institutional theory to argue the impetus behind the rise of local corporatism in China.
Boisot & Child, 1996, <i>ASQ</i> , 218 citations	<i>What</i> = 3 Developing a new concept, i.e., network capitalism, from Chinese social-economic characteristics.	<i>How</i> = 2 The evolution path of China from fiefs to clans was quite different from the Western typical path from fiefs to bureaucracies then to markets.	<i>Why</i> = 3 Although the concept of <i>guanxi</i> was not employed, network was full of Chinese culture meaning.
Xin & Pearce, 1996, <i>AMJ</i> , 279 citations	<i>What</i> = 3 Introducing a new concept named <i>guanxi</i> based on Chinese context.	<i>How</i> = 3 Investigating new relationships containing a new concept of <i>guanxi</i> , a substitute for institutional support.	<i>Why</i> = 2 Using institution theory and Chinese phenomena to argue the disproportional importance of <i>guanxi</i> among private, state-owned and collective-hybrid companies.
Zhou, Wu, & Luo, 2007, <i>JIBS</i> , 29 citations	<i>What</i> = 3 Reconceptualizing the concept of <i>guanxi</i> networks, and creating a number of new measures specifically for the study.	<i>How</i> = 3 Introducing <i>guanxi</i> networks as the mediator between internationalization and performance of born-global SMEs.	<i>Why</i> = 3 Building the hypotheses based on conceptual argument of <i>guanxi</i> .
Su, Yang, Zhuang, Zhou, & Dou, 2009, <i>JIBS</i> , 1 citation	<i>What</i> = 3 Reconceptualizing the concept of <i>guanxi</i> orientation, and developing the measures for the study using standard survey and psychometric scale development procedures.	<i>How</i> = 3 The moderators of <i>guanxi</i> orientation and inter-firm influence strategy were added for considering the economic and socio-cultural environments.	<i>Why</i> = 3 Establishing the hypotheses using the conceptual arguments, such as <i>guanxi</i> , <i>renqing</i> , <i>maizi</i> , to capture the context meaning.

Note:
The 2009 papers have few citations due to the delay of at least one year after the publication of the paper.

Table 10. Four exemplars of deep contextualization studies from MOR

	Contextualization in <i>what</i>	Contextualization in <i>how</i>	Contextualization in <i>why</i>
Luo, 2005, MOR. 4 citations	<i>What</i> = 3 Developing an indigenous concept and measure of particularistic trust based on Fei's framework of network circle differentiation (Fei, 1948) and Hwang's three categories of Chinese social relations (Hwang, 1987).	<i>How</i> = 3 Introducing particularistic trust as the mediator between social networks and general trust.	<i>Why</i> = 3 Using Confucianism logic, particularly concept of <i>hao</i> , to explain the Chinese dynamics of trust formation in interpersonal networks.
Choi & Chen, 2006, MOR. 1 citations	<i>What</i> = 3 Reconceptualizing the concept of perceived family demands and developing new measures for it.	<i>How</i> = 3 Introducing gender's moderating role which is based on the traditional culture of <i>wulun</i> .	<i>Why</i> = 3 Using the conceptual argument of <i>wulun</i> to build the main relationships and moderating effects.
Chen & Peng, 2008, MOR. 9 citations	<i>What</i> = 3 Reconceptualizing the concept of coworker relationship closeness and developing its measures using standard survey and psychometric scale development procedures.	<i>How</i> = 3 Introducing the moderator of prior relationship closeness to capture the context feature of <i>guanxi</i> and <i>renqing</i> .	<i>Why</i> = 3 Employing the conceptual argument of <i>guanxi</i> and <i>renqing</i> to support the effect of both job relevant and non-job relevant incidents on changes in relationship closeness and the moderating role of prior relationship closeness.
Chen, Friedman, Yu, Fang, & Lu, 2009, MOR. 1 citation	<i>What</i> = 3 Developing a three-dimensional concept of supervisor-subordinate <i>guanxi</i> , which includes affective attachment, personal-life inclusion, and deference to supervisor; and developing measures using standard survey and psychometric scale development procedures.	<i>How</i> = 2 Showing different significant effects of three dimensions on commitment, turnover intention, and procedural justice, and showing moderating role of personal-life inclusion in the effect of deference to supervisor on affective commitment.	<i>Why</i> = 3 Employing the conceptual argument of <i>guanxi</i> to support the relationships.

Note:

The 2009 papers have few citations due to the delay of at least one year after the publication of the paper.

