

Leadership research in Asia: Taking the road less traveled?

Long W. (Rico) Lam · Xu Huang · Dora C. Lau

Published online: 26 April 2012
© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2012

Abstract Asia is a geographical region with a cultural emphasis on power distance, paternalism, collectivism, and social relations. Leadership in this area plays an important role in organizational processes and outcomes; however, whether this role is similar to that outlined in the mainstream leadership research and non-Asian settings is yet to be confirmed. In this Special Issue on “Leadership in Asia,” we selected six papers and identified four emerging themes. First, several mainstream leadership theories are applicable in Asia. On the other hand, we also identified processes and effects that are unique in Asia. Second, leadership in Asia affects organizational outcomes. Third, a strong emphasis on families and social ties among Asian corporations highlights intriguing leadership dynamics in this part of the world. Finally, new context-specific leadership constructs are identified and discussed. In light of these findings, we discuss the future directions of leadership research in Asia.

Keywords Leadership · Asian Context · Family Business · Social Ties · Indigenous Research

We would like to take this chance to thank our conference keynote speaker, Professor Michael Bond, our discussants, Professors Robert Liden, Chun Hui, Yaping Gong, Riki Takeuchi, and C.S. Wong, as well as our reviewers for this Special Issue. Their comments have provided us great feedback in constructing this Special Issue of *APJM*. We also thank Rachel (Rae) Pinkham and Marc Ahlstrom of Burlington County College for their editorial assistance. Finally we would also thank William Mobley, who provided comments on an early version of this paper.

L. W. Lam (✉)
University of Macau, Macau, China
e-mail: ricolam@umac.mo

X. Huang
The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong, People’s Republic of China

D. C. Lau
Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, People’s Republic of China

Asia is thought to contain a cultural context that emphasizes power distance, paternalism, collectivism, and social relations (Ahlstrom, Chen, & Yeh, 2010; Farh, Earley, & Lin, 1997; Hofstede & Hofstede, 2004; Pellegrini & Scandura, 2008). Asia is also a place where social ties are thought to play a prominent role in raising distinct organizational forms, such as family business, *keiretsu*, and *chaebol* (Okimoto, 1989; Steers, Shin, & Ungson, 1991). Such contextual and institutional characteristics may create unique leadership behaviors, while influencing the processes underlying the leadership effect, as well as the role of leaders in broader organizational and socio-economic contexts (Fu, Wu, Yang, & Ye, 2007; Peng, Li, Xie, & Su, 2010). Although scholars have long called for the development of contextualized theories and constructs that are relevant to specific cultural and institutional contexts at a variety of levels (Globerman, Peng, & Shapiro, 2011; Peng, 2005; Rousseau & Fried, 2001; Tsui, 2006), the mainstream leadership research is still dominated by the universalist and (largely) culture-insensitive perspective—assuming that leadership constructs and theories are universal across all cultures and times (Bass, 1997; Berry, Poortinga, Segall, & Dasen, 1992; Huang, 2008; Spreitzer, Perttula, & Xin, 2005). Many empirical studies on leadership in Asian societies focus on testing and extending universal theories of leadership, mainly developed in the West, by simply using Asian samples (Huang, 2007; Huang & Bond, 2012).

There are two major obstacles to the more culturally sensitive approach to leadership research. First, as pointed out by Liden (2012) in his Perspectives article of this Special Issue, large-scale cross-cultural studies have often discovered more cross-cultural similarities than differences, lending strong support to the universalist approach to the theorization of leadership research. Second, Liden also convincingly argued that in order to achieve scientific rigor and parsimony, researchers should be extremely cautious about developing indigenous constructs and theories for each culture (cf. Li, Ahlstrom, & Ashkanasy, 2010). Liden added that a more appropriate approach to addressing cross-cultural differences is to identify cultural moderators of the effects of universally endorsed leadership constructs.

