WEST MEETS EAST: NEW CONCEPTS AND THEORIES
Author(s): HARRY G. BARKEMA, XIAO-PING CHEN, GERARD GEORGE, YADONG LUO and ANNE S. TSUI
Source: *The Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 58, No. 2 (April 2015), pp. 460-479
Published by: Academy of Management
Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/43589371
Accessed: 28-11-2021 13:17 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at https://about.jstor.org/terms

Academy of Management is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Academy of Management Journal*

This content downloaded from 210.35.162.31 on Sun, 28 Nov 2021 13:17:42 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

© Academy of Management Journal
2015, Vol. 58, No. 2, 460–479.
http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/amj.2015.4021

WEST MEETS EAST: NEW CONCEPTS AND THEORIES

HARRY G. BARKEMA
London School of Economics and Erasmus University

XIAO-PING CHEN
University of Washington

GERARD GEORGE
Singapore Management University

YADONG LUO
University of Miami

ANNE S. TSUI
University of Notre Dame, Peking University, Fudan University, and Shanghai Jiao Tong University

Management scholarship has grown tremendously over the past 60 years. Most of our paradigms originated from North America in the 1950s to the 1980s, inspired by the empirical phenomena and cultural, philosophical, and research traditions of the time. Here following, we highlight the contextual differences between the East and the West in terms of institutions, philosophies, and cultural values and how they are manifest in contemporary management practices. Inspired by theory development in management studies over time, we offer insights into the conditions facilitating new theories, and how these might apply to emergent theories from the East. We discuss the contributions of the six papers included in this special research forum as exemplars of integrating Eastern concepts and contexts to enrich existing management theories. We highlight the difficulty with testing Eastern constructs as distinct from Western ones by discussing the properties of equivalence, salience, and infusion in constructs. We provide directions for future research and encourage an agentic view to creating new theories and paradigms.

Our field of management scholarship has internationalized in many ways over the past decades, but its speed does not match that of today's globalized society. Of the 17,846 Academy of Management members, the United States still represents 54% of its membership, and only 18% of its members are based in institutions outside the "West" (North America and Europe; as of February 15, 2015), of which 9% have institutional affiliations in Asia. A similar pattern is seen in publication propensity, with 8% of the 943 authors of papers accepted for publication in the *Academy of Management Journal* (*AMJ*) during the preceding five-year period (2010–2014) being based in Asia, and coming almost exclusively from Hong Kong, China, and Singapore. Further, our perception of Asia has had a predominant mainland China locus, but with the emergent signs that other Asian countries or regions are now beginning to publish in the journal's pages as well, including India, Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan. Thus, we see it as important to consider a broader cognizance of Asia and its scholarly traditions and management practices. However, in one respect, the management field does not appear to be internationalizing successfully: in terms of tapping into new concepts and theories from these varied contexts. Although Asia is where most authors outside the West publishing in the *AMJ* were based, our knowledge about management and organizations in the East remains relatively limited or colorized with a Western lens.

In fact, there have been various calls to go beyond Western settings, and to tap into the empirical phe-

We gratefully acknowledge the generous support of the University of Washington for hosting a preparatory workshop for editors in Seattle and of the Sun Yat-Sen Business School for hosting a paper development workshop in Guangzhou for the editors and for contributors to this special research forum.

Copyright of the Academy of Management, all rights reserved. Contents may not be copied, emailed, posted to a listserv, or otherwise transmitted without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, or email articles for individual use only.

This content downloaded from 210.35.162.31 on Sun, 28 Nov 2021 13:17:42 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

nomena of the East and its cultural, philosophical, and broader intellectual tradition to create a richer, more robust field of management, in terms of understanding and managing organizations and behavior globally (e.g., Barkema, 2001; Tsui, 2007, 2009). However, despite a strong increase in studies using Asian data, this typically involved applications of existing Western theories rather than development of new theories. Most studies on Eastern cultures over the past decades have come from China. Yet, a detailed content analysis of the 259 articles involving Chinese samples published in the six leading management journals, including the *AMJ* (Jia, You, & Du, 2012), revealed only a few papers that discuss new phenomena: *guanxi* (Xin & Pearce, 1996), network capitalism (Boisot & Child, 1996), and market transition theory (Nee, 1992). This condition is not unique to scholarship from China. Our review of the literature from the East suggests that there is scant new theory or understanding about management in the Middle East, India, Singapore, Philippines, Indonesia, or other Eastern countries, particularly in our leading management journals. Without assuming that these Eastern contexts necessarily have unique management practices, the lack of attention is puzzling. What might explain this mystifying lack of attention toward identifying potentially unique management practices in new Eastern contexts but with long histories and deep cultural traditions? And how can we address it?

In this special research forum (SRF), we develop the case that "East" implies very different, and indeed a great variety of, contexts for organizations and individuals, in terms of institutions, philosophies, and cultures, and correspondingly different management practices as well. We discuss a range of management writings documenting these practices. We draw on insights from Colquitt and Zapata-Phelan's (2007) study identifying trends of theory development in management in the West. We observe that, despite the increasing emphasis in recent years that accepted papers should offer theoretical contributions, most contributions tend to be "in the neighborhood" of previous concepts and theories. We discuss early work that generated the new paradigms, theories, and concepts of the 1950s–1980s to identify conditions facilitating new theory development.

Then, we discuss how we aim to make a contribution to new theory development in the Eastern context through this SRF. We go on to discuss the contributions of the six papers in this SRF, in terms of the approaches and methodologies they use, and the new concepts and theories they suggest. This is followed by a discussion of the degree of novelty in terms of which new papers suggesting new concepts can be evaluated, introducing the terms "construct infusion," "construct equivalence," and "construct salience." We end with a discussion of conditions facilitating new theory development and phenomena-focused research, driven by observed empirical puzzles and management problems.

CONTEXTUAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE EAST AND THE WEST

A significant economic trend of our time is the rise of Asia in the world economy. After centuries of Western economic dominance, China, India, and the rest of the East, alongside emerging economies more broadly, are beginning to challenge the West for positions of global industry leadership and underlying managerial philosophies and perspectives. By 2030, Asia's economy is estimated to be larger than that of the United States and the European Union combined (National Intelligence Council's Global Trends Report, 2012). Asia is the world's largest and most populous continent, comprising more than 4.2 billion people (60% of the world population) living in 46 different countries or territories. It is the fastest-growing economic region and features some of the world's longest economic booms, starting from the Japanese "economic miracle" (1950–1990), the Miracle on the Han River (1961–1996) in South Korea, and the economic boom (1978–2013) in China.

East is not synonymous to, but, instead, a central part of, Asia. Although the societies are immensely mixed geographically (East Asia, Central Asia, North Asia, South Asia, Southeast Asia, and West Asia), politically and economically, they broadly share cultural values and philosophies. Further, there is great variation among nations, states, and regions within the Eastern context, but there are clear differences between the East overall and the West in terms of institutions, philosophies, and cultural values.

Institutions

Institutional environments, especially formal institutions, are extremely varied in Asia. Constitutional monarchies, absolute monarchies, one-party states, federal states, liberal democracies, and military dictatorships are all present in the region. India

This content downloaded from 210.35.162.31 on Sun, 28 Nov 2021 13:17:42 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

and Japan were among the first Asian countries to establish a Western-style democratic system. In China, Singapore, Indonesia, and Malaysia, the one-party system is still in relatively firm control, although facing pressure to change. South Korea (and several other nations or economies, such as Taiwan) has gone through the process of transformation to a democratic leadership. Overall, Asia has strong state control, which has been viewed as one of the key factors in promoting efficient social reforms and economic development (World Bank, 1993).

As a result, fast economic growth has been seen in mainland China, Singapore, Malaysia, Taiwan, South Korea, and Indonesia. In South Korea and mainland China, a large number of strong companies have been created with the help of state intervention. However, strong government control can bring potentially restrictive covenants, particularly a difficulty in maintaining an arm's-length relationship between business sectors and political leaders, which is responsible in part (with notable exceptions of Singapore and Hong Kong) for the rampant corruption, weak enforceability of law, and uncertainty in regulatory policies (Stiglitz & Yusuf, 2001). These institutional characteristics explain why Asian businesses immensely care about their relationships with governmental authorities. Among informal institutions, many Asian societies are relationship centered, being culturally rooted in Confucianism, which views people as relational beings. Governance by social relationships is still a strong force maintaining social order and stability (Luo, 2000). Many societal rules, values, and norms in Asia are derived from the relationship-centered pervasiveness, which explains why trust building, social capital, networks, relational governance, and reciprocity maintenance are critical in the East.

Philosophies

Given the complexity and volatility of the political and institutional environments of the East, a major source of stability is its deep-rooted cultural values, traditions, and philosophies that guide entrepreneurs and executives to lead, manage, and grow their businesses. The East is rich in the variety of philosophical traditions and religions. Confucianism is deeply rooted in Korea, Singapore, and Taiwan. Buddhism is practiced in Japan, Taiwan, Burma, and Thailand; Catholicism is dominant in the Philippines; and Islam in Indonesia, Malaysia, and much of the Middle East. Within China, there are five major schools of philosophy; four locally developed (Confucianism, Taoism, Legalism, and Militarism) and one imported (Buddhism).

An empirical study found that Chinese citizens cognitively combine Taoism and Buddhism due to the high level of similarity between their basic tenants (Pan, Rowney, & Peterson, 2012). Confucianism is an ethical and philosophical system, emphasizing that human beings are teachable, improvable, and perfectible through personal and communal endeavor, especially self-cultivation. Confucianism also teaches the importance of observing one's role in relation to others, and the need to be obedient to authority. Its emphasis on morality, benevolence, and authority forms the foundation of paternalistic leadership (Farh & Cheng, 2000), which was found to be prevalent among Chinese family firms operating in Taiwan and Southeast Asia (Redding, 1990).