Pearce (1996) integrate institution theory and Chinese market transition to explain *guanxi*'s disproportional importance among private, state-owned, and collective-hybrid companies. The four *MOR* articles develop particularistic trust, perceived family demands, coworker relationship closeness, and supervisor-subordinate *guanxi* to describe Chinese-specific *pao*, *guanxi*, and *renqing*, and bridged these to Western concepts such as social ties (Granovetter, 1973), social exchange (Blau, 1964), leader-member exchange (Liden, Sparrowe, & Wayne, 1997; Wang et al., 2005), and team-member exchange (Seers, 1989), to render the novel more familiar (Whetten, 2009).

The other seven articles are good examples of outside-in research, 'choosing popular topics or phenomena in the existing literature and examining how they are manifested in the Chinese context' (Tsui, 2006: 3). They reconceptualize outside concepts to fit Chinese contexts, and/or contextualized existing measures. For example, Farh et al. (1997) re-conceptualize OCB in Taiwan, develop an indigenous measure using a scale development procedure, introduce traditionality and modernity as moderators of OCB and justice, and use Confucianism logics for the moderating effects in comparing reactions of Chinese and U.S. employees. This strategy uses familiar concepts to inform novel ones (Whetten, 2009).

DISCUSSION

Our study asks this question, 'What has research in the Chinese context contributed to management and organization theory during the last three decades?' First, using our context-emic model, our sample of articles published in leading journals shows that Chinese-context-centered studies have offered three new concepts: market transition, network capitalism, and *guanxi*. Also, they have reconceptualized concepts such as trust, citizenship behaviour, and emotional intelligence. However, the Chinese context has failed to contribute new theoretical logics to existing management knowledge, except for Confucianism and related concepts such as *guanxi*, face, *wulun*, *renqing*, *li*, *pao*, and traditionality. Our results affirm that for three decades 'research in Chinese management has exploited existing questions, theories, constructs, and methods developed in the Western context' (Tsui, 2009: 1).

Second, our context-emic model reveals that, for Chinese-context research appearing in leading journals, the degree of contextualization in *why* decreased over the past three decades. However, Colquitt and Zapata-Phelan's taxonomy demonstrates that theoretical contributions increased over time in theory-building and theory-testing. In addition, compared with articles published in *AMJ* from 1963 to 2007, Chinese-context research made almost equal theoretical contributions along theory-building and higher contributions along theory-testing. The increase in theoretical contributions are mostly in the constructs (*what*) and relationships (*how*) rather than the logic explaining the relationships (*why*).

Third, although Leung (2007) lamented the ‘tyranny of citation impact’ that has homogenized East Asian management research, our analysis reveals that articles with higher contextualization in *what* or *how* are cited more frequently, and those with combined high contextualization in *what*, *how*, and *why* garner the most citations.

Scientific progress requires tensions between old understandings and new directions (Kuhn, 1996; March, 2005). ‘A multidisciplinary, multinational and multi-lingual association of scholars’ (March, 2005: 5) should strive to promote deep mutual cross-disciplinary, cross-national, and cross-lingual conversation and understandings (Huff, 1999). Contributing theory to the academic conversation not only refines and extends knowledge developed from the dominant context, currently ‘Western hegemony’ (March, 2005: 7), to novel contexts, but also develops novel context-specific concepts (*what*), relationships (*how*), and logics (*why*) from novel contexts. However, contextualization research aims to provide reliable knowledge that makes research cumulative rather than to proliferate weak or false theory (Tsang & Kwan, 1999); metaphorically, to avoid using new bottles for dispensing old wine (Spell, 2001). To be qualified as reliable knowledge, any novel context-emerging concepts, relationships, and logics should not only render clear and distinctive phenomena about the context, but also should describe and explain the phenomena within or even beyond the context in a way that outperforms existing concepts, relationships, and logics (Pfeffer, 1993; Spell, 2001). We find that articles from the leading journals and from *MOR* failed to replicate the relationships found in the context-free study (See Panel A in Table 3. No articles were coded as the lowest degree of contextualization in *how*.) This conforms to Davis’s (1971) interestingness [‘interesting theories deny certain assumptions of their audience’ (209)], and Whetten’s (1989) theoretical merit [‘new setting suggests the theory shouldn’t work under those conditions’ (493)].

