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Abstract

Since the Chinese economic reform in 1979, there have been various types of enterprises being established instead of the period when the market was mainly dominated by state-owned enterprises (SOEs). Nowadays, except for the government (GOV) departments, the three main types of enterprises are state-owned enterprises (SOEs), private-owned enterprises (POEs) and foreign-owned enterprises (FOEs). In the paper, the aim is to compare the difference in empowering and coaching of the leadership style from employees’ perspective across different types of enterprises and government in Shanghai and find out the potential reasons for the differences. To make the suggestions for improvement in leadership, the paper has compared the existing condition with the employees’ preference in both empowering and coaching leadership style. 144 Questionnaires have been collected in order to make quantitative tests. The questionnaires have been distributed to both employees and managers in different types of companies and government in Shanghai. SPSS 19.0 were used to deal with the data and helped to draw the conclusion.

Based on the literature reviews, the paper proposed three hypotheses. The results show that some of the hypotheses are confirmed; however, some of the hypotheses are rejected. For the rejected ones, the paper give the possible explanations and at the same time, based on other variables of the information of respondents, further analysis has been done to find out how the ideal and actual leadership styles affected by other variables in different groups.
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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction
With the dominating trend of globalization, the Chinese economic market has been fast developing in recent years. The rapid speed of development attracts more and more foreign investors to settle their branches in China, which not only helps the business between China and other countries, but also stimulates the local entrepreneurs to establish and expand their business with the experience they learned from multinational companies. Decades ago, getting a position in government (GOV) is a main trend, however, especially after China joined the World Trade Organization (WTO), Chinese economic reform policy has affected the growing diversification of Chinese enterprise styles. It is no longer limited in state-owned enterprises (SOEs) which are controlled by the government (GOV), many private-owned enterprises (POEs) and even foreign-owned enterprise (FOEs) has been founded. The diversification in Chinese enterprise styles directly stimulates the competition and triggers the vitality into the Chinese market. To face the intense competition in the market, different kinds of enterprises applied their own enterprise culture to ensure the enterprise to develop steadily. However, the three kinds of cultures in these enterprises are different from each other, which is to say that each of them has its own characters as well as advantages and disadvantages.

Leadership style is another key factor which is helpful to an enterprise to have ability to develop under the high pressure of the business competition in Chinese market. A leader is playing the significant role in shaping business values and transfers the organizational values into actions in managerial activities. The leadership refers to the relationship between managers and employees, which not only reflects the hierarchical power structure in an enterprise, but also reflects the nature of the relationship between the “leader” and who are “being leaded”.

From an employee’s perspective on the three kinds of enterprises, SOE, POE, FOE and GOV, what do they think a good leader should be and how about their leader actually is? In this study, we defined what the employees think a good leader should be as “ideal leadership” and what they feel the leadership actually is in their enterprises as “actual leadership”. The gap between the ideal leadership and actual leadership from an employee’s perspective is what a leader should behave in managerial activities. The gap will also be an important reason for the
managers to put emphasis on diminishing the discrepancy between ideal and actual leadership style.

The study presented in this paper attempt to find out the relationship between perceptions of leadership (which called interpersonal leadership Zander (1997) and ideal preferences of leadership in different ownership style companies in Shanghai, China. There are huge differences in empowering and coaching in different countries. In the UK and the US both empowering and coaching are shown as positive in Zander’s research (1997), while in German management, the results are totally different. The employees have accepted the frequent supervision and reviews as granted but they don’t think that the boss should have an interest in their personal issues.

There are several studies that have done research on the different corporate cultures in China, for example, the empirical study by Tsui (2006) including of organizational culture values and firm ownership under different organizational culture type shows that compared to the FOEs and POEs. Furthermore, Chinese SOEs have a stronger hierarchy culture in internal integration, while the firms with higher integrative culture are more likely to have a higher level of perceived firm performance. In Chinese POEs, empowerment is mentioned more than democracy, but only in a slight majority (Tsui et al.2006). But the study they did was based on an open-ended question survey, in where they asked 160 students from the executive MBA program in top Chinese universities in Shanghai and Beijing to answer it, with half of these graduates were from POEs, while the rest were from foreign companies. The managers were asked to offer five answers to describe the organizational culture of their companies with definitions instead of offering the questions with descriptive facts and behaviors.

1.2 Purpose and problems

The aim of the study is to do research on employees’ leadership preference and actual leadership experience in different companies in Shanghai, China with different ownership structures. If the investigation results between the ideal and actual leadership of managers from employees’ perspective are close, it can be interpreted that the employees are satisfied with the leadership style of their managers. However, China was not included in the 18 countries research studied by Zander (1997), and there has been no study which values the empowering and coaching of leadership style in different types of ownership of enterprises.
Although extensive research has been carried out on the difference from different ownership firms, no single study exists which show the difference in empowering and coaching in different types of ownership firms in China. This study is meant to provide a research insight in Shanghai, to consider the differences across GOV, SOEs, POEs and FOEs in China.

In this paper, the leadership style is focusing on two dimensions of empowering and coaching, and except for GOV, the Chinese enterprises are divided into three classifications: SOEs, POEs and FOEs. This paper is to answer the following questions:
1. Is there a relation between actual leadership and different types of ownership in Chinese enterprises?
2. Is there a relation between ideal leadership and different types of ownership in Chinese enterprise?
3. Is there a discrepancy between ideal leadership and the actual leadership?

1.3 Limitations

As the research time is limited to two months, the amounts of questionnaires are also limited. There are 144 questionnaires gathered including different ownership types of companies and government. Work years, work position, age, education background and gender are set as background variables, but the sample amounts are limited.

To draw conclusions based on a sample made up by different ownership type of firms in Shanghai, can be a bit challenging as Shanghai is one of the most wealthy and prosperous cities with many foreign investments. Thanks to frequent communications with foreigners for the workforce in Shanghai, the employees in Shanghai have more chances to absorb in diverse cultures and learn from the updated management style. Therefore, the conclusion may not be representative to reflect the viewpoints of the employees who are not working in first-tier cities in China.
2 LITERATURE REVIEW

The study of Lena Zander (1997) presented that employees' preference for empowering are connected with the possible outcome of empowering according to the combination of status and authority in different culture of different country. Under the circumstance that independence, ambition, daring and choosing own goals are valued as significant principles in a country, the preferences for empowering of the employees working in the country are shown as high. Moreover, employees believe that empowering is accorded in with policies and principles. Meanwhile, employees' preference for coaching was shown as being highly related to different culture, such as Confucian and individualistic values, which means it varies in different cultural dimensions more than the employees' preference for empowering. Confucian values prefer employees to keep steady and stable, while individualistic values encourage employees to develop themselves and doing challenging work.

2.1 Empowering

The rise of employee empowerment has increased during the last decades (Lawler et al., 2001). This movement is based on the notion that employees who are given greater opportunities for self-direction will deliver more superior outcome, such as higher level of job performance and job satisfaction.

Within the field of leadership, empowerment has been focused on in the recent years (Spreitzer, 2008), which means that employees are given power by their supervisors and also share the decision-making with their supervisors (Conger & Kanungo, 1988). The theory which called “Super Leadership” means supervisors tend to “lead others to lead themselves” (Manz & Sims, 2001) instead of leading subordinates and give orders all the time, and “shared leadership” means that supervisors tend to share their duties among their teams, instead of handling all the responsibilities and decision-making (Carson et al., 2007). However, there are still many problems occurred in shared leadership teams (Locke, 2003), because the successful firms more or less keep hierarchical control as tradition. Importantly, empowering leadership is a method which motivates subordinates to improve self-control and take actions by themselves Liu, et al (2003), it is a new approach which can help the supervisors to arrange tasks efficiently. Furthermore, “substitutes for leadership” of Kerr and Jermier (1978) state that because of well-trained employees’ self directedness, the managers’ guidance and orders should be avoided to disturb subordinates’ professional standards and value. There are also
many recent statements of “shared leadership” (Avolio et al., 1996,) and “empowering leadership” (Ahearne et al., 2005) demonstrated the significance to build the sense of self-management of employees. As stated by Carson et al (2007), empowering leadership is to share power and responsibility with subordinates.

There have been many substantial studies on various aspects of empowerment (Cotton et al., 1988), and most of the empirical researches are focusing on how to make use of leadership behaviors to build the culture of sharing power with traditional hierarchy. One significant study in this area is what Manz and Sims (1987) asked respondents to describe the leadership in firms generally rather than the leadership style to each individual employee, which shows that to some leaders, they are willing to share power with subordinates. Further important research by Cohen & Bailey (1997) has shown that self-managed group members are the important foundation of empowering leadership style, which also proved in many traditional groups.