Similar to Buddhism, Taoism favors philosophical anarchism, pluralism, and naturalism. Tao manifests itself through natural principles, including yin–yang duality, the circular nature of changes, natural courses of action, and harmony with internal and external environments. Its key tenants of mindfulness, compassion, a middle path, and interdependent causation have implications for leadership and management, though its passivity may be inconsistent with the extremely dynamic and competitive business terrain in the contemporary setting. Legalism has a philosophical view of the human being as dependent, disliking responsibility and pursuing self-interest. Legalism defines a system of detailed policies and rules to govern followers and the exercise and preservation of power by leaders. Legalism proposes rule by law and not the rule of law, in that the law covers everyone but the leader. There are clear reward and punishment systems applied equally to anyone who does not perform or breaks the laws. In an analysis of the leadership practices of 15 successful Chinese entrepreneurs, Ma and Tsui (2015) found legalism to be the most prevalent philosophy underlying their leadership and management practices, followed by Confucianism, and, lastly, Taoism.

Finally, *The Art of War*, written by the prominent military strategist and philosopher, Sun Tzu, articulated various components and tactics of militarism. This ancient text covers analysis of internal and external environments, strategic planning, positioning, and defensive and offensive strategies in various competitive scenarios. Militarism enlightens how to win battles but advocates how to estab-

This content downloaded from 210.35.162.31 on Sun, 28 Nov 2021 13:17:42 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

lish and cultivate relationships and partnerships. It further holds that knowledge is a greater weapon in battle than the pure force of strength. In the corporate world, many Japanese and Korean companies make Sun Tzu's book required reading for their key executives. The book is also popular among Western managers, who turn to it for inspiration on how to succeed in a competitive environment (e.g., McNeilly, 1996).

Cultural Values

Differences in cultural values between the East and the West are well-studied topics at the individual and team levels of analyses. Cross-cultural studies have shown significant differences in values, beliefs, and approaches to problem solving (e.g., Hall, 1989; Triandis, 1995), and these differences have proved to be persistent over time (Barkema & Vermeulen, 1997). Out of the long list of cultural values, individualism–collectivism and power distance may be considered the most prominent values that distinguish the East from the West, as they are at the core of how people view/deal with their relationship with others.

"Individualism–collectivism" refers to the extent to which people value individual versus pursue group interests and goals. For individualists, the self is an independent entity that has a set of unique characteristics. Self-interest and individual goals take priority over group interest and goals, and getting their own work done is more important than maintaining group harmony. For collectivists, their relationship with others is an integral part of the self. Fitting in with the group is more important than being unique; interpersonal harmony is of paramount importance, and group instead of individual interests and goals take precedence. There is robust research evidence that people from the East (e.g., China, Japan, Korea, India) are more collectivistic than are people in the West (e.g., United States, Canada, United Kingdom, the Netherlands) (Chen, Chen, & Meindl, 1998; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1995).

Collectivists also tend to make a sharp distinction between in-group and out-group members, which reflects particularism rather than universalism (Schwartz, 1992). Thus, Chinese people typically believe that it is acceptable to treat people differently depending on their relationship with oneself, whereas people in the United States tend to believe that it is only fair to treat everyone the same based on a set of principles or rules (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 2012). Based on differences in this belief, it follows that (a) the Chinese have low trust in strangers and need to develop *guanxi* (particularistic ties) before engaging in meaningful interactions, and (b) they are flexible in dealing with problems, as different solutions and options can be applied in different contexts (people and situation). In contrast, Americans can be thought of as having high trust in strangers (coined as "general trust" by Fukuyama, 1995), but little flexibility in dealing with similar issues in different contexts.

While individualism–collectivism deals with relationships with peers and the group as a whole, "power distance" describes how people view and react to vertical relationships. Power distance refers to the extent to which an individual accepts unequal distribution of power in institutions and organizations (Clugston, Howell, & Dorfman, 2000). Research has indicated that people from the East (e.g., Japan, China, India) regard unequal distribution of power as more acceptable than do people in the West (e.g., United States, Canada, Australia, the Netherlands). Leaders in high power distance cultures tend to be more authoritarian (demand total control and obedience) than those in low power distance cultures (Pellegrini & Scandura, 2008). Employees who endorse a high power distance value tend to respect authority and follow leader decisions rather than exercise autonomy in decision making (Morrison & Milliken, 2000). They accept the imbalance of power between themselves and their superiors, and are less likely to initiate changes to the status quo. In contrast, people with low power distance orientation tend to view themselves as equals of their supervisors and are willing to exercise autonomy and take initiatives to make changes.

Another important difference between the East and the West is the communication style people adopt in conveying and interpreting meanings (Hall, 1989). High-context communicators (e.g., those in Japan, Korea, or China) tend to rely heavily on contextual cues to avoid conflict or embarrassment, whereas low-context communicators (e.g., those in the United States, Canada, or the Netherlands) tend to use explicit and coded messages (verbal language and written words) while relying very little on the context itself in conveying meaning (Gudykunst et al., 1996; Holtgraves, 1997; Matsumoto, 1996). More recent research has focused on deciphering the meaning of context, and has identified four key dimensions: the message, rela-

This content downloaded from 210.35.162.31 on Sun, 28 Nov 2021 13:17:42 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

tionship, spatial, and temporal contexts (Adair, Buchan, Chen, & Liu, 2013). This study found that people in China and Chile (high-context culture) relied more on contextual cues in communication than did people in the United States (low-context culture). Such efforts documenting major differences are intended to be indicative, rather than exhaustive, comparisons of the East and the West in their formal and informal institutions, traditional philosophies, and cultural values.

Contemporary Practices and Management Knowledge in the Eastern Context

The different institutions, philosophies, and cultures in the "East" are associated with different management practices and business systems (Whitley, 1992), some of which became well known in the West in the 1970s, when several major Asian players began to emerge internationally. For instance, the Japanese "Theory Z" model of management (Ouchi, 1981), which combines Japanese and American management practices, was seen as a major challenge to the American management model.

The Asian management practices and business systems reflect many of the philosophical and cultural features discussed above; for instance, the importance and process of networks (Chang & Hong, 2000; Keister, 1998). In Japan, large business groups (*keiretsu*) have maintained a closely interlocked, self-financed and extensively networked group structure to strengthen their capability to deal with external uncertainties and externalities (Luo, 2001). In South Korea, *chaebols* have maintained close relationships with the Korean government and each established sophisticated business networks inside and outside the group (Chang, 2003; Steers, Sin, & Ungson, 1989). These close family and business ties and networking dynamics reduce the dependency on governmentally owned or controlled resources and supports organizational flexibility to cope with environmental uncertainty and turbulence.

Chen and Miller (2010) used an "ambicultural" perspective to describe Asian firms' tendency as more ambidextrous than their Western counterparts in pursuing simultaneous fulfillment of two disparate, and sometimes seemingly tensional, objectives. This ambidexterity simultaneously facilitates short-term firm growth and long-term competitive positions in the global marketplace. Ambidexterity is consistent with cultural (e.g., yin–yang philosophy) and institutional (e.g., regulatory uncertainty) conditions facing Asian firms. This ambicultural perspective is also reflected in some Korean firms' (e.g., Samsung) success in mixing Western best practices with an essentially Japanese system (Khanna, Song, & Lee, 2011). Finally, Cappelli, Singh, Singh, and Useem (2010) studied leadership characteristics of successful Indian firms, and found that the primary difference between Western and Indian executives lied in the degree to which strategies and goals reflected core values and community embeddedness.

Beyond formal business organizations of some scale, there are a variety of social and institutional challenges in the emerging economies of the East that are not faced in the developed Western context to the same degree; for instance, approximately one billion people, mostly in Asia, live on the equivalent of less than $1 per day. Awareness of management researchers of these issues has increased over the past decade (e.g., Mair, Marti, & Ventresca, 2012; Peredo & Chrisman, 2006; Prahalad, 2004). The current management literature, built from studies of large listed corporations in highly developed economic contexts, has far too limited a repertoire of solutions and empirical evidence to aid practitioners and policymakers in these economically disadvantaged regions of the East (George, McGahan, & Prabhu, 2012). In fact, most private organizations (e.g., social entrepreneurs, non-governmental organizations) addressing these issues are relatively small. The presence of widespread poverty in India, Africa, and other regions in Asia (for that matter, the rest of the world) would require novel approaches to entrepreneurship and business development (e.g., George, Kotha, Parikh, Alnuaimi, & Bahaj, 2015). It is presently not clear whether—and which—concepts and theories developed in the Western context of large organizations premised on shareholder value creation in relatively open market economies apply to currently emerging, new business models based on social goals (i.e., poverty reduction) in informal contexts in the "East," or whether—and which—new concepts and theories are needed.

However, despite the very different—and the great variety of—contexts in the "East" (e.g., institutions, philosophies, and cultural beliefs), their economic and social challenges, and associated management practices, this has led to very few new concepts and theories in our "top management journals." The largest number of studies on Eastern cultures has come from China in the past 30 years. Nevertheless, as mentioned, an analysis of 259 ar-

This content downloaded from 210.35.162.31 on Sun, 28 Nov 2021 13:17:42 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

ticles involving Chinese samples published in the top six management journals, including the *AMJ* (Jia et al., 2012), led to only three new concepts being introduced. The other articles essentially applied existing Western concepts and theories to Chinese samples. Even for cross-cultural comparisons, researchers used existing concepts to compare samples from the East and the West, without introducing new concepts capturing Eastern phenomena (except the idea of *guanxi* or network capitalism). Despite the great variety in institutions, philosophies, cultures, and associated management practices, there are no new concepts on management in the Middle East, India, Singapore, Philippines, Indonesia, or other Eastern countries. This is a puzzling observation. It was, in fact, the main reason for our call for papers in *AMJ* inviting new concepts and theories on the "East." However, a more fundamental question is *why* do we see so few new concepts and theories tapping into the "East?" Especially in view of the large number of concepts, theories, and paradigms that emerged from the "West?" And what can we do to address the issue? It is to these questions that we turn next.