Although Colquitt and Zapata-Phelan’s taxonomy shows that over the last three decades China-context research contributed theoretically and increasingly in the areas of theory-building and theory-testing, Chinese contexts generated few new concepts and theoretical logics. Rather, most research refined and extended existing work. One reason could be that context-specific concepts or logics are objectively rare. Another reason may be that leading journals and *MOR* have rigorous standards based on the existing research paradigm (Tsui, 2009), which may exclude publication of totally new concepts and logics. This calls for contextualization studies to use relevant and rigorous methods to identify and develop new ideas. In addition to the hypothetic-deductive approach to build theory, scholars can use observations, for example, case studies, grounded theory, and ethnography, to generate theory through inductive reasoning (Colquitt & Zapata-Phelan, 2007). Among the 259 empirical articles from six leading journals, we find only one study that used an inductive approach. Venkatraman and Nelson (2008) employed the qualitative research methodology of photo-elicitation with in-depth interviews to explore how

young, urban Chinese consumers transformed the iconic global brand Starbucks into a consumption-scape by enacting personally meaningful experiences, roles, and identities in the setting. Li (2011: 12) advocated ‘to adopt more inductive and synthesis-based qualitative methods to build novel constructs and theories at the early stage of indigenous research’. To develop clear and value-added concepts and logics from Chinese contexts, we encourage scholars to leave the ivory tower and ‘go and get the seat of your pants dirty in real research’ to experience ‘deep knowledge of the phenomena’ (Park quoted in Bulmer, 1994: 97) and then to ‘develop insight about the nature of the phenomena’ (9). These ventures will fulfill the ideals of theoretical contribution and, from a practical perspective, enhance academic reputations.

Limitations

Our study has some limitations. First, we treat the three elements in our model equally and weigh each component the same. Contextualization in *why* – developing context-emerging or context-specific logics – might be most difficult because it ‘requires an in-depth knowledge of the context’ (Tsui, 2006: 3). Second, our model captures only articles dealing with the three components and thus shares limitations with Colquitt and Zapata-Phelan’s (2007: 1283) model in that ‘it does not capture *how well they actually do it*’ (original italics). However, by their publication in the leading top journals, we can assume that these studies should be well done. Third, we focus on six leading journals and *MOR*, and sample articles related to strategic management, international business, organizational theory, human resources management, and organizational behaviour, which limits our ability to generalize our findings to other domains of Chinese management such as marketing, finance, or accounting. Therefore, further research should expand samples to more journals and other management areas.

Contributions

Despite limitations, our study contributes to current discussions on contextualized research. First, we establish a model to evaluate the theoretical merits of empirical studies from the context-emic perspective. Distinguishing from Colquitt and Zapata-Phelan’s (2007) taxonomy of theory-building and theory-testing, which was built from the perspective of ‘a core establishment’ (currently North American hegemony), our model focuses on theoretical contributions from peripheral challengers such as China. Inspecting theoretical contributions from the periphery will advance management and organization science by driving the research community to ‘optimal allocation of effort between exploitation and exploration’ (March, 2005: 8). Global management science will stagnate under the status quo, the heavy reliance on existing management theories, and the reluctance to offer new

concepts, relationships, or logics. Research health requires mutual understanding that includes the core establishment and peripheral challengers. To that end, the International Association for Chinese Management Research and *MOR* promote contextualization research and mutual understanding. Additionally, as our results (Table 7) show, our evaluation model uniquely explains citation variances. Therefore, we encourage scholars who see the value of contexts outside the current hegemony to conduct contextualized studies for the sake of scientific advancement.

Second, we present a systematic and novel approach along dimensions of *what*, *how*, and *why* as different aspects of contextualization in management research. This may be a useful model for evaluating the status of management research in other emerging contexts. For example, Rodrigues, Duarte, and de Padua Carrieri (2012) showed that Brazilian management research faces similar challenges. However, this model is useful only when a field has accumulated enough research for such a systematic evaluation. Researchers have debated ways to conduct contextualized studies. Rousseau and Fried (2001) suggested a three-tiered approach that includes rich description, direct observation, analysis of contextual effects, and comparative studies. Whetten (2009) proposed that researchers should make the novel appear familiar and the familiar appear novel, and should contribute theoretically by contextualizing theory and theorizing about context. Tsui (2006) offered guidelines for choosing phenomena and developing theories, methods, and measurement. And Li (2011) discussed three major procedures, that is, micro-emic, macro-emic, and macro-geocentric, for indigenous research. Our approach clearly and concisely integrates elements of concepts and measurement (*what*), phenomena (*what* and *how*), and logics (*why*).