When we planned for this Special Issue on “Leadership in Asia,” we took a set of positions similar to those of Liden in that: (1) understanding cross-cultural differences in leadership behaviors and leadership influences through contextualization can help us develop novel ideas and uncover previously understudied constructs and theories of leadership; (2) developing new constructs and theories do not necessarily need to compromise scientific rigor and generalizability, especially when those new constructs can help explain leadership behaviors in a broad geographical region such as the Asia Pacific; and (3) contextualizing leadership research can also broaden our understanding of leaders’ role in specific organizational and socio-economic contexts (Ahlstrom et al., 2010; Chhokar, Brodbek, & House, 2007).

With all this in mind, in addition to Liden’s Perspectives paper, we selected six additional papers out of the 26 submissions to this Special Issue. We believe that these six papers, each with varied perspectives, have substantially advanced the existing leadership theories through contextualized theorization and empirical testing in the socio-cultural context of several Asian countries. In the remainder of this article, we outline the key themes that emerged from these papers, identify

several important issues for further research, and give our suggestions whether Asian researchers should take the “road less traveled” when conducting leadership research.

Four emerging themes

Established leadership theories are applicable in Asia

As a majority of leadership theories and research have been conducted by scholars in the Western context, some have wondered whether our current understanding of leadership is relevant in other cultural contexts (Fu et al., 2007; Rousseau & Fried, 2001; Tsui, 2006). Papers of this Special Issue indicate that established leadership theories are certainly applicable in Asia.

Using a multi-foci approach, Bai, Li, and Xi (2012) found that transformational leadership leads to better followers' performance at the top management and supervisory levels. The relationship at the top management level is mediated by perceived organizational support and trust in top management team, whereas the relationship at the supervisor level is mediated by leader–member exchange and trust in supervisor. The constructs in Bai et al.'s (2012) study are well established in the organizational behavior literature. Although this research team collected the data in China, their study does not lead to any speculation that the influencing and mediating mechanisms of transformational leadership should differ between the West and Asia. Bai et al.'s (2012) study thus contributes to our existing leadership research by showing that there are different levels of exchanges in the organization initiated by transformational leadership (e.g., Masterson, Lewis, Goldman, & Taylor, 2000). In addition to Bai et al.'s (2012) paper, two studies in this Special Issue have shown that transformational leadership is conducive to individual performance, team performance (Ishikawa, 2012), and business unit innovation (Chen, Lin, Lin, & McDonough, 2012). These findings are consistent with what have been previously found in Western societies.

Although these studies attempted to test and extend the universal leadership theories using Asian samples, they also uncovered some unique patterns that are qualitatively different from those found in the West. Specifically, Chen et al. (2012) failed to find a significant moderating effect of intrinsic incentives on the link between transformational leadership and innovation at the business unit level using data collected from Taiwan, as would be expected based on universal theories. This finding, however, is consistent with prior cross-cultural research that intrinsic motivation generally has a weaker effect on work motivation in countries with more collectivistic and larger power distance cultures (Huang & Van de Vliert, 2003). Also, empirical evidence in the Western context suggests that micro-level rather than macro-level social exchange is more likely to shape employees' organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002). Yet, based on the sample from China, Bai et al. (2012) found that, among other things, both macro-level and micro-level exchange (i.e., employees' trust in top management team and trust in supervisor) were related to OCB. This result suggests that in the Chinese context, employees may translate their trust in their immediate supervisors into behavioral

reactions towards their organizations, perhaps due to collectivistic values (Chen, Tsui, & Farh, 2002).

Leadership can improve organizational outcomes in Asia

While most prior studies focus on leadership effects at the individual level and the team level, we received quite a few more this in Special Issue that examined macro outcomes in Asia (Chen et al., 2012; Chung & Chan, 2012; Ishikawa, 2012; Wu & Chen, 2012), adding to the burgeoning literature on the leadership effect at the organizational level (e.g., Ling, Simsek, Lubatkin, & Veiga, 2008; Waldman, Ramirez, House, & Puranam, 2001). Although the focus on macro outcomes is not emic or indigenous, it does reflect the scholarly interest of whether leadership matters for Asian corporations. Such scholarly interest is consistent with Asia's cultural emphasis on power distance and paternalism. The underlying assumption of these two cultural values is that top management is more knowledgeable and competent, such that subordinates should respect leaders and defer to them for strategic decisions. If this is the case, leaders in Asia should have a greater impact on organizational outcomes (cf. Bruton, Ahlstrom, & Wan, 2003).

In particular, Chen et al. (2012) found supportive evidence that firms are more innovative under transformational leadership. Given that transformational leaders provide idealized influence and inspirational motivation to their followers, it is rather logical to expect firms to be innovative under such influences. More importantly though, Chen et al.'s (2012) study further reveals that organizational culture has substituting whereas corporate incentives have neutralizing effects on this relationship. These are important boundary conditions in understanding when transformational leadership can matter the most in Asian firms. Chung and Chan (2012) examine leadership of family businesses. Although firm performance is not the primary focus of Chung and Chan's (2012) study, these authors found that family leadership is positively related to sales revenue among family businesses in Taiwan.

Leadership and family and social ties

In the original call for papers, we thought that Asian companies may emphasize family business and social ties, and this could shape our views of leadership in Asia (Chu, 2011). Indeed two of the accepted papers confirm our speculation. These studies have gone beyond the emphasis on impact of specific leadership behaviors in the extant literature, such as transformational leadership (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978), empowering leadership (Arnold, Arad, Rhoades, & Drasgow, 2000), and ethical leadership (Avolio & Luthans, 2006; Luthans & Avolio, 2003), by incorporating leaders' social capital as well as familial relational capital in to their theoretical models.

Family business is a very common organizational and ownership form in Asia (e.g., Chu, 2011; La Porta, Lopez-de-Silanes, & Shleifer, 1999). Consistent with the stewardship theory (Davis, Schoorman, & Donaldson, 1997), Chung and Chan's (2012) study provides additional evidence that family leaders can improve firm performance. In particular, they found that family business in Taiwan assumes either direct or pyramidal ownership. This choice of ownership structure affects family

performance and such relationship is mediated by family leadership. Chung and Chan (2012) thus illustrated how Taiwanese family business groups used family members as familial relational capital to head affiliate firms in order to reduce agency costs—a common practice in Asia that is not yet well understood.

Wu and Chen (2012) also analyze the role of social ties of leaders. They focus on two forms of social ties, business and government ties, and propose that these two ties can contribute to firms' competitive advantages. Among firms in China, Wu and Chen (2012) found that absorptive capacity of the organization has opposing effects on whether business and government ties are related to competitive advantages. In sum, they showed the important role of leaders' social capital in the form of business ties and government ties in shaping firms' competitive advantages in China, whereby there is much uncertainty in the institutional and legal environments.

New constructs can be established by studying leaders in Asia

In this Special Issue, two studies have focused on introducing and testing new constructs, which help advance our understanding of some unique leadership influences in Asian countries. For instance, to explain the observed insignificant effect of transformational leadership on R&D teams' shared leadership, Ishikawa (2012) introduced two constructs, gatekeeping leadership and maintaining consensus. He argued that the collectivistic culture of Japan is likely to predispose team members to maintain consensus rather than engaging in shared leadership behaviors, and transformational leadership was found to strengthen such consensus norm. Ishikawa then empirically demonstrated that gatekeeping leadership, a leadership style that encourages information sharing, is conducive to shared leadership in R&D teams, which results in high team performance. Likewise, Chan and Mak (2012) examined the effect and the influencing mechanism of benevolent leadership, an indigenous Chinese leadership style. The results of Chan and Mak's (2012) study support the critical role of benevolent leadership behavior in shaping leader–member exchange qualities and employees' work performance using the sample of a Hong Kong volunteer organization.

Future research on leadership in Asia

Researchers can undertake different paths when pondering how to conduct leadership research in Asia (Bhagat, McDevitt, & McDevitt, 2010; Fang, 2010; Ismail & Ford, 2010). After reviewing the general themes of papers in this Special Issue, we offer the following suggestions whether leadership scholars should take the road less traveled in planning for their future research in Asia.

First, due to the unique Asian context, there could be leadership styles indigenous to this part of the world (Ahlstrom et al., 2010). However, as Cheng, Wang, and Huang (2009) vividly pointed out, conducting indigenous research is similar to taking the road less traveled—on the one hand, it is very fulfilling, but on the other hand, it is also challenging in terms of the extensive steps needed in making such journey successful. If researchers are interested in this route, we suggest they try to demonstrate how such indigenous styles enrich our current understanding of leadership

using the methodological standards commonly adopted in the management and social science literature (e.g., construct validity, reliability, incremental explanation). In other words, if researchers intend to take the road less traveled, they need to demonstrate their proposed leadership form is unique and at the same adds explanatory power beyond the existing leadership constructs.

Second, this Special Issue illustrates that there exists a set of universal leadership theories that are also equally applicable in the Asian and non-Asian context. Our first set of papers reflects this possibility. Yukl (1998) once suggested that 95 % of leadership research still refers to the North American leaders. By taking this research path that most people travel, researchers are likely to come across a lot of competition for that research space. We therefore suggest that researchers interested in this route explain how their studies add value to the current leadership literature when conducting their leadership research in Asia.

Third, there are variants of universal leadership theories (Dickson, Hanges, & Lord, 2001) such that researchers should consider contextual variables more unique to Asia (e.g., power distance) affecting how leaders influence their followers (e.g., Kirkman, Chen, Farh, Chen, & Lowe, 2009; Loi, Lai, & Lam, 2012). Our third set of papers illustrates how to conduct leadership research using this approach. Liden's (2012) Perspectives paper has also provided several suggestions how this can be done. As mentioned earlier, we were surprised by the lack of papers investigating how the Asian context shapes the influence of leadership on micro outcomes. In the future, we should therefore need more papers taking this route. The advent of multi-group analyses (e.g., hierarchical linear modeling) has provided sufficient analytical tools for researchers to account for cultural context when studying leadership in Asia.

Finally, our state of research can also benefit from analyzing antecedents and outcomes of leadership that are more common in Asia. For instance, there has been discussion and evidence that the Chinese share an indigenous personality emphasizing interpersonal relations (Cheung et al., 2001; Leung, Chen, Zhou, & Lim, 2012a). Future research can therefore explore if this indigenous personality is related to leadership constructs that we are aware of. If results are negative, researchers will then have evidence to ponder leadership styles that may be indigenous to China. Leaders' values (Fu, Tsui, Liu, & Li, 2010) and emotions (Li, 2011; Li et al., 2010) can be another important and fundamental individual-level predictor of leadership and related behaviors. Besides the categorization of self-transcendent and self-enhancement values, are there other types of values that will affect Asian leadership? Prior research has shown that ethical leadership can promote employees' voice (e.g., Walumbwa & Schaubroeck, 2009). While constructive voice is certainly desirable, Asian culture also emphasizes the importance of harmony (Chen, Chan, Bond, & Stewart, 2006; Kwan, Bond, & Singelis, 1997; Leung, Brew, Zhang, & Zhang, 2012b). It is therefore interesting to explore in Asia which leadership styles are conducive to employee voice, and whether there are leadership approaches (e.g., servant leadership) that can promote harmony along with the necessary cooperative conflict within and between organizations (Wang, Chen, Tjosvold & Shi, 2010). Another possibility is to examine Asian leadership via the followers' perspective. The implicit theory suggests that followers have preconceived expectations about effective leaders, and these beliefs may well be affected by cultural values and beliefs

(Hernandez, Eberly, Avolio, & Johnson, 2011; Lord, 1977). The information-processing perspective also offers similar predictions by suggesting that leadership prototypes vary across cultures of followers (Dickson et al., 2001). Future research may also compare the successful leadership profiles between Asian and non-Asian organizations.

Special thanks

We received a total of 26 submissions for this Special Issue in 2010. After the first round of review, we invited 16 authors to present their work at the *APJM* Special Issue Conference hosted by University of Macau on December 11 and 12, 2010. Five discussants (Professors Robert Liden, Chun Hui, Yaping Gong, Riki Takeuchi, and C.S. Wong) provided comments on these 16 papers. Professor Michael Bond also commented on these papers and gave a keynote speech regarding how cross-cultural research can add insight to the study of leadership in Asia. In addition, Professor David Ahlstrom, Editor-in-Chief of the *Asia Pacific Journal of Management* also attended the conference and made remarks on this Special Issue. We further invited some of the presented papers to go through additional revision based on the comments raised by the conference participants. In total, six papers were accepted for the Special Issue. In addition to this editorial essay, we also invited Professor Robert Liden to give his perspective of leadership research in Asia.

