Theses and Dissertations

2013

The impact of leadership practices on engagement within the Chinese cultural and business environment

Ping Wang

Recommended Citation

THE IMPACT OF LEADERSHIP PRACTICES ON ENGAGEMENT

WITHIN THE CHINESE CULTURAL

AND BUSINESS ENVIRONMENT

_____

A Research Project

Presented to the Faculty of

The George L. Graziadio

School of Business and Management

Pepperdine University

_____

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

in

Organization Development

_____

by

Ping Wang, Ph.D.

August 2013

This research project, completed by

PING WANG, Ph.D.

under the guidance of the Faculty Committee and approved by its members, has been

submitted to and accepted by the faculty of The George L. Graziadio School of Business

and Management in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT

Date: August 2013

Faculty Committee

Committee Chair, Christopher Worley, Ph.D.

Committee Member, Kent Rhodes, Ph.D.

Linda Livingstone, Ph.D., Dean
The George L. Graziadio
School of Business and Management

ii

Abstract

This study examined the impact of leadership practices on engagement within the

Chinese cultural and business environment.   The study identified the management

practices used by Chinese managers that engaged people differently from US managers.

The relationship between these specific leadership practices and employee engagement

in a small, privately-owned Chinese business was studied.   Eight managers were

evaluated with LPI-Self surveys and 61 LPI-Observer surveys.   In general, organization

leaders scored themselves much higher than their observers in the LPI survey, and the

average scores from 61 Leveking observers were all much lower than the overall mean

from Asian benchmarks.   Sixteen of the observers for four of the eight managers were

chosen for a further interview study.   The interview results showed that there was a

positive relationship between the leadership practices and employee engagement.   The

uniqueness of these relationships/impacts to the Chinese culture and business

environment were discussed.

Acknowledgment

To my family, for their support; and especially to my son, Frank Li, for accompanying and supporting me throughout this MSOD program.

To my mentor, Sharon Shoemaker, for her encouragement and guidance; through her and her friend Charlie Hathorn, I first learned about this MSOD program, which changed my life.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1

Introduction

Many US corporate giants have been outsourcing, opening manufacturing, or moving their research headquarters into China, as part of the third wave of globalization (Friedman, 2007). As an incredibly fast-growing economy and a country with the largest population in the world, China is an integral part of the global economy and corporations worldwide are eager to expand their businesses into its borders. By 2011, China had become the second largest economy in the world after the United States, and is expected to overtake the United States as early as 2016 (Johansson et al., 2012; OECD, 2012).

Due to the radically increasing size of its impact on the world stage, the Chinese economy has become a hot topic for many books and studies. These publications have attempted to understand the differences between Chinese and Western business environments, how cultural differences affect business operations there, and differences in leadership styles. Many recent writings strive to become the "bible" for newcomers to China (Gallo, 2011; Hoffmann & Enright, 2008; Koch & Ramsbottom, 2008). These books, which have become popular as business resources, include anecdotal data based on the authors' personal experiences, not necessarily from well-organized research (McGregor, 2005; Hoffmann and Enright, 2008; Gallo, 2011). A majority of the studies use large-scale surveys with large corporations and do not typically collect data at individual employee level (Dessler, 2006; Koch & Ramsbottom, 2008; Leininger, 2004; Weldon, 2004).

The purpose of this study was to examine the impact of leadership practice/ behavior on employee engagement in the Chinese cultural environment, as leadership practice has been shown to have strong impact on bottom line performance and employee engagement (Attridge, 2009; Gallo, 2011; Kouzes & Posner, 2002a; Wiley, 2010). Specifically, the study surveyed and interviewed employees in a privately-owned biotechnology company in the fast growing Shenzhen Special Economic District of China.

Research Purpose

This study attempted to reveal how leadership behaviors and management styles in the Chinese cultural and business environment affected employee engagement. It explored whether these effects mirror the impacts in Western cultures – most notably, the United States. The hypothesis tested in the research design was that leadership practices in the subject company produced similar effects on engagement as they would in a US company. At the same time, idiosyncrasies unique to the Chinese cultural context might emerge. The following research questions were defined:

1. Do Chinese managers engage in different leadership practices from US managers?

2. What is the relationship between the use of specific leadership practices and employee engagement in a small, privately-owned Chinese business?

3. Are these relationships/impacts unique to the Chinese culture and business environment**?**

Significance of Study

This study evaluated concepts and findings in literature and through the three research questions, generated insights about employees' reactions to leadership practices in the Chinese cultural environment, where bureaucracy and power distance, as opposed to involvement and empowerment, are dominant and expected (Hofstede, 2001). While previous studies have focused primarily on multinational, state-owned companies or large-sized organizations, this study focused on a small privately-owned business.

Small businesses are expected to be less bureaucratic and the managers are less trained in western leadership practices compared to their state-owned counterparts. As in the US, the majority (70% -80%) of Chinese businesses tends to be small to medium sized and family owned (Hofstede, n.d.); small/medium businesses are contributing more and more to the Chinese economy. Therefore, studying a smaller firm provides a unique glimpse into an important and under-researched element of the Chinese economy. By looking inside a Chinese small business and understanding how employees think and respond to their leaders, this study can help to better understand the big picture of Chinese business environment. The insights from interviews and personal stories will help illuminate the relationships between leadership practice and employee engagement and can, in turn, help Western and Chinese leaders become more effective in the Chinese cultural environment.

Methodology and Study Setting

This study conducted surveys and interviews at Shenzhen Leveking Bio-Engineering Co. Ltd., a small Chinese biotechnology company located in Shenzhen, Guangdong Province, China. The company, established in 2001, has approximately 130

employees in 2013. It develops and produces "greener" enzyme products, including lypase to replace the synthesized chemicals used in the tanning and paper industries, thereby helping to reduce pollution. Leveking produces five product lines of eighteen enzyme products for customers in China, Southeast Asia, Africa, South America, and European Union countries.

The Leadership Practice Inventory (LPI®) created by Kouzes and Posner (2002b), was administered, by publisher's permission, to eight managers and six to nine observers who had direct experience with each of the managers in a leadership role. These observers included bosses, co-workers, direct reports, and others. According to the survey results, observers of two managers from each of the high and low scores groups of the LPI® survey were interviewed with further questions regarding employee engagement.

Outline of the Thesis

Chapter One of this thesis provides an introduction of the overall study. This chapter reviews the background of the issue with the focus on the impact of the Chinese culture and business environment to the results. The chapter also presents the research purpose, study significance, and the study setting.

Chapter Two examines relevant literature that provided the foundation for this study. The literature to be reviewed delves into the main research questions of this thesis, namely, do Chinese managers engage in different management practices from US managers, the relationship of managers' leadership practices to employee engagement, and a comparison of the results to the conclusions of similar studies in a Western environment for uniqueness of the Chinese culture and business environment to the

results.   Literature regarding globalization and the Chinese economy is reviewed first to provide a global perspective for the particular scene of economic activities in China. Literature examining commonly used measurements of cultural dimensions is covered, along with an overview of Chinese culture relative to other world cultures.   Literature on leadership styles under the influence of Chinese culture and Chinese business environment are also reviewed and discussed.   This chapter emphasizes a leadership literature review, focused on discussion of the leadership impact on employee engagement and the introduction of Kouzes and Posner's Leadership Practice Inventory.

Chapter Three describes the research methods used in this study.   The research setting and study design are discussed first, followed by a review of procedures employed for participants' selection.   Survey data collection, interview data collection, and data analysis methods are also described in detail.

The fourth chapter of this thesis presents the study results.   Survey results are presented first.   Analysis of the survey results and the implications of the results to the interview design and interviewee selection are briefly discussed.   These are followed by the interview results.   Similarities and differences of the results from those in the Western environment and from the previous studies for China are highlighted and summarized.

The final chapter, Chapter Five, provides a discussion of indications of the findings to the leaders and to the employees, conclusions for each of the research questions, and suggestions for doing business in China with small- to medium-sized companies.   This chapter also identifies the study limitations.   Finally the chapter indicates some future opportunities for further study in this area.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

This study examined the impact of leadership practice/behavior on employee engagement in the Chinese cultural environment.   The purpose of this chapter is to examine the relevant literature that provided the foundation for the study.   The literature to be reviewed supports the main research questions of this thesis, namely, do Chinese managers engage in different management practices from US managers; what is the relationship between the use of specific leadership practices and employee engagement in a Chinese small business; and are these relationships/impacts unique to the Chinese culture and business environment.

Literature regarding globalization and the Chinese economy is reviewed first to provide a global perspective for the assessment of economic activities in China. Literatures on the widely used cultural dimensions developed by Hofstede for measuring cultural differences and Chinese culture that have major impact on the subjects of this research are covered next.   Overviews of Chinese culture relative to other world cultures are discussed using some of the dimensions.   These are followed by a review of literature on the practices of Chinese leaders and the leadership styles under the influence of Chinese culture and the Chinese business environment.   Finally, this chapter is focused on a review of literature regarding employee engagement, and the leadership literature directly related to Kouzes and Posner's Leadership Practice Inventory survey.

Globalization and the Chinese Economy

Globalization has changed the world; the world has become "flat" (Friedman, 2007).   After starting economic reforms, applying the "Open Door" policy, and joining

the World Trade Organization (WTO), China has been playing a more important role on the world stage, and contributing to the world economy (Friedman, 2007; McGregor, 2005). The Western world has since discovered that there is a "new world" that has been around for centuries. Companies from the United States and other countries have shown strong interests in China and have been eager to do business with Chinese companies since it reopened itself to the world. China has been growing at an unprecedented rate in the past two decades. According to a report of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) in 2011, China was expected to have the highest growth rate among the OECD countries through 2012. Moreover, the Chinese economy is expected to overtake the United States as the world's largest economy as early as 2016 (Johansson et al., 2012; OECD, 2012).

Cultural Dimensions and Chinese Culture

China's radically growing influence on the world stage and increasing interactions with Western business has led to considerable research on cultural differences. While there are numerous definitions of culture (Cameron & Quinn, 2011; Schein, 2010), this thesis adopts the Lustig and Koester position (2006): "Culture is a learned set of shared interpretations about beliefs, values, norms, and social practices, which affect the behaviors of a relatively large group of people (p. 25)."