CONCLUSION

This study indicts the status quo of Chinese management research that has homogeneously relied on Western models during the last three decades. Fortunately, as measured by article citations, our analyses reveal that separate or joint contextualizations in *what*, *how*, and *why* positively impact research, as measured by citation counts. We urge researchers to conduct contextualized studies that will both contribute novel insights and enhance academic reputations. More importantly, such studies will produce new knowledge that fills a void in global management research. Although *MOR* is in its infancy, it is significantly advancing Chinese contextualization research and enhancing the global conversation regarding management in the Chinese context.

NOTES

We are greatly indebted to the editor, Professor Anne Tsui, and two anonymous reviewers for their input and support in developing the manuscript, especially to Max Boisot. He was one of the most

distinguished pioneers of Chinese management research. We acknowledge constructive comments from Yan Jiang, Xue Yang, and Yi Tang on earlier versions. A grant from the Fudan Premium Fund of Management and from the National Science Foundation of China (NSFC grant no. 70872045; no. 70902080) supported this study. The authors are responsible, however, for conclusions and views, which may not necessarily represent those of the sponsors.

- [1] As an exception, recently, Li (2011) developed a local-oriented typology of indigenous research along the dimension of exploitation-exploration research methods and the dimension of unilateral-bilateral impact of either a borrowed or local perspective on research content.
- [2] We omitted *Academy of Management Review* because the journal published only two articles related to Chinese phenomena during the last 30 years; one in 1981, the other in 1996.
- [3] The criterion automatically disqualifies *MOR* although it has published primarily Chinese management research since it started in 2005.
- [4] The list of studies included in our analyses is available from the first author upon request.

REFERENCES

- *Adler, N. J., Brahm, R., & Graham, J. 1992. Strategy implementation: A comparison of face-to-face negotiations in the People's Republic of China and the United States. *Strategic Management Journal*, 13(6): 449–466.
- *Bachrach, D. G., Wang, H., Bendoly, E., & Zhang, S. 2007. Importance of organization citizenship behaviour for overall performance evaluation: Comparing the role of task interdependence in China and the USA. *Management and Organization Review*, 3(2): 255–276.
- Barney, J. B., & Zhang, S. J. 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.
- Batjargal, B. 2007. Network triads: Transitivity, referral and venture capital decisions in China and Russia. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 38(6): 998–1012.
- *Batjargal, B., & Liu, M. 2004. Entrepreneur's access to private equity in China: The role of social capital. *Organization Science Special Issue on China*, 15(2): 159–172.
- Behling, O., & Law, K. S. 2000. *Translating questionnaires and other research instruments: Problems and solutions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Blau, P. M. 1964. *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: Wiley.
- Bliese, P. D. 2000. Within-group agreement, non-independence, and reliability: Implications for data aggregation and analysis. In K. J. Klein & S. W. J. Kozlowski (Eds.), *Multilevel theory, research, and methods in organizations: Foundations, extensions, and new directions*: 349–381. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- *Boisot, M., & Child, J. 1996. From fiefs to clans and network capitalism: Explaining China's emerging economic order. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41(4): 600–628.
- Brislin, R. W. 1981. Translation and content analysis of oral and written material. In H. C. Triandis & J. W. Berry (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology*, vol. 1: 389–444. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- *Bruton, G. D., Ahlstrom, D., & Wan, J. C. C. 2003. Turnaround in East Asian firms: Evidence from ethnic overseas Chinese communities. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24(6): 519–540.
- *Buckley, P., Clegg, J., & Wang, C. 2002. The impacts of FDI on the performance of Chinese manufacturing firms. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 33(4): 637–655.
- *Buckley, P. J., Clegg, J., & Wang, C. 2007. Is the relationship between inward FDI and spillover effects linear? An empirical examination of the case of China. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 38(3): 447–459.
- Bulmer, M. 1984. *The Chicago school of sociology: Institutionalization, diversity, and the rise of sociological research*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Burt, R. S. 1992. *Structural holes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Campbell, J. P. 1990. The role of theory in industrial and organizational psychology. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*, vol. 1: 39–73. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- *Chen, C. C., Chen, Y. R., & Xin, K. 2004. *Guanxi* practices and trust in management: A procedural justice perspective. *Organization Science*, 15(2): 200–209.