Based on the people’s human nature, Taylor (1911) found that people should be encouraged and motivated by carrots and sticks. It implies that as being an employee, he/she need to be encouraged and motivated by his/her leader by any means in order to work harder. The theory is already being proved that people request the external encouragement is a kind of human nature. From McGregor’s (1960) perspective, he defined this kind of human nature as “theory X”. After defining “theory X”, McGregor created the definition of “theory Y” which is based on the assumption that all the people are ambitious, for this reason, each of them are eager to behave well and do well is his/her position. According to the “theory Y”, it implies that for a manager, he/she has the responsibility to provide a good environment to support the employees to work hard. The good environment including provide the good resources of knowledge, skills, communication and so on (Stewart, 1991). It is defined as “empowering”.

From the aspect of psychology, “theory Y” also has prompted a lot of developments in human nature from 1970s, especially in the area that studies how to make the employees perform better. (Luthans & Davis, 1978; Mills, 1986; Latham & Frayne, 1989; and Sims & Lorenzi, 1992) The theories have put emphasis on stimulating the employees to take control by themselves and at the same time reducing the important effect of managers’ control. Self-management has been changing from external management into internal management. It
requests the employees to have more concerns on their self-control ability (Sims & Lorenzi, 1992; Stewart, 1991).

“Empowering” is associated with strategy within the company as well as the decision making. “Enable” results from “Empowering”, however, in order to make the employees to have possibility to be self-managed, “Enable” is a necessary fundamental. For this reason, only “Empowering” would provide employees such power as well as the responsibility to manager themselves. Sufficient “empowering” would help to create the conditions for employees to manager themselves. It will result to a good circle of empowering - enabling - self-management - decision making - empowering. This circle is defined as “Empowering” in the paper to measure different enterprise cultures of leadership.

2.2 Coaching

The definition of “coaching” is labeled by Zander (1997) according to the definition of “individuals and teams concerns”. Schaupp (1978), Heller & Wilpert (1981), IDE (1976 and 1993), and Bottger et al (1985) provide the literature background for interpersonal leadership in managerial activities. The studies above did research on how the decisions were made in organizations, and compared the effects of groups and individuals in decision making. The research results confirmed that participation in decision making was perceived higher in short-term decisions than in long-term decisions. (Zander, 1997, PP42) There are two main results concluded by the studies. Firstly, the employees tend to take more chances to take part in decision making than before, moreover, it is also correlated to different cultures. Secondly, Schaupp (1978) and IDE (1976 and 1993) did the research on enterprises and concluded the differences between preference and perceived leadership in hierarchy. “Power displacement effect” defined by Heller & Wilpert (1981) as the fact that the willing of employees to take part in decision making is higher than the managers expected. These studies are based on culture differences in different countries, which provide the literature background for further researches in individual and team decision making in culture.

Zander’s (1997) article is mainly about individuals and teams in analyzing the factors between leadership and culture, where the emphasis on the individuals and teams are mainly based on managers’ behavior. How the managers behave affects the behaviors of the employees, and what they aim to do is to encourage the employees to work harder. The approaches are referring to teamwork, co-operation, care for employees’ career development, ensuring the
employees’ information getting and so on. The research on the individuals and managers is in order to find the way to motivate the employees to perform the best. In an enterprise, there are huge amounts of tasks requires people to work together and accomplish them. Under the circumstance, teamwork becomes extremely important for the company’s development. For the purpose of leading a team, making the group members perform the best and acquire the biggest potential, a leader should do their best to organize the team to work together, help them to “encourage co-operation, create a team spirit, and keep the employees informed.” (Zander, 1997, PP163) Motivating employees to do their best is beneficial to increase organization cohesion and it can prevent to loss talents and high frequency of employees’ turnover. Furthermore, teamwork is also helpful to create a harmony environment and make the employees feel like being in a “big family”, at the same time the relationship between the employees and leaders are expected to be the close to relation among family members.

Zander (1997) emphasized on the facts that concerns of individuals and teams is a leader’s responsibility in an enterprise. The word “coaching” comes from the employees’ perspective. When leaders concern seriously about individuals and teams, the employees will treat the leader as a coach whose aim is to ensure each of the employees to perform the best. The real coach in the sports games is to make every player to perform best in the stadium by encouraging the teamwork and co-operate spirits of group members. Overall, the duty of coach in sports games is quite similar to the function of leader in an enterprise. That’s the reason why the definition of “coaching” being created originally. In the paper, the definition of “coaching” will be used and applied to the research on leadership and enterprise culture.

2.3 Ideal and actual leadership

A number of studies have suggested that the research on leadership of “appropriate leader behavior” is related to “actual behavior” (Larson, 1982; Phillips, 1984 and Andersson, 1989). These theories also implicated that the gap between “actual behavior” and “appropriate behavior” is the gap for leaders to improve their leadership.

According to the article of (Srivastava, et al 2006), empowering leadership has been studied from two main perspectives, with giving more power and autonomy to employees and how employees respond to empowerment (Kirkman & Rosen, 1997). In this study, focuses are
more emphasized on how the leaders sharing power with subordinates and how the subordinates think about the differences between the leadership and the ideal empowering model.

In addition, Brightharp (1999) found that there can be prominent differences between the ideal leadership scores and actual leadership scores. In the PhD dissertation of Brightharp in 1999, he made a survey of women who work in student affairs units at middle-level administrative positions together with their students to research on the real and ideal leadership style of women in this sector. Finally, the answers of the questionnaires came in from more than 10,000 students, and the research concluded that the actual and ideal leadership scores from these students actually differ a lot.

Based on Brightharp’s (1999) research, we follow the research method of investigation and applied it into the paper. The study was not only on how the employees evaluate their managers’ actual leadership style in the enterprise, but also research on how the employees think their managers’ leadership style should be. The remarkable differences between the actual and ideal leadership could inspire these women leaders to improve their leadership style and it showed a clear way and direction for the improvement. The results of the investigation by Brightharp (1999) between the ideal and actual leadership of managers from employees’ perspective are remarkably different. On the other hand,

2.4 Background and history of Chinese enterprise

From 1980s, there have been many studies associating to Chinese enterprise culture, especially in the organizational management culture aspects such as human resource management (HRM) (eg: Björkman & Fan, 2002; Gamble, 2003). Some of these literatures also relate enterprise culture to leadership style (e.g., Tsui, Zhang, Wang, Xin & Wu, 2006; Xin, Tsui, Wang, Zhang & Chen, 2002). As to the earlier studies, most of them were focused on the special Chinese cultural values which are specific to Chinese such as: guanxi and face (Biggart & Hamilton, 1997; Child, 1994; Hofstede, 1984). However, the recent studies not only expand the study range, but also try to go deeper into the Chinese enterprise culture and to compare it with the western enterprise culture (Tsui et al, 2006; Xin et al., 2002).
Since the People’s Republic of China (PRC) was founded, the building of enterprise culture can be divided into three periods (Li & Bai, 2000). The first period was from 1949 to 1976. In this period, there is no concept of “enterprise culture”, however like super large state-owned enterprises set “good model” in the companies and ask followers to behave as the “good model” (Cooke, 2008). The second period was from the early 1980s till the mid-1990s. In this period, Chinese economy started to reform and the government encouraged entrepreneurship which greatly stimulated the development of Chinese private enterprises. At the same time, different kinds of enterprises provided the workforce with more choices and the possibility to earn higher wages (Cooke, 2004; Takahara, 1992). The third period started from mid-1990s. During this period, the Chinese government has issued an opening-up policy which has attracted a lot of foreign investors.

With the policy of Chinese economic reform, more and more foreign companies have entered into Chinese market and formed enterprises such as joint venture etc. Most of these foreign-owned enterprises (FOEs) face cultural conflicts, after adapting, many foreign companies in China establish their own Sino-foreign enterprise culture. At the same time, Chinese government starts to encourage develop private companies. Many POEs established at that time were established during that period.

2.4.1 Background and history of SOE

When PRC just was founded in 1949, the SOEs in China were dominated. This situation maintain throughout the three periods which were mentioned above. Even now, SOEs still play a main role in Chinese business market (Wang & Yang, 2007). Zhang et al. (2004) contribute to the research on learning organizational culture and collect empirical data in six Chinese big SOEs. Xin et al. (2002) gave a definition of the nature of enterprise culture in Chinese SOEs. Based on Schein studies in 1992, Xin et al. (2002) issued that there are ten dimensions in enterprise culture which including external adaptation values and internal integration values. Although some of these dimensions are shared with foreign enterprise culture settings (e.g., O’Reilly et al., 1991), there are still some special dimensions for Chinese enterprise condition.

