Business and management in China:
A review of empirical research in leading international journals

(Diego Quer, Enrique Claver and Laura Rienda)

Abstract

China's growing economic importance has led to a significant increase in the volume of empirical research about business and management in this country during the last few years. This study reviews the 180 empirical papers focusing on the Chinese context that were published in 12 leading international academic journals between 2000 and 2005. A summary of the methodologies used and the topics analysed is offered, along with various rankings of journals, authors, institutions, and papers.

Keywords: China; Business and management; Review of empirical research; Contributions.

As a result of China's growing economic importance, the number of papers focusing on the Chinese context published in prestigious international journals has increased considerably. While earlier work focused on the mode of entry into China, most recent papers deal with a wider variety of issues from many different points of view. Therefore, a review of the state of the art becomes necessary.

Previous reviews have dealt with research in the Chinese context. These include (1) reviews about management in the People's Republic of China (PRC) by Shenkar (1994) and Tsui, Schoonhoven, Meyer, Lau and Milkovich (2004); (2) reviews about organisation and management research in the context of Greater China by Peng, Lu, Shenkar and Wang (2001) and Li and Tsui (2002); (3) discussion about the applicability of organisational theories developed in the United States to mainland China by Shenkar and Von Glinow (1994); and (4) analysis of the barriers faced when conducting business research in China by Roy, Walters and Luk (2001).

Nevertheless, none of the earlier reviews deals specifically with *empirical* papers focusing on *mainland* China, nor do they review work published in a more recent period. Therefore, our aim is to carry out a review of the empirical papers published in recent years (2000 to 2005, inclusive) by some of the world's highest-impact academic journals about business and management. This is a period during which China joined the World Trade Organization, became one of the world's leading recipients of foreign direct investment, and consequently attracted a significant amount of research attention (Peng, 2005), thus justifying our focus. More precisely, an effort is made to answer the following questions: Which authors and academic institutions have provided the largest number of contributions? Which are the most frequently used methodologies? Which are the most influential papers? Which are the main findings and theoretical approaches? What are the issues that have received the most attention? What are the issues that may still be in an emerging phase?

In a sense, our position is a continuation of Peng et al. (2001) and Li and Tsui (2002), who answered similar questions for an earlier period in Greater China (including Hong Kong, Taiwan, and other Chinese-speaking economies). However, the main difference here is our focus: mainland China and empirical research only.

Methodology

Journal selection

Our first step consisted of identifying the journals to be included in the review. Our intention was to consider only outstanding, high-impact international journals organised in three groups: (a) specific journals dedicated to international business (IB) and management; (b) generic journals about business and management; and (c) journals focused on business and management in the Asian context. First, five journals specifically dedicated to IB and management were included: *Journal of International Business Studies (JIBS)*, *Journal of World Business (JWB)*, *Management International Review (MIR)*, *International Business Review (IBR)*, and *Journal of International Management (JIM)*.

Both *JIBS* and *JWB* are included in nearly all the main reviews of literature about IB and management carried out in recent years (Acedo & Casillas, 2005; Chan, Fung & Leung, 2006; Dubois & Reeb, 2000; Kumar & Kundu, 2004; Lohrke & Bruton, 1997; Lu, 2003; Morrison & Inkpen, 1991). Additionally, it must be remembered that *JIBS* is the official journal of the Academy of International Business (AIB), the most important association of IB researchers worldwide.

MIR is also one of the most internationally acknowledged journals in this field. Acedo and Casillas (2005) considered it one of the ‘top five business journals’ based on a survey among members of the AIB and the International Management Division of the Academy of Management. Additionally, it is included in many previous reviews (Chan et al., 2006;

Dubois & Reeb, 2000; Kumar & Kundu, 2004; Li & Tsui, 2002; Lohrke & Bruton, 1997; Lu, 2003; Tsui et al., 2004).

Similarly, *IBR* was regarded as a “top business journal” by the researchers interviewed by Acedo and Casillas (2005), placed among the top five in the ranking elaborated by Dubois and Reeb (2000), and included in the review of Chan et al. (2006). It is the official journal of the European International Business Academy (EIBA), the most important European association of IB researchers.

Finally, we included *JIM*, another publication with a wide international impact, which has been considered a “top business journal” (Acedo & Casillas, 2005) and a “core IB journal” (Dubois & Reeb, 2000).

The group of generic journals about business and management consisted of six publications: *Academy of Management Journal (AMJ)*, *Administrative Science Quarterly (ASQ)*, *Journal of Management (JM)*, *Journal of Management Studies (JMS)*, *Organization Science (OS)*, and *Strategic Management Journal (SMJ)*.

AMJ, *SMJ*, and *ASQ* appeared in most of the previous reviews (Li & Tsui, 2002; Lohrke & Bruton, 1997; Lu, 2003; Peng et al., 2001; Tsui et al., 2004; Werner, 2002; Werner & Brouthers, 2002). Furthermore, *AMJ* and *SMJ* are the official journals of two leading academic associations, the Academy of Management and the Strategic Management Society, respectively.

JM and *JMS* were incorporated, first because they have traditionally published papers about international management and second because they have been considered in the reviews by Werner (2002), and Werner and Brouthers (2002). *OS* has been the last generic journal within this group because it has been included in previous literature reviews focused on the Chinese context (Li & Tsui, 2002; Peng et al., 2001; Tsui et al., 2004).

Regarding the group of Asian journals, we considered the *Asia Pacific Journal of Management* (*APJM*), which has the longest history among Asia-based management journals and is the most prestigious among them. Indeed, it has been included in earlier reviews of the literature on doing business in China (Li & Tsui, 2002; Peng et al., 2001; Tsui et al., 2004).

Paper selection

After identifying the journals to be analysed, the next step was to select the papers to be reviewed. The period analysed was between 2000 and 2005 (inclusive). We only considered papers with an empirical content focusing on mainland China. Therefore, both conceptual papers and empirical ones which included samples from Hong Kong, Taiwan, or Macao were left out.

A total of 2847 papers were published in the 12 journals under study between 2000 and 2005. After reviewing both their objectives and methodologies, 180 papers proved to fulfil the established criteria and therefore became the sample that was going to be the object of our review.¹

Mapping the contributions

Contributions per journal

Overall, the 180 papers were distributed as follows in each of the six years reviewed: 14 (in 2000), 29 (in 2001), 38 (in 2002), 30 (in 2003), 30 (in 2004) and 39 (in 2005). A distribution of the papers according to the journals in which they were published is provided in Table 1. The journal which published the highest number of empirical papers about business and management in mainland China between 2000 and 2005 is *APJM*, with 33

---

¹ A full list of the 180 papers included in our review can be downloaded from <http://www.ua.es/personal/diego.quer>

papers (which represent 18.3% of the total of 180 papers). *JIBS* ranks second with 28 papers (15.6%), followed by *IBR* with 21 (11.7%) and *MIR* with 20 (11.1%).

Insert Table 1

In the group of generic journals, *JMS* and *SMJ* (both with 15 papers) together with *OS* (with 14) published the largest number of empirical papers on China. At the other end, *JIM* is an IB specialty journal that included the smallest number of such papers (only 6 papers), and *ASQ* is a generic journal that occupies the last position in the ranking (only 2 papers).

Consequently, four journals (*APJM*, *JIBS*, *IBR*, and *MIR*—in descending order) accumulate 102 of the 180 publications identified, more precisely 56.7%. All these four journals dedicated more space to the publication of China papers. In the case of *APJM*, empirical papers on China represented 23.6% of all the papers it published between 2000 and 2005, whereas in *JIBS*, *IBR*, and *MIR*, 11.5%, 9.7% and 10.6% of their publications, respectively, referred to this topic during the same period.

Individual and institutional contributions

A total of 257 authors affiliated with 144 academic institutions and a small number of non-academic institutions published the 180 papers during the 2000-2005 period. The United States is the country drawing together the largest number of institutions whose authors published empirical papers about China during the period (65), followed by China—both mainland and Hong Kong (20), the United Kingdom (11), Australia (9), and Canada (9).

The methodology applied to assess individual and institutional contributions is similar to that used in previous reviews such as Li and Tsui (2002), Lohrke and Bruton (1997), Lu (2003), Morrison and Inkpen (1991), and Peng et al. (2001) Thus, we examined both the total and adjusted appearances of each author and institution. Regarding total appearances, a complete credit was counted each time an author or institution appeared in a paper, even when

several authors or institutions contributed to the same paper. Additionally, no distinction was made based on the order in which the authors appeared; each of them counted as an equal credit.

However, in the case of adjusted appearances, a paper published by a single author counted as a whole credit for that author and for his or her institution; a paper written by two authors counted as half a credit for each author and institution; and so forth. In the ranking of institutions, we considered the institution to which the author belonged at the time of publication. If an author specified that he or she belonged to two institutions, this was taken into consideration when making the count of each institution's adjusted appearances.