- Chen, M. J. 2002. Transcending paradox: The Chinese 'middle way' perspective. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 19(2–3): 179–199.
- *Chen, W. H. 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., Lam, S. S. K., Naumann, S. E., Schaubroeck, J. 2005. Group citizenship behaviour: Conceptualization and preliminary tests of its antecedents and consequences. *Management and Organization Review*, 1(2): 273–300.
- *Chen, X. P., & Li, S. 2005. Cross-national differences in cooperative decision-making in mixed-motive business contexts: The mediating effect of vertical and horizontal individualism. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 36(6): 622–636.
- *Chen, X. P., & Peng, S. Q. 2008. *Guanxi* dynamics: Shifts in the closeness of ties between Chinese coworkers. *Management and Organization Review*, 4(1): 63–80.
- *Chen, X. P., Xie, X. F., & Chang, S. Q. 2011. Cooperative and competitive orientation among Chinese people: Scale development and validation. *Management and Organization Review*, 7(2): 353–379.
- *Chen, Y., Friedman, R., Yu, E., Fang, W. H., & Lu, X. P. 2009. Supervisor–subordinate *guanxi*: Developing a three-dimensional model and scale. *Management and Organization Review*, 5(3): 375–399.
- *Chen, Z. X., & Aryee, S. 2007. Delegation and employee work outcomes: An examination of cultural context of mediating processes in China. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(1): 226–238.
- *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. 1972. Organizational structure, environment and performance: The role of strategic choice. *Sociology*, 6(1): 1–22.
- *Choi, J., & Chen, C. C. 2006. Gender differences in perceived work demands, family demands, and life stress among married Chinese employees. *Management and Organization Review*, 2(2): 209–229.
- *Chua, R. Y. J., Morris, M. W., & Ingram, P. 2009. *Guanxi* versus networking: Distinctive configurations of affect- and cognition-based trust in the networks of Chinese and American managers. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 40(3): 490–508.
- Colquitt, J. A., & Zapata-Phelan, C. P. 2007. Trends in theory building and theory testing: A five-decade study of the *Academy of Management Journal*. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(6): 1281–1303.
- *Cooke, F. L. 2008. Enterprise culture management in China: Insiders' perspective. *Management and Organization Review*, 4(2): 291–314.
- *Davies, H., & Walters, P. 2004. Emergent patterns of strategy, environment and performance in a transition economy. *Strategic Management Journal*, 25(4): 347–364.
- Davis, M. S. 1971. That's interesting! Towards a phenomenology of sociology and a sociology of phenomenology. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 1(4): 309–344.
- *Earley, P. C. 1989. Social loafing and collectivism: A comparison of the United States and the People's Republic of China. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39(1): 89–117.
- *Earley, P. C. 1993. East meets West meets Mideast: Further explorations of collective and individualistic work groups. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(3): 319–348.
- *Earley, P. C. 1994. Self or group? Cultural effects of training on self-efficacy and performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39(1): 89–117.
- *Farh, J. L., Earley, P. C., & Lin, S. C. 1997. Impetus for action: A cultural analysis of justice and organizational citizenship behavior in Chinese society. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42(3): 421–444.
- *Farh, J. L., Hackett, R. D., & Liang, J. 2007. Individual-level cultural values as moderators of perceived organizational support–employee outcomes relationships: Comparing the effects of power distance and traditionalism. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50: 715–729.
- *Farh, J. L., Tsui, A. S., Xin, K., & Cheng, B. S. 1998. The influence of relational demography and *guanxi*: The Chinese case. *Organization Science*, 9(4): 471–488.
- *Farh, J. L., Zong, C. B., & Organ, D. W. 2004. Organizational citizenship behavior in the People's Republic of China. *Organizational Science*, 15(2): 241–253.