The mentioned Chinese SOEs, are often related to “fixed jobs”, “whole life work contract” and so on. But nowadays, the situation is gradually changing. Some SOEs start to apply
annual contracts instead of whole life contracts with the employees (Chiu, et al, 2002). From this change, it is indicated that Chinese SOEs put emphasis on innovation and try to change the fixed systems in order to increase the enterprise culture value and competitive power. The annual contracts with employees could provide a competitive environment in SOEs. It is good to maintain talent and eliminate someone unsuitable from his/her position. As talents are the core competitiveness to an enterprise, to be able to keep the talents means grasp a strong competitive power. However, limited by the government policy, such constitution reformation is not thoroughly. SOEs are still the greatly supported by the government and in a leader status in the business, which directly lead to the enterprise culture is more conservative than POEs and FOEs. Unlike POEs and FOEs, SOEs are not only supported by the government, but also controlled by the government. (Lu & Yao, 1998) It leads to SOEs are difficult to change or reform the management system, business model or hierarchical power structure. One reason for the SOEs to be so conservative is the fact that it is difficult for them to change the leadership style (Hao, 1994).

In China, there are many large and super large SOEs. Such conditions are often related to industry monopoly and can also be seen as a Chinese feature. In most cases these SOEs have existed with a long history.

The operation of Chinese SOE is through control state capital investment to centralize the state capital into the focus area. Through building up large SOEs to operate state capital, the Chinese government has realized the significance of improving the value of state capital (Gong, 2012). However, there is a lack of good case studies of Chinese SOEs as excellent enterprise culture. It is closely related to the long-time developing direction and management systems of the SOEs as they get special characteristics in their operating framework. Forming these special SOEs’ characteristics is a gradually process. Nowadays, many studies of SOEs’ are focusing on American or European organizations, but only a few studies are referring to Chinese SOEs. The studies of Xin and Tsui researched a sample of EMBA students and conclude ten characters of Chinese SOEs. It can be also concluded in two aspects: internal integration value (dedication, employees’ development, harmony, leadership, equal standard and fair reward) and external adaption value (customer orientation, future orientation, creativity and goal orientation). Liu has researched on six large Chinese enterprises and all of them have been operated for more than 30 years (Liu, 2005). During the long-term of operation they have formed their own special enterprise culture. As a conclusion, ten
dimensions are included as follow: long and short term orientation, moral and interest orientation, creative and conservative orientation, customers and self orientation, system authority and self authority orientation, employees development and employees tools orientation, result and process orientation, communication openness and closure orientation and relation or working orientation. Through the period of Chinese economic reform, Chinese SOEs has the following characteristics as listed below:

Firstly, relationship orientation of “Guanxi” is a special characteristic in SOEs. In an organization, “Guanxi” refer to many aspects such as employees’ recruitment and priority. The “invisible hand” can be felt in the activities in SOEs. “Guanxi” is a lubricant which can reduce the conflicts between people and maintain a stable harmony. (Liang, 1998)

Secondly, the “family culture” orientation is that every employee behaves as a close friend to other members. The strong sense of belonging to the organization has driven employees to work in the enterprise for decades and made them feel proud of being an employee in SOE. The structure of work division is clear and fixed and leadership is one of the prominent influences of enterprise characteristics in SOEs. Just as the CEO of the company Haier Mr. Zhang Ruimin, and the Chairman of the Board at the company Hisense Mr. Zhou Houjian to Hisense. “Family culture” can be obvious when there is a leader with spiritual orientation and leadership ability in SOEs. As this reason, the leader in a SOE will take more risk and the same time he will have more power and larger management range, which will lead to a centralization authority.

Thirdly, performance and responsibility are both important. In the process in China from planned economy to market economy, the history of SOEs added a lot factors to form the leadership style. On the other hand, as SOEs play important role in the national economy, it determines that SOEs may not avoid taking social responsibility and obligation.

2.4.2 Background and history of POE

The Chinese POEs have just developed during around the last twenty years which is shorter than SOEs’ and FOEs’ (Yu & Lao, 2009). Therefore the development process of the culture building for Chinese POE is just in the beginning. Until now, there is no real lead theory that can be counted as the classical model for Chinese POEs culture building.
Chinese POEs culture has many advantages and disadvantages. Most of the Chinese POEs are in small scale. Unlike many SOEs and FOEs that can have much capital in backup; Chinese POEs usually don’t have so much capital for operations, and this is especially true for the small size scale POEs. Because of this reason, POEs are tended to take higher risk than other types of enterprises. The second problem is the short average operating life of POEs in China. According to Chinese POE development report written by China Federation of Industry and Commercial in 2012, 60% of the POEs in China will go bankrupt within five years and 85% of the POEs in China will go bankrupt within 10 years from established. The average life for Chinese POEs is around 2.9 years (Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, 1999). Many small scale POEs don’t have enough capital help them survive in an intense market competition, especially in an upstart phase. It is also proved by the Chinese National Bureau of Statistics public the research on small and middle scale enterprise development problem. It indicated that nowadays, only 30% of Chinese small and middle scale enterprises (most of them are POEs) have developing potential (National Bureau of Statistics of China). The third problem is the lack of qualified persons to take over the leader’s position (Zhang & Wang, 2006). Many leaders in POEs choose their successors to take over the enterprises instead of trying to employ a qualified management team, which can be a hidden danger for the further development of the POE. The fourth problem is the high employee turnover rate, resulting in that it is hard for POEs to maintain talents.

(Fu, 2004) indicated that the characteristics of Chinese POEs are including: localization-enterprise culture relay on local culture; blood relative- most of the POEs culture are rooted in blood relative culture; personal- POEs culture are most depend on leaders quality; changeful and short-term perspective- easy to change enterprise culture according to the environment and market changing, seek quick success and instant benefits lead to seek the short-term profit. Xu & Wang (2006) indicated that Chinese POEs culture is dominated by family culture; individual decision is surpass organization decision; utilitarianism orientation is obviously; strongly depends on local culture. Sun (2005) indicates that Chinese POEs is commonly considered not to be reliable enough.

Chinese POEs generally pay more attention on the material and wealthy culture (Su, 1996) As is mentioned above, POEs often lack capitals to face the intense competition in the market, which leads to that POEs focus tend to on wealthy more than SOEs and FOEs. POEs pays
also extra attention to saving, which can also be related to the wealth orientation of the POE’s. Especially for the small scale POEs they tend to employ relatives from their own family, which can result in a non-transparent operation and a closed type of management. The culture of the POEs is generally not democratic; it is the boss in the company dictating the decisions.

In POEs, the enterprise culture is more likely to favor entrepreneurship. In theory, the entrepreneur will inspire the company however it is not equal to the corporate culture. In many Chinese POEs, the leader who founded the company will continue to be active in the company. The management teams POEs are still stuck at the stage where they just can live by “the rule of leader”. As the entrepreneur has so big influence over the company, it can also use to hinder the development of altered management system when the entrepreneurship is equal to the corporate culture, it will restrict POEs’ development. (Su, 1996)

2.4.3 Background and history of FOE

More and more cross-border enterprises in China apply enterprise culture as one of the method in corporate governance. A study by Nankai University, Department of International Business spent two years and carried out a survey covered FOEs in China whose register capital are more than USD 10 million and chose 200 of them to do the investigation of their general manager or vice general manager. FOEs transfer the good management idea and behavior method to local employees through enterprise culture from parent enterprise in foreign country and ask the employees to do as the enterprise advocated. On one hand, it strengthens the sense of identity of employees to the value of enterprise. On the other hand, it also provides a monitor chance for employees to the managers’ behavior. In general, FOEs in China can be divided into three kinds. (Nankai University, 2002)

The first group is consists of European and American enterprises. The typical example is Coca-Cola, which presents a value of “Trust, freedom and respect individuals”, “We are all families”. It shows a full respect on people’s characters and trying to build a fair and transparent condition. Employees are invited to take part both in production and management.

The second group is Japanese enterprises. The classical company is Panasonic, which stress team work and put emphasis on “harmony” and “both manager and employees share the same object”. Pay attention on the key words such as “devotion” and “paying back” and as well the
importance of strictly obeying the rank order, advocate greatly on restrain personal character and obey the enterprise decision.

The third group is the enterprises form Korea, Singapore, and Southeast Asian countries. These FOEs’ culture has adopted the management from both eastern and western enterprises, which is similar to the development of Chinese enterprises.