THEORY DEVELOPMENT IN MANAGEMENT STUDIES OVER TIME

How did the management theories that we have today come about? Colquitt and Zapata-Phelan (2007) analyzed 667 *AMJ* articles in 75 issues (1963–2007) and found that most theories in the management field had been developed between the 1950s and the 1980s, and that new theory development has stalled in recent decades. Their results were not surprising since the period of the 1950s to the 1980s was a time of rapid industrialization and growth of American and European economies. Theories were created to explain a variety of perplexing phenomena in the management of organizations in those early years of theory development. For example, the human relations theory explains why workers respond to management attention and the importance of informal groups (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1949). Simon (1960) offered the idea of bounded rationality to explain why organizations do not make optimal but only satisficing decisions; the contingency theory informs why organizations differ in how they are structured (Burns & Stalker, 1966). In Europe, Emery and Trist (1946) formulated the sociotechnical systems theory to emphasize the importance of the interdependence between the technical and social systems of the organization. Child (1972) offered the strategic choice theory after observing that not all organizational actions were deterministic in nature. Noticing the importance of both environmental control and the agency of organizational leaders led to the open systems view of the organization (Katz & Kahn, 1966), the external control and structural power theories (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978), and institutional theory (Scott, 1987). Interestingly, most of these new theories from the earlier years were published in books rather than journals.

After this, one might expect a period of "normal science" (Kuhn, 1996) or incremental research; however, the actual pattern appears to be richer and more interesting. After generating many new paradigms and theories in the 1950s to the 1980s, Colquitt and Zapata-Phelan (2007) found that there has been an *increase* in (papers offering) theoretical contributions; however, these appear to have happened mostly "in the neighborhood" of existing theories and paradigms. They identified "builders" (articles generating new concepts, often through inductive studies), "expanders" (new theoretical formulations of existent theories, often derived in a hypothetico-deductive way), "qualifiers" (often adding a new mediator or moderator), "testers" (novel tests of theory of limited novelty), and "reporters" (testing a theory in a different setting). Further, they found that, in tandem with editors emphasizing the importance of theoretical contributions, the number of expanders had gone up in recent decades, at the expense of testers and reporters, suggesting an *increase* in the number of theoretical contributions (while no upward trend was discovered in the proportion of builders over the five decades).

However, Colquitt and Zapata-Phelan (2007) also noted that much of the progress of theories was in terms of improved formulations of earlier theories, and adding antecedents of key constructs, or moderators and mediators (expanders and qualifiers). Second, they noted that expanders—that is, novel hypothetico-deductive contributions derived from existing theories—implied a bridge with existing theory, facilitating other researchers to accept the new theoretical contribution during and after the selection and publishing process (consistent with the observed higher number of cites of these articles as well). Qualifiers also enjoyed relatively high citations scores on average, benefiting from continuity with established literatures and paradigms (McKinley, Mone, & Moon, 1999).

This content downloaded from 210.35.162.31 on Sun, 28 Nov 2021 13:17:42 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Finally, although the number of builders appears not to be increasing over the entire window of five decades, there appears to be a slight increase towards the end of this period, coinciding in time with editors emphasizing interesting, innovative, and novel research. A substantial number of new constructs emerged since the 1980s. For example, Colquitt and Zapata-Phelan (2007) listed 30 new constructs but noted many cases in which an existing concept was reconceptualized or redefined, or in which a more specific version of a broader construct was introduced. The rate of new and reconceptualized constructs being introduced appears to have increased in the last years of the window of analysis (until 2007), which, the authors conclude, is partially symptomatic of the increase in expanders in the 2000s. They conclude that, if interestingness, innovativeness, and novelty continue to be emphasized in management research, it will be critical to ensure that new and reconceptualized constructs actually do add value to the literature (see Pfeffer, 1993; Spell, 2001).

In sum, the overall pattern appears to be one where many new theories were introduced between the 1950s and the 1980s, with an increase in theoretical contributions in the form of modifications and expansions of these theories from the 1980s onwards. This may suggest that the management field in the West has reached a stage of paradigm maturity (Pfeffer, 1993). As Kuhn (1996: 35) observed, "perhaps the most striking feature of the normal research problems we have just encountered is how little they aim to produce major novelties, conceptual or phenomenal," although the analysis above suggests a slightly richer and more nuanced story. While many contributions in the early period implied novel theories and paradigms, later periods were mostly extensions of existing theories that emerged from the West in the 1950s through to the 1980s.

This period of "normal science"—with few novel concepts and theories emerging—coincided with the rise of empirical studies venturing beyond the Western context, including the very different contexts, economic and social challenges, and management practices of the "East." It also coincided with newly emerging economic and social challenges and management practices. Management has experienced dramatic changes in technology (e.g., digitization, the Internet), globalization, and economic development since the 1980s, introducing new business models and many new industries. In fact, an *AMJ* special issue on "New Management Challenges in a New Time" invited and published papers conceptualizing and testing a variety of new hypotheses—on speed, timing, and the changing nature of competition—to address these new management puzzles and problems (Barkema, Baum, & Mannix, 2002). However, neither this special issue nor later papers in our top management journals introduced many new concepts and theories. Likewise, a recent special issue invited papers on new business models in emerging economies aiming at social goals in terms of serving the poor (George et al., 2012), but this also led to few novel concepts and theories. This contrasts with the rich variety of new concepts, theories, and paradigms coming out of the Western (mostly, the United States) context in the 1950s to 1980s. What insights can be gleaned from these earlier developments, potentially inspiring richer theory for novel management practices addressing economic and social challenges in other regions and for more recent times as well?

Conditions Facilitating New Theory Development

To answer this question, we need to go back to the conditions for theory development in the earlier years. Concepts, theories, and paradigms reflect observations of empirical puzzles and problems and the "worldviews" (reflected in institutions, philosophies, cultural beliefs) of a particular place and time (Kuhn, 1985). North America of the 1950s to the 1980s showed tremendous economic growth in the context of a relatively open market economy, with large companies emerging and internationalizing, and a relatively strong emphasis on shareholder value creation. From a cultural perspective, North America showed an emphasis on "individualism," rather than on power distance and "long-term orientation," as compared to China and other Asian countries (Hofstede, 1991). Western Europe, to some extent, echoed these conditions; in particular, the United Kingdom. These worldviews (embedded in local institutions and cultural beliefs, and with major religions including Protestantism and Catholicism) formed the context for emerging management practices, perceived management puzzles and problems, and for creating new management concepts, theories, and paradigms as well.

We consulted two books reporting on the creation of influential theories in management and organizations. The first was *Great Minds in Management* by Smith and Hitt (2005), in which the editors invited 24 scholars who contributed the most influential theories in management to reflect

This content downloaded from 210.35.162.31 on Sun, 28 Nov 2021 13:17:42 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

on the process through which they developed and refined their theories. The second book was Pugh, Hickson, and Hining's (2007) *Great Writers on Organizations*, which provided a synopsis of key ideas of 65 scholars who the editors felt had provided lasting theories or ideas since the beginning of the twentieth century. They began with Max Weber's (1947) theory of social and economic organizations, in which he introduced "bureaucracy" as the "dominant institution of modern society" and "technically the most efficient form of organization possible" (Pugh et al., 2007: 5). They ended with Schumacher (1981), who proposed that "small is beautiful because it is the way to humane efficiency in the organizations of our time" (Pugh et al., 2007: 302). These two books on scholars in management and organizations give some insight into the conditions that may have contributed to the rise of new concepts and theories.

The earlier theorists were observant of the social concerns of their times, engaged in the production problems of organizations, or were puzzled by observed variations of organizational forms and practices. Taylor (1911) observed much inefficiency and great antagonism between labor and management. Mayo (1933) was surprised by the 250% turnover in one department of a spinning mill, compared to 6% in all other departments. Cyert and March (1963) wondered how complex organizations make decisions in the context of conflicting goals and abounding uncertainty. Woodward (1965) was curious about the differences across firms in levels of authority and spans of control. Staw (1976) was puzzled by the continuing investment by government or by businesspeople into failing projects and wondered why organizations or people threw good money after bad. Child (1972) observed that managers exercised discretion in a variety of areas, much different from the deterministic view of organizational structure prevalent in the decade before (e.g., technology, scale, or environment). Pfeffer and Salancik (1978) wondered why some organizations are more powerful than were others. Ouchi (1981) observed the rising Japanese economic power in the late 1970s and sought to identify the different management approaches between the American and Japanese firms.

The motivation to develop the theories was to understand these management conundrums and to find solutions to pressing management problems of the time. In these early days, with no prior theory to use, researchers had to select their own relevant management puzzles, anomalies, and problems, and create their own understanding (concepts and theories) of them. In fact, some practicing managers developed their own theories (e.g., Barnard, 1938; Sloan, 1964) to explain management systems and account for management success. There were few journals, and so many authors reported the results of their research in books (Argyris, 1957; Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967; March & Simon, 1958; Mintzberg, 1973; Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978; Taylor, 1911; Thompson, 1967; Vroom, 1964; Weber, 1947). Books allow theorists the space to discuss the relevant management issue, phenomenon, or puzzle being analyzed, as well as the new theoretical ideas and empirical method.