- Fei, H. T. 1948. *Peasant life in China*. London: Routledge & Kegan.
- *Friedman, R., Chi, S. C., & Liu, L. A. 2006. An expectancy model of Chinese-American differences in conflict-avoiding. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37(1): 76–91.
- *Friedman, R., Liu, W., Chen, C. C., & Chi, S. S. 2007. Causal attributions for inter-firm contract violation: A comparative study of Chinese and American commercial arbitrators. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(3): 856–864.
- *Giacobbe-Miller, J. K., Miller, D. J., & Victorov, V. I. 1998. A comparison of Russian and U.S. pay allocation decisions, distributive justice judgments, and productivity under different payment conditions. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 43(4): 389–406.
- *Giacobbe-Miller, J. K., Miller, D. J., Zhang, W., & Victorov, V. I. 2003. Country and organizational-level adaptation to foreign workplace ideologies: A comparative study of distributive justice values in China, Russia and the United States. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 34(4): 389–406.
- Granovetter, M. 1973. The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 78(6): 1360–1380.
- *Hornig, C., & Chen, W. 2008. From contract manufacturing to own brand management: The role of learning and cultural heritage identity. *Management and Organization Review*, 4(1): 109–133.
- Huff, A. S. 1999. *Writing for scholarly publication*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- *Hui, C., Lee, C., & Rousseau, D. M. 2004. Organization versus relationships in China: Is organizational support distinguishable from personal relations with one's manager? *Organization Science*, 15(2): 232–240.
- *Hui, C., Lee, C., & Rousseau, D. M. 2004. Psychological contract and organizational citizenship behaviors in China: Exploring generalizability and instrumentality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(2): 311–321.
- Hwang, K. K. 1987. Face and favor: The Chinese power game. *American Journal of Sociology*, 92(4): 944–974.
- *Kelley, L., Whatley, A., & Worthley, R. 1987. Assessing the effects of culture on managerial attitudes: A three-culture test. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 18(2): 17–31.
- Kerlinger, F. N., & Lee, H. B. 2000. *Foundations of behavioral research*. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt.
- Kuhn, T. S. 1996. *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- *Lau, V. P., Shaffer, M. A., & Au, K. 2007. Entrepreneurial career success from a Chinese perspective: Conceptualization, operationalization, and validation. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 38(1): 126–146.
- *Law, K. S., Wong, C. S., & Song, L. J. 2004. The construct and criterion validity of emotional intelligence and its potential utility for management studies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(3): 483–496.
- *Lee, K. H., Yang, G., & Graham, J. L. 2006. Tension and trust in international business negotiations: American executives negotiating with Chinese executives. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37(5): 623–641.
- *Leung, K. 2007. The glory and tyranny of citation impact: An East Asian perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(3): 510–513.
- *Leung, K., Koch, P. T., & Lu, L. 2002. A dualistic model of harmony and its implications for conflict management in Asia. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 19(2–3): 201–220.
- *Li, H., & Atuahene-Gima, K. 2001. Product innovation strategy and the performance of new technology ventures in China. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(6): 1123–1134.
- *Li, H., & Zhang, Y. 2007. The role of managers' political networking and functional experience in new venture performance: Evidence from China's transition economy. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(8): 791–804.
- *Li, J. J., Poppo, L., & Zhou, K. J. 2008. Do managerial ties in China always produce value? Competition, uncertainty, and domestic vs. foreign firms. *Strategic Management Journal*, 29(4): 383–400.
- *Li, J. T., & Tang, Y. 2010. CEO hubris and firm risk taking in China: The moderating role of managerial discretion. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(1): 45–68.

- Li, J. T., & Tsui, A. S. 2002. A citation analysis of management and organization research in the Chinese context: 1984–1999. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 19(1): 87–107.
- *Li, J., Zhou, C., & Zajac, E. J. 2009. Control, collaboration, and productivity in international joint ventures: Theory and evidence. *Strategic Management Journal*, 30(8): 865–884.
- Li, P. P. 2011. Toward an integrative framework of indigenous research: The geocentric implications of Yin-Yang Balance. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, forthcoming.
- Liden, R. C., Sparrowe, R. T., & Wayne, S. J. 1997. Leader-member exchange theory: The past and potential for the future. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 15: 47–119.
- Lin, N. 2002. *Social capital: A theory of social structure and action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- *Lin, Z., Peng, M., Yang, H., & Sun, L. 2009. How do networks and learning drive M&A's? An institutional comparison between China and America. *Strategic Management Journal*, 30(10): 1113–1132.
- *Liu, L. A., Friedman, R., & Chi, S. 2005. 'RenQing' versus the 'Big 5': The need for culturally sensitive measures of individual differences in negotiations. *Management and Organization Review*, 1(2): 225–247.
- Liu, Y. S., Lin, W.-T., & Cheng, K.-Y. 2011. Family ownership and the international involvement of Taiwan's high-technology firms: The moderating effect of high-discretion organizational slack. *Management and Organization Review*, 7(2): 201–222.
- *Luk, C. L., Yau, O. H. M., Sin, L. Y. M., Tse, A. C. B., Chow, R. P. M., & Lee, J. S. Y. 2008. The effects of social capital and organizational innovativeness in different institutional contexts. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 39(4): 589–612.
- *Luo, J. D. 2005. Particularistic trust and general trust: A network analysis in Chinese organizations. *Management and Organization Review*, 1(3): 437–458.
- Luo, J. D. 2011. *Guanxi* revisited: An exploratory study of familiar ties in a Chinese workplace. *Management and Organization Review*, 7(2): 329–351.
- *Luo, X., & Chung, C. 2005. Keeping it all in the family: The role of particularistic relationships in business group performance during institutional transition. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50(3): 404–439.
- *Luo, Y. D. 2003. Market-seeking MNEs in an emerging market: How parent-subsidiary links shape overseas success. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 34(3): 290–309.
- *Luo, Y. D. 2005. Transactional characteristics, institutional environment and joint venture contracts. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 36(2): 209–230.
- *Luo, Y. D. 2007. Are joint venture partners more opportunistic in a more volatile environment? *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(1): 39–60.
- 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., Williams, K. Y., Leung, K., Larrick, R., Mendoza, M. T., Bhatnagar, D., Li, J. F., Kondo, M., Luo, J. L., & Hu, J. C. 1998. Conflict management style: Accounting for cross-national differences. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 29(4): 729–747.
- *Nee, V. 1992. Organizational dynamics of market transition: Hybrid forms, property rights, and mixed economy in China. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 37(1): 1–27.
- *Park, S. H., & Luo, Y. D. 2001. *Guanxi* and organizational dynamics: Organizational networking in Chinese firms. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22(5): 455–477.
- Peng, M. W., Lu, Y., Shenkar, O., & Wang, D. Y. L. 2001. Treasures in the China house: A review of management and organizational research on Greater China. *Journal of Business Research*, 52(2): 95–110.
- *Peng, M. W., Zhang, S. & Li, X. 2007. CEO duality and firm performance during China's institutional transitions. *Management and Organization Review*, 3(2): 205–225.
- Pfeffer, J. 1993. Barriers to the advance of organizational science: Paradigm development as a dependent variable. *Academy of Management Review*, 18(4): 599–620.
- Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. R. 1978. *The external control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective*. New York: Harper & Row.