2.4.4 Background and history of GOV

Government (GOV) culture is a combination of several governmental characteristics, such as administrative value, hierarchy tradition, and administrative principles etc. Such Chinese governmental ideology has shaped the activities managed by government and as well as has affected on dealing with state issues, social issues and internal issues. The core value of Chinese government is deeply held by the employees working in government and governmental organizations. In sum, government culture and governmental leadership style is the basic structure for government system and it is praised as “the spirit in government management. (Chen & Duan, 2005) Government culture through practicable and hopeful method mix intuition and knowledge for people, organization and government. (Cameron & Quinn, 2011 and Wiley & Sons, 2011) As long as the government culture formed, it would become the common basis in perception, thinking, decision and action for all the civil servants. (Zhong, 2009)

Nowadays, Chinese government divided into central department and local departments. The central government of PRC is divided among several sections, which is the legislative branch, the National People's Congress; the executive branch, the State Council; the judicial branch, the Supreme People's Court and the Supreme People's Procuratorate; the military branch, People's Liberation Army (PLA) via the Central Military Commission. The provincial and local government is divided by provincial level, prefectural level, county level, township level and village level. There are totally 33 provincial level regions, 333 prefectural level regions, 2,862 county-level regions, 41,636 township-level regions and even more village-level regions in Chinese governmental system. (http://www.gov.cn/)

The structural hierarchy for local government is five levels and each level should report to the direct supervisor such as the department of village reports to township and township reports to
county. Each department should obey the report order in the system, and the strictly rules result in both advantages and disadvantages for the government leadership style. Based on the multi-level hierarchy of Chinese government, the empowering leadership in Chinese government is shown as decentralizing the power layer by layer and strictly operated according to Chinese government policies.

The mission of Chinese government as well as Chinese Communist Party (CCP) is to serve for people (constitution of CCP). On one hand, the strictly structural hierarchy not only makes the responsibility more clear for each department, but also decreases the possibility for favoritism and committing irregularities. However, the disadvantage of government leadership style is requiring subordinates to report their work to their supervisors frequently, which will consume much more time.

As the same as SOEs, Chinese government also used to sign tenure contracts with employees which is easily make the employees feel safe to keep their positions in government, naturally resulting in the lack of responsibility and professional dedication. The multi-level hierarchy makes the work process become complicated and at the same time also increases the time consuming in daily work. (Zhou, 2010)

Nowadays Chinese government leadership style is not only influenced by economy and politics, but also influenced by traditional culture, ethic, principles and social customs. The tradition of conservative culture and the neglect on the significance of leadership in government are the two main reasons which constrain the improvement of government leadership style. (Ke, 2004)

2.5 The relationship between this study and the study by Zander

The study by Zander was a research on the relationship between leadership styles and different cultures. Zander collected the questionnaires within an international pharmaceutical company including the following 18 countries: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, the United States, Brazil and the Philippines. The study relates to four kinds of leadership style: Empowering, coaching, directing and communicating. In the questionnaire, Zander designed the questions divided by “ideal leadership” and “actual leadership”. 
However, in the end, the “actual leadership” part did not be involved in the analysis. In the study by Zander, the analysis independent variables are not only about nation but also include gender, age, position, working time and so on.

This study is based on the study by Zander which is researching on the relationship between leadership style and different kinds of enterprises. This study is focusing on two kinds of leadership style (empowering and coaching) and four kinds of enterprises (SOE, POE, FOE and GOV). To compare to the findings in the study by Zander, in the questionnaire design, we also added the questions for gender, age, position, working time and so on, but these variables are just for comparison and further research, which are not the key variables in this study. We have collected questionnaires from Shanghai MBA student, and all of the respondents are working in the above four companies which located in Shanghai. As in Zander’s study, the respondents covered 18 countries but China, so this study is a kind of supplement to Zander’s study in geographical range. Unlike Zander’s questionnaire distribution within an international pharmaceutical company, we did not distribute the questionnaires in a specified company or industry. In the questionnaire, we designed the questions divided by “ideal leadership” and “actual leadership” as well. As all the data we collect this time passed the reliability test, we will analyze both “ideal leadership” and “actual leadership”. In this paper, we only focus on one independent variable as “kinds of enterprises” to specifically analyze the relationship between enterprises kinds and leadership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Study by Zander</th>
<th>This study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kinds of Nation</td>
<td>18 countries</td>
<td>Shanghai (China)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinds of enterprises</td>
<td>An international pharmaceutical company (POE)</td>
<td>SOE, POE, FOE and GOV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specified company and industry</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership style (dependent variables)</td>
<td>Empowering, coaching, directing and communicating</td>
<td>Empowering and coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent variables</td>
<td>Nation, gender, age, position, working time etc.</td>
<td>Kinds of enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference variables</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Nation, gender, age, position, working time etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership analysis</td>
<td>Ideal leadership</td>
<td>Ideal and actual leadership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table1: Comparison with this study and the study by Zander
2.6 Development of hypothesis

According to the study of Tsui, A. et al. (2006), it has shown the three kinds of organizations paying different emphasis on the enterprise culture in China. (See Table 2 shown as below.) Firstly, for foreign-owned enterprises, they pay equal emphasis on both integration and external adaptation values. Secondly, for private-owned enterprise, they pay more emphasis on external adaption than internal integration values. Finally, for state-owned enterprise, they pay both low emphasis on the internal integration and external adaptation values, compared to the above two kinds of enterprises (Tsui, A. et al, 2006). As the definition for the internal integration and external adaptation dimensions mentioned in literature review, leadership and employee development, the dimensions the article focus are belong to internal integration dimensions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal integration dimensions</th>
<th>Private domestic firms</th>
<th>Foreign-invested companies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common dimensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee development</td>
<td>Employee development</td>
<td>Employee development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmony</td>
<td>Harmony</td>
<td>Harmony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee contribution</td>
<td>Employee contribution</td>
<td>Employee contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific dimensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatism</td>
<td>Shared vision</td>
<td>Shared vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair rewards</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External adaptation dimensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common dimensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer orientation</td>
<td>Customer orientation</td>
<td>Customer orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome orientation</td>
<td>Outcome orientation</td>
<td>Outcome orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific dimensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future orientation</td>
<td>Result and quality</td>
<td>Result and quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entrepreneurship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Summary of culture dimensions in different types of organizations
(Tsui, A. et al., 2006, pp353)

Based on the above three results, hypothesis 1 is as follow:

Hypothesis 1: Actual leadership will differ across the different ownership type of companies in Shanghai, China.
Zander (1997) has done research in 18 countries for a study of employees’ preference leadership related to different culture. In the article, it confirms by a large amount of empirical survey that different national culture affect employees’ leadership preference. Zander chose empowering and coaching as comparison elements in leadership style to have a survey and compared in 18 countries. Although China is not included in the 18 countries, the article still provide clues that Chinese employees’ leadership preference of empowering and coaching are related to Chinese culture. Based on the theories of three kinds of enterprise conclude above (eg: Tsui, A. et al., 2006), the concerns on leadership varies among different kinds of enterprise in China, which will directly lead to different leadership in empowering and coaching in reality. Hunt (1973) concluded that leadership preference is affected by specific enterprise condition such as leadership behavior etc. However, this is only a part of corporate culture as Tsui, A. (2006) concluded in Table 1. Then it provides a fundamental to do research on whether there is a correlation between actual corporate culture and ideal enterprise culture. As to if the hypothesis is true or not, it is what this article needs to find out. Here comes hypothesis 2 as follow:

**Hypothesis 2: The score of actual leadership of coaching and empowering in foreign-owned companies in Shanghai, China is the highest, and followed by the score in private-owned companies is higher than which in state-owned companies.**

From the study of Lena Zander (1997), leadership preference is related to the national culture. However, leadership preference is not only related to the national culture, it is also related to the actual leadership behavior and actual employee satisfaction (Hunt, J. G, 1973). Hunt pointed out that the leadership preference is both related to and affected by leadership behavior and employee satisfaction. These three variables make up an interactive model to evaluate and estimate each variable changing. According to the results, leadership preference is as a direction and guide for employees expectation of leadership development. It always changes for expecting actual condition improvement. In other words, the level of leadership preference is always higher than the actual conditions. The hypothesis 3 shown as follow:

**Hypothesis 3: The score of ideal leadership of coaching and empowering is higher than actual ones at present in different ownership types of companies in Shanghai, China.**
According to the findings in the study by Zander, “Ideal empowering” is not influenced by the hierarchical differentiation. Instead, it is changing based on the different countries where the employees work. (Zander, 1997) It means that “Ideal empowering” of employees is not depend on the national culture of parent company. Instead, it is depends on the culture where the company located. Zander also conclude findings in ”Ideal coaching” in her study. “Ideal coaching” is related to Confucian and individualistic values in the country where the companies located. The same to ”Ideal empowering”, ”Ideal coaching” also depends on the culture where the company located

As all the respondents in FOEs are located in Shanghai, let alone the local companies, all of the respondents share the same Chinese Confucian, individualistic values and culture, then comes hypothesis 4 shown as follow:

_Hypothesis 4: There is no strong significant difference of ideal leadership between local enterprises (SOEs, POEs, GOV) and FOEs from different countries located in Shanghai, China._
3  METHOD

In the following section, we will introduce the research method we designed and explain why we choose the quantitative method to conduct the research as well as the data collection.

3.1  Research method

Because the research requests a certain amount of samples to get the conclusion, so we choose to apply quantitative research instead of other research methods such as interviews, since the major problem with the interview is consuming more time and more subjective and it was considered that quantitative measures would usefully supplement and extend the quantitative analysis. It was decided that the best method to adopt for this investigation was to conduct the research by questionnaires. Firstly, we only have two months for the paper, so it is required us to collect data as soon as possible. However, if we choose interview as the research method, make appointments waste much time. Secondly, the research objective we focused is the employees in China, but we are now doing study in Sweden, it is almost impossible to make interviews face to face with the employees working in Shanghai. Based on two reasons listed above, we choose to distribute questionnaires to conduct the research. The questionnaire we designed will help us to test our hypotheses which we deduced above. Moreover, questionnaires will be more relative to the research objective and the second advantage of using the quantitative method is that questionnaires are quickly and easily for distribution and collection.

Applying the method of questionnaire method is beneficial to gather a large amount of data. To analyze data, we use SPSS 19.0 to systematically deal with the data and finally draw the conclusion.

3.2  Questionnaire design

The questionnaire includes two parts. The first part is focusing on the personal information of the respondents. The part of information is related to the variables including gender, age, education background, working years, position. These variables are reference variables in this study just for compare to the study of Zander, finding problems and further research. The most important independent variable for this time is the type of company. Although the research objective we focus in the paper is the relationship between different types of enterprises and leadership style regarding empowering and coaching, we still try to find out if there is any other variables affect on the leadership. Based on the personal information, we
can analyze what and how these variables result in the difference in leadership. Moreover, we will also try to analyze whether these variables independently or synergistically influenced by the variable of different ownership styles on leadership. These variables provide the chance for the research to find some unexpected interesting results which previous research did not recover.

The second part of questionnaire is about leadership style of empowering and coaching. According to the research of Zander (1997) and the questionnaire reformulated by Julian Birkinshaw (2002), the survey which consists of ten questions about empowering and coaching by asking what the boss should do. The part is to test what is the ideal leadership for employees. The ten questions divided by ideal empowering and ideal coaching and five questions for each part. The questions from one to five are labeled as “ideal empowering” which is regarding delegate responsibility, work review frequently, decision-making sharing, initiative appreciating and take advice. The five questions are to test what employees’ preference for empowering leadership. The following question six to ten are labeled as “ideal coaching” which is regarding co-operate encouraging, informed guarantee, care for performance, career development and personal issues and make employees feel proud of the work. The five questions are to test what employees’ preference for coaching leadership.

Motivated by the empirical study of Brightharp (1999), what we contributed to this model is to add ten more questions to ask what the boss actually does based on the questions which Zander (1997) has designed in the questionnaire but has not concluded into her results. The ten questions also divided by actual empowering and ideal coaching and five questions for each part. The questions from 11 to 15 are labeled as “actual empowering” which is designed to be the same description to question one to five with moving the word “should”, which means that the respondents answer the five questions based on their actual experience in empowering. Similarly, the questions from sixteen to twenty are labeled as “actual coaching” which is designed to be the same description to question six to ten. The respondents answer the five questions based on employees’ actual experience in coaching.

Totally there are twenty questions on leadership in the questionnaire. Each of question is one of the indicators for ideal empowering, ideal coaching, actual empowering or actual coaching. To measure the indicators, we applied 1-5 point LIKERT scale measurement for all of the twenty questions. From score 1 to 5 are represent “completely disagree” to “completely
agree”. Therefore, adding each five questions together then the full score is 25. The same as the full score of ideal or actual of empowering or coaching dimensions is also 25. By setting empowering as vertical axis and coaching as horizontal axis, we build a quadrant for both actual and ideal.

![Figure 1: Leadership of Empowering and Coaching model](Julian Birkinshaw, 2002, pp16)

In the questionnaire, the following five items were put label on "empowering" because they indicate the methods of empowering employees. Empowering includes delegating responsibility to the employees and avoiding reviewing employees’ work too frequently. The employees are encouraged to offer advices to their managers, and their initiatives are appreciated and welcomed by their managers. Furthermore, sharing decision-making is also an important signal to represent empowering. The following items can be considered as examples of "coaching", which means to motivate them to co-operate in team, make all the employees feel as a part of the team and have them feel being proud of their work, which can be achieved by keeping them informed as well as taking an interest not only in the development of their performance and careers, but also in their personal issues.

3.3 Questionnaire distribution

The research target is on Chinese employees, so we mainly ask the students of the MBA center of Shanghai University who have at least worked for three years to complete the questionnaire. Besides that, we also asked our friends and relatives in Shanghai to do the survey.
Due to the limitation of limited research period and location, we designed the questionnaire and post it on Wenjuan.com, which is a Chinese professional website for questionnaire collection. Through various kinds of social networks such as social tools QQ, Wechat, e-mail and so on to mainly inform the MBA students in Shanghai University to respond to the questionnaire. As most of the respondents are MBA students in Shanghai University and all of the respondents have working experience and high education background. So they can be expected to fill in the questionnaires correctly and precisely, which has ensured the validity of the respondents for this paper.

### 3.4 Data collection

The data collected from employees working in different ownership firms in Shanghai, China, including state owned firms (as the SOE also operated by the entrepreneurs set by the government, so we analyzed the employees working in government departments and SOE together ), domestic private owned firms and foreign firms. Data was collected in 2014 from 144 respondents in different types of industries and all of the questionnaires are completed and valid.

![Figure 2: Enterprises type](image1.png)  ![Figure 3: Gender](image2.png)

Totally, we have collected 144 questionnaires and all the data is valid. The distribution of different ownership type is shown in Figure 2. Of the 144 respondents who completed the questionnaire, 62 of them working in SOEs, which occupied 43% of all the respondents. The amount of respondents from FOEs is 41, which occupied 28% of all the population. Rest of those who responded are from POEs which are 24, taking a minority of participants (17%) of all the answers.
As can be seen from the Figure 3, of the initial cohort of 144 responders, there are 75 male and 69 female joined in the investigation. The average age for the 144 respondents is 29.86, the youngest one is 19 years old and the oldest one is 50 years old. Figure 4 indicated that all of the respondents are well educated. 64 of the respondents are Master and occupied 45%. Followed by 58 of them are bachelor which occupied 40%. And then, there are 13 respondents graduated from college and 9 respondents have PhD degree. For the FOEs employees, we especially designed question to know their FOEs are belongs to which country. Totally received 41 respondents from FOEs and these FOEs can be divided into three kinds: Asia, Europe and North America. 12 of them are Asia enterprises which spread in Hong Kong, Taiwan, Singapore and Japan. Nine of them are European enterprises, which come from Germany, Britain, Denmark and France. The last 20 enterprises are North America enterprises, 19 of them are American enterprises and only one is Canadian enterprise. From the answers for enterprises working years, we can find that the average working years is 4.73 years and the median is 3. The shortest working year is just three months and the longest working year is 32 years. From Figure 5, it shows that within the all respondents, most of them work as a general staff in the enterprise which is 97 respondents and occupied 67%. Followed by 33 of them are working as managers in the middle level and this part respondents occupied 23%. Lastly, there are 14 respondents reach top level management in our investigation and the amount is occupied 10% for this time.
4 RESULTS AND DATA ANALYSIS

4.1 Results

As a consequence, these five items varies a lot when related to different ownership style firms in China. Difference between different ownership style firms is also obviously indicated in another five items which stand for "coaching".

![Figure 6: Ideal leadership](image)

Figure 6 has shown the mean of all the answers for Question 1-10, which aims to test the perception of ideal empowering and coaching. The scores of Question 1-10 are approximately around 4. The highest average score is shown on Q6 (The boss should encourage employees to co-operate, and feel part of the team) and Q10 (The boss should make employees feel proud of their work), of which is 4.33. The lowest average score is shown on Q9 (The boss should care for employees’ personal issues), of which score is 3.37.

![Figure 7: Actual leadership](image)
Figure 7 has shown the mean of all the answers for Question 11-20 which aims to test the actual empowering and coaching. The scores of Question 11-20 are approximately around 3.5. The highest average score is shown on Q16 (Your boss encourage employees to cooperate, and feel part of the team), of which score is 3.85. And the lowest average is on Q13 (Decision-making is shared between your boss and employees), which score is 3.08.

4.2 Reliability test

Before we applied the collection data of the second part to questionnaire regarding four groups of leadership in two dimensions (ideal/actual) and (empowering/coaching), we should make sure that these data are reliable enough to be analyzed. Therefore we calculated Cronbach’s alpha for each part. The results of Cronbach’s alpha proved that the data we collected are reliable. The Cronbach’s alpha is shown as below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>Ideal empowering</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>Ideal coaching</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>Actual empowering</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>Actual coaching</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Cronbach’s alpha table

The internal consistency method was applied to examine the data analysis reliability. Cronbach’s alpha is the calculated result showing coefficient which is used to test the consistency of internal constructs. The calculation formula is shown as below:

$$\alpha = \frac{N}{N(N-1)}\{1 - \sum \sigma^2 (Y_i)/\sigma_2^2\}$$

Where N is equal to the number of items, $\sum \sigma^2 (Y_i)$ is equal to the sum of item variances, and $\sigma_2^2$ is equal to the variance of the total construct (Zander, 1997).

As long as Cronbach’s alpha is over 0.7, it indicated that the collected data are good (Nunnally 1978). From table 2, it is showed that all of the four part of questionnaire analysis are above 0.7. According to the rule, the Cronbach’s alphas provide the validity of our study to present the data analyses is reliable.
4.3 Data analysis for testing hypotheses

Through applying SPSS to do a series of statistic analysis on the data collected, we examine whether the empirical research confirm our hypotheses.

We applied T-test to check the significant difference with various variables. We chose \( \alpha = 0.05 \) because it is the criteria to test the 2-tailed T-test significance. The principle of 2-tailed significance result is that the bigger the data is, the less the significance between the variables. In details, while the 2-tailed significance result is more than 0.1, the difference between the variables is not significant; while the 2-tailed significance result is more than 0.05 and less than 0.1, the significance between the variables is weak; and while the 2-tailed significance result is less than 0.01, the significance between the variables is strong. (Richard A. J., 2010)

In the following analysis, we label “*” as a weak significance at the 0.1 significance level, label “**” as a significance at the 0.05 significance level and label “***” as a strong significance at the 0.01 significance level by 2-tailed T-test.

**Hypothesis 1: There are differences of actual leadership across the different ownership type of companies in Shanghai, China.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enterprises Leadership</th>
<th>SOE Vs POE</th>
<th>SOE Vs FOE</th>
<th>SOE Vs GOV</th>
<th>POE Vs FOE</th>
<th>POE Vs GOV</th>
<th>FOE Vs GOV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual empowering</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-.76</td>
<td>-1.21</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-.81</td>
<td>-.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual coaching</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>-.64</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>-1.69*</td>
<td>-1.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: T-test among enterprise type in actual leadership

* The correlation coefficient shows a weak significance at the 0.1 significance level.
** The correlation coefficient shows significance at the 0.05 significance level.
*** The correlation coefficient shows a strong significance at the 0.01 significance level.

According to Table 4, it shows that all the 2-tailed significances are over 0.05. Just 2 tailed significance for actual coaching between POE and GOV is 0.99 and with a weakly significant different. However, to accept the hypothesis should exit the significance at least on 0.05 level by 2-tailed T-test. The T-test results prove that for any two types of enterprises compared in actual leadership of empowering and coaching, there is no significant difference between
them. Due to the test results, we have to reject hypothesis 1 and accept the opposite hypothesis which is:

**Conclusion 1:** There is no significant difference of actual leadership across the different ownership type of companies in Shanghai, China.

**Hypothesis 2:** The score of actual leadership of coaching and empowering in FOEs in Shanghai, China is the highest, and followed by the score in POEs is higher than which in SOEs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enterprises Leadership</th>
<th>SOEs</th>
<th>FOEs</th>
<th>POEs</th>
<th>GOVs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideal empowering</td>
<td>18.63</td>
<td>19.39</td>
<td>20.21</td>
<td>18.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal coaching</td>
<td>20.26</td>
<td>20.37</td>
<td>20.67</td>
<td>19.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual empowering</td>
<td>16.71</td>
<td>17.34</td>
<td>17.04</td>
<td>18.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual coaching</td>
<td>18.58</td>
<td>17.85</td>
<td>17.17</td>
<td>19.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5:** Mean among enterprise type in ideal and actual leadership

![Figure 8: Scatter diagram of mean among enterprise types in leadership](image)

According to the mean analysis of Table 5, it showed that the mean of SOEs actual of empowering and coaching are 16.71 and 18.58 respectively. The mean of FOEs actual of
empowering and coaching are 17.34 and 17.85 respectively. The mean of POEs actual of empowering and coaching are 17.04 and 17.17 respectively. Finally, the mean of GOVs actual of empowering and coaching are 18.12 and 19.29 respectively. Figure 8 shows the data from Table 4 into the empowering and coaching framework designed by Birkinshaw which provides a visualized proof for mean discussion. The three different ownership styles of companies and government department of actual leadership are shown as diamond icon.

According to both Table 4 and Figure 8, the mean analysis data from them provided the order of actual empowering for four kinds of enterprises including government is shown as below:

**GOVs>FOEs>POEs>SOEs**

The mean analysis also provided the actual coaching for four kinds of enterprises including government is shown as below:

**GOVs>SOEs>FOEs>POEs**

Based on the two orders of actual empowering and actual government for the four kinds of enterprises, for actual empowering part, the investigation data could support hypothesis 2 (exclude GOVs), which means:

**Conclusion 2.1: The score of actual leadership of empowering in FOEs in Shanghai, China is the highest, and followed by the score in POEs is higher than which in SOEs.**

However, for actual coaching aspect, the data reject hypothesis 2. The mean of data results shown as below:

**Conclusion 2.2: The score of actual leadership of coaching in SOEs in Shanghai, China is the highest, and followed by the scores in FOEs is higher than which in POEs.**

In sum, hypothesis 2 need to be analyzed divided by actual empowering and actual coaching. For actual empowering, the results of data can support hypothesis 2, however, for coaching, the results of data reject hypothesis 2 and set up a new conclusion which is different from hypothesis 2.
Hypothesis 3: The score of ideal leadership of coaching and empowering is higher than actual ones at present in different ownership types of companies in Shanghai, China.

According to the mean analysis of Table 4, it shown that the mean of SOEs actual of empowering and coaching are 16.71 and 18.58 respectively. They are both lower than the mean of SOEs ideal of empowering and coaching are 18.63 and 20.86 respectively.

The mean of FOEs actual of empowering and coaching are 17.34 and 17.85 respectively. They are both lower than the mean of FOEs ideal of empowering and coaching are 19.39 and 20.37 respectively.

The mean of POEs actual of empowering and coaching are 17.04 and 17.17 respectively. They are both lower than the mean of POEs ideal of empowering and coaching are 20.21 and 20.67 respectively.

Finally, the mean of GOVs actual of empowering and coaching are 18.12 and 19.29 respectively. They are both lower than the mean of GOVs ideal of empowering and coaching are 18.47 and 19.53 respectively.

All the data reflected on Figure 8 also support Hypothesis 3 is true. The four kinds of enterprises of actual leadership are shown as diamond icon and ideal leadership are shown as triangle icon on Figure 8. From Figure 8, it is obviously clear to figure out that all the triangle icons (ideal) are located higher than diamond icons (actual) in both dimensions (empowering and coaching). So Figure 3 intuitively support that hypothesis 3 is true again. So here comes conclusion as below:

Conclusion 3: The score of ideal leadership of coaching and empowering is higher than actual ones at present in different ownership types of companies in Shanghai, China.

Hypothesis 4: There is no strong significant difference of ideal leadership between local enterprises (SOEs, POEs, GOV) and FOEs from different countries located in Shanghai, China.

The table shown as below is the data of all the FOEs. It can be used to test whether the employees working in FOEs from different continents will show significance in ideal and actual leadership style. In table 6 shown as below, “China” represents all the SOEs, POEs and
GOV in China mainland; “Asia” refers to the FOEs established in Asia countries, the same as the definition of “Europe” and “North America”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continent</th>
<th>China VS Asia</th>
<th>China VS Europe</th>
<th>China VS North A.</th>
<th>Asia VS Europe</th>
<th>Asia VS North A.</th>
<th>Europe VS North A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideal empowering</td>
<td>-1.73 *</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal coaching</td>
<td>-1.36</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: T-test between ideal leadership and continents

* The correlation coefficient shows a weak significance at the 0.1 significance level.
** The correlation coefficient shows significance at the 0.05 significance level.
*** The correlation coefficient shows a strong significance at the 0.01 significance level.

Based on the t-test results in table 6, there is a weak significance in ideal empowering between China and Asia. The mean for ideal empowering in China is 18.96, while the mean for ideal empowering in Asia is 20.73. The negative correlation means that the score of the ideal empowering of the employees in FOEs in Asia (except for China mainland) is higher than the scores of the employees in Chinese enterprises and GOV. The countries including Asia for this investigation are: Taiwan, Singapore, Hong Kong and Japan.

Although there is a there is a weak significance in ideal empowering between China and Asia, it is not a strong significance, so we accept the hypothesis 4 and here is conclusion 4:

**Conclusion 4: There is no strong significant difference of ideal leadership between local enterprises (SOEs, POEs, GOV) and FOEs from different countries located in Shanghai, China.**

4.4 Further data analysis

4.4.1 Further analysis for Hypothesis 1 in ideal leadership

Hypothesis 1 is related to the actual leadership across the different ownership type of companies. Based on hypothesis 1, there could be a further data analysis in ideal leadership across the different ownership type of companies.
Table 7: T-test between ideal leadership and enterprise type

* The correlation coefficient shows a weak significance at the 0.1 significance level.
** The correlation coefficient shows significance at the 0.05 significance level.
*** The correlation coefficient shows a strong significance at the 0.01 significance level.

According to table 7, it shows that most of the 2-tailed significances are over 0.1. Only the 2-tailed significance of ideal empowering between SOE and POE is 0.049<0.05<0.1 that means significant. For ideal empowering between POEs and GOVs, the 2-tailed significance is 0.57<0.1, which means weakly significant. The T-test result proves that ideal empowering between SOE and POE has a significant difference and between POE and GOV has a weakly significant difference. For other two types of enterprises compared in ideal leadership of empowering and coaching, there is no significant difference between them. Based on the T-test results, we draw the conclusion shown as below:

Conclusion 5: There is a significant difference in ideal empowering between SOE and POE in Shanghai and a weak significance in ideal empowering between POE and GOV.

4.4.2 Further analysis for Hypothesis 3

Based on the conclusion of hypothesis 3, there could be a further data analysis on how big the differences are between each kind of enterprise of ideal and actual for empowering and coaching. The gap of different means is calculated and presented as below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enterprise</th>
<th>Gap of mean: Empowering from ideal to actual</th>
<th>Gap of mean: Coaching from ideal to actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOEs</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOEs</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POEs</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOVs</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Gap of means between ideal and actual in leadership in enterprise type

From Table 8, we can rank the gaps of each kind of enterprise between ideal and actual for empowering and coaching.

The gap of Empowering: POEs>FOEs>SOEs>GOVs

The gap of Coaching: POEs>FOEs>SOEs>GOVs
Both of empowering and coaching gaps show that POEs’ gap between ideal and actual is higher than FOEs’ gap between ideal and actual, which is higher than SOEs’ gap between ideal and actual and higher than GOVs’ gap between ideal and actual.

It is apparent to compare from Figure 8, the same gap orders are shown. The gap between POEs actual and POEs ideal is the most significant. However, the gap between GOVs actual and GOVs ideal is not so apparent. In addition, the gap between SOEs actual and ideal is smaller than the gap between FOEs actual and ideal. The finding for gaps of mean analysis between ideal and actual can be concluded as below:

**Conclusion 6:** The order of gaps between ideal and actual of four enterprise types in empowering and coaching are the same. To be specific, the gap between POEs ideal and actual leadership is more than the gap between FOEs ideal and actual leadership; the gap between FOEs ideal and actual leadership is more than the gap between SOEs ideal and actual leadership; the gap between SOEs ideal and actual leadership is more than the gap between GOVs ideal and actual leadership.

### 4.4.3 Further analysis for Hypothesis 4 in actual leadership

Hypothesis 4 is related to the *ideal* leadership across the different ownership type of companies. Based on hypothesis 4, there could be a further data analysis in *actual* leadership across the different ownership type of companies.

In table 7 shown as below, “China” represents all the SOEs, POEs and GOV in China mainland; “Asia” refers to the FOEs established in Asia countries, the same as the definition of “Europe” and “North America”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continent Leadership</th>
<th>China VS Asia</th>
<th>China VS Europe</th>
<th>China VS North A.</th>
<th>Asia VS Europe</th>
<th>Asia VS North A.</th>
<th>Europe VS North A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual empowering</td>
<td>-.55</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual coaching</td>
<td>-.79</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 9:** T-test between actual leadership and continents

* The correlation coefficient shows a weak significance at the 0.1 significance level.
** The correlation coefficient shows significance at the 0.05 significance level.
*** The correlation coefficient shows a strong significance at the 0.01 significance level.
Based on the t-test results in table 9, there is no significance in actual empowering and coaching between Chinese local enterprises including SOEs, POEs and GOV with FOEs from worldwide countries including Asia, Europe and North America.

**Conclusion 7:** There is no strong significant difference of actual leadership between local enterprises (SOEs, POEs, GOV) and FOEs from different countries located in Shanghai, China.
5 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

5.1 Discussion for the conclusion which be rejected from the original hypothesis

In results and data analysis, the explanation and potential reasons for the confirmed and rejected hypothesis has been given. Further data analysis has been done not only on the hypotheses were rejected but also on the independent variables of the information of respondents. However, more reasons for why some hypotheses have been rejected need to be discussed deeply. In the following discussion section, we will discuss the hypotheses which we rejected according to the data from our empirical study. We will discuss some possible reasons for conclusion 1, conclusion 2.2, which are different from the hypotheses we proposed based on the literature review.

5.1.1 Discussion for conclusion 1

Returning to the hypotheses posed at the beginning of this study, it is now possible to state that there are differences in actual leadership across the different ownership type of companies in Shanghai, China. However, the T-tests of the study only show a significant difference between SOEs and POEs in Shanghai, China for actual “empowering” but no differences between the others.

Since the hypothesis 1 was rejected and we made a new Conclusion 1: There is no significant difference of actual leadership across the different ownership type of companies in Shanghai, China.

There are three main potential reasons why the hypothesis 1 could not be confirmed. Firstly, the respondents in the study are employees in different enterprises in Shanghai. As Shanghai is a metropolitan city which developing at a high speed and was ranked as “the Global Cities” based on the main parameters are "Business activity" (30%), "Human capital" (30%), "Information exchange" (15%), "Cultural experience" (15%) and "Political engagement" (10%). (Foreign Policy, 2008) In the latest ranking of “the Global Cities” in 2014, Shanghai was ranked on 18th all over the world. (Foreign Policy, 2014) The ranking proved that Shanghai is leading the trend in business as well as culture as a global city in China. Since the Chinese reform economic in 1979, the government has gradually stimulated local entrepreneurs to establish private companies, and has encouraged the foreign investors to set branches in China. It is obvious that Shanghai is one of the coastal cities and the harbor for
external business, which determines that it is also one of the first cities to absorb in foreign cultures and international business models. During the visit by the chairman of China Xi Jinping in Shanghai on 24th May 2014, he announced that Shanghai is the most important economic center in China, and it should keep on developing at rapid speed (www.news.xinhuanet.com). As the leading city in China, Shanghai faces to the strong impact of foreign enterprises both in business and culture. The history of Chinese enterprise has experienced three different developing periods as below:

Firstly, facing the conflicts with foreign cultures, and then learning to accept the differences among different cultures and business models instead of trying to struggle with keeping on the old business model of Chinese enterprises. The third step is to develop Chinese business models based on the knowledge and experience learnt from foreign companies and foreign cultures. Decades ago, quitting job in SOE and working in a FOE is a suboptimal decision because it means to give up the stable position. However, nowadays, some of the SOEs also have learned from the management from FOEs and applied it into practice. For example, in order to avoid signing permanent contract with new employees, the new policy of GOV and SOEs is to recruit more labor dispatching employees instead of hiring affiliated employees in traditional way (www.news.163.com). Since the Chinese economic reform in 1979, different ownership style of firms including SOEs, POEs and FOEs have developed to adapt in Chinese local economy. So the discussion above might be the reason why there is no significant difference of actual leadership across the different ownership type of companies in Shanghai.

Secondly, the economic levels between different cities in China vary a lot, which means that the investigation results in Shanghai in enterprises culture and leadership style could not represent the other cities in China. In other words, if the questionnaires were distributed in other countries in China, hypothesis 1 might have been proved.

Finally, most of the respondents are MBA students in Shanghai University. They have similar education background with work experience. They are respectively working in different types of enterprises but because of they have learned a lot about the cutting-edge theories of leadership and management and some of them has worked in FOEs for many years, they are affected deeply by what they learned and experienced in work. Furthermore, they are also quite familiar with the western culture since they grow up in booming economy in Shanghai as we mentioned in literature review. This also might be a reason for why there is no significant difference among different types of enterprises.
5.1.2 Discussion for Conclusion 2.2

Hypothesis 2 was only partly confirmed. So it needs to be analyzed divided by actual empowering and actual coaching. For actual empowering, the results of data can support hypothesis 2. However, for coaching, the results of data reject hypothesis 2 and set up a new conclusion which is different from hypothesis 2 which is Conclusion 2.2: The score of actual leadership of coaching in SOEs in Shanghai, China is the highest, and followed by the scores in FOEs is higher than which in POEs.

The main characteristics of SOEs in Shanghai may be the reason why the score of actual leadership of coaching in SOEs is the highest. As described in the literature review section, SOEs are always labeled as “stable job” from Chinese people’s perspective. Actually, it is true at least in the past 35 years in Chinese economic reform (Chiu, et al, 2002). Although nowadays the government and the SOEs has realized the disadvantage of keeping employees work in government department for long time, for example, there are some unwritten rules about only when elder employees get retired then have new employees take their places. Since SOEs have the longest developing history in China (Wang & Yang, 2007), the leadership style of encouraging employees to build the relationship between colleagues plays the important role. Furthermore, the relationship between employees and managers can also be considered as “coaching”. Finally, such as the rules of “tenure contracts”, highly active “Labor Union” and various staff activities in SOEs help to establish the relationship between employees and managers. In sum, referring to the “actual coaching” in the questionnaire, it is reasonable that the managers care about employees’ career and their personal issues to encourage them by impressing them of not only being as a manager but also as a friend.