These developments triggered a rich variety of concepts, theories, and paradigms, including human relationships theory (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1949), strategic choice theory (Child, 1972), institutional theory (Scott, 1987), and so on. However, over the past two decades, the focus shifted from "contribution to practice" to "contribution to theory." This increasing attention to theory, and the correspondingly decreasing attention to puzzles, problems, and economic and social concerns in practice, appears to have led to *more* theoretical contributions, but in the neighborhood of existing paradigms, with few (entirely) novel theories and concepts tapping into regions beyond the "West" or into newly emerging puzzles and problems. In the words of Barney (2005: 296): "Prior literature is both a guide and a blinder." So what can we learn from how the field of management started, in terms of developing a richer variety of novel concepts and theories? What can our journals do to self-correct? It is to this question that we turn next.

What Can Journals Do? Lessons from Our SRF

Journals can contribute to new theory development by encouraging research on new management puzzles and problems. *AMJ*'s current editorial team has published a series of editorials on "grand challenges" calling for research on the bigger challenges facing society and how management and organizations can play a role (George, 2014)—for example, the implications of climate change (Howard-Grenville, Buckle, Hoskins, & George, 2014) or aging populations (Kulik, Ryan, Harper, & George, 2014) for management. Our call for this SRF encouraged authors to submit novel theories and concepts to capture management puzzles or phenomena of the "East," while discouraging marginally novel contri-

This content downloaded from 210.35.162.31 on Sun, 28 Nov 2021 13:17:42 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

butions, e.g., "qualifiers" (like simply adding a new moderating "culture" variable), testers, and reporters.

As our discussion above suggests, simply inviting new theory—for instance, through SRFs—is not enough. Learning from the early days of management research, what is needed in addition is tapping in depth and inductively into new management problems and puzzles, either in new geographies beyond the West or with newly emerging management practices associated with new economic and social concerns. Contemporary researchers may benefit from better methodologies around inductive research in this respect; for instance, in generating grounded theory and using ethnographic research to tap into new concepts and theories. Consistent with this view, our call explicitly invited inductive research.

In addition, we tried to self-correct as an editorial team. Editors and reviewers may evaluate new research according to the topics, theories, and research methods defined by existing paradigms. Researchers apply self-regulation and tend to follow existing paradigms in terms of questions, theories, and methods. Venturing outside an existing paradigm is therefore a risky decision by any author, nascent or seasoned. We tried to self-correct for potential biases in several ways. We developed a database starting with scholars who had reviewed for the *AMJ* and were listed at Asian schools, supplemented with our own knowledge and networks of experts. We typically used two international reviewers for each submission from this database, supplemented with researchers based in the West. Rejections (both initial submission and revisions) typically required the concurrence of two guest editors, and sometimes three, to reduce idiosyncratic biases of individual editors. In fact, as some (but not all) authors had not been actively engaged in theory-building work before, we used a more intensive and developmental editorial process than usual. This included a two-day paper development workshop (in Guangzhou) with all authors and papers in receipt of a "revise and resubmit" request, to further support the paper development process.

We received 73 submissions. Most of the "desk rejects"—papers rejected without review (30)—were "reporters" (Colquitt & Zapata-Phelan, 2007). Of the papers that got rejected after review (37), most seemed to be reporters, testers, or qualifiers. However, most of the accepted papers (6) seemed to be builders or expanders, or a mixture. We discuss these papers in the next section, in terms of the types of approaches and methodologies they used as well as their specific theoretical contributions.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE SIX PAPERS IN THIS RESEARCH FORUM

Most accepted papers have inductive elements. For instance, in the *dojo* (a space committed to Japanese martial arts) study, the author records his observations and identifies a phenomenon that is not often observed in U.S. culture (Cole, this issue). That is, when the grandmaster of the *dojo* observes a student violating the *dojo* norm, he would never directly tell the student and correct him on the spot. Instead, he would communicate his dissatisfaction in very indirect ways (e.g., looking at the student up and down without saying a word). Moreover, Cole observes that not every student can understand the indirect message, especially if the student is from the United States. In his article, Cole documents these cases and identifies their common characteristics. On the basis of this, he forms his research questions: "What is the nature of these common characteristics?", "What happens when the indirect communication does not work?", and "Why did not the grandmaster communicate directly in the first place?" He then engages in a qualitative analysis of these cases guided by the existing theoretical frameworks in cross-cultural communication, and discovers the answers to the questions he set out to study. To conclude, he proposes a theoretical model that provides new insights into the existing communication literature, which might be generalized to contexts outside Japan.

Several new constructs emerge from this study. One is the new insight on the context of communication (Hall, 1989). Cole proposes two new constructs: "message content" (implicit or explicit language) and "message context" (shared understanding: reliance or non-reliance on context) to describe the extent to which a person is a high-context communicator. A true high-context communicator is a person who uses implicit language and relies on "shared" understanding in conveying a message. When such communication fails, two processes are likely to occur. One is "continuum staggering," in which the person will try to use less implicit but more explicit language to convey meaning, and the other is "continuum straddling," in which the person creates a new shared understanding for people involved in the context to make the message clear. These new constructs become

This content downloaded from 210.35.162.31 on Sun, 28 Nov 2021 13:17:42 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

building blocks of a new theoretical model of high-context communication, suggesting a new lens to explain why people adopt high-context communication, when they make adjustments to that (boundary conditions), and how they do it.

The authors of the "paradoxical leadership" study, Zhang, Waldman, Han, and Li (this issue), observed many leaders who engage in seemingly paradoxical behaviors in Chinese organizations. For example, the leaders in the study reported that they should treat all employees equally but they also emphasized the importance of treating different subordinates differently depending on the situation. This triggered the research questions: "What are commonly observed paradoxical behaviors?", "Why are leaders engaging in these behaviors?", and "What are the unique effects of these leader behaviors on employee outcomes that are not explained by existing leadership theories such as transformational leadership?" The authors identify Taoist integrative thinking as a psychological underpinning. Then, they use rigorous steps to establish a scale that measures paradoxical leader behaviors, testing how integrative thinking is responsible for these behaviors and the positive consequences of these behaviors on employee outcomes beyond other types of leader behaviors. Finally, a new leadership theory emerges that enriches the existing leadership literature.

Paradoxical behavior by lower-level leaders (the sample of this study) is an underexplored phenomenon even though it is ubiquitous in the Chinese context. Treating people differently and inconsistently is often described as bad practice in the Western leadership literature, as it violates the universalism or justice value. However, the yin–yang philosophy rooted in the Chinese culture would suggest that two opposites often could be integrated to produce better results than either behavior alone. The article's authors propose a new construct: "paradoxical leader behaviors." These behaviors are defined as seemingly competing yet interrelated behaviors of the leader to simultaneously and over time meet structural and follower demands of the organization. Through qualitative and quantitative approaches, the authors identify five types of behavior, labeling them as "combining self-centeredness with other-centeredness," "maintaining both distance and closeness," "treating subordinates uniformly while allowing individualization," "enforcing work requirements while allowing flexibility," and "maintaining decision control while allowing autonomy," contributing to a new leadership theory.

The study on person–organization fit by Chuang, Hsu, Wang, and Judge (this issue) shares similar characteristics. The authors view the "fit" issue quite differently than does the dominant literature in the West. The main difference is in whether people view "fit" as a static or a dynamic concept. Whereas fit is often seen as static in the West (i.e., one's current values and skills fit the organizational requirements), Taiwanese workers tend to view it as dynamic (i.e., one can change oneself, in both values and skills, to fit the need of the organization after becoming a member). Based on this observation, the authors ask the following questions: "Is this a reliable phenomenon?", "What are the key characteristics of this phenomenon?", and "Why is this happening in Taiwan?" Following the grounded theory approach, they interview employees working in various Taiwan organizations and document in detail their responses. After analyzing the interview notes, they are able to answer their research questions and propose a theoretical model of person–organization fit that sheds new light on the existing fit literature.

The authors adopt a dynamic view of fit on the basis of the Confucian doctrine of self-cultivation and serving the collective, and they propose several new constructs to capture the dynamic process. First is the distinction between "task-related fit" and "relation-related fit," indicating that Chinese employees not only pay attention to whether they have the competence to complete a task, but also are concerned about the extent to which they have harmonious relationships with colleagues at work. Fit means both, not just one or the other. Second is the notion of "dynamic fit"; that is, if one does not have the skills to complete a task at the time of entering the organization, one can always learn and cultivate oneself to become qualified and competent. Moreover, in addition to completing tasks and building harmonious relationships with co-workers, one will continuously improve personal capabilities and achieve the realization of making contributions to the collective. These new constructs that enable a more nuanced understanding of fit include "cultivation," "competence at work," "harmonious connections at work," "balance among life domains," and "realization."

Li and Liang (this issue) were intrigued by their observation that some successful Chinese entrepreneurs ran for election in the national, provincial, and municipal governments' representational com-

This content downloaded from 210.35.162.31 on Sun, 28 Nov 2021 13:17:42 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

mittees. These committees, even though only a part-time engagement, require a lot of time, and these successful entrepreneurs did not seem to need any further government connections for their businesses. The authors' knowledge of Confucian philosophy suggested to them that these political behaviors might be more socially oriented than self-interest based. Confucius teaching emphasizes the roles of a person throughout the different stages of their lives. This life-stage model of human development and contribution has some similarity but is not identical to the Western career/life models. The Confucian social model (which the authors develop, based on Confucian teaching) specifies a focus on self-cultivation in early life, developing family and professional success in middle life, and contributing to society in later life. This final stage is not evident in Western life-/career-stage models. However, Confucius offered a prescriptive model of life development—not all people move through all stages, and most do not reach the final "sage" stage. Only those who are pro-socially motivated would consider acting on the final stage of expectations consistent with Confucian teaching. Further, in the Chinese context, being a government official was and still is the most influential position to effect changes at a societal level. Using both a survey and a secondary dataset of listed private entrepreneurial firms, the authors find support for their hypotheses that the pro-social motive was strong among successful entrepreneurs who either desired or have attained political appointments. Successful entrepreneurs with a higher level of pro-self motive, on the other hand, expressed a lower desire to pursue political appointments.