- *Ralston, D. A., Gustafson, D. J., Cheung, E., & Terpstra, R. H. 1993. Differences in managerial values: A study of U.S., Hong Kong and PRC managers. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 24(2): 249–275.
- *Ralston, D. A., Egri, C. P., Stewart, S., Terpstra, R. H., & Yu, K. C. 1999. Doing business in the 21st century with the new generation of Chinese manager: A study of generational shifts in work values in China. *Journal of International Business*, 30(2): 415–428.
- Redding, S. G. 1990. *The spirit of Chinese capitalism*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Rodrigues, S. B., Gonzalez Duarte, R., & de Padua Carrieri, A. 2012. Indigenous or imported knowledge in Brazilian management studies: A quest for legitimacy? *Management and Organization Review*, 8(1): 211–232.
- Rousseau, D. M., & Fried, Y. 2001. Location, location, location: Contextualizing organizational research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 22(1): 1–13.
- *Schaubroeck, J., Lam, S. S. K., & Cha, S. E. 2007. Embracing transformational leadership: Team values and the impact of leader behavior on team performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4): 1020–1030.
- *Schaubroeck, J., Lam, S. S. K., Xie, J.-L. 2000. Collective efficacy versus self-efficacy in coping responses to stressors and control: A cross-cultural study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(4): 512–525.
- Schwab, D. P. 2005. *Research methods for organizational studies*. Manwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Seers, A. 1989. Team-member exchange quality: A new construct for role-making research. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 43(1): 118–135.
- *Shenkar, O., & Ronen, S. 1987. The structure and importance of work goals among managers in the People's Republic of China. *Academy of Management Journal*, 30(3): 564–576.
- Spell, C. S. 2001. Management fashions: Where do they come from, and are they old wine in new bottles. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 10(4): 358–373.
- *Su, C., Yang, Z., Zhuang, G., Zhou, N., & Dou, W. Y. 2009. Interpersonal influence as an alternative channel communication behavior in emerging markets: The case of China. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 40(4): 668–689.
- Sutton, R. I., & Staw, B. M. 1995. What theory is not. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40(3): 371–384.
- Tahai, A., & Meyer, M. J. 1999. A revealed preference study of management journals' direct influences. *Strategic Management Journal*, 20(3): 276–296.
- *Thomas D. C., & Au, K. 2002. The effect of cultural differences on behavioral responses to low job satisfaction. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 33(2): 309–326.
- *Tinsley, C. A., & Pillutla, M. M. 1998. Negotiating in the United States and Hong Kong. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 29(4): 711–727.
- Tsang, E. W. K., & Kwan, K.-M. 1999. Replication and theory development in organizational science: A critical realist perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(4): 759–780.
- *Tse, D. K., Francis, J., & Walls, J. 1994. Cultural differences in conducting intra- and inter-cultural negotiations: A Sino-Canadian comparison. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 25(3): 537–555.
- 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. 2009. Autonomy of inquiry: Shaping the future of emerging scientific communities. *Management and Organization Review*, 5(1): 1–14.
- Tsui, A. S., Schoonhoven, C. B., Meyer, M. W., Lau, C. M., & Milkovich, G. T. 2004. Organization and management in the midst of societal transformation: The People's Republic of China. *Organization Science*, 15(2): 133–144.
- *Tsui, A. S., Wang, H., & Xin, K. R. 2006. Organizational culture in China: An analysis of culture dimensions and culture types. *Management and Organization Review*, 2(3): 345–376.
- *Venkatraman, M., & Nelson, T. 2008. From servicescape to consumptionscape: A photo-elicitation study of Starbucks in the New China. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 39(6): 1010–1026.

- *Wan, W. P., & Yiu, D. W. 2009. From crisis to opportunity: Environmental jolt, corporate acquisitions, and firm performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 30(7): 791–801.
- Wang, H., Law, K. S., Hackett, R. D., Wang, D., & Chen, Z. X. 2005. Leader-member exchange as a mediator of the relationship between transformational leadership and followers' performance and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(3): 420–432.
- *Weber, E. U., Ames, D. R., Blais, A.-R. 2005. 'How do I choose thee? Let me count the ways': A textual analysis of similarities and differences in modes of decision-making in China and the United States. *Management and Organization Review*, 1(1): 87–118.
- Whetten, D. A. 1989. What constitutes a theoretical contribution? *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4): 490–495.
- 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, J. B., Hom, P. W., Tetrick, L. E., Shore, L. M., Jia, L., Li, C., & Song, L. J. 2006. The norm of reciprocity: Scale development and validation in the Chinese context. *Management and Organization Review*, 2(3): 377–402.
- *Xiao, Z. X., & Bjorkman, I. 2006. High commitment work systems in Chinese organizations: A preliminary measure. *Management and Organization Review*, 2(3): 403–422.
- *Xiao, Z. X., & Tsui, A. S. 2007. When brokers may not work: The cultural contingency of social capital in Chinese high-tech firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 52(1): 1–31.
- *Xie, J. L., Schaubroeck, J., & Lam, S. S. K. 2008. Theories of job stress and the role of traditional values: A longitudinal study in China. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(4): 831–848.
- *Xin, K. R., & Pearce, J. L. 1996. *Guanxi*: Connections as substitutes for formal institutional support. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(6): 1641–1658.
- *Yang, N., Chen, C. C., Choi, J., & Zou, Y. 2000. Sources of work-family conflict: A Sino-U.S. comparison of the effects of work demands. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(1): 113–123.
- *Yiu, D. W., Lau, C.-M., & Bruton, G. D. 2007. International venturing by emerging economy firms: The effects of firm capabilities, home country networks, and corporate entrepreneurship. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 38(4): 519–540.
- *Zhang, Y., Li, H., Hitt, M., & Cui, G. 2007. R&D intensity and performance of international joint ventures in an emerging market: Moderating effects of market focus and ownership structure. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 38(6): 944–960.
- *Zhou, K. Z., & Poppo, L. 2010. Exchange hazards, relational reliability, and contracts in China: The contingent role of legal enforceability. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 41(5): 861–881.
- Zhou, K. Z., Tse, D. K., & Li, J. 2006. Organizational change in emerging economies: Drivers and consequences. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37(2): 248–263.
- *Zhou, L. X., Wu, W. P., & Luo, X. M. 2007. Internationalization and the performance of born-global SMEs: The mediating role of social networks. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 38(4): 673–690.

Liangding Jia (jldyxlzs@nju.edu.cn) is a Professor of Management at the School of Management, Nanjing University. He earned his Ph.D. at Nanjing University. His research focuses on the Chinese context regarding employment relationships and employee creativity, CEO values and organizational culture, and top management team and firm strategy. Two of his studies were included in the Best Paper Proceedings of the 69th and 71st Annual Meetings of the Academy of Management.

Shuyang You (youshuyang008@163.com) is a Ph.D. candidate at the School of Management, Nanjing University. His research interests include institutional change processes, Chinese contextualization research, and business strategic management.

Yunzhou Du (duyunzhou_2000@sina.com) is an Associate Professor of Management at the School of Management, Anhui University of Finance & Economics. He earned his Ph.D. at Nankai University. His research interests include entrepreneurship and international business.

Manuscript received: March 31, 2011
Final version accepted: December 22, 2011
Accepted by: Anne S. Tsui