Table 2 includes the 26 authors with more than one adjusted appearance in the period analysed. That ranking of authors is ordered first by the number of adjusted appearances and second by the number of total appearances. When both scores coincided in different authors, they were given the same position in the ranking.

Insert Table 2

A very important initial comment can be made about Table 2. Yadong Luo (with 22.74 adjusted appearances and 30 total appearances) significantly leads this ranking. Following Luo, those with the largest number of adjusted appearances are Justin Tan (3.5), Mike W. Peng (3.33), and Eric W.K. Tsang (3), whose total appearances are 7, 5, and 3, respectively. In addition, three top four contributors (Luo, Tan, and Peng) have collaborated on a total of 5 papers (Luo & Tan, 2003; Luo, Tan, & O'Connor, 2001; Peng & Luo, 2000; Peng, Tan, & Tong, 2004; Tan & Peng, 2003). It is also interesting to note that Luo, Tan, and a few others exclusively work on China, while Peng, Child, Guillén, and a few others pursue a more global research agenda. Therefore, Table 2 reports who are the most prolific contributors to the empirical literature on China, but does not represent the overall scholarly ranking of these authors' work.

Overall, only 26 authors mentioned in Table 2 (out of 257 who made contributions during the period under study) have more than one adjusted appearance, and only 12 have at least two adjusted appearances. These data, along with the figure of 257 authors who appeared at least once, show both (1) the wide variety of researchers who contributed to the empirical literature on business and management in China between 2000 and 2005 and (2) the scarcity of authors who consistently hit the 12 top journals.

Similarly, Table 3 presents the ranking of 34 institutions which have more than one adjusted appearance. In this case, the first outstanding issue is logically the University of Miami's comfortable lead (with 22.57 adjusted appearances and 30 total appearances), derived from the fact that it is Yadong Luo's institution.² Among those situated relatively near the University of Miami stand out the Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK), the institution with the second highest number of appearances—both adjusted (10.99) and total (20) appearances. CUHK was also found to be a top contributor in an earlier review by Peng et al. (2001). After that, the Ohio State University, City University of Hong Kong, Lingnan University, and Hong Kong Baptist University (all of them with more than 5.5 adjusted appearances) stand out. Overall, Hong Kong's academic institutions are the most represented (7) among the top 10 in the ranking (all of which have more than 3.5 adjusted appearances), followed by U.S. institutions (2).

Insert Table 3

Methodology used in the papers

Regarding the methodology applied, quantitative approach—used in 148 of the papers analysed (82.2%)—clearly prevails. Within this group, papers based on primary data sources through surveys are the predominant type (66.1%). Far behind them are case studies (17.2%)

---

² However, it must be highlighted that this author appears in one of the papers reviewed as belonging to the University of Hawaii. Therefore, the fact that the University of Miami has 30 total appearances is due to the appearance of another author affiliated with that institution.

along with a paper that designed an experiment with students from several universities based on the prisoner's dilemma.

A more in-depth analysis of these results reveals the difficulty to obtain primary data in China. The fact that many Chinese regions have traditionally remained closed to foreigners very often forced Western researchers to look for data in those cities that were open to them (Shenkar, 1994). Additionally, due to the restrictions imposed by the Chinese authorities on the collection of information by foreign researchers, the latter frequently had to seek the support of the National Bureau of Statistics of China, of Chinese enterprises specialised in market research, and of other local intermediaries hired or of contacts inside the country (*guanxi*) when they had to carry out interview-based surveys. It is the case of some studies included in our review, such as Brouthers, O'Donnell and Hadjimarcou (2005), Ellis (2005), Murray, Kotabe and Zhou (2005), Wang, Lin, Chan and Shi (2005), and Yiu, Bruton and Lu (2005).

As for the quantitative papers which utilised secondary information, the databases most often used in the papers were *China Statistical Yearbook* and *China's Third Industry Census* (provided by the National Bureau of Statistics of China), *Almanac of Foreign Economic Relations and Trade of China* (elaborated by the Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Cooperation—MOFTEC), and *China Business Review* (published by the U.S.-China Business Council). Only two papers used archival data from China's stock exchanges (Peng, 2004; Tian & Lau, 2001).

A citation analysis

In addition to the number of publications, the number of citations also matters a great deal as a measure of scholarly influence and impact (Peng & Zhou, 2006). To assess the impact of the 180 papers from the 12 academic journals, we conducted a citation analysis with

the Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI) database and Google Scholar website. In the China literature, a citation analysis has been used previously by Li and Tsui (2002). The 180 papers generated a total of 748 citations (following SSCI) and 1,893 citations (according to Google Scholar). However, it must be pointed out that papers published in *APJM*, *JIM*, and *MIR* are not included in SSCI, which thus would under-report the citations for these journals. Table 4 lists the papers which generated the largest number of citations as of December 31, 2006. Because of self-citations, we also report the number of citations excluding self-citations.

Insert Table 4

Peng and Luo (2000), which is cited 108 times (91 times excluding self-citations) according to Google Scholar and 62 times (51 times excluding self-citations) according to SSCI, is the most frequently cited paper in this literature. The second most frequently cited paper is Park and Luo (2001), which is cited 100 times (98 times excluding self-citations) and 37 times (35 times excluding self-citations) according to Google Scholar and SSCI, respectively.

Overall, the most cited papers in the SSCI ranking were published by seven journals: *AMJ* (6 papers), *JIBS* (4), *SMJ* (4), *ASQ* (2), *JMS* (2), *OS* (1), and *JM* (1). Regarding the Google Scholar ranking, the top cited papers were published by six journals: *AMJ* (6 papers), *JIBS* (4), *SMJ* (4), *ASQ* (2), *JMS* (2), and *OS* (2).

Research topics and main findings

The last group of results refers to the analysis of the different topics during the 6 years covered in our review. In this case, any classification attempt becomes complicated when one sees the wide range of topics and perspectives. Nevertheless, after studying the classifications made in previous reviews (Li & Tsui, 2002; Lohrke & Bruton, 1997; Lu, 2003; Peng et al., 2001; Tsui et al., 2004; Werner, 2002), we have created a classification with nine generic

categories, which were later disaggregated to include different topics inside each one of them. This is summarized in the Appendix.

The most often treated research topics fall within three broad categories: (a) joint ventures and strategic alliances in China (43 papers), (b) strategy and behaviour of Chinese firms (36 papers), and (c) human resource management in China (30 papers). Therefore, 109 out of the 180 papers studied (that is, 60.6%) belong to these three categories. One of the characteristics of this review is the heterogeneity of the research, along with the low number of papers concentrating on certain specific topics. Accordingly, to compare research results on similar subjects, here we review the main findings and ideas of the 44 papers concentrating on the four most frequent topics: (1) the determinants of performance for international joint ventures (IJVs) in China (17 papers), (2) the process of reform and change in Chinese state-owned enterprises (SOEs) (12 papers), (3) organisational commitment and employee and manager trust in China (8 papers), and (4) knowledge transfer to and from the Chinese subsidiary (7 papers).

Performance determinants for IJVs in China

Transaction cost economics, contingency theory, and the resource-based view of the firm have been the mainstream theoretical perspectives used in studies on the performance of IJVs. The first block of papers examined the impact of the ownership structure and the level of control held by the partners. Yan and Duan (2003) reported that the greater the IJV performance, the closer the interpartner fit with regards to the structure of relative bargaining power and control. However, we found empirical evidence to qualify the previous statement: (1) higher degrees of control and equity stake were associated with greater performance perceived by the foreign partner (Luo, Shenkar & Nyaw, 2001); (2) parent control only became a significant predictor of IJV performance when the quality of parent resourcing was

taken into account (Child & Yan, 2003); (3) greater independence of the IJV (compared to shared management or the existence of a dominant partner) was associated with greater performance (Zhang & Li, 2001); and (4) the effectiveness of the IJV was higher the more autonomy it had to implement, but not to formulate, strategic business plans (Newburry, Zeira & Yeheskel, 2003).

The resources provided by the partners have also been emphasised as performance determinants. Thus, it has been empirically supported that the performance of an IJV will be greater under the following circumstances: when the parent company provides high quality resources in terms of capital investment, new facilities and operational inputs (Child & Yan, 2003); when the partners work closely with regards to contribution and joint management of critical resources (Yan & Duan, 2003); when the foreign partner's degree of commitment to technology transfer is higher (Isobe, Makino & Montgomery, 2000); and when the foreign partner's contractual resource investments are greater, as the same effect is not obtained when resources are provided beyond any formal contracts and written agreements (Yan & Child, 2004).