The contribution of this study is in the meaning of political connections for entrepreneurs with different degrees of salience in their pro-self and pro-social motives. The Western literature has treated political connection as pursuit of economic interests, consistent with the study's Chinese entrepreneurs with a strong pro-self motive. The authors reason that the pro-social motive and willingness of successful entrepreneurs to participate in political life for the betterment of the society might be unique to China due to its Confucian influence. In the West, the desire to contribute to social or public good may not be life-stage dependent. This Chinese study, rooted in the traditional Confucian philosophy, clearly enriches the career-/life-stage theories of the West.

Chen, Chittoor, and Vissa (this issue) study the social channels that CEOs use to transfer material information to equity analysts in India. Specifically, they argue that embedded network ties between equity analysts and the CEOs of the firms they follow influence the accuracy of analysts' earnings forecasts. Analyses of earnings forecasts issued from 2001 to 2010 by equity analysts in India reveal that CEOs blend reliance on traditional institutions of caste and regional language with contemporary institutions such as universities as the locus for such ties. They find that CEOs from the post-economic-reform generation in India are more likely to transfer material private information via their school ties while pre-reform generation CEOs favor caste or language ties. Similarly, they ask if organizational form, whether a domestic business group or a Western multinational corporation, affects the use of such social ties. Here, they find that domestic business groups legitimate the transfer of private information along particularistic ties, whereas multinational corporations mitigate such transfers.

Chen et al. (this issue) identify how traditional social institutions, such as caste and regional language, persist in their effects, despite India's growth and transformation story. Like the Li and Liang (this issue) study of the Confucian social model, these authors raise a particularly important point for the special research forum—that our research should incorporate the influence of larger, historical social structures within which economic action is embedded, and to view business groups as repositories that blend modern management practices with particularistic behavioral patterns among top executives. Though this study does not tackle a new construct, it does well in highlighting that "modernizing" does not equal "Westernizing" in the Asian context. The use of traditional constructs of caste and language is well understood in the relational demography literature (e.g., Tsui, Egan, & O'Reilly, 1992), yet its juxtaposition in a contemporary setting of CEOs social ties and organizational form (business group versus multinationals) shows that some relational attributes do not change, even if the world changes around us.

Reinecke and Ansari (this issue) conducted a six-month ethnography of Fairtrade, an organization straddling Western (or Northern) markets and Eastern (or Southern) development. During the fieldwork, the authors observed heated conflicts between the market-driven, economic demands of the North and the development-driven, social requirements of the South. The authors observe that conflicts centered on the tension between Northern

This content downloaded from 210.35.162.31 on Sun, 28 Nov 2021 13:17:42 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

clock time (a pre-defined, unitary measurement of events, activities, and tasks) to evaluate outputs, and Southern *process time* (intersubjective and event based) closer to the outcomes and processes of human development.

These observations trigger the question: "How does the organization manage this tension?" Qualitative analysis suggests two mechanisms: "temporal reflexivity" (both sides of the organization beginning to understand each other) and "mutual interdependencies" (only cooperation can lead to success for both). These mechanisms jointly induce "*ambitemporality*," a new concept indicating the development of processes and structures that can simultaneously handle both types of time within one organization. Hence, time can be "agentic," the outcome of a managed process, rather than driven by an external cultural context. This also suggests a missing link in understanding how organizations may be able to operate simultaneously in Western and in emerging economy contexts, reaching both economic goals (related to clients in the West) and explicitly addressing crucial aspects of their social goals (i.e., event-based processes related to producers in the South).

A common feature of these six papers is that authors tapped inductively into an observed empirical puzzle or problem, often starting by documenting it in some depth, then asking the "why" question, then undertaking analysis, eventually leading to the proposal of novel constructs and theories. An additional interesting pattern emerged from informally looking at the backgrounds of the authors of these articles. Most authors had (a) lived in the broad environment of the observed phenomenon or puzzle for a number of years, beyond the time span of their inductive research projects, and (b) had multicultural exposure, whether individually, as a team, or both. Having "lived experience" (including local language skills), beyond the time line of the research project, seems to echo the in-depth experience with local management problems and conundrums that many early management theorists had. A multicultural background may have helped to identify novel problems and puzzles. If one lives in one culture all her life, everything happening in that culture is "normal." Alternatively, living in different cultures and experiencing "cultural shock"—a series of events that shock cognitions of what seems to be "normal" in one culture into being perceived as "strange" in another—stimulates observing what is unique or perplexing, for example, in the "East," and thinking about the "why" question, increasing the likelihood of developing new concepts and theories.

Management theorists can also learn from research in other disciplines, such as sociology and development (in terms of conceptualizing and measuring social goals) and anthropology, which conceptualize phenomena—in terms of what, how, and, often, why, given a specific when, where, and for whom (see Whetten, 1989)—based on local people's understanding of local phenomena.

A Potential Difficulty with Testing Eastern Constructs as Distinct from Western Ones

Though several Asian concepts exist, few manuscripts with these concepts have managed to successfully navigate the review process. Part of the challenge stems from ineffective framing and articulating of the contribution by authors not familiar with the *AMJ* style (George, 2012). However, the fundamental issue is likely a deeper problem. We see three types of challenges faced by researchers studying phenomena in the new cultural contexts: (1) construct equivalence, (2) construct salience, and (3) construct infusion.

Construct equivalence is when the constructs are essentially the same; for instance, the constructs of trust or respect have their Eastern equivalents, most often with a local nomenclature. Therefore, validating a new scale for trust based on nomenclature differences but not theoretically substantive differences does not meet the threshold for theoretical contribution. A predominant number of submissions to this special forum fell in this category—existing construct, but named differently and framed as a new construct. On close reading, it becomes apparent that the underlying construct has the same form and function as an existing Western counterpart. Submissions with this approach did not fit the purpose of this research forum, and were not invited for revision.

Construct salience is when a specific attribute of an existing Western construct becomes more pronounced in the Eastern context. One example is the Chinese word *moqi* (mo-chee), defined as perfect understanding between two individuals (e.g., supervisor and subordinate; co-workers; teammates) without saying a word. In practice, *moqi* involves high-context communication in which there is alignment of individuals' understanding of the goals and tasks needed to be performed—akin to improvisation in jazz, where the other team member reciprocates without the need to articulate spe-

This content downloaded from 210.35.162.31 on Sun, 28 Nov 2021 13:17:42 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

cifically a set of tasks or actions. In theory, however, Western constructs of mutual knowledge and common ground provide equivalent constructs, but the Eastern high-context communication environment makes the construct more salient or important. While the *moqi* construct itself might not be a new concept, its application and context make the effects of mutual knowledge more salient. The study of Indian social ties and the salience of specific attributes of these ties (language, caste, school) and its impact on organizational action or performance (Chen et al., this issue) is an example of construct salience. Likewise the Confucian social model study (Li & Liang, this issue) of the high degree of salience in the pro-social motivation of some Chinese entrepreneurs (at least in the context of serving government roles).

Construct infusion adds new elements that flavor an existing construct in the literature by making it richer and nuanced. For example, the Chuang et al. (2015) article discusses dynamic fit based on the Confucian doctrine of self- cultivation and serving the collective. Here, the "fit" construct itself is well understood in Western theories, but what they provide is a new interpretation by infusing the context into the existing construct to reveal new nuances. The new interpretation of dynamic fit helps explain other related concepts, such as "harmonious connections at work" or "balance among life domains." The constructs of "continuum staggering" and "continuum straddling" in high-context communication (Cole, this issue) are another example of construct infusion. "Paradoxical leadership behavior" (Zhang et al., this issue) is a new construct infused into the leadership literature. Finally, although the prefix "ambi-" is well known in management, often referring to managing two processes with seemingly opposite characteristics, the new construct of "ambitemporality" (Reinecke & Ansari, this issue) helps to understand how an organization managed tensions related to different understandings of time, enabling the organization to address both economic goals (associated with large Northern companies and their clients) and social goals (of Southern small producers living in poverty).

Scholars who intend to import new constructs from the Asian context face an added set of challenges compared to Western scholars, with the first being to understand the concept as distinct from existing Western constructs, or whether overlaps exist. In reality, many constructs have equivalents—thus, it may be futile to convince readers of something being entirely novel when equivalents exist. As the six papers show, potential strategies to overcome the contribution threshold for an article could lie in understanding whether there is construct salience or construct infusion; salience would highlight when a specific construct or its attribute becomes more important, and infusion is when the context adds a particular dimension or idea that has not been observed or discussed in the existing Western literature. In the rare case that a construct is indeed new to the Western world, then the processes of identification, validity, reliability, and the boundary conditions need to be clarified.

The new concepts and theories developed from an Eastern context (as presented in this special issue) may serve as a starting point to develop more universal theories that explain phenomena in Western contexts as well, just as original theories developed in the West have been tested in places beyond the West. This process can be coined as "the evolution of theories" (Whetten, 2014). It suggests that a theory often goes through several stages to become a good theory that can explain a large amount of phenomena (i.e., a universal theory). The first stage is to establish a solid theory regarding the relationship between X and Y in one single context (indigenous). This context can be East or West, any particular country or region, or any industry or firm. To increase the explanatory power of the theory, the second step is to test if X is also related to a group of outcomes, such as y1, y2, and y3, in the same single context; or to test if X is related to Y in a different context, such as context1, context2, and so on. The last stage of the theory's evolution would be to identify boundary conditions and underlying mechanisms regarding the particular theory between X and Y in all different contexts (universal).