References

- Ahlstrom, D., Chen, S.-j., & Yeh, K. S. 2010. Managing in ethnic Chinese communities: Culture, institutions, and context. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 27(3): 341–354.
- Arnold, J. A., Arad, S., Rhoades, J. A., & Drasgow, F. 2000. The empowering leadership questionnaire: The construction and validation of a new scale for measuring leader behaviors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21: 249–269.
- Avolio, B. J., & Luthans, F. 2006. *The high impact leader: Authentic, resilient leadership that gets results and sustained growth*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Bai, Y., Li, P. P., & Xi, Y. 2012. The distinctive effects of dual-level leadership behaviors on employees' trust in leadership: An empirical study from China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 29(this issue). doi:10.1007/s10490-011-9280-6.
- Bass, B. M. 1985. *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. 1997. Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries?. *American Psychologist*, 52: 130–139.
- Berry, J. W., Poortinga, Y. H., Segall, M. H., & Dasen, P. R. 1992. *Cross-cultural psychology: Research and applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bhagat, R. S., McDevitt, A. S., & McDevitt, I. 2010. On improving the robustness of Asian management theories: Theoretical anchors in the era of globalization. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 27(2): 179–192.
- Bruton, G. D., Ahlstrom, D., & Wan, J. 2003. Turnaround in East Asian firms: Evidence from ethnic overseas Chinese communities. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24: 519–540.
- Burns, J. M. 1978. *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Chan, S. C. H., & Mak, W.-M. 2012. Benevolent leadership and follower performance: The mediating role of leader–member exchange (LMX). *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 29(this issue). doi:10.1007/s10490-011-9275-3.
- Chen, M. Y.-C., Lin, C. Y.-Y., Lin, H.-E., & McDonough, E. F. 2012. Does transformational leadership facilitate technological innovation? The moderating roles of innovative culture and incentive compensation. *Asia Pacific Journal of Mnaagement*, 29(this issue). doi:10.1007/s10490-012-9285-9.

- Chen, S. X., Chan, W., Bond, M. H., & Stewart, S. M. 2006. The effects of self-efficacy and relationship harmony on depression across cultures: Applying level-oriented and structure-oriented analyses. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 37: 643–658.
- Chen, Z., Tsui, A., & Farh, J. 2002. Loyalty to supervisor vs organizational commitment: Relationships to employee performance in China. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 75(3): 339–356.
- Cheng, B.-S., Wang, A.-C., & Huang, M.-P. 2009. The road more popular versus the road less traveled: An “insider’s” perspective of advancing Chinese management research. *Management and Organization Review*, 5: 91–105.
- Cheung, F. M., Leung, K., Zhang, J. X., Sun, H. F., Gan, Y. Q., Song, W. Z., & Xie, D. 2001. Indigenous Chinese personality constructs—Is the Five-Factor model complete?. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32: 407–433.
- Chhokar, J. S., Brodbek, F. C., & House, R. J. (Eds.). 2007. *Culture and leadership across the world: The GLOBE book of in-depth studies of 25 societies*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Chu, W. 2011. Family ownership and firm performance: Influence of family management, family control, and firm size. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 28(4): 833–851.
- Chung, H.-M., & Chan, S.-T. 2012. Ownership structure, family leadership, and performance of affiliate firms in large family business groups. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 29(this issue). doi:10.1007/s10490-011-9281-5.
- Davis, J. F., Schoorman, D., & Donaldson, L. 1997. Towards a stewardship theory of management. *Academy of Management Review*, 22: 20–47.
- Dickson, M. W., Hanges, P. J., & Lord, R. G. 2001. Trends, developments and gaps in cross-cultural research. In: W. H. Mobley & M. W. McCall (Eds.). *Advances in global leadership*, vol. 2: 75–100.
- Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. 2002. Trust in leadership: Meta-analytic findings and implications for research and practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87: 611–628.
- Fang, T. 2010. Asian management research needs more self-confidence: Reflections on Hofstede (2007) and beyond. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 27(1): 155–170.
- Farh, J.-L., Earley, P. C., & Lin, S.-C. 1997. Impetus for action: A cultural analysis of justice and organizational citizenship behavior in Chinese society. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42: 421–444.
- Fu, P. P., Tsui, A. S., Liu, J., & Li, L. 2010. Pursuit of whose happiness? Executive leaders’ transformational behaviors and personal values. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 55: 222–254.
- Fu, P. P., Wu, R. X., Yang, Y., & Ye, J. 2007. Chinese culture and leadership. In J. S. Chhokar, F. C. Brodbek & R. J. House (Eds.). *Culture and leadership across the world: The GLOBE book of in-depth studies of 25 societies*: 875–907. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Globerman, S., Peng, M. W., & Shapiro, D. M. 2011. Corporate governance and Asian companies. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 28(1): 1–14.
- Hernandez, M., Eberly, M. B., Avolio, B. J., & Johnson, M. 2011. The loci and mechanisms of leadership: Exploring a more comprehensive view of leadership theory. *Leadership Quarterly*, 22: 1165–1185.
- Hofstede, G., & Hofstede, G. J. 2004. *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Huang, M. P. 2007. Research on leadership in Taiwan. In B. S. Cheng, D. Y. Jiang & H. Y. Cheng (Eds.). *Organizational behavior studies in Taiwan*: 248–279. Taipei: Hwa Tai Publishing.
- Huang, X. 2008. Motivation and job satisfaction across cultures: How much do we really know?. In P. B. Smith, M. F. Peterson & D. C. Thomas (Eds.). *Handbook of cross-cultural management research*: 77–94. London: Sage.
- Huang, X., & Bond, M. 2012. There is nothing more American than research on Chinese organizational behavior: Into a more culturally sensitive future. In X. Huang & M. Bond (Eds.). *The handbook of Chinese organizational behavior: Integrating theory, research, and practice*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Huang, X., & Van de Vliert, E. 2003. Where intrinsic motivation fails to work: National moderators of intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24: 159–179.
- Ishikawa, J. 2012. Transformational leadership and gatekeeping leadership: The roles of norm for maintaining consensus and shared leadership in team performance. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 29 (this issue). doi:10.1007/s10490-012-9282-z.
- Ismail, K. M., & Ford, D. L., Jr. 2010. Organizational leadership in Central Asia and the Caucasus: Research considerations and directions. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 27(2): 321–340.
- Kirkman, B. L., Chen, G., Farh, J.-L., Chen, Z. X., & Lowe, K. B. 2009. Individual power distance orientation and follower reactions to transformational leaders: A cross-level, cross-cultural examination. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52: 744–764.