Further research concentrated on the influence of relationships between partners. Partner cooperation was positively associated with performance and greater market uncertainty required greater cooperation between all parties: local partner, foreign partner, and IJV management (Luo & Park, 2004). Personal and structural attachments positively contributed to performance, although this decreased as attachments increased (Luo, 2002g). Moreover, performance was positively affected the closer the partners worked together on the compatibility of strategic objectives, the more consensus there was concerning culture, strategy and policies (Yan & Duan, 2003) and when the boundary spanners of each party perceived high procedural justice (Luo, 2005a). Finally, trust between partners played a more important role in improving performance when the alliance was younger, risk was more

commensurate between parties, market was less volatile, interpartner dependency in resources was greater, and commitment to the ongoing partnership from each party was higher (Luo, 2002a).

Cultural distance, a factor frequently underlined by many Western companies as a possible hindrance to doing business in China, has also been observed to affect IJV performance, although with surprising results. Thus, Luo (2002a) reported that cultural distance between partners influenced the level of trust, but not the relationship between the level of trust and performance. Li, Karakowski and Lam (2002) could not confirm that lower cultural distance between partners positively affected performance, and Li, Lam and Qian (2001) even found that IJVs with a Western foreign partner (more individualistic culture) had a greater performance than others with a foreign partner from another Asian country. These results were complemented by those of Li et al. (2002), who reported that an appropriate level of management team diversity in culture led to the best IJV performance; i.e., neither too low nor too high cultural diversity was beneficial for performance.

Performance was also affected by the characteristics of the contract, positive effects on performance being observed when there was an alignment between contractual design of the IJV and environmental characteristics (Luo & Tan, 2003). Moreover, when contracts were more complete, cooperation between partners contributed more to performance (Luo, 2002c).

Parent companies' experience with international business and joint ventures was also a performance predictor (Child & Yan, 2003). Specifically, foreign companies that established IJVs in China created more value as they accumulated international experience and specific experience in setting up and managing IJVs in China (Meschi, 2004).

Lastly, we found empirical evidence of another two possible performance predictors: early entry into China (Isobe et al., 2000) and the relatedness of IJV's products with that of its foreign and local parents (Luo, 2002f).

Process of reform and change in Chinese SOEs

Due to the diversity of the sectors analysed, the methodologies, and the theoretical approaches used (institutional theory, transaction cost economics, agency theory, organisational capabilities or resource dependence perspectives), this is the most heterogeneous of the topics. Accordingly, it is more difficult to systematise and generalise the findings.

Some studies have analysed the early years of reforms in Chinese SOEs in different sectors. Regarding sources of funding, Keister (2004) documented that retained earnings were considered a signal of financial health, loans were used to reduce dependence on the state, and most SOEs relied almost exclusively on bank financing and imitated the borrowing behaviour of large, profitable companies. Concerning worker compensation systems, Keister (2002) observed that the use of piece rates increased in the early years of reform, when the manager was elected by the workers and the company was market-oriented or located in areas where labour markets were poorly developed. In this way, He, Chen and Zhang (2004) reported that the employees of manufacturing SOEs which had experienced a greater degree of ownership reform (listed on the stock market) expressed stronger preferences for differential allocation rules (e.g., job position and performance).

Charles-Pauvers and Wang (2002) also studied a heterogeneous industrial sample, and observed that organisation commitment in SOEs increased the greater the degree of satisfaction with relationships with colleagues and superiors, decreasing when management was based on a *laissez-faire* style and when the company's performance level was low.

The determinants of this performance have been studied in several papers centred on manufacturing SOEs. Thus, Lin and Germain (2003) observed that growth performance relative to the industry was positively predicted by formal control, inversely predicted by

decentralisation, and positively predicted by the interaction of the two. Tan and Peng (2003) found that the relationship between organisational slack and performance was curvilinear, where only a moderate level of slack had a positive effect on performance.

Other papers on this topic analysed different issues in SOEs in specific sectors. In the pharmaceutical sector, White (2000) reported that it was more likely for SOEs to develop R&D independently in regions with greater competitiveness in the industry, when technical uncertainty regarding the product was low and when the company had prior experience in independent R&D. In the same sector, White and Liu (2001) observed that institutional factors, organisational capabilities, and transaction costs only sometimes led to the same strategic choice of access to R&D and distribution resources (from alternatives including internal development or “make”, market transaction or “buy”, and interorganisational relationships or “ally”).

In the electronics industry, the environment-strategy co-alignment was moderated by the Chinese transition stage in which the SOEs were founded: those founded since 1990 were more proactive and innovative than those which existed earlier (Tan & Tan, 2005). In the same industry, Peng et al. (2004) reported that SOEs and privately-owned enterprises tended to adopt defender and prospector strategies, respectively, while collectively-owned enterprises and foreign-invested enterprises exhibited an analyser orientation.

Based on a study of one SOE in the logistics services sector, Buckley, Clegg and Tan (2005) observed that effective organisational change required the withdrawal of government interference in management decision making and the separation of operation and regulation.

Finally, in their analysis of a reformed SOE in the steel sector, Hui, Lee and Rousseau (2004) found the following results: organisational support for workers was linked to their affective commitment more strongly than to their organisational citizenship behaviour, while

personal relations between workers and their immediate superiors were linked similarly with both.

Organisational commitment and employee and manager trust in China

Many of the papers on this topic have taken a cultural perspective to analyse issues such as work-family conflict, organisational trust, work values, job satisfaction or turnover intention. The first group of papers compared the differences between China and other countries. On the one hand, Yang, Chen, Choi and Zou (2000) found that family demands had a greater impact on work-family conflict in the United States than in China, while work demands had a greater impact on the same conflict in China. Huff and Kelley (2003) reported that members of organisations in societies with collective cultures such as China were more inclined to trust in-group members more than out-group members (such as suppliers and clients), unlike organisations in more individualist cultures such as the United States. Farh, Zhong and Organ (2004) observed particularly relevant dimensions of organisational citizenship behaviour in China unlike Western countries such as the United States: interpersonal harmony, self-training, protecting and saving company resources, keeping the workplace clean, and participation in social welfare activities. Finally, Shin (2004) observed that, in comparison with Indonesian and Korean workers, Chinese workers showed a high affective commitment to the organisation (as an emotional attachment or identification), but low continuance commitment (whether or not they stay in the organisation).

This last aspect of organisational commitment was also present in other papers concentrating on businesses based on China, not seeking comparison with other cultures. Thus, Wong, Wong, Hui and Law (2001) reported that, due to the traditional Chinese values of loyalty, *guanxi* and reciprocity, for Chinese employees, organisational commitment had direct effects on job satisfaction and turnover intention. Wong, Ngo and Wong (2003) found

that employees' trust in their organisation had a stronger effect on turnover intention than did trust in their supervisors, while trust in supervisors affected the organisational citizenship behaviour of employees. Fryxell, Dooley and Li (2004) observed that competency-based attributions were positively related to employees' value commitment, whereas affect-based attributions were positively related to employees' continuance commitment.

Lastly, Lau, Tse and Zhou (2002) concentrated on changes in organisational culture, finding that the extent that changes in the cognitive schemes of managers and workers had beneficial effects was positively related to job satisfaction and firm commitment.

Knowledge transfer to and from the Chinese subsidiary

Understandably, the dominant conceptual framework in the papers covering this topic was organisational learning/knowledge management theory. Three papers analysed knowledge flows from the headquarters of multinational companies (MNCs) to subsidiaries in China. First, Wang, Tong and Koh (2004) developed a two-stage model to describe this transfer of knowledge: the extent of knowledge contributed by the MNC and the extent of knowledge acquired by the Chinese subsidiary. Zhao, Anand and Mitchell (2005) applied a dual network perspective, identifying two groups of determinant factors. On the one hand, the characteristics of the source network that facilitated knowledge flow to the Chinese subsidiary (existence of a training plan tailored to emerging economies and interactions with other subsidiaries with similar tasks and culture). On the other hand, the characteristics of the recipient network that favoured the flow of received knowledge (movement of skilled individuals from multiple members of the recipient network and forming relationships with multiple MNC partners). L. Li (2005) examined the impact of trust and shared vision on inward knowledge transfer to the subsidiary from both the subsidiary's corporate and external

relations. While trust was more important in the transfer of knowledge based on relationships with other organisations, shared vision positively affected both knowledge flows.

Two papers analysed knowledge flows from the Chinese subsidiary to other subsidiaries of the MNC. Zhao and Luo (2005) found that this knowledge flow depended on the strategic interdependence and technological linkage with peer subsidiaries, in addition to the presence of an adequate infrastructure. Björkman, Barner-Rasmussen and Li (2004) observed that this flow was positively associated with two factors: the perceived importance headquarters attached to knowledge transfer when evaluating subsidiary performance, and the use of corporate socialization mechanisms (interaction between the management of the Chinese subsidiary and that of other units).