For example, the paradoxical leader behaviors identified in the Zhang et al. (this issue) study may be examined in the same Chinese context to see if they also affect other employee work outcomes besides the proactive behaviors they tested. For example, job creativity may also be influenced by leaders' paradoxical behaviors (based on integrative thinking), as these behaviors might stimulate employees to follow suit and integrate differing perspectives to think about their job, which are likely to induce new ways of solving problems and completing tasks. The theory of paradoxical leadership can also be tested in a different cultural context that shares the Taoist philosophy, such as Japan. If the findings are replicated, a context that has less commonality can be chosen to test the

This content downloaded from 210.35.162.31 on Sun, 28 Nov 2021 13:17:42 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

theory. Eventually, through testing the theory in numerous contexts, the boundary conditions would emerge to account for the potentially differing findings, and the underlying mechanisms will be discovered to understand *why* paradoxical leadership would affect employee behaviors in certain cultural contexts but not others.

DISCUSSION AND FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

Reducing biases due to normal science by actively tapping into a variety of worldviews (embedded in local institutions, philosophies, cultural beliefs), and perceived management puzzles and problems, may lead to a rich variety of concepts, theories, and paradigms in management—as happened in the North American context in the 1950s to 1980s. It may also lead to the further development of these theories in terms of antecedents, mediators, modifiers, and outcome variables, and to identifying boundary conditions in a highly diverse and changing world. This is relevant from a practical perspective as well. New assumptions and theoretical models—adopted to explain empirical phenomena better—may influence, and potentially change, debates and perspectives outside the narrow domain of research (Kuhn, 1985). In sum, it may increase the validity and the relevance of management research, in terms of explaining new management puzzles, solving new management problems, and addressing new social concerns. Below, we will first give some suggestions for further research. We will then offer an "agentic" view on how individual researchers, journals, and management schools may reduce biases implied by normal science, potentially increasing the theoretical contribution, timeliness, and relevance of management research.

New Studies of Emerging Management Issues in the East

Recognizing that different values and norms guide people's behavior in the East and the West—often manifested in how people communicate (Hall, 1989) and why they misunderstand one another—studying communication in Asian organizations will bring new insight into the leadership and management literature. Cole's (this issue) paper clarified the meaning of high-context communication by introducing two components—message content (implicit versus explicit) and message delivery (indirect versus direct). Implicit and indirect communication is the highest-context communication, in which all meaning is conveyed through contextual cues rather than words; explicit and direct communication is the lowest-context communication, in which all meaning is conveyed through words. While both represent extremes, implicit and indirect communication is more likely to occur in Asian organizations than in U.S. companies, where explicit and direct communication is more likely. Interesting research questions regarding the highest-context communication include "What is implicit and indirect communication?", "How does it convey meaning?", and "When will targets understand implicit and indirect communication?" To answer these questions, Cole and Chen (2015) developed a new construct, "inception" (i.e., the active yet covert manipulation of environmental or communicative cues), which may be used to avoid conflicts, to save face, or to evoke intrinsic motivation. We encourage more research on these and other forms of communication prevalent in the East and West, on how and why they influence management practices and behavior, and on the boundary conditions for such theories.

Another important area of research in the Eastern context is the nature and potential evolution of leadership in organizations. Beyond the idea of paternalistic leadership (Farh & Cheng, 2000) and the leadership model of successful Indian firms (Cappelli et al., 2010), little is known about leadership in Asia. Ma and Tsui (2015) showed the cultural root of legalism in the modern management practices of structure and control, and the influence of Confucianism on contemporary forms of paternalistic leadership. Zhang, Chen, Chen, and Ang (2014) suggested promising ideas for studying leadership in China in response to changes in the institutions, cultural values, and new generations of workers. These externalities may require changes in leadership approaches in firms. Zhang et al. (2015) found that Chinese leaders, even those at lower organizational levels, engage in paradoxical behaviors to meet the paradoxical requirements of firms and followers. The Asian context, characterized by both deep traditions and modern practices, may be particularly germane to the study of paradox at the individual, firm, and societal levels.

Many Asian businesses, especially from China and India, are becoming global firms. Analyzing the motivation and pattern of outward direct investment is another interesting topic for future research. Child and Marinova (2014) discuss the implication of

This content downloaded from 210.35.162.31 on Sun, 28 Nov 2021 13:17:42 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

both home and host country contexts for Chinese enterprises investing into foreign countries. They argue for sensitivity to *both* home and host country contexts, and study how the institutions and political systems in those contexts affect strategies and resource development associated with international expansion. While these insights were developed from the China context, Child and Marinova (2014) argued that this theory can be applied to outward foreign direct investment from any country.

Internal to the firm, many Asian businesses, especially medium- and small-sized ones, only possess ordinary resources and do not own strategic or critical capabilities as implied by the resource-based view (Barney, 1991). While they may be at a disadvantage in term of unique, valuable, and non-imitable resources, these firms know how to combine generic resources they can purchase and generic capabilities they possess. This composition-based strategy (Luo & Child, forthcoming) involves amalgamating an extended array of product features, functions, and services, providing customers with new services, value, convenience, and time savings at a cost that is significantly less than that of non-amalgamated functions or services. Many Asian firms—notably, those from South Korea, Taiwan, and mainland China—adopt this strategy because a pure cost leadership strategy would not support sustained growth, while pure differentiation is not appropriate due to a lack of advanced technologies, brand reputation, and innovation. Future research could investigate how, why, and when these firms create competitive advantage, whether they are a uniquely suited to the Asian context, or whether it has implications for management theories and practices beyond Asia.

Finally, to tackle some of the grand challenges of poverty, poor healthcare, and access to education, multilateral agencies, governments, non-government organizations, private firms, and individuals are stepping up with solutions to what appears as intractable social ailments. Many of these problems leave individuals helpless, wanting or aspiring for a better life (e.g., George et al., 2015; Tsui, 2013). Yet true solutions will tend to have multiple parties with differing incentives and goals working together to make a dent in these broader social challenges. These settings make for interesting contexts to learn and study coordination challenges, organizational design and business models, public–private partnerships and novel governance structures (e.g., Roehrich, Lewis, & George, 2014; Tihanyi, Graffin, & George, 2014). The sociocultural context of poverty could yield novel insights into what motivates workers, how individuals transition between jobs and joblessness, or when individuals take up entrepreneurship or self-employment.

Such research may also explore why so few business models (e.g., of social enterprises and other social businesses, or non-governmental organizations) scale up, limiting their social impact. Or, how and why organizational factors (networks, leadership, and so on) contribute differently to organizational performance at different growth stages (Barkema, Coleridge, Qin, Smit, & Stam, 2014; Busch & Barkema, 2015). This research will likely need to be inductive, to explore whether new concepts and theories are needed to understand entrepreneurial organizations operating in informal contexts serving people in poverty in Asia (and other parts of the world), rather than existing ones. Moreover, while economics-based theory (e.g., the modern theory of finance) suggests context-free measures of an organization's economic performance (e.g., shareholder value), its social performance (Tsui & Jia, 2013) will likely depend on institutional, economic, and cultural aspects of local settings and on target groups (women, youths, etc.), requiring an understanding of the organization's interactions with local target groups and communities. This suggests multidisciplinary research in which management researchers may cooperate with researchers from development and anthropology (Barkema, Priego-Hernandez, & Soylu, 2015; Huang, 2015), potentially leading to new theories, concepts, and performance measures.

These are just a few illustrations of exciting research opportunities for the Eastern context, with potential implications for enriching management knowledge in the West. Engaging with these "new" research questions will require scholars to break out of the bondage of normal science. Below, we propose an "agentic" view for individual researchers, for journals, and for management schools to advance the creation of new concepts, theories, and paradigms, which we believe is important for the development of scholarship and management knowledge in Asia and beyond.

An Agentic View of Creating New Theories and Paradigms

We will first discuss potential actions of individual researchers. We encourage an agentic view—that is, researchers making explicit choices about which novel management problems or puzzles to

This content downloaded from 210.35.162.31 on Sun, 28 Nov 2021 13:17:42 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

study, and addressing which economic or social concerns, rather than be driven by "given" theoretical gaps in existing paradigms. This is similar to what early management theorists did, leading to a rich variety of concepts, theories, and paradigms, although contemporary researchers need to show how new concepts and theories add to existing ones (see our discussion of construct salience, etc.), while benefiting from contemporary research methods and methodologies. The early days of management research and the contributions to this SRF jointly suggest going beyond "one-shot" studies of new settings; for instance, based on "lived experience" to adequately tap into local management problems, puzzles, and underlying worldviews, and having multicultural experience as individuals or as teams, facilitating an understanding of which management puzzles are interesting and novel in a new setting.

Publishing books may be an appropriate avenue to surface novel management problems, and to suggest initial questions and answers, as well as popular articles, followed by more neutral, scientific work (Abrahamson, 1996; Abrahamson & Fairchild, 1999), while the new journal outlet *Academy of Management Discoveries* has the explicit remit to describe new management phenomena. An agentic view, building on a researcher's individual worldviews and knowledge advantage (in terms of cultural and philosophical beliefs, knowledge, values, and social concerns), will likely lead to more novel concepts and theories, potentially triggering more interesting debate and increasing the relevance and impact for society of the research (Kuhn, 1985).

Second, journals may help reduce biases due to normal science. For instance, by using procedures that correct for potential editor or reviewer bias. In this SRF, we experimented with using multiple editors for editorial decisions to correct for potential idiosyncratic biases. Journals may also—perhaps even more consciously than they already do—select multicultural sets of reviewers, to increase the likelihood of recognizing and tapping into novel management conundrums, concepts, and theories that explicitly add to existing theory. Journals may also—even more systematically—use special research fora inviting inductive work on emerging management problems, puzzles, and worldviews (e.g., related to organizations or ecosystems addressing aging, climate change, poverty) that are highly relevant but differ from those that triggered the original paradigms. These efforts may also lead to further new concepts, theories, and paradigms, and, in turn, increase the relevance and social impact of management research.