At the national or country level, Hofstede (2001) identified five widely-used dimensions of cultural patterns, including power distance, individualism-collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity-femininity, and time orientation. In addition, the GLOBE study identified nine cultural dimensions (House et al., 2004) and Hall (1989) summarized culture according to what he calls high vs. low "context." Exploring

Chinese culture through these dimensions provides a good overview of Chinese culture relative to other cultures in the world.

In general, China is most different from the West along the power distance, collectivism, time orientation, and context dimensions (Cummings & Worley, 2009). China scores relatively high on power distance, that is, as a society, China believes that inequalities amongst people are acceptable (Grove 2005; House et al., 2004). China is a highly collectivist and long-term oriented society. People act in the interests of the group and not necessarily of themselves, and are persistent and perseverant (Hofstede, n.d.). Chinese culture is a high context culture according to Hall's dimension because Chinese people are more likely to judge what is said in terms of actions and surroundings rather than then words themselves. There are many "unwritten rules" and what people say is less important than the symbols that surround the behavior and give it meaning (Hall, 1989).

Chinese Leadership and Business Culture

Many books and articles have described the social and cultural values that underpin Chinese business practices and affect day-to-day business decisions. The authors attempt to paint a picture of the Chinese business environment and explain what Chinese business leaders are like (Chan, 2005; Chen, 2001; Dessler, 2006; Gallo, 2011; Hofstede & Bond, 1988; McGregor, 2005). The most mentioned rules and key cultural elements include: Guanxi, Face, Confucianism, hard-work and harmony. Compared to Western leaders, Chinese leaders are low-key, humble, hands-on, and often seek compromise when making tough business decisions (Chen, 2001; Gallo, 2011). Chinese business society is relationship-based. Guanxi is defined as personal relationship

networking or connections by reciprocity and mutual obligation.   Establishing guanxi is fundamental to the world of Chinese business (Chen, 2001).   Face, *mianzi* in Chinese, was defined by Erving Goffman (1955) as the favorable social impression that a person wants others to have of him or her.   In Chinese culture, mianzi is an important element of interpersonal relationships.   It is also reciprocal: a shared responsibility not to damage the standing or reputation of others.

Confucianism has influenced the beliefs and behaviors of Chinese and people in surrounding countries for over 2000 years.   Key principles of Confucian teaching include the following: 1) Social order and stability are based on unequal relationships between people ("power distance" in Western dimensions); 2) The family is the prototype for all social relationships ("collectivism" in Western dimensions); 3) Proper social behavior consists of not treating others as you would not like to be treated yourself; 4) People should be skilled, educated, hardworking, thrifty, modest, patient, and persevering (Lustig & Koester, 2006).   This hierarchical way of thinking and the harmony-seeking mentality has also deeply influenced Chinese business culture, leaders' behavior and employees' expectations today.

Other studies focus on the Chinese managers' unique leadership and managerial styles.   Wang et al. (2010) studied how organization-based self-esteem, psychological ownership, and supervisor-subordinate guanxi influence manager voice.   They found that supervisor-subordinate guanxi was a more critical factor influencing manager voice. At the group level, authoritarian leadership was negatively related to manager voice (and is opposed to one of the five practices of exemplary leadership by Kouzes and Posner, referred to in the next section of this Chapter).   In addition, Li and Madsen (2010)

examined perceptions of work-related values among managers of state-owned enterprises (SOE) to generate insights into how managers interact with their workers.   They revealed four overarching themes that influence managerial behavior in Chinese SOEs: the absolute power of the boss; work as the center of life; social network ties in the workplace; and hope placed in the hands of the boss.

Leadership, Leadership Practice, and LPI

A complete review of the leadership literature is beyond the scope of this study. Leadership has been studied from a variety of perspectives including transactional vs. transformational leadership (Burns, 1978) and leadership competencies (Bennis, 1999; Bolden & Gosling, 2006).   This study focused on one of the most applied theories of leadership: *The Leadership Challenge* (Kouzes & Posner, 2002a).   Their research has isolated five exemplary practices and forged these practices into a leadership model. The five practices are: 1) model the way, 2) inspire a shared vision, 3) challenge the process, 4) enable others to act, and 5) encourage the heart.   This leadership model has been used by a variety of organizations around the world (Abu-Tineh et al., 2008; Bass, 1997; Smith et al., 1994; Zagorsek et al., 2004) including many studies outside the United States.   Some authors believe that these practices are valid generally in all cultures (Kouzes & Posner, 2002b; Posner, 2011; Zagorsek et al., 2004) while others believe that there may be a need for some adjustments when applying these Western developed practices to Eastern world (Gallo, 2011; Weldon, 2004).

The *Leadership Practice Inventory* (LPI) has also been designed as a multi-rater instrument to generate insights into a manager's leadership practices based on feedback from bosses, direct reports, peers and others in a questionnaire format.   Kouzes and

Posner (2002b) reviewed over a hundred studies done worldwide (though mostly in the US) using the instrument. They compared the responses on the five leadership practices from US and other geographic regions. Table 1 shows the data that compared to Asia, US responses were statistically significantly higher along all five leadership practices both for Self and Observer responses (Posner, 2010). Posner reports that the contribution of demographic variables is negligible and pales in comparison to the importance of how leaders are seen as behaving by their constituents (Posner, 2011). The Leadership Practices Inventory survey has high reliability (Cronbach Alpha) coefficients and has excellent validity.

Table 1

Comparison of Average LPI Scores – US and Asia

	Model the way		Inspire a shared vision		Challenge the process		Enable others to act		Encourage the heart	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
US [LPI-SELF] (N = 59,497)	47.16	8.84	44.21	10.94	45.16	9.67	49.8	8.08	46.18	10.49
Asia [LPI-SELF] (N = 3,746)	45.4	7.57	42.12	9.47	43.6	8.10	48.63	6.98	44.42	9.04
US [LPI-OBSERVER] (N = 180,620)	47.4	9.07	44.54	11.07	45.38	9.85	49.83	8.44	46.5	10.71
Asia [LPI-OBSERVER] (N = 18,665)	45.33	8.13	42.27	9.85	43.46	8.62	48.31	7.64	44.41	9.53

M = Mean
SD = Standard Deviation

Leadership Practice and Engagement

Work engagement is defined by Schaufeli and Bakker (2004, 2010) as a positive and fulfilling work-related state of mind, characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption.   In essence, engagement captures how organization members experience their work.   Vigor refers to an employee's experience of work as stimulating and energetic and something to which they really want to devote their time and effort. Dedication refers to whether the work is a significant and meaningful pursuit for the employee.   Absorption reflects whether the work is an engrossing and interesting experience for the employee (Bakker et al., 2008).

Macey and Schneider (2008) defined high levels of engagement as when employees are involved with, committed to, enthusiastic, and passionate about their work.   They believe that employee engagement is a desirable condition, has an organizational purpose, and has both attitudinal and behavioral components.   They suggest that engaged employees not only contribute more but also are more loyal and therefore less likely to voluntarily leave the organization.

Leadership has been shown to have a direct impact on employee engagement and bottom-line business performance.   Wallace and Trinka's research (2009) identifies a vital few leadership competencies that differentiate the top-performing leaders from the rest.   These vital few competencies include coaching performance, developing careers, and communicating the meaning in an employee's work.   They found that a manager's ability to create a vivid line of sight from an employee's work to critical organizational outcomes creates greater engagement (Wallace & Trinka, 2009).   These competencies have some similarities to Kouzes and Posner's five exemplary leadership practices,

namely, coaching performance and developing careers are similar to "enable others to act"; communicating the meaning in one's work is similar to "model the way" with shared values; and ability to create a vivid line of sight is similar to "inspire a shared vision" (Kouzes & Posner, 2002a).

Similarly, Tuckey et al. (2012) showed that leadership behaviors are likely to play an important role in stimulating motivation processes that enhance work engagement. They found that leaders can directly inspire engagement, as well as optimize working conditions to enhance vigor, dedication, and absorption. Their findings also suggest that the process through which leaders can empower workers and enhance well-being is through their influence on and interaction with follower working characteristics, such as job demands, particularly challenge demands, and job resources. These leadership behaviors also present similarities to Kouzes and Posner' practices as empower workers is a part of "enable others to act," and enhance well-being is a component of "encourage the heart."

Some researchers believe that employee engagement (energy toward one's job) is different from employee satisfaction (satiation resulting from one's job) (Schneider et al., 2009). Lavigna (2010) studied how to drive performance by building employee satisfaction and engagement in the government sector. He defined employee satisfaction as committed employees who are willing to give their "discretionary energy" to their work. Engaged employees are committed to their organizations and their jobs (Lavigna, 2010). His survey results suggest that the top four drivers of employee satisfaction/ engagement are: 1) effective leadership, 2) employee skills and mission match, 3) work/life balance, and 4) training and development. Effective leadership topped the list

of individual leader, manager, and supervisor behavior that can move the needle by focusing on the critical workplace dimensions and the issues embedded in each of the four dimensions. These four engagement drivers are well matched with Kouzes and Posner's leadership behaviors.

Many other researchers have found a relationship between effective leadership and employee engagement, and between employee engagement and company performance (Attridge, 2009; Getz, 2011; Macey & Schneider, 2008; Wiley, 2010). Attridge believes that business benefits are linked to positive engagement. Leadership style and support is crucial for encouraging employee engagement. Transformational leaders provide a clear vision, inspire and motivate, offer intellectual challenges, and show real interest in the needs of the workers. These behaviors are what Kouzes and Posner described in their Five Practices: "inspire the vision," "challenge the process," and "encourage the heart." The result of such a leadership style is often that employees develop greater trust in management and have an improved sense of self-efficacy, both of which are factors that are strongly associated with well-being and productivity (Attridge, 2009).

Visionary leaders who create a culture of engagement maintain employee trust, drive optimal levels of productivity, increase overall satisfaction and retention, and are able to position the company for success. According to a research from the Kenexa Research Institute (KRI), an organization's senior leadership team has a significant impact on its employees' overall opinions of the company and engagement levels, which have been linked to both earnings per share and total shareholder return (Wiley, 2010). Towers Watson's 2012 Global Workforce Study (Towers Watson, 2012) identified the

top five drivers of sustainable engagement, including leadership, stress, balance and workload, goals and objectives, supervisors, and organization's image.   They are largely consistent with the LPI dimensions.   For example, the first driver, leadership, consists of behaviors such as "shows sincere interest in employees' well-being" is connected with "encourage the heart," and "behaves consistently with the organization's core values" is similar to "model the way."   Lanier (2013), from a client's point of view, links many of the Towers Watson's engagement drivers and the five practices of exemplary leadership of Kouzes and Posner and claims that the key to an engaged workforce is a leader's behavior (see Table 2 below):

Table 2

Lanier's of Engagement Driver Versus Leadership Challenge Behavior

Engagement/driver	Leadership challenge behavior
Understanding how role contributes to the organization	Inspire a shared vision
Treats me with respect	Model the way
Encourages new ideas	Challenge the process
Effective development discussions	Enable others to act
Shows interest in employees' well-being	Encourage the heart

Note. Adapted from "Employee Engagement: A Client's View," by M. Lanier, 2013, *Leader's Almanac Newsletter*, *8*(4). Retrieved from http://sonomaleadership.com /newsletter/a-client-view-of-employee-engagement/ Used by permission.

In their recent book regarding leadership practices in Asia, Kouzes and Posner (2013) reported results from more than 26,000 people from Asia (China, Hong Kong, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore, Taiwan, Thailand, and Vietnam).   Their results support the conclusion that people's commitment and engagement are largely driven by the extent to which their managers demonstrate the five

leadership practices.   The impact of how those Asian managers behaved as leaders was sixty times more important than any personal or organizational characteristic of their constituents.   It is strongly believed, based on their nearly thirty years of research worldwide, that leadership is not about who you are or where you come from; it is about what you do.   Generally speaking, the leadership behaviors described in literature reviewed in this chapter show strong impact on engagement.   These leadership behaviors are essentially covered by Kouzes and Posner's thirty statements in LPI, which was used in this study to evaluate the eight managers of Leveking.

Summary

This chapter reviewed literature on cultural dimensions and Chinese culture, Chinese leadership and business culture, leadership practice and LPI, and leadership's impact on engagement.   The literature revealed that the Chinese culture is high power distance, highly collective, long-term oriented and high context (Grove, 2005; Hall, 1989; Hofstede, n.d.; House et al., 2004); Chinese leaders are low-key, humble, hands-on, and often seek compromise when making tough business decisions (Chen, 2001; Gallo, 2011).   Guanxi, Face, Confucianism, hard-working, seeking harmony and the absolute power of the boss are among the key cultural elements mentioned in literature affecting the leadership behavior of Chinese managers (Chan, 2005; Chen, 2001; Dessler, 2006; Gallo, 2011; Li & Madsen, 2010; McGregor, 2005; Wang et al., 2010).

Engagement is a positive and fulfilling work-related state of mind, comprised of vigor, dedication, and absorption in one's work (Bakker et al., 2008; Macey & Schneider, 2008; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004, 2010).   Leadership, including the Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership (Kouzes & Posner, 2002a), has been shown to have a direct

impact on employee engagement by providing a clear vision, inspiring and motivating, offering intellectual challenges, and showing real interest in the needs of the workers (Attridge, 2009; Getz, 2011; Lanier, 2013; Lavigna, 2010; Macey & Schneider, 2008; Tuckey et al., 2012; Wallace & Trinka, 2009; Wiley, 2010).   While it is generally believed that the Exemplary Leadership model is adoptable worldwide in different cultures (Abu-Tineh et al., 2008; Bass, 1997; Kouzes & Posner, 2002b; Posner, 2011; Smith et al., 1994; Zagorsek et al., 2004), some suggested adjustments when applying these Western developed practices to Eastern world (Gallo, 2011; Weldon, 2004).

It is important to note that most of the literature regarding Chinese leadership practices focused primarily on multinational, state-owned companies, conducted via large scale surveys or from leaders' perspectives.   This study focused on a small privately-owned biotechnology company via surveys and face-to-face interviews, dug deeper into the employees' perspective to reveal whether Chinese managers engage employees differently, and correlated the use of specific leadership practices and employee engagement.   The next chapter will discuss the study design and methodology for sample selection and data analysis.

Chapter 3

Methodology

This study examined, in a Chinese cultural and business environment, how leadership practices affect employee engagement. It attempted to discover if these effects mirror those in Western cultures – most notably, the United States. The hypothesis tested in the research design was that leadership practices in the subject company produced similar effects on engagement and results as they would in a US company. At the same time, idiosyncrasies unique to the Chinese cultural context could emerge. The following research questions were defined:

1. Do Chinese managers engage in different management practices from US managers?

2. What is the relationship between the use of specific leadership practices and employee engagement in a small, privately-owned Chinese business?

3. Are these relationship/impacts unique to the Chinese culture and business environment?

This chapter describes the methods used in this study. The research setting and study design are discussed first, followed by a review of procedures related to participant and interviewee selection. Survey data collection, interview data collection, and data analysis methods are also described.

Research Setting and Study Design

This study conducted surveys and interviews in a small, privately owned biotechnology company, Shenzhen Leveking Bio-Engineering Co. Ltd., located in the fast growing Shenzhen Special Economic District in Guangdong Province, China. The

company claims four strategy focuses: market needs, technology, effectiveness, and talents.   It has a vision to become an influential company in the global enzyme industry and to "create a green world with biotechnology."

The basic research design of this study was a one-shot case study.   Case studies are analyses of systems that are studied holistically by one or more methods.   They take place in a natural setting; they illuminate and explicate an instance of a class of phenomena (Thomas, 2011).   The case study approach is comparatively flexible and specializes in "deep data" about a single subject or small group of subjects.   This emphasis allows researchers to compare their firsthand observations with the quantitative results obtained through other methods of research.   The weaknesses of case studies include inherent subjectivity (i.e., the approach relies on personal interpretation of data and inferences), high investment (i.e., it usually takes longer to collect the data), and a restricted ability to generalize the findings to a broader range of situations (Becker et al., 1994-2012).

The research was performed in a "sequential design" with semi-structured interviews.   *Sequential* means that collection and analysis of one type of data is used to inform the collection and analysis of the other type, as opposed to *simultaneous* designs, where the two types of data are gathered at roughly the same time (Creswell, 2009).   In this study, the survey was conducted first and the results of the survey were used to direct the selection of interview participants.

Procedures

Survey sample selection.   The manager self-report sample was selected first. It included the president, the general manager, the deputy general manager, and five

department directors to evaluate leaders of different levels and areas.   Then the observers, including bosses (if applicable), co-workers, direct reports, and others who had direct interactions with the individual managers in their leadership positions, were chosen with help of the administration personnel in the company.   A total of eight LPI-Self questionnaires and sixty-one LPI-Observer questionnaires were collected.

Interview sample selection.   Based on the LPI survey results, "observers" from two managers with high scores and two managers with low scores were interviewed. There were a total of sixteen face-to-face interviews.   All the interviews were conducted in a confidential environment consisting of an office room where the interview conversation could not be heard by colleagues.

Data collection.   Survey data were collected by calling a meeting for the participants.   The researcher explained to all participants what the survey was about and distributed the LPI-Self and/or LPI-Observer to everyone in the audience depending on the role of the individual participant.   The Leadership Practice Inventory developed by Kouzes and Posner (领越 ^{TM} LPI$^{®}$, 2003 – see Appendix A) was given to the eight

managers (using the LPI-Self Survey) and six to nine people who had direct experience of each individual manager in a leadership role (using LPI-Observer Survey).   Some of the participants received two or more survey forms in the cases in which they were the leader to be assessed and/or an observer for more than one leader.   The researcher reviewed the instructions on the assessment with the group, and then asked them to complete the assessment.   A consent form (see Appendix B) was also distributed at the same time to each participant.   Once the surveys were completed, they were collected

with the consent forms.   Some participants submitted the survey at the end of the meeting; some of them brought their survey forms to the researcher later.

Primary questions asked during interviews are listed in Appendix C.   These interview questions were designed to measure employee engagement through their answers with examples and stories of the interviewees.   Interview conversations were recorded.   These recordings were then hand-transcribed into text for analysis.

Data Analysis

After the survey forms were collected, the LPI surveys were scored according to the survey instructions.   Scores from LPI-Observers were recorded the same way as for the LPI-Self survey.   Then data were grouped to each of the managers and averaged against each leadership practice of that manager.   Based on responses to the LPI$^®$, the mangers being studies were divided into "high" and "low" cohorts.   Two managers who received high scores and two managers who received low scores were chosen.

Interview data were examined by using content analysis.   Themes were identified from the participants' responses to a group of questions that gave rise a common theme.   In general, answers to questions 2 and 3 were grouped into a theme labeled Purpose and Meaning.   Similarly, a second theme labeled Stimulates and Energizes consisted of answers to questions 5 and 6.   A total of five themes were identified and analyzed.   Table 3 shows the themes, questions included in the theme, the main components asked in the questions, and the engagement elements involved in that theme.

After the interview responses were grouped as described in Table 3, the responses of the subordinates of the "High" or "Low" cohort of the LPI survey were identified and

separately grouped.   For the purpose of presenting the results, sample responses from "High" and "Low" cohorts were listed in tables of Chapter Four.   The sample responses were chosen by leaving out the responses that were unclear or irrelevant.   For example, one interviewee talked about what criteria the company needed to match before it could consider becoming a public company, when asked Question #3 about the challenges the company may face.   This answer would not be included as a sample result in Chapter Four.   When there were similar responses to a question, one typical response was presented in the Table for that theme as a "Sample Result."   When one response gave a unique and clear point, that response was used as a "Sample Result."

Table 3

Theme Identification

Theme	Interview questions	Main components in the questions	Engagement driven
Purpose and meaning	2, 3	The best of working in Leveking and the challenges the company is facing or will face in ten years	Dedication, Absorption
Stimulates and energizes	5, 6	Whether they look forward to work and what stimulates them in job	Vigor
Empowerment	8, 11, 13	Involvement in decisions, talent used, and accomplishments	Vigor, Dedication, Absorption
Care and trust	12, 14, 15	Pressure/stress, work-life balance, and who do they trust the most	Dedication, Absorption
Community	7, 9, 10	Whether work is important for the company, self as part of the family, and if received any training in this job	Dedication

The samples of "High" and "Low" groups' responses were compared to reveal any impact of leadership practices on employee engagement.   When the responses reflected one or more of the three engagement areas in the "High" cohort but not in the

"Low" cohort, a positive relationship between the leader's leadership practice and employee engagement was noted.

The results that did not fit to any of the themes were collected in a separate section of Chapter Four, the Overall Style and Additional Data.   Chapter Four will present the survey and interview results.

Chapter 4

Results

This study examined, in a Chinese cultural and business environment, how leadership behavior and management styles affect employee engagement. It discovered if these effects mirror those in Western cultures – most notably, the United States. The hypothesis tested in the research design was that leadership practices in the subject company produce similar effects on engagement and results as they would in an US company. At the same time, idiosyncrasies unique to the Chinese cultural context could emerge.

This chapter reports the results of the study. The LPI survey results are presented first. Analysis of the survey results and the implications of the results to the interview design and interviewee selection are briefly discussed. These are followed by the interview findings through different themes. Similarities and differences of the results from those in the Western environment and from the previous studies for China are highlighted and summarized.

Survey Results

The scores of the LPI survey are shown in Table 4. There are six statements of behavior for each of the five practices, the ratings for each statement can range from 1 to 10, and therefore the total for each practice can range from a low of 6 to a high of 60. The observers' scores also are highlighted in Table 4. It can be seen that most leaders scored themselves much higher than the observers did. Six of the eight leaders scored themselves higher than the observers did; one leader scored himself very closely to the way the observers did; and one leader scored himself lower than the observers did.

Table 4

LPI Responses for Eight Managers

	Model the way	Inspire a shared vision	Challenge the process	Enable others to act	Encourage the heart	Average
Leader A: Self	46	55	55	52	52	52.0
Observers, $N = 6$	40.5	45	46.7	44.3	42.7	43.8
Leader B[a]: Self	51	51	49	46	52	49.8
Observers, $N = 7$	48.9	52.3	47.1	49.6	51.9	49.9
Leader C: Self	43	39	40	43	41	41.2
Observers, $N = 8$	42.3	41.8	41.3	48.5	43.6	43.5
Leader D[a]: Self	53	50	54	54	52	52.6
Observers, $N = 8$	44.8	42.9	42.9	41.4	42	42.8
Leader E[b]: Self	49	42	48	50	49	47.6
Observers, $N = 9$	33.8	31.6	35.4	37.7	33.8	34.4
Leader F[b]: Self	53	54	55	58	59	55.8
Observers, $N = 9$	37.3	29.1	31.8	41.2	37.8	35.4
Leader G: Self	47	34	39	51	46	43.4
Observers, $N = 7$	42	36	37.7	46.4	39.7	40.4
Leader H: Self	45	42	42	42	45	43.2
Observers, $N = 7$	26.9	20.4	23.3	29.9	23.3	24.7

[a] Chosen as higher scored leader.   [b] Chosen as lower scored leader.

The leaders being assessed were divided into two groups: those with observers' scores higher than 42 (an average score of "7" in each behavior on a 1 to 10 scale generates a total score of 42), and those lower than 36 (an average score of below "6" in each behavior).   Managers B and D were chosen for the higher-scored group ("High" cohort), and managers E and F were chosen for the lower-scored group ("Low" cohort). B and D were chosen instead of A and C, or E and F were chosen instead of H because of the number of direct reports and availability of the observers.   Some of the observers of these managers were invited for interview based on the administrator's recommendation as well as their availability.

LPI data from Asia and from United States by Posner (2010) are listed in Table 5 to compare with the average survey data from Leveking in this study.   As mentioned in Chapter Two, scores from Asia are generally lower than those from the United States. The table shows that the LPI-Self scores of Leveking managers were all higher than the mean scores from the Asia leaders, and almost all higher than the scores from United States.   On average, the Leveking managers see themselves as demonstrating more of these leadership behaviors than US managers.   They appear to have strong and positive beliefs about their own leadership practices.   However, the LPI-Observer scores from 61 Leveking observers are across-the-board lower than the mean from the Asian observers, in some cases much lower.   The observers saw an opposite picture for most of their managers.

Table 5

Comparison of Average LPI Scores – US, Asia, and Leveking

	Model the way	Inspire a shared vision	Challenge the process	Enable others to act	Encourage the heart
LPI - Self					
US ($N = 59,497$)	47.16	44.21	45.16	49.8	46.18
Asia ($N = 3,746$)	45.4	42.12	43.6	48.63	44.42
Leveking ($N = 8$)	48.4	45.9	47.8	49.5	49.5
LPI - Observer					
US ($N = 180,620$)	47.4	44.54	45.38	49.83	46.5
Asia ($N = 18,665$)	45.33	42.27	43.46	48.31	44.41
Leveking ($N = 61$)	39.4	37.0	38.0	42.2	39.2

Interview Results

Five themes were identified from the participants' responses to the interview and follow up questions.   Sample responses for the five themes are presented in Table 6 through Table 10.   The responses from the observers of the "High" cohort and of the "Low" cohort are listed in each of the tables for comparison to reveal relationship between leadership practices and employee engagement.   Additional data not included in the themes but related to the research questions are also included at the end of this chapter as an independent section.

Table 6

Theme One: Purpose and Meaning

Description: What attracted the employee to his/her current job and how much s/he knows or cares about the company's challenges or its future indicate the employee's dedication to his/her job – an element of engagement.	
High cohort	"This company has a very good future because of its industry. My field is biochemistry, so it's a very good fit." "The executives of the company have big ambitions and long-term goals." "The challenges are long-term development, the need to expand R&D, and the development of new products." "We must pay more attention to management. Our management system is not very good. Some of the decisions are made after long discussion and then forgotten. The leaders' energy is not focused."
Low cohort	"It is just a job. The challenge now is marketing. I have not paid much attention to think about future challenges in 10 years." "I think I can learn a lot of things since the company is small, I have to wear many hats. It's great for my development. The company's current operation is not ideal. In next 10 years, talents are the most important." "I come to this job to make money. The company's products are new to the market, so it should have a good future. I have never thought about company challenges." "Developing new products is not easy. The enzyme is not stable. In ten years, we will face bigger competition when the potential in bioenzymes is recognized by other companies and further international competitions join in."

Purpose and meaning of the job. Interview questions 2 and 3 asked the interviewees about the best part of working in Leveking and the challenges the company is facing right now or in the next ten years. Answers to these questions illustrated the purpose of the interviewee in this job and whether this job was a meaningful pursuit for the employee.

From the responses shown in Table 6, subordinates of "High" and "Low" cohorts are different in their work engagement. Employees of "High" cohort leaders reported more meaningful and significant jobs and more dedication.

Stimulates and energizes. Interview questions 5 and 6 asked the employees whether they were looking forward to coming to work and what would stimulate them to change their job. These questions measured whether the interviewee felt the job was something stimulating and energetic, so that they really wanted to devote their time and efforts. Table 7 shows the results. The "High" cohort showed higher energy and motivation to devote time and effort to their jobs than the "Low" counterparts.

The differences between sentiments expressed in the "High" and the "Low" cohorts are apparent. The comments were more positive, and there is a clear "feel" in the vigor of the words from the subordinates of the "High" cohort. Their energy and their motivation to devote time and effort to their jobs seem stronger than those of the "Low" cohort. Although the employees of the "Low" cohort are also "good" employees and want to do a good job, under the poor leadership, they seem to be suppressing their feelings and forcing themselves to "tolerate" the situations instead of vigorously wanting to devote time and energy to the job. There is good evidence here that leadership practices impacted in this area for Leveking employees.

Table 7

Theme Two: Stimulates and Energizes

Description: Whether employees found the job stimulating and energizing, whether they were looking forward to coming to work shows the vigor of the employees toward the job – s/he is or is not engaged.	
High cohort	"Most of the time I look forward to and have the motivation to come to work. I feel gratitude working here and have a sense of belonging. Therefore I am not considering leaving the company." "My job is my responsibility and a part of my life. If a project deadline is approaching, I wouldn't be able to sleep well. I would want to work overtime to get the job done." "I love this company. Although I am not satisfied in some areas, I want to help and hope the company has a great future." "My manager does affect my engagement. I like the job and look forward to coming in for work. When looking for a job I consider company future and culture. This company has a good culture."
Low cohort	"I don't 'look forward' to coming to work, I just 'need to go to work'. If another company has a good future, and I can learn new things from the job, I may consider it." "Most of time I look forward to coming to work, because I want to learn and develop my abilities. Sometimes, when my boss has treated me unfairly, I felt unhappy and thought to resign. However, I later convinced myself that other companies also very possibly have this kind of manager, or even worse ones. I decided to tolerate it." "I do not look forward, but would plan what I need to do today when coming to work. I come to work not because I love the job but only because of my responsibility. Company culture, salary, and learning new things are what stimulate me to consider a new job." "Even if my boss does not treat me well, I would not consider leaving. There are bad managers everywhere. When you work for others, being bullied is common. Changing jobs is not easy; you'd have to get used to the new environment. This company gives me a good hope for future."

Empowerment. Empowerment was a significant topic during the interviews. The employees felt strongly that they should be empowered more and most of them wanted their potential to be utilized and developed further. Table 8 displays sample responses for interview questions 8, 11, and 13. These questions asked the interviewees

Table 8

Theme Three: Empowerment

Description: Employees liked to be empowered more. Most employees felt their potential was not fully utilized. Their feelings of accomplishment are related to whether the leaders are empowering them and increasing their self-esteem.	
High cohort	"I hope my leader could trust me and give me more information, so that I could accomplish more. Clear career goal and sense of accomplishment are my biggest motivations for work." "Sometimes the leaders didn't want to discuss things with us as they believe it would cause the company to delay decisions and miss good opportunities." "People have unlimited potential. I have utilized about 80% of my potential, and can still do more. I am very proud of what I have contributed to the company in the past 6 years." "My potential is not fully utilized; only half is used. Leaders must change their philosophy. When the positioning is not clear, rights and responsibilities are not well identified, we do not know how to do the work."
Low cohort	"My manager often doesn't allow me do the work that the company needs but not assigned by her. She blocks me. If it continues like this, I will consider leaving." "If my boss gave me more opportunities, I would be able to do better and to contribute more." "I have my own ideas but no opportunity to show them. Managers have already made the decisions; there is no space to think." "I don't have much potential; I'm just here to finish my work. If the company makes more money, and I make more for the family, I'd feel that I accomplished something." "My potential is fully unleashed. I could complete the tasks. When I am finished with my tasks after working hard, I feel relaxed."

whether they were given the chance to be involved in decision making processes, whether their talents were fully utilized, and about their accomplishments.