- Kwan, V. S. Y., Bond, M. H., & Singelis, T. M. 1997. Pancultural explanation for life satisfaction: Adding relationship harmony to self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73(5): 1038–1051.
- La Porta, R., Lopez-de-Silanes, F., & Shleifer, A. 1999. Corporate ownership around the world. *Journal of Finance*, 54: 471–517.
- Leung, K., Brew, F. P., Zhang, Z.-X., & Zhang, Y. 2012a. Harmony and conflict: A cross-cultural investigation in China and Australia. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 42: 795–1051.
- Leung, K., Chen, Z., Zhou, F., & Lim, K. 2012b. The role of relational orientation as measured by face and *renqing* in innovative behavior in China: An indigenous analysis. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*. doi:10.1007/s10490-011-9277-1.
- Li, Y. 2011. Emotions and new venture judgment in China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 28(2): 277–298.
- Li, Y., Ahlstrom, D., & Ashkanasy, N. M. 2010. A multilevel model of affect and organizational commitment. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 27(2): 193–213.
- Liden, R. C. 2012. Leadership research in Asia: A brief assessment and suggestions for the future. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 29(this issue). doi:10.1007/s10490-011-9276-2.
- Ling, Y., Simsek, Z., Lubatkin, M. H., & Veiga, J. F. 2008. The impact of transformational CEOs on the performance of small- to medium-sized firms: Does organizational context matter?. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93: 923–934.
- Loi, R., Lai, J. Y. M., & Lam, L. W. 2012. An investigation of the trickle-down effect of affective commitment in supervisor-subordinate dyad. *Leadership Quarterly*. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.12.001.
- Lord, R. G. 1977. Functional leadership behavior: Measurement and relation to social power and leadership perceptions. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22: 114–133.
- Luthans, F., & Avolio, B. J. 2003. Authentic leadership development. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton & R. E. Quinn (Eds.). *Positive organizational scholarship*: 241–258. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Masterson, S. S., Lewis, K., Goldman, B. M., & Taylor, M. S. 2000. Integrating justice and social exchange: The differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on work relationships. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43: 738–748.
- Okimoto, D. 1989. *Between MITI and the market: Japanese industrial policy for high technology*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Pellegrini, E. K., & Scandura, T. A. 2008. Paternalistic leadership: A review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Management*, 34: 566–593.
- Peng, M. W. 2005. From China strategy to global strategy. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 22(2): 123–141.
- Peng, M. W., Li, Y., Xie, E., & Su, Z. 2010. CEO duality, organizational slack, and firm performance in China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 27(4): 611–624.
- Rousseau, D. M., & Fried, Y. 2001. Location, location, location: Contextualizing organizational research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 22: 1–13.
- Spreitzer, G. M., Perttula, K. H., & Xin, K. 2005. Traditionality matters: An examination of the effectiveness of transformational leadership in the United States and Taiwan. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26: 205–227.
- Steers, R., Shin, Y. K., & Ungson, G. R. 1991. *The chaebol: Korea's new industrial might*. New York: Harpercollins.
- Tsui, A. S. 2006. Contextualization in Chinese management research. *Management and Organization Review*, 2(1): 1–13.
- Waldman, D. A., Ramirez, G. G., House, R. J., & Puranam, P. 2001. Does leadership matter? CEO leadership attributes and profitability under conditions of perceived environmental uncertainty. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44: 134–143.
- Walumbwa, F. O., & Schaubroeck, J. 2009. Leader personality traits and employee voice behavior: Mediating roles of ethical leadership and work group psychological safety. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(5): 1275–1286.
- Wang, Z., Chen, Y.-F. N., Tjosvold, D., & Shi, K. 2010. Cooperative goals and team agreeableness composition for constructive controversy in China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 27(1): 139–153.
- Wu, J., & Chen, X. 2012. Leaders' social ties, knowledge acquisition capability and firm competitive advantage. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 29(this issue). doi:10.1007/s10490-011-9278-0.
- Yukl, G. 1998. *Leadership in organizations*, 4th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Long W. (Rico) Lam (PhD, University of Oregon) is an associate professor of Management at the University of Macau. He is currently doing research on ethical leadership, interpersonal trust, and organizational identification. His publications have appeared in numerous journals including the *Leadership Quarterly*, *Journal of Business Ethics*, *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, and the *Journal of Business Research*. Professor Lam became a Senior Editor of *APJM* in 2010.

Xu Huang (PhD, University of Groningen) is a professor at the Department of Management and Marketing at The Hong Kong Polytechnic University. Professor Huang has published widely in journals such as the *Human Relations*, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, and the *Journal of Applied Psychology*. His primary research interests include employee well-being, emotion and stress, leadership, cross-cultural psychology, and managing people in China. Professor Huang became a Senior Editor of *APJM* in 2010.

Dora C. Lau (PhD, University of British Columbia) is an associate professor at The Chinese University of Hong Kong. Her research interests include demographic diversity and faultlines, relational trust, team dynamics, upper echelon composition and organizational impact, family business challenges and management, and Chinese management. She has published extensively in journals such as the *Academy of Management Review*, *Academy of Management Journal*, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, and *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*. Dora has served as the Associate Editor of the *Journal of Trust Research* since 2010 and is guest editing this current Special Issue of *Asia Pacific Journal of Management* on Leadership research in Asia.