Third, management schools may help to reduce biases due to normal science and increase the likelihood of research that addresses contemporary social concerns. Just as organizations can adopt an agentic view towards culturally embedded concepts such as "time" (Reinecke & Ansari, 2015), management schools can be agentic in terms of supporting research on management puzzles and problems related to a specific geographical setting (e.g., Asia, South America, Africa) or newly emerging management puzzles and issues—for instance, by recognizing, rewarding, or funding such research (e.g., through external funding or research centers). This is particularly relevant, because such research may take longer to develop and to publish than research that narrowly fits existing concepts and theories, due to the need to develop new measures, or because of higher costs, larger problems of data collection, and biases of established journals. Hence, schools may strategically tap into management puzzles and problems, building on their worldviews and competitive advantage (in terms of cultural and philosophical beliefs, knowledge, values, and social concerns), and where they are particularly interested in supporting debate and relevance for society. For example, schools in Asia, South America, and Africa might opt to exploit their relative strengths (i.e., tapping into local problems or puzzles) and build a distinct, competitive advantage in the global game of competition for management schools, in addition to contributing to (building up competencies and output in) normal science. Or, management schools may tap into management problems and puzzles related to newly emerging economic, social, or environmental concerns, with similar implications.

Interestingly, the agency of management researchers, schools, and journals actively supporting, selecting, studying, and publishing research on a variety of novel management problems and puzzles may lead, at the aggregate level of the management field, to more novel concepts, theories, and paradigms; transcending the constraints of normal science and the setting from which management research emerged, and potentially—through journal articles, education (bachelor's and master's degree-taught programs, executive education, PhD programs), books, and popular press articles and blogs—leading to more timely debates and more relevance for society.

This content downloaded from 210.35.162.31 on Sun, 28 Nov 2021 13:17:42 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

In sum, we strongly encourage researchers, journals, and management schools to be "agentic" in terms of selecting management problems and puzzles based on their worldviews and social concerns, causing useful variation in the system rather than uniformity implied by normal science, given the large potential benefits for researchers, management schools, the field of management as a whole, and in view of the potential relevance and impact for society.

REFERENCES

Abrahamson, E. 1996. Management fashion. ***Academy of Management Review,*** 21: 254–285.

Abrahamson, E., & Fairchild, G. 1999. Management fashion: Life cycles, triggers, and collective learning processes. ***Administrative Science Quarterly,*** 44: 708–740.

Adair, W., Buchan, N., Chen, X. P., & Liu, D. 2013. ***The challenge of nonverbal context in international business: A model of communication and social interaction style.*** Istanbul, Turkey: Academy of International Business.

Argyris, C. 1957. ***Personality and organizations.*** New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Barkema, H. G. 2001. From the editors. ***Academy of Management Journal,*** 44: 615–617.

Barkema, H. G., Baum, J. A. C., & Mannix, E. A. 2002. Management challenges in a new time. ***Academy of Management Journal,*** 45: 916–930.

Barkema, H. G., Coleridge, C., Qin, F., Smit, J., & Stam, D. 2014. ***Business model innovation: Team networks and leadership*** (Working Paper). London, U.K.: London School of Economics and Political Science.

Barkema, H. G., Priego-Hernandez, J., & Soylu, S. 2015. ***A dynamic model of business model innovation and women empowerment in a Delhi slum*** (Working Paper). London, U.K.: London School of Economics and Political Science.

Barkema, H. G., & Vermeulen, F. 1997. What differences in the cultural backgrounds of partners are detrimental for international joint ventures? ***Journal of International Business Studies,*** 28: 845–864.

Barnard, C. 1938. ***Functions of the executive.*** Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Barney, J. 1991. Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. ***Journal of Management,*** 17: 99–120.

Barney, J. B. 2005. Where does inequality come from? The personal and intellectual roots of resource-based theory. In K. G. Smith & M. A. Hitt (Eds.), ***Great minds in management: The process of theory development.*** New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Boisot, M., & Child, J. 1996. From fiefs to clans and network capitalism: Explaining China's emerging economic order. ***Administrative Science Quarterly,*** 41: 600–628.

Burns, T., & Stalker, G. M. 1966. ***The management of innovation.*** London, U.K.: Tavistock Publications.

Busch, C., & Barkema, H. G. 2015, ***From rags to bridges: Social capital and bricolage in the context of deep poverty*** (Working Paper). London, U.K.: London School of Economics and Political Science.

Cappelli, P., Singh, H., Singh, J., & Useem, M. 2010. ***The India way: How India's top business leaders are revolutionizing management.*** Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business Press.

Chang, S. J. 2003. ***Financial crisis and transformation of Korean business groups: The rise and fall of chaebols.*** Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Chang, S. J., & Hong, J. 2000. Economic performance of group-affiliated companies in Korea: Intragroup resource sharing and internal business transactions. ***Academy of Management Journal,*** 43: 429–450.

Chen, C. C., Chen, X. P., & Meindl, J. R. 1998. How can cooperation be fostered? The cultural effects of individualism–collectivism. ***Academy of Management Review,*** 23: 285–304.

Chen, G., Chittoor, R., & Vissa, B. 2015. Modernizing without Westernizing: Social structure and economic action in the Indian financial sector. ***Academy of Management Journal,*** 58: 460–479.

Chen, M.-J., & Miller, D. 2010. West meets East: Toward an ambicultural approach to management. ***Academy of Management Perspectives,*** 24: 17–24.

Child, J. 1972. Organizational structure, environment and performance: The role of strategic choice. ***Sociology,*** 6: 1–22.

Child, J., & Marinova, S. 2014. The role of contextual combinations in the globalization of Chinese firms. ***Management and Organization Review,*** 10: 347–371.

Chuang, A., Hsu, R. S., Wang, A. C., & Judge, T. A. 2015. Does West "fit" with East? In search of a Chinese model of person–environment fit. ***Academy of Management Journal,*** 58: 480–510.

Clugston, M., Howell, J. P., & Dorfman, P. W. 2000. Does cultural socialization predict multiple bases and foci of commitment? ***Journal of Management,*** 26: 5–30.

Cole, B. M. 2015. Lessons from a martial arts *dojo*: A prolonged process model of high-context communication. ***Academy of Management Journal,*** 58: 567–591.

This content downloaded from 210.35.162.31 on Sun, 28 Nov 2021 13:17:42 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Cole, B. M., & Chen, X. P. 2015. ***Planting an idea in your boss's head: A preliminary conceptualization of inception and its consequences.*** Paper submitted to Academy of Management annual conference, August 7–11, 2015, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.

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: 1281–1303.

Cyert, R. M., & March, J. G. 1963. ***A behavioral theory of the firm.*** Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Emery, F. E., & Trist, E. L. 1946. Socio-technical systems. In C. W. Churchman & M. Verhulst (Eds.), ***Management science, models and techniques,*** vol. 2: 83–97. Oxford: Pergamon.

Farh, J. L., & Cheng, B. S. 2000. A cultural analysis of paternalistic leadership in Chinese organizations. In J. T. Li, A. S. Tsui & E. Weldon (Eds.), ***Management and organizations in the Chinese context:*** 85–127. London: Macmillan.

Fukuyama, Y. F. 1995. ***Trust: The social virtues and the creation of prosperity.*** New York, NY: Free Press.

George, G. 2012. Publishing in *AMJ* for non-U.S. authors. ***Academy of Management Journal,*** 55: 1023–1026.

George, G. 2014. Rethinking management scholarship. ***Academy of Management Journal,*** 57: 1–6.

George, G., Kotha, R., Parikh, P., Alnuaimi, T., & Bahaj, A. S. 2015. Social structure, reasonable gain, and entrepreneurship in Africa. ***Strategic Management Journal,*** in press. doi: 10.1002/smj.2381.

George, G., McGahan, A. M., & Prabhu, J. 2012. Innovation for inclusive growth: Towards a theoretical framework and a research agenda. ***Journal of Management Studies,*** 49: 661–683.

Gudykunst, W. B., Matsumoto, Y., Ting-Toomey, S., Nishida, T., Kim, K., & Heyman, S. 1996. The influence of cultural individualism–collectivism, self-construals, and individual values on communication styles across cultures. ***Human Communication Research,*** 22: 510–543.

Hall, E. T. 1989. ***Beyond culture.*** New York, NY: Anchor Books.

Hofstede, G. 1991. ***Cultures and organizations: Culture of the mind.*** New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Holtgraves, T. 1997. Styles of language use: Individual and cultural variability in conversational indirectness. ***Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,*** 73: 624–637.

Howard-Grenville, J., Buckle, S. J., Hoskins, B. J., & George, G. 2014. Climate change and management. ***Academy of Management Journal,*** 57: 615–623.

Huang, J. 2015. ***Digital aspirations: An ethnography of the iAgent social entrepreneurship model in Bangladesh.*** PhD thesis, Department of Anthropology, London School of Economics and Political Science (forthcoming).

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

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. 1966. ***The social psychology of organizations.*** New York, NY: Wiley.

Keister, L. A. 1998. Engineering growth: Business group structure and firm performance in China's transition economy. ***American Journal of Sociology,*** 104: 404–440.

Khanna, T., Song, J., & Lee, K. 2011. The paradox of Samsung's rise. ***Harvard Business Review,*** 89: 142–147.