Buckley, Clegg and Tan (2003) explored three types of knowledge transfer: primary knowledge transfer (knowledge transferred from headquarters to the Chinese subsidiary), secondary knowledge transfer (knowledge transferred from the Chinese subsidiary to other subsidiaries) and reverse knowledge transfer (knowledge transferred to the parent company). The results indicated that ownership entry choice may lock foreign firms into constraints from which it is difficult to escape, and that secondary and reverse transfer are conditioned by the characteristics and success of primary knowledge transfer.

Finally, Wang and Nicholas (2005) studied knowledge transfer, knowledge replication and learning in contractual JVs operating in China. Their study found that collective or cooperative learning (where partners learn to work together) dominated competitive learning (where partners strive to out-learn each other).

Conclusions

This review has contributed to the literature by identifying (1) the most prolific authors and institutions, (2) the most influential papers, and (3) the most frequently

researched topics in empirical work focusing on the Chinese context. We first find that the journals which published the largest number of empirical papers on China between 2000 and 2005 were *APJM*, *JIBS*, *IBR*, and *MIR*, representing 56.7% of the 180 papers included in our review. Although it is true that the United States accumulates the highest number of institutions whose authors published papers during the period under analysis, Hong Kong institutions prevail among those which contributed the most. The University of Miami occupies the first position in the ranking, thanks to the contributions of Yadong Luo who, in turn, leads the ranking of individual contributors. Regarding the methodology applied in the research papers reviewed, quantitative-type methods, especially those based on primary data sources, prevail. The most cited papers have been Peng and Luo (2000), and Park and Luo (2001), while the most frequent topics have been IJV performance, reform and change in SOEs, organisational commitment, and knowledge transfer.

From a theoretical standpoint, transaction cost economics, agency theory, resource-based view of the firm, organisational learning, and institutional theory are the main theoretical approaches present in the papers dealing with these four topics. When reviewing research on emerging economies, Hoskisson, Eden, Lau and Wright (2000), and Wright, Filatotchev, Hoskisson and Peng (2005) identify these theories as the leading perspectives, a proposition with which Meyer and Peng (2005) concur in their review of research on Central and Eastern Europe. However, resource-based theories (including both the resource-based view of the firm and organisational learning) prevail in our review, perhaps because of the current stage of China's economic development. Papers published in 2000-05 may have captured the dynamics of the relatively "late" stage of transitions during which resource-based theories are likely to become more prominent. Hoskisson et al. (2000) argue that in the early stages of market emergence, institutional theory, which focuses on interorganisational relationships, is pre-eminent in helping to explain impacts on firm strategies. As emerging

economies evolve, resource-based theories, which focus on firm-specific factors, are likely to be more relevant. In this regard, Peng (2003) highlights the relative decline of networks and connections (albeit still important) vis-à-vis competitive resources and capabilities.

However, our review reveals that research agendas have been dominated by theories developed in other contexts and relatively little attention has been paid to the influence of contextual variables. In emerging economies such as China, many issues are substantially new and different. As Meyer (2006) suggests, theories should be adapted to explain locally interesting phenomena; or new models and theories ought to be developed to overcome low explanatory power of adapted theories. Accordingly, Chinese management researchers should be more self-confident in exploring locally relevant research issues and in developing theories that explain Chinese phenomena. The *APJM*, as the leading journal in the field of Asian management, has played and should continue to play a leadership role in publishing context-specific research.

We are aware that our review has some limitations. On the one hand, having selected—essentially following the trend identified in previous reviews—only the most relevant journals about business and management that are published in English, we are unable to investigate contributions made in other languages, especially Chinese. Our method has also prevented us from examining research books. Probing into these directions is one of the future ways to extend this review. On the other hand, regarding the classification of the topics researched, some of the papers might at times have been included in some alternative category. It is the case of a paper about the impact of human resource management on performance and another paper about the acquisition of knowledge by a foreign partner which, because they both dealt with IJVs, could have been included in this category. Nevertheless, the absence or presence of a given paper in a specific category would not substantially change the data presented here.

In our opinion, this study has made a number of interesting contributions despite the limitations described above. First, we have organised and systematised—following a methodology that resembles the one used in previous reviews—the ever-increasing number of empirical papers focusing on China. Second, this review has allowed us to identify which of the highest-impact international journals can be potential outlets for the publication of future research papers in this area. It additionally provides a guide both about the issues that have received the most attention lately and about those that will require a more in-depth analysis in the next few years.

In terms of promising future research directions, two of them deserve a special mention because, in our opinion, they are emerging topics of great relevance if we consider the phase that China is reaching in its economic evolution as well as the role it is currently playing in the context of globalisation. On the one hand, the country's spectacular development during the last 25 years, unparalleled in terms of speed and consequences for the world's economy, raises an issue for the future: the environmental sustainability of that growth. Only five papers (Branzei, Ursacki-Bryant, Vertinsky & Zhang, 2004; Chan, 2005; Child & Tsai, 2005; Christmann & Taylor, 2001; Yeung & Mok, 2005) deal with this important topic. This is why it becomes necessary to carry out more research on environmental management in China. On the other hand, it would be interesting to acquire deeper knowledge of the processes of outbound FDI undertaken by Chinese firms and the role of threat or opportunity that Chinese multinationals play in the new global scenario (Tung, 2005). Only one paper (Liu, Buck & Shu, 2005) informs us of these strategies and actions of outbound FDI from China. Clearly, more research in this direction is needed.

References³

- Acedo, F.J., & Casillas, J.C. 2005. Current paradigms in the international management field: An author co-citation analysis. *International Business Review*, 14: 619-639.
- Ambler, T., & Wang, X. 2003. Measures of marketing success: A comparison between China and the United Kingdom. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 20: 267-281.
- *Björkman, I., Barner-Rasmussen, W., & Li, L. 2004. Managing knowledge transfer in MNCs: The impact of headquarters control mechanisms. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 35: 443-455.
- Branzei, O., Ursacki-Bryant, T.J., Vertinsky, I., & Zhang, W. 2004. The formation of green strategies in Chinese firms: Matching corporate environmental responses and individual principles. *Strategic Management Journal*, 25: 1075-1095.
- Brockner, J., Chen, Y.R., Mannix, E.A., Leung, K., & Sklarlicki, D.P. 2000. Cultural and procedural fairness: When the effects of what you do depend on how you do it. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 45: 138-159.
- Brookfield, J., & Liu, R.J. 2005. The internationalization of a production network and the replication dilemma: Building supplier networks in mainland China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 22: 355-380.
- Brouthers, L.E., O'Donnell, E., & Hadjimarcou, J. 2005. Generic product strategies for emerging market exports into Triad nation markets: A mimetic isomorphism approach. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42: 225-245.
- Bu, N., & Roy, J.P. 2005. Career success networks in China: Sex differences in network composition and social exchange practices. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 22: 381-403.
- *Buckley, P.J., Clegg, J., & Tan, H. 2003. The art of knowledge transfer in China's telecommunications manufacturing industry. *Management International Review*, 43: 67-93.
- *Buckley, P.J., Clegg, J., & Tan, H. 2005. Reform and restructuring in a Chinese state-owned enterprise: Sinotrans in the 1990s. *Management International Review*, 45: 147-172.
- Chan, K.C., Fung, H.G., & Leung, W.K. 2006. International business research: Trends and school rankings. *International Business Review*, 15: 317-338.
- Chan, R.Y.K. 2005. Does the natural-resource-based View of the firm apply in an emerging economy? A survey of foreign invested enterprises in China. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42: 625-672.
- *Charles-Pauvers, B., & Wang, Z. 2002. Organizational commitment: Examining the case of China. *Management International Review*, 42: 155-168.
- Chen, G., & Tjosvold, D. 2002. Conflict management and team effectiveness in China: The mediating role of justice. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 19: 557-572.
- Chen, S., & Wilson, M. 2003. Standardization and localization of human resource management in Sino-foreign joint ventures. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 20: 397-408.
- Child, J., & Tsai, T. 2005. The dynamic between firms' environmental strategies and institutional constraints in emerging economies: Evidence from China and Taiwan. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42: 95-125.
- *Child, J., & Yan, Y. 2003. Predicting the performance of international joint ventures: An investigation in China. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40: 283-320.