The responses from the subordinates of the leaders being evaluated, in lower scored or higher scored groups, had some similarities as both groups felt that their managers did not empower them enough and that they would like to see more. However, there were deeper differences. Some subordinates in the "Low" group did not seem to understand the extent of their own potential, and it seems that their potential has

not been developed or utilized by their managers; it may have even been blocked. Employees, who feel empowered and have a sense of accomplishing some meaningful things in their job, are engaged more.

   Care and trust.   This theme compares interview responses for leaders with "Low" or "High" observer scores on the theme of care and trust.   Whether an employee trusts and puts faith in the leader is affected by the leader's leadership behavior, and in turn affects employees' engagement.   Interview questions 12, 14, and 15 asked about the pressure they felt at work, work-life balance, and who they trusted the most in the company.

   The data is displayed in Table 9.   It shows that there is a clear contrast between the responses for the "High" and "Low" cohorts.   When leaders care about the employees, along with other leadership behaviors, they gain the most trust.   It is important to note that there are also company policy related issues regarding the care of an employee's family and support of work-life balance.   These will be discussed in more detail in Chapter Five.

   Community.   This theme explored whether employees felt that their work was important to the company, whether they consider themselves part of the company family, and whether they considered working for their own community.   When these concerns were positive, employees wanted to devote time and energy.   This last theme presents the responses of the above interview questions (questions 7, 9, and 10) to compare engagement of subordinates of leaders in "High" and "Low" cohorts.

Table 9

Theme Four: Care and Trust

Description: Employees trust the managers who care about them more, and are in turn willing to devote more of their energy to work.	
High cohort	"This is the reality in China – it is not that important how long you spend with your family, but rather your family's quality of life." "I got married not long ago, and will have my new baby soon. I have big pressure to support my family." "I desire bigger platform and more opportunities, the executives are supportive." "I trust Mr. Wang [*the president*] the most. He focuses on talents, gives everyone the opportunity to show them, and is very forgiving." "I trust my direct manager more. If I don't trust him, why would I want to work for him?" "The more everyday contact you have with a person, the easier it is for you to trust them."
Low cohort	"Once I took time off for family reasons, but my boss was not happy. I got a call asking 'Why is xyz not finished yet?' I do not dare to take time off anymore ... I don't trust my boss. I trust Mr. Li [*the general manager*] the most." "I do not trust my manager. In this company, I trust Mr. Li and Mr. Zhang [*the deputy general manager*] the most. My manager doesn't recognize my work and wouldn't allow me time when my family needed me ... when part of the company was relocating last year, I was the only tech support person, but my boss didn't support me. This put a lot of pressure on me." "I trust the highest level [*executives*] because they know the most about company affairs."

Table 10 shows the sample responses. It shows that most of the employees from either group considered the company as a family or their own community, and themselves as a part of the family. Because training typically involved mostly company-wide events, individual leaders may not have had strong influences on it, although leaders' behaviors may influence employees' perception about the training. Therefore, it appears there are no apparent differences between these two types of leaders in followers' opinions in considering the company as a family and about the training programs.

Table 10

Theme Five: Community

Description: Employees feel their work is important and meaningful, they feel like a part of the family, and they receive useful training for the job – all these stimulate engagement.	
High cohort	"Yes, I think of the company as like my own family and have a strong emotional attachment to it. Though I'm not very satisfied, I want to help and hope the company develops well." "My job is critical to the company." "There were only a few training seminars, and they were mostly policy training." "I have a sense of belonging to my department more than to my company. My job is very important. I work overtime when needed." "Last year we had sales training, which is pretty good." "My job is so important to the company. If I don't pay great attention to it, the company would suffer a huge loss." "I have attended Accountant Certification Training and Sales Training. They were very valuable."
Low cohort	"I believe my job is very important. There are only a few of us for production. I think we are equal to those who are doing mental work." "I am a part of the family – I feel respected." "I'm satisfied with the operations training." "Leveking is a family! There are many things that depend on our work. Of course my job is important." "During most of the training, I didn't understand what they were talking about." "I don't have a feeling of importance." "The training was for the Certificate, which the government requires. It was for the company, not for my own development."

Overall style and additional data. The perceived overall leadership style of Leveking executives was, in general, positive. However, there are some noticeable differences from the Western style of management. Here is some of what the interviewees said regarding Leveking executive leadership practices that reflect or indicate these differences:

"It is very random. Decisions made without consensus."

"There are policies, but they are often broken. Therefore the execution of policies seems mostly at will."

"Mr. Wang's thoughts are jumping around, not focused. Often things are just
tried a little bit, no real execution, no follow up."

"I had two big arguments with my boss and was considering resigning. However,
the executives told me that my boss would be replaced soon, so I did not leave."

"Mr. Li is the general manager, but influenced by Mr. Wang when making
decisions. He had to hire some people who were very unfit to the positions."

"There is one obvious change recently that Mr. Wang is often checking if we turn
the computers off at end of the day, to cut cost."

Compared to Western or US leadership styles, these quotes suggest that Chinese
leaders may be more guanxi and face oriented, making decisions more randomly and at
will, acting with less focus on execution of ideas and policies, and less often applying the
use of norms and policies to regulate behaviors.

The company policy regarding family time off or other needs is also different
from typical US companies. According to the policy, there are three ways to take time
off: 1) take your vacation time (which is relatively much shorter than we have in the US);
2) trade your over time with your off time; 3) your salary is deducted in a prorated
manner for the hours or days off.   Many of the privately owned Chinese companies
engage in similar practices.   In contrast, most US companies have established policies
that meet or exceed national regulatory standards.

Summary of Findings

This chapter reported the results of the study.   The LPI survey results showed
that most of the leaders scored themselves much higher than what the observers did for
them.   The LPI-Self scores from Leveking of this study were also higher than the mean

scores from Asia and US leaders.   The LPI-Observer scores from 61 Leveking observers were, across-the-board, much lower than the mean from Asian observers.

The interview results showed that the managers' leadership practices did impact employee engagement.   Specifically, the job is a more meaningful and significant pursuit for the subordinates of the "High" cohort leaders – they showed more dedication to their jobs.   The direct reports of the "High" cohort of leaders also showed stronger vigor - their energy and their motivation to devote time and effort to their jobs, than those of the "Low" cohort.   Both groups had similar response about empowerment. They felt that their managers did not empower them enough and would like to see more, while their potential seemed less developed in the "Low" cohort than did in their "High" counterpart. There is a clear contrast between the responses for the "High" and "Low" cohorts regarding the pressure they felt at work, work-life balance, and who they trusted the most in the company.   The leaders who care about the employees, along with other leadership behaviors, gain the most trust.   Employees from either "High" or "Low" group considered the company or their working group as a family, and themselves as an important part of the family.   It appears there are no apparent differences between these two types of leaders – leadership practices of their direct boss did not have a significant impact on employees considering the company as a family.

Overall, in most of the themes, the "High" cohort has higher work engagement, and vice versa, except that both groups felt they were not empowered enough, and that in the areas where individual managers can only make limited influence, such as training and company policy.

In next Chapter, the survey and interview results will be discussed and analyzed according to the three research questions.

Chapter 5

Discussion

This study examined, in a Chinese cultural and business environment, how leadership behavior and management style affected employee engagement.   The following research questions were defined:

1.   Do Chinese managers engage in different leadership practices from US managers?

2.   What is the relationship between the use of specific leadership practices and employee engagement in a small, privately-owned Chinese business?

3.   Are these relationships/impacts unique to the Chinese culture and business environment?

This Chapter discusses indications of the findings, and provides conclusions for each of the research questions.   This chapter also identifies the study's limitations, and suggestions for doing business in China with small- to medium-sized companies. Finally the chapter discusses some future opportunities for study in this area.

Discussion of Findings

The discussion of the results is organized by the research questions.   Relevant evidences to each research question are briefly mentioned, similarities and differences are compared and discussed, and conclusions for each of the research questions are provided.

Chinese managers lead differently.   The findings suggest that Chinese managers do engage in different leadership and management practices compared to their Western counterparts.

Given the much smaller difference between self-report and observer scores for both the US and Asian sample compared to the much larger differences between self-report and observer scores for the Leveking sample as shown in Table 5, it appears that Leveking managers have a much higher and potentially distorted view of their leadership behaviors. This constitutes an important difference. The interview data support this disconnection. While some of the managers enjoyed the feeling that they were good leaders, their observers complained that they often were not good role models of doing what they said; they were making decisions more randomly and at will without consulting the "front-line" employees; or that when their family member got sick, it took long time to get manager's approval for them to go take care of the family.

The data suggests that the Leveking leaders are disconnected from their employees. This disconnection may result in employee engagement issues, efficiency issues and potentially turnover issues. In turn, the company's bottom line may be impacted. In fact, during this study, one of the interviewees in the "low" observer cohort, and five other employees, left the company. As will be discussed later in this chapter, the sources of Leveking employee engagement in some areas were not the leaders, but the industry or the larger environment, though when leaders did practice better leadership, their employees engaged better.

After over 20 years of high speed development, Chinese economy is facing some corrections. In the first half of 2013, it has already showed slow down across many industries. Leveking may have some rough road ahead, and possibly face surviving issue depend on how the overall economy is landing. If Leveking can survive through this rocky period, the disconnection between leaders and employees will still be very

costly for them. The leaders must realize this and take actions to make behavior changes right away.

Other differences of leadership style involve guanxi and mianzi (personal relationship and face). As part of the Chinese culture, managers in this privately-owned company relied more on guanxi to engage people. For example, one employee, who said the fourth quote in *Overall Style and Additional Data* section of Chapter Four (see on p.34), has worked in the company for eight years, and has been happy and engaged. His direct manager was "Leader E" on Table 4, a leader in the "low" cohort. The employee is the driver of the company car, so has more opportunities to establish guanxi with the executives. The executives seem to engage him by showing "trust" in him and telling him about the plan of replacing his manager. He said in the interview that he could easily damage the company's reputation as he was the "first window" for the company. When any guests, customers, investors, or officials came to the company, he would be the person to pick them up and transport them to the company. However, by making this "key" employee happy without following rules, the company may have to pay by losing the engagement of others, for example that of the manager of this particular employee. The company sometimes also has to accept candidates recommended by friends or government officials (when their children or their relatives need a job – other companies also face this similar issue) because of guanxi. These people are usually hired without having to go through the interview process at Leveking. The company accepted the recommendations because they want to give the other party mianzi. Interviewees of this study mentioned this and were not very happy about the way managers handled it.

In a US company, although there might be managers who have "chemistry" with certain employees but not with others, managers are usually not considering guanxi or mianzi when making business decisions. It is an apparent difference in leadership practice. On the other hand, Leveking managers are hard-working; they are more hands-on than the average US managers. They work more overtime than the average employees, and they are not willing to empower the employees. Both the survey and interview data suggested that the three executives displayed better leadership practices than the second level managers, and they were able to gain more trust from employees. These are some apparent differences revealed in this study. Some of the cultural indications of the differences are discussed with the third research question.

Relationship between leadership practices and engagement. The findings from this study support the conclusion of a positive relationship between the use of the Five Exemplary Leadership Practices and employee engagement at Leveking. When observer scores were high, employees reported better engagement in their jobs. This was true when considering the purpose and meaning of the job, the vigor of the employees toward the job, for the use of employees' talent and potential, and for employees' trust on leaders. When a leader's awareness of their employees' desires impacts their leadership behavior and their effectiveness, it, in turn, impacted employee engagement.

The "High" cohort employees reported that they cared and were attracted more by the company's future, and they knew more about the challenges the company was or would be facing than did the "Low" cohort. There are more employees in the "Low" cohort who consider "making money" as the purpose of the job unlike those in the

"High" cohort.   Therefore, the "High" group showed more dedication, and considered the job a more meaningful and significant pursuit for them.

Similarly, the high cohort showed higher energy and motivation to devote time and effort to their jobs.   They talked about not wanting to leave the job when asked what would stimulate them to change jobs.   They are motivated to work overtime to get the job done.   They have a passion for the job and toward their company.   In contrast, the "Low" cohort employees were more ready to exit.   Those who decided to tolerate the situation were no longer engaged as their reason to stay was not because they were looking forward to doing the work, but afraid of getting the same kind of bad bosses, or even worse, if they changed their jobs.   This reflected the business environment; good managers with strong leadership skills are not easy to find in China.   In general, the conclusion is that the higher the observer score the leader received, the more likely his or her employees showed vigor toward their jobs and found the job stimulating and energizing.

Both groups had similar responses about empowerment: they believed their managers did not empower them enough.   Although empowerment did not conform to traditional Chinese culture, the China economy is changing rapidly and so is the business environment there.   The younger generation, unlike their predecessors, is expressing strong signals that they want leaders who practice strong leadership as defined by the LPI.   As mentioned in Chapter Four, empowerment appeared to be an important issue in the eyes of the interviewees.   One interviewee, also a department head, stated his belief that "amongst the five leadership practices, 'Enabling Others to Act' had the biggest impact on performance of the team."   However, when asked how he empowered his

own team members, he said that "the fit between manager and subordinate is very important. Sometimes some employees purposely act against the manager." He started to find excuses for not empowering his employees. Similar to this manager, some of the leaders were contradictory in their beliefs: they wanted their own superiors to empower them more, but did not want to empower their own employees. This is a typical story in China during this transition era.

There is a clear contrast between the responses for the "High" and "Low" cohorts regarding who they trusted the most in the company. The leaders who cared about the employees by "encouraging the heart", along with other leadership behaviors, gained the most trust. Some leaders have realized this and have started to move with the times. The results of this study support that conclusion. For example, the majority of the interviewees said they trust the top executives of the company the most. As shown in Table 4, the top executives of the company had the highest LPI-Observer scores (Leaders A, B, and C). These scores are very similar to the average Asian leaders' observer scores. Although both levels do use guanxi in their practices to some extent, the executives seem to engage the employees more effectively than most of the mid-level managers. While this is good news for the executives, it is not good news for the company. If many of the mid-level managers are not trusted by their subordinates, they will have trouble effectively leading a team. The company's strategies, goals, and processes will then not be executed effectively and efficiently. Leveking executives should consider coaching, mentoring, and developing the mid-level managers more, encourage them to lead, instead of doing most of the things by themselves.

We can see that employee engagement is significantly impacted by leaders' behaviors. Although for the situations in China, the employees under the lower-scored leaders tolerated the situation, most of them were not engaged in their current jobs either. When observers reported high leadership behaviors, they were more likely to report attitudes indicating engagement. However, observers generally thought their managers were weak in these behaviors whereas the leaders viewed themselves as stronger. Despite the big gap in self vs. observer scores, the higher the observer score the more engaged the employee. This is a very new concept to Leveking and its management team. If the company realizes that their own leadership behaviors could affect employee engagement, and hence the company's performance, they should pay attention and take actions to learn and improve their leadership practice. This study was the first time that employee feedback regarding their leadership behavior has been brought to the company. Comparing the observers' scores with their own as well as the interview responses, Leveking managers should see that it is not how the leaders feel about themselves, but how they are perceived by the employees that would have the impact on engagement – that is where they need to work.

Relationships/impacts unique to China. The findings support a positive answer to this question. The interview data suggest that many of the practices and relationships can be attributed to cultural background and today's business environment. For example, as discussed with the first research question, it appears that employees are empowered less than in the US. As reviewed in Chapter Two, a high power distance culture and Confucius' hierarchy concept in Chinese culture does not favor empowerment. This strong cultural background may have silently influenced some of

the leaders' behaviors.   Lower level managers may naturally think that they cannot

challenge decisions made by those above them, or that there is no need to encourage

those below them.

There were suggestions in the literature that Western oriented leadership practices

in China need to be modified to fit the Chinese culture.   For example, Chinese

employees might get confused or suspicious if their leaders tried overt methods to

empower them (Chen, 2001; Gallo, 2011).   This study suggests something different.

Many interviewees talked about their frustrations when leaders made decisions without

discussing them with "front line" employees who knew more about the topic.   Many

complained that the boss looked over their shoulders and did not allow them make own

decisions.   They wanted to be empowered, they wanted to know the company's direction,

they wanted their voice to be heard, and they wanted to play a bigger role in the

company's future.   The managers who made the employees feel confused and suspicious

may have been leading out of a traditional Chinese paradigm and may not authentically

want to empower the employee.   However, Western thought in this area of leadership

has clearly permeated the business environment in China.   There is a great desire for

empowerment and a significant resistance to displaying it.

Both groups of subordinates who were interviewed (from the higher- and the

lower-scoring leaders) believed that they were primarily working for the good of the

company or for their own professional development rather than for their direct superiors.

Those from the higher-scored group had more of a *wanting to help* attitude, while their

counterparts merely *tolerated* how their bosses treated them.   On the other hand, their

management practices made most of the employees feel as if the company were a family

and themselves as an important part of the family, no matter if their bosses were scored "high" or "low." Again, culture has a strong influence here. According to Hofstede's cultural dimensions, China is a highly collective society. It makes perfect sense for people to work for the "group," the company, and not for the "individuals," or bosses even when that means sacrificing themselves by tolerating and depressing their own needs. Confucius hierarchy measure taught the employees to tolerate rather than confront the bosses for fair treatment. Using guanxi and seeking harmony added another adhesive to keep the group together and increased the feeling of family.

Different ways of thinking about time also plays a role here. Reflecting Chinese society's focus on long-term goals, these people were looking to the future of their company and of themselves as opposed to the short-term and ultimately temporary relationship with their bosses.

As discussed with the first research question above, mianzi and guanxi are something in the cultural background that is unique in China comparing to Western world, so as the hierarchy and seeking harmony culture that influence the leadership behaviors. When the managers made a decision randomly and at their own will, using the culturally-informed rationale that they were the "boss" and therefore had the "authority" to make the decision, others are compelled to obey. The subordinates are likely to accept this behavior though Western leadership theories are gaining traction with young employees.

As for the business environment, China is a "seller's market" now. A college graduate cannot easily find a job. Many of the privately-owned Chinese companies have similar Human Resources policies as Leveking's for taking time off. From the

interview data, when employees felt that they were treated unfairly by the boss, they choose to tolerate for both cultural and market reasons.   This kind of environment, mixed with the conservative and hierarchy culture, made managers resist learning the modern practices or organization development concepts.   These leaders' beliefs in their own effectiveness (indicated by evaluating themselves much higher relative to their observers' ratings) could be a hindrance blocking them from improving their leadership behaviors.

In conclusion, leadership practices significantly impact employee engagement although Chinese managers may sometimes have engaged employees in some different ways.   These differences are mainly culture-related. However, this does not mean that the principles of the leadership practices should be modified according to the culture. Data of this study showed strong relationship between these "Western oriented" practices and the engagement of Chinese employees.   Chinese managers should adapt more of the practices, though they should choose culturally more acceptable ways for their practices.

Limitations of the Study

Several limitations affected the study:

1. Remote research site - The researcher is living in the United States, but the research was conducted in China.   This limitation directly affected the length of time the researcher could spend in the research site.   As such there was not enough time for the researcher either to learn further details regarding company structure or to get to know some key employees.   The research design process was also indirectly affected.   Selection of the survey participants and the interview participants was assisted by the administrative director.   This director's personal bias might have

influenced her choice of the participants. Further studies could avoid this limitation by spending longer time on site, getting to know the people and building rapport with them first, and taking control of the participant selection process.

2. One organization – The study was conducted within one organization. Therefore, the conclusions drawn from this study must be seen in the context of a case study, which – though revealing in many ways – cannot be considered as a generalized conclusion. Further studies could reduce this limitation and increase representation by conducting the study in different organizations and across a range of industries.

3. **Short period of time** – The study was conducted over a short time span. Therefore, no comparison of performances before and after the introduction of the Exemplary Leadership Practices could be conducted. This limitation could be avoided by utilizing a longer term study design and returning to the site for a follow-up study.

Future Opportunities

Continued research with leadership training and coaching interventions would be helpful for confirming and extending the results of this study. By comparing leadership behaviors and employee engagement before and after the interventions, further confirmation of the impacts of leadership practice to employee engagement might be discovered.

Another suggestion for continued study would be to include financial and employee performance as additional variables before and after interventions.

To further understand the differences of leadership behavior and its impacts on employee engagement and performance in Chinese cultural and business environment, continued research should include multiple organizations and industries.

References

References

Abu-Tineh, A. M., Khasawneh, S. A., & Al-Omari, A. A. (2008). Kouzes and Posner's transformational leadership model in practice: The case of Jordanian schools. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *29*, 648-660. doi:10.1108/01437730810916613

Attridge, M. (2009). Measuring and managing employee work engagement: A review of the research and business literature. *Journal of Workplace Behavioral Health, 24*, 383-398. doi:10.1080/15555240903188398

Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., & Taris, T. W. (2008). Work engagement: An emerging concept in occupational health psychology. *Work & Stress*, *22*, 187-200. doi:10.1080/02678370802393649

Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American Psychologist*, *52*, 130-139. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.52.2.130

Becker, B., Dawson, P., Devine, K., Hannum, C., Hill, S., Leydens, J., . . . Palmquist. M. (1994-2012). Case studies. Retrieved from http://writing.colostate.edu/guides/guide.cfm?guideid=60

Bennis, W. (1999). Five competencies of new leaders: Emerging leaders are purveyors of hope. *Executive Excellence*, *16*, 4-5. www.worldcat.org/title/executive-excellence/oclc/42326528

Bolden, R., & Gosling, J. (2006). Leadership competencies: time to change the tune? *Leadership*, *2*, 147-163. doi:10.1177/1742715006062932

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R. E. (2011). *Diagnosing and changing organizational culture: Based on the competing values framework*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Chan, C. A. (2005). [Review of the book *Myths about Doing Business in China*]. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *26*, 596-597. http://www.emeraldinsight.com/products/journals/journals.htm?id=lodj

Chen, M-J. (2001). *Inside Chinese business: A guide for managers worldwide*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cummings, T., & Worley, C. (2009). *Organization development and change* (9th ed.). Cincinnati, OH: Southwestern College.

Dessler, G. (2006). Expanding into China? What foreign employers should know about human resource management in China today. *SAM Advanced Management Journal*, *71*(4), 11-23. http://www.questia.com/library/p1057/sam-advanced-management-journal

Friedman, T. L. (2007). *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Picador.

Gallo, F. T. (2011). *Business leadership in China: How to blend best Western practices with Chinese wisdom* (Rev. ed.). Singapore: Wiley.

Getz, I. (2011). Leader of the free culture. *Leadership Excellence, 28*(8), 5. http://www.magazinemall.in/Display-ProductDetail.aspx?PID=798

Goffman, E. (1955). On face-work: An analysis of ritual elements of social interaction. *Psychiatry: Journal for the Study of Interpersonal Processes 18*, 213-231. http://psychology.wikia.com/wiki/Psychiatry:_Journal_for_the_Study_of_Interpersonal_Processes

Grove, C. N. (2005). Worldwide differences in business values and practices: Overview of GLOBE research findings. Retrieved from http://www.grovewell.com/pub-GLOBE-dimensions.html

Hall, E. T. (1989). *Beyond culture.* New York, NY: Anchor Books. doi:10.1177/026327689006003016

Hoffmann, W. J., & Enright, M. J. (2008). *China into the future.* Singapore: Wiley.

Hofstede, G. (n.d.). National culture: China. Retrieved from http://geert-hofstede.com/china.html

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences, comparing values, behaviours, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Thousand oaks, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G., & Bond, M. H. (1988). The Confucius connection: From cultural roots to economic growth. *Organizational Dynamics*, *16*(4), 5-21. doi:10.1016/0090-2616(88)90009-5

House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Johansson, A., Guillemette, Y., & Murtin, F. (2012). *Looking to 2060: Long-term global growth prospects: A going for growth report* (OECD Economic Policy Papers, No. 3). Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. doi:10.1787/5k8zxpjsggf0-en

Koch, T., & Ramsbottom, O. (2008, July). A growth strategy for a Chinese state-owned enterprise. *McKinsey Quarterly.* Retrieved from http://www.mckinsey.it/storage/first/uploadfile/attach/140408/file/grst08.pdf

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2002a). *The leadership challenge* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2002b). The Leadership Practices Inventory: Theory and evidence behind the five practices of exemplary leaders. Retrieved from http://www.leadershipchallenge.com/UserFiles/lc_jb_appendix.pdf

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2013). *Making extraordinary things happen in Asia: Applying the five practices of exemplary leadership.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Lanier, M. (2013). Employee engagement: A client's view. *Leader's Almanac Newsletter*, *8*(4). Retrieved from http://sonomaleadership.com/newsletter/a-client-view-of-employee-engagement/

Lavigna, B. (2010). Driving performance by building employee satisfaction and engagement. *Government Finance Review, 26*, 51-53.

Leininger, J. (2004). *Finding the key to commitment in China.* Watson Wyatt Beijing, Work China. Retrieved from http://www.watsonwyatt.com/asia-pacific/localsites/hongkong/research/Aug04_a3.asp

Li, J., & Madsen, J. (2010). Examining Chinese managers' work-related values and attitudes. *Chinese Management Studies*, *4*, 57-76. doi:10.1108/17506141011033007

Lustig, M. W., & Koester, J. (2006). *lntercultural competence: Interpersonal communications across cultures.* San Francisco, CA: Pearson Education.

Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, *1*, 3-30. doi:10.1111/j.1754-9434.2007.0002.x

McGregor, J. (2005). *One million customers: Lessons from the front lines of doing business in China.* New York, NY: Free Press.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2012). China in focus: Lessons and challenges. Retrieved from http://www.oecd.org/china

Posner, B. Z. (2010). Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) data analysis 2010. Retrieved from http://media.wiley.com/assets/2260/07/LPIDataAnalysisSept2010.pdf

Posner, B. Z. (2011). The impact of leadership practices within cultures. Retrieved from http://www.leadershipchallenge.com/UserFiles/ATE0212_CrossCulturalMgtPaper.pdf

Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *25*, 293-315. doi:10.1002/job.248

Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2010). Defining and measuring work engagement: Bringing clarity to the concept. In A. B. Bakker & M. P. Leiter (Eds.), *Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research* (pp. 10-24). New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Schneider, B., Macey, W. H., Barbera, K. M., & Martin, N. (2009). Driving customer satisfaction and financial success through employee engagement: *People & Strategy, 32,* 22-27.

Smith, P. B., Peterson, M. F., & Misumi, J. (1994). Event management and work team effectiveness in Japan, Britain and the USA. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *67*, 33-43. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8325.1994.tb00547.x

Thomas, G. (2011). A typology for the case study in social science following a review of definition, discourse and structure. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *17*, 511-521. doi:10.1177/1077800411409884

Towers Watson. (2012). *Global workforce study: Engagement at risk: Driving strong performance in a volatile global environment.* Retrieved from http://towerswatson.com/assets/pdf/2012-Towers-Watson-Global-Workforce-Study.pdf

Tuckey, M. R., Dollard, M. F., & Bakker, A. B. (2012). Empowering leaders optimize working conditions for engagement: A multilevel study. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *17*, 15-27. doi:10.1037/a0025942

Wallace, L., & Trinka, J. (2009). Leadership and employee engagement. *Public Management*, *91*(5), 10-13.

Wang, L., Huang, J., Chu, X., & Wang, X. (2010). A multilevel study on antecedents of manager voice in Chinese context. *Chinese Management Studies*, *4*(3), 212-230. doi:10.1108/17506141011074110

Weldon, E. (2004, August 16). Chinese leadership models. *China-Biz enewsletter*. Retrieved from http://www.cbiz.org

Wiley, J. W. (2010). The impact of effective leadership on employee engagement. *Employment Relations Today, 37*(2), 47-52. doi:10.1002/ert.20297

Zagorsek, H., Jaklic, M., & Stough, S. J. (2004). Comparing leadership practices between the United States, Nigeria, and Slovenia: Does culture matter? *Cross Cultural Management*, *11*(2), 16-34. doi:10.1108/13527600410797774

Appendix A: LPI Surveys

领越™ LPI 自我评测

领导者习惯行为清单

詹姆斯·M·库泽斯
巴 里·Z·波斯纳

说明

请对自己的领导行为进行评估。请仔细阅读随后的 30 个有关各种领导者具体行为的描述，然后根据右边的评分标准，问问自己。

评分标准从 1 到 10 共十个等级。请根据自己的实际行为，选择最适合的分数。

"在下述领导行为中，发生在我身上的频率有多高？" 为自己打分。

在对每个表述评分时，请你：

- 对自己实际表现出的具体领导行为要实事求是。
- 尽量公正并准确。
- 评价自己的实际行为，而不是你期望自己具有的或者你认为自己应该具有的行为。
- 基于自己在大多数时间里，在大多数事务上对大多数人的表现来回答。
- 适当地给自己评分。比如，在所有项目上给自己都打 10 分，很可能不是对自己的表现的准确评估。同样地，给自己全打 1 分或者 5 分也很可能不是一个准确的评定。大多数人在做不同的事时的表现或多或少会不一样。
- 如果你觉得某个描述不适用自己，很可能是因为你没有感受到这种表现。这说明，自己并不经常表现出这种行为，你就打 3 分或者低于 3 分。