Kuhn, T. S. 1985. ***The Copernican revolution: Planetary astronomy in the development of Western thought.*** Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kuhn, T. S. 1996. ***The structure of scientific revolutions*** (3rd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kulik, C. T., Ryan, S., Harper, S., & George, G. 2014. Aging populations and management. ***Academy of Management Journal,*** 57: 929–935.

Lawrence, P. R., & Lorsch, J. W. 1967. ***Organization and environment: Managing differentiation and integration.*** Homewood, IL: R.D. Irwin.

Li, X., & Liang, X. 2015. A Confucian social model of political appointments among Chinese private entrepreneurs. ***Academy of Management Journal,*** 58: 592–617.

Luo, Y. 2000. ***Guanxi and business.*** Singapore: World Scientific Publishing.

Luo, Y. 2001. ***Strategy, structure, and performance of international firms: Comparing Asian and Western MNEs in China.*** Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Luo, Y., & Child, J. 2014. The growth of emerging economy enterprises: A composition-based view. *Management and Organization Review*, forthcoming.

Ma, L., & Tsui, A. S. 2015. Traditional Chinese philosophies and contemporary leadership. ***Leadership Quarterly,*** 26: 13–24.

Mair, J., Marti, I., & Ventresca, M. J. 2012. Building inclusive markets in rural Bangladesh: How intermediaries work institutional voids. ***Academy of Management Journal,*** 55: 819–850.

March, J. G., & Simon, H. A. 1958. ***Organizations.*** New York, NY: Wiley.

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. 1991. Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. ***Psychological Review,*** 98: 224–253.

This content downloaded from 210.35.162.31 on Sun, 28 Nov 2021 13:17:42 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Matsumoto, D. 1996. ***Unmasking Japan: Myths and realities about the emotions of the Japanese.*** Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Mayo, E. 1933. ***The human problems of an industrial civilization.*** New York, NY: Macmillan.

McKinley, W., Mone, M. A., & Moon, G. 1999. Determinants and development of schools in organization theory. ***Academy of Management Review,*** 24: 634–648.

McNeilly, M. 1996. ***Sun Tzu and the art of business: Six strategic principles for managers.*** New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Mintzberg, H. 1973. ***The nature of managerial work.*** New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Morrison, E. W., & Milliken, F. J. 2000. Organizational silence: A barrier to change and development in a pluralistic world. ***Academy of Management Review,*** 25: 706–731.

Nee, V. 1992. Organizational dynamics of market transition: Hybrid forms, property rights, and mixed economy in China. ***Administrative Science Quarterly,*** 37: 1–27.

Ouchi, W. 1981. ***Theory Z: How American business can meet the Japanese challenge.*** Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

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

Pellegrini, E. K., & Scandura, T. A. 2008. Paternalistic leadership: A review and agenda for future research. ***Journal of Management,*** 34: 566–593.

Peredo, A. M., & Chrisman, J. J. 2006. Toward a theory of community-based enterprise. ***Academy of Management Review,*** 31: 309–328.

Pfeffer, J. 1993. Barriers to the advance of organizational science: Paradigm development as a dependable variable. ***Academy of Management Review,*** 18: 599–620.

Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. R. 1978. ***The external control of organizations.*** New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Prahalad, C. K. 2004. ***The fortune at the bottom of the pyramid.*** Harlow, U.K.: Financial Times/Prentice Hall.

Pugh, D. S., Hickson, D. J., & Hining, C. R. 2007. ***Great writers on organizations.*** Aldershot, U.K.: Ashgate.

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

Reinecke, J., & Ansari, S. 2015. When times collide: Temporal brokerage at the intersection of markets and development. ***Academy of Management Journal,*** 58: 618–648.

Roehrich, J. K., Lewis, M. A., & George, G. 2014. Are public–private partnerships a healthy option? A systematic review. ***Social Science and Medicine,*** 113: 110–119.

Roethlisberger, F. J., & Dickson, W. J. 1949. ***Management and the worker.*** Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Schumacher, E. F. 1981. ***Small is beautiful: A study of economics as if people mattered.*** London: Blond and Briggs.

Schwartz, S. H. 1992. Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. ***Advances in Experimental Social Psychology,*** 25: 1–65.

Scott, W. R. 1987. The adolescence of institutional theory. ***Administrative Science Quarterly,*** 32: 493–511.

Simon, H. A. 1960. ***Administrative Behavior,*** 2nd Ed. New York, NY: Macmillan.

Sloan, A. P. 1964. ***My years with General Motors.*** New York, NY: Doubleday.

Smith, K. G., & Hitt, M. A. 2005. ***Great minds in management: The process of theory development.*** New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Spell, C. S. 2001. Management fashions: Where do they come from, and are they old wine in new bottles? ***Journal of Management Inquiry,*** 10: 358–373.

Staw, B. M. 1976. Knee-deep in the big muddy: A study of escalating commitment to a chosen course of action. ***Organizational Behavior and Human Performance,*** 16: 27–44.

Steers, R. M., Sin, Y. G., & Ungson, G. R. 1989. ***The chaebol: Korea's new industrial might.*** New York, NY: Harper & Row, Ballinger Division.

Stiglitz, J. E., & Yusuf, S. 2001. ***Rethinking the east-Asian miracle.*** Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.

Taylor, F. W. 1911. ***The principles of scientific management.*** London: Harper & Brothers.

Thompson, J. 1967. ***Organizations in action.*** New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Tihanyi, L., Graffin, S., & George, G. 2014. Rethinking governance in management research. ***Academy of Management Journal,*** 57: 1535–1543.

Triandis, H. C. 1995. ***Individualism and collectivism.*** Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Trompenaars, F., & Hampden-Turner, C. 2012. ***Riding the waves of culture.*** New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Tsui, A. S. 2007. From homogenization to pluralism: International management research in the academy

This content downloaded from 210.35.162.31 on Sun, 28 Nov 2021 13:17:42 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

and beyond. ***Academy of Management Journal,*** 50: 1353–1364.

Tsui, A. S. 2009. Editor's introduction—Autonomy of inquiry: Shaping the future of emerging scientific communities. ***Management and Organization Review,*** 5: 1–14.

Tsui, A. S. 2013. The spirit of science and socially responsible scholarship. ***Management and Organization Review,*** 9: 375–394.

Tsui, A. S., Egan, T. D., & O'Reilly, C. A. O., III. 1992. Being different: Relational demography and organizational attachment. ***Administrative Science Quarterly,*** 37: 549–579.

Tsui, A. S., & Jia, L. 2013. Calling for humanistic scholarship in China. ***Management and Organization Review,*** 9: 1–15.

Vroom, V. 1964. ***Work and motivation.*** New York, NY: Wiley.

Weber, M. 1947. ***The theory of social and economic organization.*** New York, NY: Free Press.

Whetten, D. A. 1989. What constitutes a theoretical contribution? ***Academy of Management Review,*** 14: 490–495.

Whetten, D. 2014. ***What constitutes a contextualized theoretical contribution?*** Paper presented at the Theory Development Workshop, Stockholm, Sweden.

Whitley, R. 1992. ***Business systems in East Asia: Firms, markets and societies.*** Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Woodward, J. 1965. ***Industrial organization: Theory and practice.*** Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.

World Bank. 1993. ***The East-Asian miracle: Economic growth and public policy.*** Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.

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

Zhang, Y., Waldman, D., Han, Y., & Li, X. 2015. Paradoxical leader behavior in people management: Antecedents and consequences. ***Academy of Management Journal,*** 58: 538–566.

Zhang, Z.-X., Chen, G. Z. X., Chen, Y.-R., & Ang, S. 2014. Business leadership in the Chinese context: Trends, findings, and implications. ***Management and Organization Review,*** 10: 199–221.

Harry Barkema (barkema@lse.ac.uk) is professor of management at the London School of Economics and at Erasmus University. He is also the founder-director of the LSE's Innovation Lab (ICCL), which co-creates and disseminates knowledge on organizational innovation and growth in relation to extreme poverty. The Lab works in sectors such as education, health care, and agriculture, together with local social entrepreneurs in the broad sense (in global and local social businesses, NGOs, government, and so on), in countries such as India, Bangladesh, Kenya, and South Africa.

Xiao-Ping Chen (xpchen@u.washington.edu) is currently Philip M. Condit Endowed Chair Professor and Chair of Department of Management and Organization at the Foster School of Business, University of Washington. She is a Fellow at Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. She is also Editor-in-Chief for Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes and Editor-in-Chief for Management Insights, a bilingual (Chinese and English) magazine for business educators and practitioners. Her research interests include cooperation and competition in social dilemmas, teamwork and leadership, entrepreneur passion, Chinese guanxi, and cross-cultural communication and management.

Gerry George (ggeorge@smu.edu.sg) is dean and professor of innovation and entrepreneurship at Lee Kong Chian School of Business at Singapore Management University. He also serves as the editor of the AMJ. He received his Ph.D. from Virginia Commonwealth University. His recent work examines strategic and organizational factors, such as business models and organizational design, and their impact on innovation and performance. He has specific interest in the area of socially inclusive innovation in Asia and Africa, working on issues such as rural electrification and healthcare delivery.

Yadong Luo (yadong@miami.edu) is the Emery M. Findley Distinguished Chair and Professor of Management at the University of Miami. He received his PhD in strategy and international business from Temple University. His research focuses on global strategy, international management, and business growth in emerging economies.

Anne S. Tsui (atsui@nd.edu) is the Visiting Distinguished Professor of Management at the Mendoza College of Business, University of Notre Dame, Emerita Motorola Professor of International Management, Arizona State University, and Special Appointment Professor of Fudan University, Peking University, and Shanghai Jiao Tong University. She received her Ph.D. from the University of California, Los Angeles. Her research interests include managerial effectiveness, human resources management, demographic diversity, employment relationship, executive leadership, organizational culture, and Chinese management.

This content downloaded from 210.35.162.31 on Sun, 28 Nov 2021 13:17:42 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms