经济转型期中国人力资源管理研究丛书

企业人力资源管理研究

——新发展、复杂性与绩效管理

Research on Enterprise Human Resource Management:

New Development, Complexity and Performance Management

赵曙明 刘洪 编著

南京大学出版社

经济转型期中国人力资源管理研究丛

企业人力资源管理研究

——新发展、复杂性与绩效管理

赵曙明 刘洪 编著

南京大学出版社

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

企业人力资源管理研究. 新发展、复杂性与绩效管理/赵曙明,刘洪编著. — 南京 :南京大学出版社,2014.2
(经济转型期中国人力资源管理研究丛书)
ISBN 978-7-305-12803-5

Ⅰ. ①企… Ⅱ. ①赵… Ⅲ. ①企业管理—人力资源管理—研究—中国 Ⅳ. ①F279.23

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2013)第 318798 号

出版发行 南京大学出版社
社 址 南京市汉口路 22 号 邮 编 210093
网 址 http://www.NjupCo.com
出 版 人 左 健

丛 书 名 经济转型期中国人力资源管理研究丛书
书 名 企业人力资源管理研究——新发展、复杂性与绩效管理
编 著 赵曙明 刘 洪
责任编辑 周建波 唐甜甜 编辑热线 025-83594087

照 排 南京南琳图文制作有限公司
印 刷 扬中市印刷有限公司
开 本 787 mm×1092 mm 1/16 印张 31.5 字数 850 千
版 次 2014 年 2 月第 1 版 2014 年 2 月第 1 次印刷
ISBN 978-7-305-12803-5
定 价 120.00 元

发行热线 025-83594756
电子邮箱 Press@NjupCo.com
Sales@NjupCo.com(市场部)

前 言

近年来，很多专家和学者都呼吁，我国的管理科学研究要能够做到“顶天立地”。何谓“顶天”？就是要能够掌握规范的研究方法，把握科学发展的国际前沿，从而推进科研成果的国际化；何谓“立地”？就是要尽可能从我国的具体的管理实践中提炼出有研究价值的科学问题，在进行理论创新和升华的同时，尽可能地运用这些新的理论来指导解决中国的实践问题。因此，“好的”管理研究，一定是能够同时推动理论和实践的发展。

因此，在逐步引进国外先进人力资源管理理念和方法的同时，我们也一直致力于对中国人力资源管理的现实问题的研究。目前我国经济体制还处于计划经济向市场经济的转型时期。经济转型导致了宏观经济中资源配置方式、经济增长方式的变化。经济转型对我国传统的企业管理理论和方法都产生了重要的影响。企业人力资源管理受旧体制影响很深，同时对企业的改革影响巨大、牵动社会面较广。由于经济社会的转型，使得我国人力资源管理无论在理论研究层面上，还是在管理实践层面上，都还存在着诸多值得进一步思考和探讨的课题。现在我国企业学习和应用的人力资源管理理论与方法大多来自西方发达的资本主义国家。西方人力资源管理理论对于我国企业的适应性是理论和实践界一直关注的问题。在引入并借鉴发达国家的人力资源管理实践经验的同时，我们还要创建适合中国转型经济特点和发展趋势的“本土化”的人力资源管理理论和方法。在我国经济转型过程中，人力资源管理的职能、手段所依赖的社会、文化、技术背景和企业制度都发生了演变，企业必须根据转型经济需要、结合中国特色重视和解决若干现实的人力资源管理问题。

2008 年 1 月到 2011 年 11 月期间，我主持完成了国家自然科学基金的重点项目：《转型经济下我国企业人力资源管理若干问题研究》(项目编号：70732002)。本项目结合我国经济转型的特征、内容和演变路径，对转型经济下我国企业人力资源管理理论与方法进行理论与实证研究。期间，我们的团队的研究形成了三百多篇高质量的研究论文。现在我们拟在对这些论文进行整理、汇编的基础上，结集出版《企业人力资源管理研究——新发展、复杂性与绩效管理》和《企业人力资源管理研究——组织文化、创新与国际化》两本书。在《企业人力资源管理研究——新发展、

复杂性与绩效管理》一书中，主要包括了我和刘洪教授的研究成果，对转型经济下我国企业人力资源管理的新发展、绩效管理、复杂性与适应性等问题做了大量的研究分析。

一、人力资源管理新发展

近年来，在多元全球化、全球经济危机和低碳化经济的影响下，企业的经营环境呈现高度的动态性、复杂性与不确定性特征，这就要求人力资源管理理论对变化了的环境做出相应的反应。高胜任素质、高积极性和高协作性的员工能力开发已成为企业获取持续竞争优势的源泉。战略人力资源管理的核心在于培养员工的高素质、高协作性与高积极性。高素质的员工能提高组织的人力资本；高协作性的员工有助于拓宽组织的社会资本；积极主动的员工具有更强的心理资本。组织通过运用高绩效的人力资源管理政策和实践来帮助员工提升素质，提高协作能力，培养积极主动性，最终实现竞争优势。

这一部分，我们从企业继任者、雇佣保障、组织承诺、社会交换和心理授权等方面对人力资源管理在中国的新发展进行了探讨，为转型经济背景下企业构建和谐的雇佣关系，开发和管理高胜任素质、高积极性和高协作性的人力资源和变革原有的人力资源管理体系提供了理论建议。

二、绩效管理

在转型经济下，要提高人力资源管理系统的绩效，必须要尊重制度的人力资源管理理念、人力资源管理高度信息化、组织内部信息的有效沟通、稳定而高效的职业经理团队、利益分享的企业价值观、人力资源管理的战略地位、高度重视企业内部培训等实践对案例企业具有重要的贡献价值，表现出高绩效的特征。

在第二部分中，我们就对企业的组织和员工绩效造成影响的各种因素进行了分析，并提供了具有可操作性的建议，包括：雇佣保障、领导—成员关系、员工的程序公平感知、情感承诺、心理契约等方面。提升员工对组织的承诺，从而使其在组织中实现良好的心理契约状态，并且积极地开发其心理资本，将有助于提高个人及组织的整体绩效。企业要能够积极地通过以下手段提升团队绩效：提升团队成员个体情商，增强成员的内驱力；构建团队心理契约，强化团队目标聚焦力；健全角色管理机制，提高团队分工协作效率；建立有效的沟通机制，营造和谐组织氛围。这些建议都有助于提高企业、团队和员工的绩效，推动企业的发展。

三、组织复杂性和适应性

现代经济的最大特征是知识经济，这给中国企业提出了许多新的要求，人力资源管理的发展也要相应地适应这些新要求。只有系统性地提高人力资源管理实践的适应性，才能有效提高组织有效性，才能对人力资源管理进行转变以适应不断变化的环境。在转型经济中，危机的发生是任何企业不可避免的难题。危机时期，企业迫切需要提高自身应对危机的能力，使企业不断变革、发展。伴随着我国经济转

型的深入，企业管理的各个方面都进行了适应性的转变，由于企业与环境之间的互动关系，伴随着社会经济复杂性提高，企业组织的行为与状态也变得愈加复杂起来，企业的多样性、相互关联性、模糊性、流动性等特性不断增强。由于转型经济的影响，组织要想长期生存与发展，其复杂性增加的速度应该高于所处环境的复杂性增加速度。我们从组织复杂性和适应性能力开发、企业新产品开发、组织即兴和员工的自我领导等方面做了探讨，为我国的企业更好地适应复杂多变的社会环境、为员工的成长提供了建议。

我们对本书所采用的论文进行了多次讨论，力争能够尽可能多地涵盖人力资源的各个方面，从而更加全面、真实、深入地呈现出转型经济背景下我国人力资源管理实践的变化。

然而，本书由于篇幅和研究内容的限制，并不能穷尽转型经济下我国人力资源管理所面对的所有问题。但是，我们相信，对这些问题的研究一定能够推动对转型经济下我国人力资源管理的了解和认识，并进一步推动人力资源管理理论在中国的发展。这种对中国管理实践的探索，不仅是理论的发展，还将推动我国企业的发展，为我国的经济建设提供理论支持，达到“顶天立地”的目的。

赵曙明

2013 年 5 月 28 日

于南京大学商学院安中大楼

目　录

第一部分　新发展

第二部分 绩效管理

第三部分 组织复杂性和有效性

第一部分

新发展

Learning by Doing: Emerging Paths of Chinese Management Research*

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

Practice is the sole criterion for testing truth.

Fuming Hu, Guangming Daily(1978)

1. Introduction

Since its economic reform and opening to the outside world in 1978 and especially following its entry into the World Trade Organization(WTO) in November 2003, China has made great progress in economic development, changing not only its economic system and structures, but also reorganizing and restructuring its Chinese enterprises. Prior to 1978, no management research was conducted in China. From 1978 through the early 1990s, Chinese management research began to emerge concurrent with the transformation from a planned economy to a market economy. During that period, some scholars trained in Western countries returned to China and conducted preliminary empirical studies, especially comparison studies, on Chinese organizations. For example, Zhao published a Sino-US comparative study exploring Chinese and American universities' governance structures (Zhao, 1990) and a book about human resource management in international business(Zhao, 1992). However, at this embryonic stage of development, most Chinese management research was not comparable with the development of management research outside of China, especially in North America and

* Shuming Zhao. , & Chunyan Jiang. 2012. Learning by Doing: Emerging Paths of Chinese Management Research. Management and Organization Review, 5(1): 107 - 119.

Europe. Unlike Western research, which was built upon a long history and foundation of studying organizations and the individuals working in them, Chinese management research was only in its beginning stage. Even though it has been more than thirty years since China first opened its doors and undertook its extensive economic reforms, active and serious management research, especially by Chinese scholars inside China, is still a relatively recent phenomenon.

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. Implications of Each Road for Chinese Scholars

2.1 A Debate Between the Two Roads

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

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

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

Third, it is unclear what types of scholars would be in the best position to pursue either type of research. One could argue that it is difficult for young researchers to publish papers on a Chinese theory of management owing to their inexperience. Young scholars also lack legitimacy in the Chinese culture where age is respected because it is a sign of wisdom. Therefore, young Chinese scholars are generally advised to focus their efforts on contributing to a theory of Chinese management. However, young minds are often more creative, and most of the influential theories in the Western management literature were developed by scholars during their doctoral and assistant professor periods(Smith & Hitt, 2006). Similarly, some interesting Chinese works also were introduced by Chinese scholars in their early careers, and they continue to refine these works over the years. Examples include Wei'an Li's Chinese index on corporate governance(e. g. , Li, 2002), Youmin Xi's harmony management theory(e. g. , Xi & Shang, 2002), and Shuming Zhao's unique Chinese characteristics of human resource management(e. g. , Zhao, 2001). Of course, there may also be other distinctions in determining who, between Chinese and non-Chinese scholars or Chinese versus non-Chinese educated scholars, is best positioned to pursue either type of research.

2.2 Interplay Between the Two Roads

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

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

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

Second, Whetten(2009) suggested that the scholar should 'manage the perception of what readers consider familiar and unfamiliar'. Since the 1990s, Chinese management scholars have become increasingly familiar with their Western counterparts, owing to the many young scholars who receive their train-ing from Western universities, to greater familiarity with publication requirements, and to participation in an intellectual atmosphere created by academic conferences such as the biennial conference of the IACMR(http://www.iacmr.org). This growing familiarity with Western research has enabled Chinese scholars to put their studies of Chinese phenomenon in the context of familiar Western literature, making these studies more internationally accessible and shedding new insight on established ideas. For example, Lau, Lu, Makino, Chen, and Yeh(2002) adopted Western theories such as social capital, absorptive capacity, and institution theory to examine the knowledge management of Chinese high-tech firms. Similarly, Fan, Lau, and Wu(2002) pointed out that agency theory has different implications in China, such as the performance effects of the duality of CEOs/Chairpersons, independent board directors, and incentive programs of external board directors. Su, Xu, and Phan(2008) provide corroborating evidence that principal-agent conflict can lead to high agency costs by examining the level of ownership concentration across Chinese companies listed on the Shanghai and Shenzhen stock exchanges during 1999—2003. Other scholars have examined the impact of social capital and social network on organizational structure and strategy(Li & Atuahene-Gima, 2001, 2002; Park & Luo, 2001; Peng & Health, 1996), the mindsets of the entrepreneur and entrepreneurial behavior, partner selection, the positive and negative effects of guanxi and trust(Bian, 1997), and the influences of institutional isomorphism and culture in international business researc(Chen, Peng & Saparito, 2002; Child & Tse, 2001; Xin & Pearce, 1996). Most Chinese management scholars, particularly young scholars, are now on the road to making the familiar appear novel by adding contextual moderators or changing the exist-ing relationships in current theories, thus, contributing directly to a theory of Chinese management.

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

There are two opportunities to alleviate this problematic asymmetry. The first is Western scholars' keen interest in China. Chinese management practices have attracted many Western management scholars, similar to the attention given to Japanese management practices twenty years ago. The concept of Theory Z(Ouchi, 1980) introduced Western management scholars to novel Japanese management practices. Likewise, there are many excellent Chinese firms such as Haier, Lenovo, and Huawei that deserve systematic study. The second opportunity to alleviate asymmetry lies in the efforts of Chinese management scholars. Some argue that unique Chinese management practices can only be understood well by insiders. Recent institutional developments in China, such as the revised faculty evaluation system, rise of new management journals, increasing number of aca-demic conferences, and research funds should make both the Chinese theory of management road and the path toward making the novel appear familiar more promising.

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

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

However, with increasing numbers of cross-context research teams, the follow-ing challenges should be borne in mind. Corresponding to the consideration that Chinese manufacturing(Made in China) should be upgraded to Chinese innova-tion (Innovated in China), Chinese management scholars should consider that their participation in cross-context research teams should evolve from primarily collecting data to participating constructively in the development of intellectual ideas. Chinese scholars should be more confident about contributing to the under-standing of Chinese management phenomena. They can provide complementary capabilities for the production of management knowledge. Such international collaboration research teams offer great promise for the development of a Chinese theory of management and a theory of Chinese management and for break-throughs on global management knowledge.

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

2.3 Toward the Road Less Travelled

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

What changes in the institutional environment would encourage high quality Chinese management research in general and the development of a Chinese theory of management in particular? At present, there are a variety of policies issued by all levels of governments and