1	=	几乎从不
2	=	很少
3	=	偶少
4	=	偶尔
5	=	不定期地
6	=	间或
7	=	还算经常
8	=	通常
9	=	经常频繁
10	=	几乎总是

当你完成这份"领越™ LPI 自我评测"时，请将其交至：

_____

_____

_____

谢谢！

填表者姓名：_____

自己在多大程度上表现出下列行为？请根据自己的实际行为，选择最符合每个描述的分数，填写在右边的横线上。

1. 在要求他人之前我会以身作则。　☐
2. 我同他人探讨未来的发展对我们现在所做工作的影响。　☐
3. 我会寻找具有挑战性的机会来检验自己的技能和才干。　☐
4. 我可以和同事建立起良好的合作关系。　☐
5. 我会对工作完成得好的人员提出表扬。　☐
6. 我会花时间和精力来确保同事们按已经达成一致的原则和标准工作。　☐
7. 我能描绘出令人信服的我们的未来远景。　☐
8. 我要求员工在所做的工作中尝试创新。　☐
9. 我乐于倾听各种不同人的见解。　☐
10. 我让团队的同事知道我对他们胜任工作的能力充满信心。　☐
11. 我履行我做出的誓言和承诺。　☐
12. 我邀请他人与我一起分享对美好未来的憧憬。　☐
13. 我会打破部门或组织之间的界限，在部门或组织之外寻找创新的方法来改进工作。　☐
14. 我尊重他人的尊严。　☐
15. 我确保以富有创意的方式对项目中做出突出贡献的员工进行奖励。　☐
16. 我就我的行为如何影响他人的表现征询反馈意见。　☐
17. 我向大家展示他们的长期利益是可以在共同的目标和愿景下实现的。　☐
18. 当事情按我们预期发展不一样时，我会问"我们能从中学到什么？"。　☐
19. 我支持他人独立做出决定。　☐
20. 我会当众表彰那些为实现共同价值而奋斗的人。　☐
21. 我会努力让他人接受对我影响重大有利的价值体系。　☐
22. 我能勾画出我们渴望实现的将来远景。　☐
23. 对正在我们的计划和项目我能够确保设定可实现的目标、制定具体的计划，并设立可衡量的标准。　☐
24. 我让员工自由去决定如何进行他们的工作。　☐
25. 我用不同的方法来为我们取得的成果进行庆祝。　☐
26. 我清楚自己的领导理念。　☐
27. 我描述我们所做工作的深远意义和目的，我对我所说的确信不疑。　☐
28. 即使有失败的可能，我也敢于尝试和冒险。　☐
29. 我确保员工能通过学习新的技能在工作中成长，并得到自身发展。　☐
30. 我对团队成员所做的贡献给予许多表扬和支持。　☐

领越™ LPi 观察者评测

领导者习惯行为清单

詹姆斯·M·库泽斯
巴 里·Z·波斯纳

说明

请对下一页顶端所提及领导者的领导具体行为进行评估。请仔细阅读随后的 30 个有关各种领导者具体行为的描述，然后根据右边的评分标准，问问自己：

"在下述领导具体行为中，发生在该领导者身上的频率有多高？"为该领导者打分。

在对每个表述评分时，请你：

- 对此人实际表现出的领导具体行为要实事求是。
- 尽量公正并准确。
- 评价他（她）的实际行为，而不是你期望他（她）具有的或者你认为他（她）应该具有的行为。
- 基于他（她）在大多数时间里，在大多数事务上对大多数人的表现来回答。
- 适当地给他（她）评分。比如，在所有项目上给他（她）都打 10 分，很可能不是对他（她）的表现的准确评估。同样地，给他（她）全打 1 分或者 5 分也很可能不是一个准确的评定。大多数人在做不同的事时的表现或多或少会不一样。
- 如果你觉得某个描述不适用该领导，很可能是因为你没有看到或者感受到这种表现。这说明，此人并不经常表现出这种行为，或者至少是没有经常在你面前表现出来，你就打 3 分或者低于 3 分。

评分标准从 1 到 10 共十个等级。请根据该领导者的实际行为，选择最适合的分数。

1	=	几乎从不
2	=	极少
3	=	很少
4	=	偶尔
5	=	不定期地
6	=	间或
7	=	还算经常
8	=	通常
9	=	非常频繁
10	=	几乎总是

当你完成这份"领越™ LPI 观察者评测"时，请将其交至：

_____
_____
_____

谢谢！

Leadership Practices Inventory

领导者姓名：_____

我（填写问卷者）是该领导者的　_____　A．上级　　B．直接下属　　C．同事　　D．其他

该领导者在多大程度上表现出下列行为？请根据该领导者的实际行为，选择最符合每个描述的分数，填写在右边的横线上。

他或者她：

1. 在要求他人之前会以身作则。 ▭
2. 会谈论未来的发展对我们现在所做工作的影响。 ▭
3. 会寻找具有挑战性的机会来检验自己的技能和才干。 ▭
4. 可以和同事建立起良好的合作关系。 ▭
5. 表扬工作完成得好的所有人。 ▭
6. 会花时间和精力来确保同事们按已经达成一致的原则和标准工作。 ▭
7. 能描述出令人信服的我们的未来远景。 ▭
8. 要求员工在所做的工作中尝试创新。 ▭
9. 乐于倾听各种不同人的见解。 ▭
10. 让团队的同事知道他对他们胜任工作的能力充满信心。 ▭
11. 履行所做出的誓言和承诺。 ▭
12. 呼吁大家与他一起分享对美好未来的憧憬。 ▭
13. 会打破部门或组织之间的界限，在部门或组织之外寻找创新的方法来改进工作。 ▭
14. 尊重他人的尊严。 ▭
15. 能确保以富有创意的方式对项目中做出突出贡献的员工进行奖励。 ▭
16. 会对自己的行为如何影响他人的表现征询反馈意见。 ▭
17. 向大家展示他们的长期利益是可以在共同的目标和愿景下实现的。 ▭
18. 当事情同我们预期发展不一样时，会问"我们能从中学到什么？"。 ▭
19. 支持他人独立做出决定。 ▭
20. 会当众表彰那些为实现共同价值而奋斗的人。 ▭
21. 努力使大家接受对组织运营最为有利的价值体系。 ▭
22. 能够勾画出我们渴望实现的宏伟蓝图。 ▭
23. 对正在实行的计划和项目能够确保设定可实现的目标，制定具体的计划，并设立可衡量的标准。 ▭
24. 给予员工充分的自由去决定如何进行他们的工作。 ▭
25. 用不同的方法来为我们取得的成果进行庆祝。 ▭
26. 对自己的领导理念非常清楚。 ▭
27. 阐述我们所做工作的深远意义和目的，并对他自己所说的确信不疑。 ▭
28. 即使有失败的可能，也敢于尝试和冒险。 ▭
29. 确保员工能通过学习新的技能在工作中成长，并得到自身发展。 ▭
30. 对团队成员所做的贡献给予许多表扬和支持。 ▭

Appendix B: Participant Consent Form

Participant Consent Form

Consent to Participate in a Research Study

STUDY TOPIC: Leadership Practices, Engagement, and Performance.

PURPOSE: The purpose of this research is to explore how leadership behaviors and management styles can influence employee engagement and performance. This study is being conducted as part of a requirement for a Master of Science in Organization Development degree through the Pepperdine University, under the supervision of Chris Worley, Ph.D. If you have questions or concerns please confer with the researcher or you may contact Dr. Worley directly at 1-310-568-5598.

PROCEDURES: You will complete a paper-based survey and, if selected, will also participate an interview. You will be asked questions about your own leadership practice and/or other managers' leadership practices, as well as employees' engagement via answering survey questions and storytelling during interviewing. The paper-based survey will take 15-20 minutes, and the interview will take 45-60 minutes.

The researcher will be taking notes and recording all interviews. All data (audio and written) will be stored in a secure place during the research and then destroyed. No actual names will be used to identify anyone who takes part in this research.

PARTICIPATION: Participation in this study is voluntary and you may withdraw at any time without penalty.

CONFIDENTIALITY: Information gathered by the researcher will be used to complete a master's degree program report. However, no research report will include any names or other identifying comments. Only the researcher will have direct access to the data. The records will be kept confidential during and after the study.

CONTACT INFORMATION: You can contact me at +001-408-599-2642 or pwang95@gmail.com. For questions about the study, you can also contact my advisor, Chris Worley at +001-310-568-5598 or cworley@pepperdine.edu. For questions about participant's rights contact Yuying Tsong, Interim Chairperson for the International Review Board, at +1-310-568-5768 or yuying.tsong@pepperdine.edu.

_____   _____

Signature of Participation   Date

Appendix C: Interview Questions

Interview Questions

1.   How long have you been here?   Tell me a little bit about the work you are doing?

2.   What's the best thing about working here?

3.   What are the challenges the company is facing right now? In the next 10 years?

4.   How would you describe the leadership behaviors or styles of most managers here? Do you see any behaviors that are common or typical? Have you seen any changes on leadership styles of your company in the past 5-10 years (depend on the person's tenure in the company, the numbers may be adjusted)? Could you describe the most significant ones?

5.   When you wake up in the morning, would you say that you look forward to coming to work every day, most days, a few days, or rarely?

6.   If there was another opportunity, a similar job function in a different company, what are the most important factors that would trigger you to consider that job? Would it be salary, benefits, more time with family, working environment/culture, opportunities for development, company's future ...?

7.   Considering your relationship with the company, do you feel that you are part of the family?

8.   How much do you know about the project you are working on?   Do you get heavily involved in the project? How much do you get involved in decision making? If you were given more information about the project, do you think you would contribute more?

9.   Do you feel that your work is important for the company?

10.   Did you receive any training at this job? How satisfied are you with the training you received for your job?

11.   Do you feel that your talents are used well here? If not, why?

12.   How much pressure is there to complete your work? Can you tell me a story about the stresses here at work?

13.   Do you feel that your current work gives you a feeling of personal accomplishment?   Can you tell me a story about when work made you feel good about yourself?

14.   Has there ever been a time when your supervisor let you work on family/personal issues? When there is a family need, does your supervisor support your need to balance work and family issues?

15. When the managers, your immediate supervisor, the VP, the GM, or the President, tell you something, who you tend to trust the most? Why?