---

³ A select number of the 180 papers that we have reviewed are labeled with *. The full list of these papers can be downloaded from <http://www.ua.es/personal/diego.quer>

- Christmann, P., & Taylor, G. 2001. Globalization and the environment: Determinants of firm self-regulation in China. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 32: 439-458.
- Dubois, F.L., & Reeb, D. 2000. Ranking the international business journals. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 31: 689-704.
- Ellis, P. 2005. The traders' dilemma: The adverse consequences of superior performance in mediated exchanges. *International Business Review*, 14: 375-396.
- *Farh, J.L., Zhong, C.B., & Organ, D.W. 2004. Organizational citizenship behavior in the People's Republic of China. *Organization Science*, 15: 241-253.
- *Fryxell, G.E., Dooley, R.S., & Li, W.S. 2004. The role of trustworthiness in maintaining employee commitment during restructuring in China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 21: 515-533.
- Fu, P.P., & Tsui, A.S. 2003. Utilizing printed media to understand desired leadership attributes in the People's Republic of China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 20: 423-446.
- Guillén, M. 2002. Structural inertia, imitation, and foreign expansion: South Korean and business groups in China, 1987-1995. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45: 509-525.
- Gupta, V., & Wang, J. 2004. From corporate crisis to turnaround in East Asia: A study of China Huajing Electronics Group Corporation. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 21: 213-233.
- Han, C.M. 2002. Korea's direct investments in China: Technology, experience, and ownership factors in performance. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 19: 109-126.
- *He, W., Chen, C.C., & Zhang, L. 2004. Rewards-allocation preferences of Chinese employees in the new millennium: The effects of ownership reform, collectivism, and goal priority. *Organization Science*, 15: 221-231.
- Hoskisson, R.E., Eden, L., Lau, C.M., & Wright, M. 2000. Strategy in emerging economies. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43: 249-267.
- *Huff, L., & Kelley, L. 2003. Levels of organizational trust in individualist versus collectivist societies: A seven-nation study. *Organization Science*, 14: 81-90.
- *Hui, C., Lee, C., & Rousseau, D.M. 2004. Employment relationships in China: Do workers relate to the organization or to people? *Organization Science*, 15: 232-240.
- Hutchings, K. 2003. Cross-cultural preparation of Australian expatriates in organisations in China: The need for greater attention to training. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 20: 375-396.
- *Isobe, T., Makino, S., & Montgomery, D.B. 2000. Resource commitment, entry timing, and market performance of foreign direct investments in emerging economies: The case of Japanese international joint ventures in China. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43: 468-484.
- Jolly, D.R. 2005. The exogamic nature of Sino-foreign joint ventures. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 22: 285-306.
- *Keister, L.A. 2002. Adapting to radical change: Strategy and environment in piece-rate adoption during China's transition. *Organization Science*, 13: 459-474.
- *Keister, L.A. 2004. Capital structure in transition: The transformation of financial strategies in China's emerging economy. *Organization Science*, 15: 145-158.
- Kotabe, M., & Zhao, H. 2002. A taxonomy of sourcing strategic types for MNCs operating in China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 19: 11-27.

- Kumar, V., & Kundu, S.K. 2004. Ranking the international business schools: Faculty publication as the measure. *Management International Review*, 44: 213-228.
- *Lau, C.M., Tse, D.K., & Zhou, N. 2002. Institutional forces and organizational culture in China: Effects on change schemas, firm commitment and job satisfaction. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 33: 533-550.
- Li, H., & Atuahene-Gima, K. 2001. Product innovation strategy and the performance of new technology ventures in China. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44: 1123-1134.
- Li, J.T., & Tsui, A.S. 2002. A citation analysis of management and organization research in the Chinese context: 1984-1999. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 19: 87-107.
- *Li, J., Karakowsky, L., & Lam, K. 2002. East meets East and East meets West: The case of Sino-Japanese and Sino-West joint ventures in China. *Journal of Management Studies*, 39: 841-863.
- *Li, J., Lam, K., & Qian, G. 2001. Does culture affect behavior and performance of firms? The case of joint ventures in China. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 32: 115-131.
- Li, J.J. 2005. The formation of managerial networks of foreign firms in China: The effects of strategic orientations. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 22: 423- 443.
- Li, L. 2001. Networks, transactions, and resources: Hong Kong Trading companies' strategic position in the China Market. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 18: 279-293.
- Li, L. 2003. Determinants of export channel intensity in emerging markets: The British experience in China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 20: 501-516.
- *Li, L. 2005. The effects of trust and shared vision on inward knowledge transfer in subsidiaries' intra-and inter-organizational relationships. *International Business Review*, 14: 77-95.
- Li, M., & Wong, Y.Y. 2003. Diversification and economic performance: An empirical assessment of Chinese firms. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 20: 243-265.
- *Lin, X., & Germain, R. 2003. Organizational structure, context, customer orientation, and performance: Lessons from Chinese state-owned enterprises. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24: 1131-1151.
- Liu, X., Buck, T., & Shu, C. 2005. Chinese economic development, the next stage: Outward FDI? *International Business Review*, 14: 97-115.
- Lohrke, F.T., & Bruton, G.D. 1997. Contributions and gaps in international strategic management literature. *Journal of International Management*, 3: 25-57.
- Lu, J.W. 2003. The evolving contributions in international strategic management research. *Journal of International Management*, 9: 193-213.
- Luo, Y. 2001a. Antecedents and consequences of personal attachment in cross-cultural cooperative ventures. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46: 177-201.
- Luo, Y. 2001b. Determinants of entry in an emerging economy: A multilevel approach. *Journal of Management Studies*, 38: 443-472.
- *Luo, Y. 2002a. Building trust in cross-cultural collaborations: Toward a contingency perspective. *Journal of Management*, 28: 669-694.
- Luo, Y. 2002b. Capability exploitation and building in a foreign market: Implications for multinational enterprises. *Organization Science*, 13: 48-63.

- *Luo, Y. 2002c. Contract, cooperation, and performance in international joint ventures. *Strategic Management Journal*, 23: 903-919.
- Luo, Y. 2002e. Partnering with foreign firms: How do Chinese managers view the governance and importance of contracts?. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 19: 127-151.
- *Luo, Y. 2002f. Product diversification in international joint ventures: Performance implications in an emerging market. *Strategic Management Journal*, 23: 1-20.
- *Luo, Y. 2002g. Stimulating exchange in international joint ventures: An attachment-based view. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 33: 169-181.
- *Luo, Y. 2005a. How important are shared perceptions of procedural justice in cooperative alliances? *Academy of Management Journal*, 48: 695-709.
- Luo, Y., & Park, S.H. 2001. Strategic alignment and performance of market-seeking MNCs in China. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22: 141-155.
- *Luo, Y., & Park, S.H. 2004. Multiparty cooperation and performance in international equity joint ventures. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 35: 142-160.
- *Luo, Y., & Tan, J. 2003. Structuring international joint ventures: How should contractual design be aligned with environmental conditions? *Management International Review*, 43: 185-211.
- *Luo, Y., Shenkar, O., & Nyaw, M.K. 2001. A dual parent perspective on control and performance in international joint ventures: Lessons from a developing economy. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 32: 41-58.
- Luo, Y., Tan, J.J., & O'Connor, N.G. 2001. Strategic response to a volatile environment: The case of cross-cultural cooperative ventures. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 18: 7-25.
- *Meschi, P.X. 2004. Valuation effect of international joint ventures: Does experience matter? *International Business Review*, 13: 595-612.
- Meschi, P.X., & Hubler, J. 2003. Franco-Chinese joint-venture formation and shareholder wealth. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 20: 91-111.
- Meyer, K.E. 2006. Asian management research needs more self-confidence. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 23: 119-137.
- Meyer, K.E., & Peng, M.W. 2005. Probing theoretically into Central and Eastern Europe: Transactions, resources, and institutions. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 36: 600-621.
- Morrison, A.J., & Inkpen, A.C. 1991. An analysis of significant contributions to the international business literature. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 22: 143-153.
- Murray, J.Y., Kotabe, M., & Zhou, J.N. 2005. Strategic alliance-based sourcing and market performance: Evidence from foreign firms operating in China. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 36: 187-208.
- *Newbury, W., Zeira, Y., & Yeheskel, O. 2003. Autonomy and effectiveness of equity international joint ventures (IJVs) in China. *International Business Review*, 12: 395-419.
- Ng, I., & Chow, I.H.S. 2005. Does Networking with colleagues matter in enhancing job performance? *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 22: 405-421.
- Pan, Y., & Tse, D.K. 2000. The hierarchical model of market entry modes. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 31: 535-554.

- Park, S.H., & Luo, Y. 2001. Guanxi and organizational dynamics: Organizational networking in Chinese firms. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22: 455-477.
- Peng, M.W. 2003. Institutional transitions and strategic choices. *Academy of Management Review*, 28: 275-296.
- Peng, M.W. 2004. Outside directors and firm performance during institutional transitions. *Strategic Management Journal*, 25: 453-471.
- Peng, M.W. 2005. From China strategy to global strategy. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 22: 123-141.
- Peng, M.W., & Luo, Y. 2000. Managerial ties and firm performance in a transition economy: The nature of a micro-macro link. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43: 486-501.
- Peng, M.W., Lu, Y., Shenkar, O., & Wang, D.Y.L. 2001. Treasures in the China house. A review of management and organizational research on Greater China. *Journal of Business Research*, 52: 95-110.
- *Peng, M.W., Tan, J., & Tong, T.W. 2004. Ownership types and strategic groups in an emerging economy. *Journal of Management Studies*, 41: 1105-1129.
- Peng, M.W., & Zhou, J.Q. 2006. Most cited articles and authors in global strategy research. *Journal of International Management*, 12: 490-508.
- Roy, A., Walters, P.G.P., & Luk, S.T.K. 2001. Chinese puzzles and paradoxes: Conducting business research in China. *Journal of Business Research*, 52: 203-210.
- Schlevogt, K.A. 2001. Institutional and organizational factors affecting effectiveness: Geoeconomic comparison between Shanghai and Beijing. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 18: 519-551.
- Selmer, J. 2000. Adjustment of Western business expatriates in Hong Kong versus the Chinese mainland. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 17: 519-538.
- Shenkar, O. 1994. The People's Republic of China. Raising the bamboo screen through international management research. *International Studies of Management and Organization*, 24: 9-34.
- Shenkar, O., & Von Glinow, M.A. 1994. Paradoxes of organization theory and research: Using the case of China to illustrate national contingency. *Management Science*, 40: 56-71.
- *Shin, M. 2004. Convergence and divergence of work values among Chinese, Indonesian and Korean employees. *Management International Review*, 44: 105-129.
- Snell, R.S., & Tseng, C.S. 2003. Images of the virtuous employee in China's transitional economy. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 20: 307-331.
- Takeuchi, N., Wakabayashi, M., & Chen, Z. 2003. The strategic HRM configuration for competitive advantage: Evidence from Japanese firms in China and Taiwan. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 20: 447-480.
- *Tan, J., & Peng, M.W. 2003. Organizational slack and firm performance during economic transitions: Two studies from an emerging economy. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24: 1249-1263.
- *Tan, J., & Tan, D. 2005. Environment-strategy co-evolution and co-alignment: A staged model of Chinese SOEs under transition. *Strategic Management Journal*, 26: 141-157.
- Tata, J., Fu, P.P., & Wu, R. 2003. An examination of procedural justice principles in China and the U.S. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 20: 205-216.
- Tian, J.J., & Lau, C.M. 2001. Board composition, leadership structure and performance in Chinese shareholding companies. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 18: 245-263.
- Tong, C.S.P., & Chan, H.L. 2003. Disparity in production efficiency of China's TVEs across regions: A stochastic frontier production function approach. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 20: 113-131.

- Tsang, E.W.K. 2002a. Acquiring knowledge by foreign partners from international joint ventures in a transition economy: Learning-by-doing and learning myopia. *Strategic Management Journal*, 23: 835-854.
- Tsui, A.S., Schoonhoven, C.B., Meyer, M.W., Lau, C.M., & Milkovich, G.T. 2004. Organization and management in the midst of societal transformation: The People's Republic of China. *Organization Science*, 15: 133-144.
- Tung, R. L. 2005. New era, new realities: Musings on a new research agenda . . . from an old timer. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 22: 143-157.
- Wang, C.L., Lin, X., Chan, A.K.K., & Shi, Y. 2005. Conflict handling styles in international joint ventures: A cross-cultural and cross-national comparison. *Management International Review*, 45: 3-21.
- *Wang, P., Tong, T.W., & Koh, C.P. 2004. An integrated model of knowledge transfer from MNC parent to China subsidiary. *Journal of World Business*, 39: 168-182.
- *Wang, Y., & Nicholas, S. 2005. Knowledge transfer, knowledge replication, and learning in non-equity alliances: Operating contractual joint ventures in China. *Management International Review*, 45: 99-118.
- Werner, S. 2002. Recent developments in international management research: A review of 20 top management journals. *Journal of Management*, 28: 277-305.
- Werner, S., & Brouthers, L.E. 2002. How international is management? *Journal of International Business Studies*, 33: 583-591.
- *White, S. 2000. Competition, capabilities, and the make, buy, or ally decisions of Chinese State-Owned firms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43: 324-341.
- *White, S., & Liu, X. 2001. Transition trajectories for market structure and firm strategy in China. *Journal of Management Studies*, 38: 103-124.
- Wong, A., Tjosvold, D., & Zhang, P. 2005. Supply chain relationships for customer satisfaction in China: Interdependence and cooperative goals. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 22: 179-199.
- *Wong, C.S., Wong, Y.T., Hui, C., & Law, K.S. 2001. The significant role of Chinese employees' organizational commitment: Implications for managing employees in Chinese societies. *Journal of World Business*, 36: 326-340.
- *Wong, Y.T., Ngo, H.Y., & Wong, C.S. 2003. Antecedents and outcomes of employees' trust in Chinese joint ventures. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 20: 481-499.
- Wright, M., Filatotchev, I., Hoskisson, R.E., & Peng, M.W. 2005. Strategy research in emerging economies: challenging the conventional wisdom. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42: 1-33.
- Wu, W. P., & Leung, A. 2005. Does a micro-macro link exist between managerial value of reciprocity, social capital and firm performance? The case of SMEs in China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 22: 445-463.
- *Yan, A., & Duan, J. 2003. Interpartner fit and its performance implications: A four-case study of U.S.-China joint ventures. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 20: 541-564.
- Yan, A., & Gray, B. 2001. Antecedents and effects of parent control in international joint ventures. *Journal of Management Studies*, 38: 393-416.
- *Yan, Y., & Child, J. 2004. Investors' resources and management participation in international joint ventures: A control perspective. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 21: 287-304.

- *Yang, N., Chen, C.C., Choi, J., & Zou, Y. 2000. Sources of work-family conflict: A Sino-U.S. comparison of the effects of work and family demands. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43: 113-123.
- Yeung, G., & Mok, V. 2005. What are the impacts of implementing ISOs on the competitiveness of manufacturing industry in China? *Journal of World Business*, 40: 139-157.
- Yiu, D., Bruton, G.D., & Lu, Y. 2005. Understanding business group performance in an emerging economy: Acquiring resources and capabilities in order to prosper. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42: 183-206.
- *Zhang, Y., & Li, H. 2001. The control design and performance in international joint ventures: A dynamic evolution perspective. *International Business Review*, 10: 341-362.
- *Zhao, H., & Luo, Y. 2005. Antecedents of knowledge sharing with peer subsidiaries in other countries: A perspective from subsidiary managers in a foreign emerging market. *Management International Review*, 45: 71-97.
- *Zhao, Z., Anand, J., & Mitchell, W. 2005. A dual networks perspective on inter-organizational transfer of R&D capabilities: International joint ventures in the Chinese automotive industry. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42: 127-160.
- Zhou, C., Delios, A., & Yang, J.Y. 2002. Locational determinants of Japanese foreign direct investment in China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 19: 63-86.

Table 1

Ranking of journals analysed during the 2000-2005 period

<i>Journal</i>	<i>Total number of papers published 2000-2005</i>	<i>Empirical papers about China 2000-2005</i>
1. <i>Asia Pacific Journal of Management (APJM)</i>	140	33 (18.3% of 180 papers)
2. <i>Journal of International Business Studies (JIBS)</i>	244	28 (15.6%)
3. <i>International Business Review (IBR)</i>	217	21 (11.7%)
4. <i>Management International Review (MIR)</i>	188	20 (11.1%)
5. <i>Journal of Management Studies (JMS)</i>	343	15 (8.3%)
6. <i>Strategic Management Journal (SMJ)</i>	415	15 (8.3%)
7. <i>Organization Science (OS)</i>	251	14 (7.8%)
8. <i>Journal of World Business (JWB)</i>	160	12 (6.7%)
9. <i>Academy of Management Journal (AMJ)</i>	392	11 (6.1%)
10. <i>Journal of International Management (JIM)</i>	129	6 (3.3%)
11. <i>Journal of Management (JM)</i>	256	3 (1.7%)
12. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly (ASQ)</i>	112	2 (1.1%)
Total	2847	180 (100%)

Table 2

Ranking of individual contributions to the empirical literature on China (2000-05)^a

<i>Author</i>	<i>Institution</i>	<i>Total appearances</i>	<i>Adjusted appearances</i>
1. Yadong Luo	University of Miami (US)/ University of Hawaii (US)	30	22.74
2. Justin Tan	Creighton University (US)/ California State University, San Marcos (US)	7	3.5
3. Mike W. Peng	Ohio State University (US)/ University of Texas at Dallas (US)	5	3.33
4. Eric W.K. Tsang	Nanyang Technological University (Singapore)/ Wayne State University (US)	3	3
5. John Child	University of Birmingham (UK)	6	2.83
6. Lee Li	York University (Canada)	3	2.5
7. Yigang Pan	York University (Canada)/ University of Hong Kong (Hong Kong)	4	2.33
8. Dean Tjosvold	Lingnan University (Hong Kong)	5	2
9. Haiyang Li	Lingnan University (Hong Kong)/ Texas A&M University (US)	4	2
10. Pierre-Xavier Meschi	Université de la Méditerranée (France)/Graduate School of Commerce of Marseille (France)	3	2
11. Mauro Guillén	University of Pennsylvania (US)/ Instituto de Empresa (Spain)	2	2
11. Lisa A. Keister	Ohio State University (US)	2	2
13. Hongxin Zhao	Saint Louis University (US)	4	1.95
14. Oded Shenkar	Ohio State University (US)	5	1.91
15. Xiaohua Lin	University of Windsor (Canada)	3	1.75
16. David K. Tse	University of Hong Kong (Hong Kong)	4	1.5
17. Kwaku Atuahene-Gima	City University of Hong Kong (Hong Kong)	3	1.5
17. Yanni Yan	City University of Hong Kong (Hong Kong)	3	1.5
17. Seung Ho Park	Rutgers University (US)/CEIBS Shanghai (China)	3	1.5
20. Paul Ellis	Hong Kong Polytechnic University (Hong Kong)	2	1.5
20. Steven White	Chinese University of Hong Kong (Hong Kong)	2	1.5
20. Deli Yang	Manchester School of Management-UMIST (UK)/ Bradford University School of Management (UK)	2	1.5
23. Li Li	Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration (Finland)	2	1.33
23. Jan Selmer	Hong Kong Baptist University (Hong Kong)	2	1.33
25. Chao C. Chen	Rutgers University-The State University of New Jersey (US)/New York University (US)	4	1.25
26. Yizheng Shi	Hong Kong Baptist University (Hong Kong)	2	1.25

^a Theoretical papers are excluded. The journals considered are *AMJ*, *APJM*, *ASQ*, *IBR*, *JIBS*, *JIM*, *JM*, *JMS*, *JWB*, *MIR*, *OS*, and *SMJ*. A complete table of individual contributions is posted at <http://www.ua.es/personal/diego.quer>

Table 3

Ranking of institutional contributions to the empirical literature on China (2000-05)^a

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Country</i>	<i>Total appearances</i>	<i>Adjusted appearances</i>	<i>Leading contributors</i>
1. University of Miami	US	30	22.57	Y. Luo
2. Chinese University of Hong Kong	Hong Kong, China	20	10.99	C. Hui, K. Lam, S. White
3. Ohio State University	US	13	7.57	L. Keister, M.W. Peng, O. Shenkar
4. City University of Hong Kong	Hong Kong, China	15	6.18	K. Atuahene-Gima, Y. Yan, N. Zhou
5. Lingnan University	Hong Kong, China	13	5.81	M.K. Nyaw, D. Tjosvold
6. Hong Kong Baptist University	Hong Kong, China	10	5.74	J. Li, J. Selmer, Y. Shi
7. York University	Canada	9	4.91	Lee Li, Y. Pan
8. Hong Kong Polytechnic University	Hong Kong, China	7	4.83	H. Davies, P. Ellis
9. University of Hong Kong	Hong Kong, China	9	4.48	Y. Pan, D.K. Tse
10. Hong Kong University of Science and Technology	Hong Kong, China	11	3.69	K.S. Law, J.T. Li
11. Non-academic institutions	—	9	3.4	—
12. Creighton University	US	6	3.16	J. Tan
13. Nanyang Technological University	Singapore	3	3	E.W.K. Tsang
13. University of Leeds	UK	3	3	P.J. Buckley, J. Clegg
15. Rutgers University (The State University of New Jersey)	US	8	2.91	C.C. Chen, S.H. Park
16. University of Birmingham	UK	6	2.83	J. Child
17. Texas A&M University	US	5	2.2	H. Li
18. Saint Louis University	US	4	2	H. Zhao
19. Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration	Finland	3	2	I. Björkman, Li Li
20. China Europe International Business School (CEIBS)	China	6	1.83	K. Xin
21. University of Windsor	Canada	3	1.75	X. Lin
22. University of Hawaii	US	3	1.5	L. Kelley, Y. Luo, G. Taylor
23. Korea University	South Korea	2	1.5	S.J. Chang, M. Shin
23. Manchester School of Management (UMIST)	UK	2	1.5	D. Bosworth, P. Ghauri, D. Yang
23. Stockholm School of Economics	Sweden	2	1.5	J. Carlsson, T. Fang, A. Nordegren, F. Sjöholm
23. University of Pennsylvania	US	2	1.5	M. Guillén
27. Temple University	US	3	1.33	M. Kotabe
28. Duke University	US	2	1.33	W. Mitchell, W. Zhao, X. Zhou
29. Pennsylvania State University	US	3	1.25	W.S. Desarbo, B. Gray, D.C. Hambrick
30. Aston University	UK	2	1.25	X. Liu, D. Parker, K. Vaidya, X. Wu
30. Université de la Méditerranée	France	2	1.25	P.X. Meschi
32. Harvard University	US	2	1.16	B. Batjargal, N. Katz, L.A. Perlow
33. King's College London	UK	2	1.12	R. Strange
34. Peking University	China	3	1.03	K.A. Schlevogt, H. Wang, C. Zhou

^a Theoretical papers are excluded. The journals considered are *AMJ*, *APJM*, *ASQ*, *IBR*, *JIBS*, *JIM*, *JM*, *JMS*, *JWB*, *MIR*, *OS*, and *SMJ*. A complete table of institutional contributions is posted at <http://www.ua.es/personal/diego.quer>

Table 4

Most cited empirical papers on business and management in mainland China (2000-2005)^a

<i>Social Sciences Citation Index</i>		<i>Google Scholar</i>	
<i>Paper</i>	<i>Total citations/Excluding self-citations</i>	<i>Paper</i>	<i>Total citations/Excluding self-citations</i>
1. Peng, M.W. & Luo, Y. (2000)	62/51	1. Peng, M.W. & Luo, Y. (2000)	108/91
2. Park, S.H. & Luo, Y. (2001)	37/35	2. Park, S.H. & Luo, Y. (2001)	100/98
3. Isobe, T., Makino, S. & Montgomery, D.B. (2000)	33/30	3. Pan, Y. & Tse, D.K. (2000)	72/69
4. Brockner, J., Chen, Y.R., Mannix, E.A., Leung, K. & Sklarlicki, D.P. (2000)	31/23	4. Christmann, P. & Taylor, G. (2001)	65/63
5. Christmann, P. & Taylor, G. (2001)	25/24	5. Isobe, T., Makino, S. & Montgomery, D.B. (2000)	59/57
6. Li, H. & Atuahene-Gima, K. (2001)	25/22	6. Tsang, E.W.K. (2002a)	43/42
7. Luo, Y., Shenkar, O. & Nyaw, M.K. (2001)	21/21	7. Guillén, M. (2002)	39/37
8. Pan, Y. & Tse, D.K. (2000)	21/17	8. Li, H. & Atuahene-Gima, K. (2001)	38/37
9. White, S. (2000)	19/14	9. Brockner, J., Chen, Y.R., Mannix, E.A., Leung, K. & Sklarlicki, D.P. (2000)	38/32
10. Luo, Y. & Park, S.H. (2001)	17/15	10. Luo, Y. (2002c)	37/37
11. Luo, Y. (2001a)	17/14	11. Yang, N., Chen, C.C., Choi, J. & Zou, Y. (2000)	36/35
12. Luo, Y. (2002c)	16/16	12. Luo, Y. (2001b)	35/35
13. Yang, N., Chen, C.C., Choi, J. & Zou, Y. (2000)	15/15	13. Farh, J.L., Zhong, C.B. & Organ, D.W. (2004)	34/33
14. Guillén, M. (2002)	15/12	14. White, S. (2000)	33/24
15. Luo, Y. (2001b)	14/14	15. Luo, Y., Shenkar, O. & Nyaw, M.K. (2001)	32/31
16. Li, J., Lam, K. & Qian, G. (2001)	13/12	16. Luo, Y. (2002b)	30/28
16. Luo, Y. (2002b)	13/12	17. Luo, Y. & Park, S.H. (2001)	30/27
18. Luo, Y. (2002f)	12/12	18. Li, J., Lam, K. & Qian, G. (2001)	28/25
19. Yan, A. & Gray, B. (2001)	12/10	19. Luo, Y. (2001a)	27/25
20. Luo, Y. (2002a)	11/11	20. Yan, A. & Gray, B. (2001)	26/22

^a All citation numbers are as of December 31, 2006.

Appendix

Topics analysed by categories^a

Category	Topic	Papers
JVs and strategic alliances in China	<i>Performance determinants for international JVs in China</i>	Child & Yan (2003), Isobe, Makino & Montgomery (2000), Li, Karakowsky & Lam (2002), Li, Lam & Qian (2001), Luo (2002a, 2002c, 2002f, 2002g, 2005a), Luo & Park (2004), Luo & Tan (2003), Luo, Shenkar & Nyaw (2001), Meschi (2004), Newburry, Zeira & Yeheskel (2003), Yan & Child (2004) , Yan & Duan (2003) , Zhang & Li (2001),
43 papers (23.9%)	Relationships between JVs partners	Chen & Li (2005), Jolly (2005) , Luo (2001a, 2002e) , Tsang (2002b), Zhang & Rajagopalan (2002)
	Foreign partner's ownership share and control level	Chen, Hu & Hu (2002), Luo (2001d), Pan (2002), Yan & Gray (2001)
	Negotiation between partners	Ghuri & Fang (2001), Luo & Shenkar (2002), Shi, X. (2001)
	Supply strategic alliances in China	Brookfield & Liu (2005) , Murray, Kotabe & Zhou (2005), Trimarchi & Tamaschke (2004),
	Distribution strategic alliances in China	Li (2001, 2003) , Li & Ng (2002)
	Identification of potential partners	Hitt, Ahlstrom, Dacin, Levitas & Svobodina (2004), Wong & Ellis (2002),
	Impact of the announcement of Sino-European JVs on the price of European partner's shares	Meschi & Cheng (2002), Meschi & Hubler (2003)
	Relationship between firm size and formation of JVs	Pan & Li (2000)
	Strategic behaviour and managerial practices in JVs	Child & Yan (2001)
	JV contract characteristics	Luo (2005b)
Strategy and behaviour of Chinese firms	<i>Process of reform and change in Chinese SOEs</i>	Buckley, Clegg & Tan (2005), Charles-Pauvers & Wang (2002), He, Chen & Zhang (2004), Hui, Lee & Rousseau (2004), Keister (2002, 2004), Lin & Germain (2003), Peng, Tan & Tong (2004), Tan & Peng (2003), Tan & Tan (2005), White (2000), White & Liu (2001)
36 papers (20%)	Strategy and performance of Chinese export firms	Brouthers & Xu (2002), Brouthers, O'Donnell & Hadjimarcou (2005), Ellis (2005), Ling-Yee & Ogunmokun (2001a, 2001b),
	New Chinese technological firms	Atuahene-Gima & Li (2004), Gupta & Wang (2004) , Li & Atuahene-Gima (2001, 2002),
	Corporate governance and board of directors of Chinese firms	Mar & Young (2001), Peng (2004), Tian & Lau (2001)
	Impact of inward FDI on the productivity and performance of Chinese firms	Buckley, Clegg & Wang (2002), Liu, Parker, Vaidya & Wei (2001), Zhou, Li & Tse (2002)
	Development and changes of rural companies in China	Krug (2002), Tong & Chan (2003) , Wu & Leung (2005)
	Corporate and competitive strategies of Chinese firms	Desarbo, Di Benedetto, Song & Sinha (2005), Li & Wong (2003)
	Factors leading to effectiveness in different regions	Schlevogt (2001)
	Supplier and distribution relationships of Chinese manufacturing companies	Wong, Tjosvold & Zhang (2005)
	Resource access and performance of large Chinese business groups	Yiu, Bruton & Lu (2005)
	Outward FDI of Chinese companies	Liu, Buck & Shu (2005)
Human resource management in China	<i>Organisational commitment and employee and manager trust</i>	Farh, Zhong & Organ (2004), Fryxell, Dooley & Li (2004) , Huff & Kelley (2003), Lau, Tse & Zhou (2002), Shin (2004), Wong, Ngo & Wong (2003) , Wong, Wong, Hui & Law (2001), Yang, Chen, Choi & Zou (2000)
30 papers (16.7%)	Local or expatriate employees in China	Chen, Choi & Chi (2002), Goodall & Roberts (2003), Hutchings (2003) , Li & Hambrick (2005), Selmer (2000)
	Distributive justice values and procedural justice principles	Brockner, Chen, Mannix, Leung & Skarlicki (2000), Chen, Chen & Xin (2004) Giacobbe-Miller, Miller, Zhang & Victorov (2003), Tata, Fu & Wu (2003)

	Leadership and leader-member relationships	Chen & Tjosvold (2005), Fu & Tsui (2003) , Wang, Law, Hackett, Wang & Chen (2005)
	Impact of human resource management on performance	Gong, Shenkar, Luo & Nyaw (2005), Law, Tse & Zhou (2003), Takeuchi, Wakabayashi & Chen (2003)
	Work teams in China	Perlow, Gittell & Katz (2004), Tjosvold, Yu & Hui (2004)
	Effects of empowerment	Hui, Au & Fock (2004)
	Images of employee virtue and managers' perceptions of actual employee conduct	Snell & Tseng (2003)
	Standardization or localization of human resource management in China	Chen & Wilson (2003)
	Hiring of Chinese immigrants	Chung (2004)
	Chinese expatriates in Hong Kong	Selmer, Ebrahimi & Mingtao (2002)
Strategy and behaviour of foreign firms in China 15 papers (8.3%)	Determinants of performance of foreign subsidiaries in China	Carlsson, Nordegren & Sjöholm (2005), Child, Chung & Davies (2003), Han (2002) , Kotabe & Zhao (2002) , Zhao & Luo (2002)
	Alignment to environmental requirements and performance	Davies & Walters (2004), Lukas, Tan & Hult (2001), Luo & Park (2001), Luo, Tan & O'Connor (2001) , Tan, J. (2002)
	Chinese subsidiary's integration into the rest of the multinational	Luo (2002d, 2003b), Luo & Zhao (2004)
	Local responsiveness achieved by the subsidiary	Luo (2001c)
	Marketing success	Ambler & Wang (2003)
Entry decisions in China 15 papers (8.3%)	Determinants of entry mode choice in China	Chen & Hu (2002), Guillén (2003), Luo (2001b), Pan & Tse (2000)
	Choice of a specific location inside China	Chang & Park (2005), Wu & Strange (2000), Zhou, Delios & Yang (2002)
	Timing of entry into China	Gaba, Pan & Ungson (2002), Li, Lam, Karakowsky & Qian (2003)
	Technological advantages and FDI decisions in China	Shi, Y. (2001)
	New manufacturing plants in China	Guillén (2002)
	Capability exploitation and building for multinational companies in China	Luo (2002b)
	Resource commitment level and environmental conditions	Luo (2004)
	Reasons to undertake manufacturing investments	Pak & Park (2005)
	Corporate governance in FDI decisions in China	Lien, Piesse, Strange & Filatotchev (2005)
Knowledge management 15 papers (8.3%)	<i>Knowledge transfer to and from the Chinese subsidiary</i>	Björkman, Barner-Rasmussen & Li (2004), Buckley, Clegg & Tan (2003), L. Li (2005), Wang & Nicholas (2005), Wang, Tong & Koh (2004), Zhao & Luo (2005), Zhao, Anand & Mitchell (2005)
	Intellectual property and technology transfer risk in China	Bosworth & Yang (2000), Cannice, Chen & Daniels (2004), McGaughey, Liesch & Poulson (2000), Yang (2005)
	Acquisition of foreign technology and knowledge by Chinese firms	Li & Shenkar (2003), Lin (2005)
	Acquisition of knowledge by foreign enterprises in China	Tsang (2002a)
	Knowledge creation in Chinese subsidiaries	Andersson, Björkman & Forsgren (2005)
Managers in China 12 papers (6.7%)	Managerial style (conflict handling)	Chen & Tjosvold (2002) , Chen, Liu & Tjosvold (2005), Wang, Lin, Chan & Shi (2005)
	Managerial performance	Neelankavil, Mathur & Zhang (2000), Ng & Chow (2005)
	Managerial value systems	Egri & Ralston (2004), Tan, B. (2002)
	Managerial learning	Tsang (2001)
	Trust of foreign managers in local staff	Child & Möllering (2003)
	Changes in promotion patterns	Zhao & Zhou (2004)

	Male and female managers' career success networks	Bu & Roy (2005)
	Trust among business associates	Rao, Pearce & Xin (2005)
Relationships and contacts in China	<i>Guanxi</i> and social contacts and links in China	Batjargal & Liu (2004), Li, J.J. (2005) , Luo (2003a), Luo, Shenkar & Nyaw (2002), Park & Luo (2001), Peng & Luo (2000),
9 papers (5%)	Relationships between foreign multinationals and Chinese authorities	Luo (2001e), Peng (2000), Sanyal & Guvenli (2000),
Environmental and quality management	Environmental management in China	Branzei, Ursacki-Bryant, Vertinsky & Zhang (2004), Chan (2005), Child & Tsai (2005), Christmann & Taylor (2001)
5 papers (2.8%)	Impact of implementing international environmental and quality standards on firm competitiveness	Yeung & Mok (2005)

^a Due to space constraints, not every topic is reviewed and not every paper is cited in the references. A complete list of references is posted at <http://www.ua.es/personal/diego.quer>. The four topics that received the largest research attention are *italicized* and discussed in the text. A **bold** typeface indicates that the paper was published in *APJM*.