5.2 Verification for findings by Zander

5.2.1 Discussion for Conclusion 4

Hypothesis 4 is completely based on the findings by Zander. It is designed for verify if the findings by Zander of can be applied into this research. Conclusion 4 proved again that the finding by Zander is true. Conclusion 4: There is no strong significant difference of ideal leadership between local enterprises (SOEs, POEs, GOV) and FOEs from different countries located in Shanghai, China.
For all the FOEs, we divided them into three kinds “Asia”, “Europe” and “North America” according to different national area of their mother companies. According to the T-test results in comparison with different kinds of FOEs and local companies, there is only a weak significance between local companies and Asia FOEs in “Ideal empowering”. Except that, there’s no significance in the comparison by different FOEs and local companies in both “Ideal empowering” and “Ideal coaching”. There is no strong significant difference of ideal leadership between local enterprises (SOEs, POEs, GOV) and FOEs means accept the original hypothesis and it proved that the findings by Zander which the Hypothesis 4 bases on is true.

Firstly, no significant difference in “Ideal empowering” verify that “Ideal empowering is based on the different countries where the employees work” is true. (Zander, 1997) As all the companies in the research are located in Shanghai and according to Zander’s finding, no matter the where the FOEs are based, “Ideal empowering” only depends on the culture where the companies located. AS all the companies located in Shanghai, so there is no strong significance among different kinds of FOEs and local companies.

Secondly, no significant difference in “Ideal coaching” verify that “Ideal coaching is related to Confucian and individualistic values in the country where the companies located” is true. (Zander, 1997) As all the respondents in FOEs are located in Shanghai, let alone the local companies, all of the respondents share the same Chinese Confucian and individualistic values, and that’s why there is no strong significant difference in different FOEs and local companies for “Ideal coaching”.

**Conclusion 4** is in accordance with the findings in the study by Zander. Zander’s finding also provided good theory basis to explain why **Conclusion 4** is true in this study.

### 5.3 Discussion for further conclusion

#### 5.3.1 Discussion for Conclusion 5

For the further analysis for conclusion 1 in ideal leadership, here comes **Conclusion 5: There is a significant difference in ideal empowering between SOE and POE in Shanghai and a weak significance in ideal empowering between POE and GOV.**
Similar to the discussion for conclusion 1, the significant difference in ideal empowering between SOE and POE might because Chinese SOEs always have a long running history and always related to major industry, which can promise within the enterprise has fixed rank system and fixed reporting system, all the operation are followed by rules within the enterprise. (Wang & Yang, 2007) However, in contrary to POEs, they always have a short running history and always related to small size enterprise. (Yu & Lao, 2009) These cannot promise POEs have fixed rank and reporting system. That might directly lead to the employee from POEs might have more power than an employee for SOEs in the same level. That might be the reason for “There is a significant difference in ideal empowering between SOE and POE.”

As to Chinese GOV, it is represent Chinese political system, and established the longest one in the four kinds of enterprises. So compare to POEs, it have stricter rules, reporting and managing system. Every civil servant has fixed power and duty. That might be the reason for “There is a weak significance in ideal empowering between POE and GOV.”

5.3.2 Discussion for Conclusion 6

For the further analysis for conclusion 3 in gap between ideal and actual leadership for each type of enterprises, here comes Conclusion 6: The order of gaps between ideal and actual of four enterprise types in empowering and coaching are the same. To be specific, the gap between POEs ideal and actual leadership is more than the gap between FOEs ideal and actual leadership; the gap between FOEs ideal and actual leadership is more than the gap between SOEs ideal and actual leadership; the gap between SOEs ideal and actual leadership is more than the gap between GOVs ideal and actual leadership.

The gap between each kind of enterprise provides improvement room for each. That means, the bigger the gap is, and the more improvement room is. As we analyzed above, GOV is represent by Chinese policy. It must be managed by strict rules and every civil servant with fixed power and difficult to change for it is run by rules. For this reason, it restricts improvement room for GOV, which is why the gap between ideal and actual of GOV is the smallest. Chinese SOEs are running by Chinese government and always related to big monopolistic companies. The degree of strict rules just second to GOV, it restricts the
improvement room and it makes SOEs become the second smallest gap between ideal and actual. Although FOEs enter into Shanghai after Chinese economic reform, the nature for FOEs invest in Shanghai, means it runs well in their own countries and has the power to expand the business. FOEs always run for a period in their own country and reach a stage, than they will consider about expand their business into worldwide. So FOEs always have mature reporting system and implement process. So when FOEs come into Shanghai, they already have fixed system and rules, of course, some of them might be change for localization. That’s why FOEs become the third smallest gap between ideal and actual in leadership. In the end, Chinese POEs has short running time and always not with strict system and rules, that provide a big improvement room for POEs, which directly lead to POEs have the biggest gap between ideal and actual in leadership.

5.3.3 Discussion for Conclusion 7

For the further analysis for conclusion 4 in actual leadership between local enterprises and FOEs, here comes Conclusion 7: There is no strong significant difference of actual leadership between local enterprises (SOEs, POEs, GOV) and FOEs from different countries located in Shanghai, China.

Nearly all the FOEs invest and establish companies in China will modified their system and rules in their own countries and then applied in China. We call it as “localization”. (Chen, 2004) Of course the localization is including reporting system and management methods, which will influence leadership. Through localization, FOEs can rapidly shorten the distance in enterprise culture to local enterprises and quickly join into the local market. That is the main reason to explain conclusion 6 for why there is no strong significant difference of actual leadership between local enterprises and FOEs.
6 CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION FOR FURTHER STUDY

6.1 Conclusions

Our research is based on the achievement in Zander’s research in 1997, although the research has covered 18 countries, however, China was not included in this study. So we referred to Zander’s research and made a quantitative study in Shanghai. This study set out with the aim of comparing the difference in both ideal and actual leadership style from employees’ perspective across different types of enterprises and finding out the potential reasons for the results.

The present study confirms previous findings and contributes additional evidence that suggests there are discrepancies between ideal leadership and actual leadership. The findings from this study make several contributions to the current literature. The research is based on a survey according to the leadership model which consists of two dimensions of empowering and coaching (Figure 1). 144 questionnaires were collected in order to make a quantitative test. In the research, the Cronbach’s alpha of “empowering” and “coaching” are shown to be all above 0.70 in both the actual and ideal leadership style, which determines that the data and results are reliable. Therefore, these reliable constructs can be helpful to compare the difference between different ownership types of firms.

Although the current study is based on a small sample of participants, the findings suggest that the score of ideal leadership of coaching and empowering is higher than actual ones at present in different ownership types of companies in Shanghai, China.

Contrary to expectations, this study did not find a significant difference of actual leadership across the different ownership type of companies in Shanghai. We discussed the reason for the results into three points. Firstly, most of the respondents are MBA students in Shanghai University. They have learned theories of leadership and have been familiar with the western management. Secondly, the sample amounts are 144 which are not so big. Thirdly, Shanghai is a global city and influenced by western culture deeply.

However, the find in empowering and coaching are different in Chinese enterprises. There is a weak significance in ideal leadership between GOV and POE. To summarize the reason, firstly, it might because many FOEs in Shanghai, GOV learned a lot from FOE and its operation mode is close to an enterprise. Secondly, the sample for POE is small as well as GOV sample. It might directly lead to the test results might not overall and the scale of POE
are different, leadership is also changeable according to the scale of enterprise. For actual coaching leadership, there is a weak significance between GOV and POE as well.

### 6.2 Contributions

What we contributed to the literature is that there is a significant difference between SOEs and POEs in Shanghai, China for actual “empowering”, however, with a small sample size, caution must be applied, and conclusions are drawn based on the different ownership type of firms in Shanghai, as the findings might not be transferable to reflect the viewpoints of the employees who are not working in first-tier cities in China. Although the study has successfully demonstrated that there are differences in actual leadership across the different ownership type of companies in Shanghai, China, it has certain limitations in terms of the question of why there were no significant differences between the FOEs and SOEs. This research will serve as a base for future studies to do more research on the leadership style in different ownership types of firms in China.

There are many studies have researched on ideal leadership style, and few researches has shown empirical studies about actual leadership style, but not so many studies have been done on both the ideal and actual leadership style. This study contributed to the literature in both “actual” and “ideal” leadership in Shanghai. However, more research on this topic needs to be undertaken before the relation between different ownership types of enterprises and leadership styles is more clearly understood. Since mentioned in discussion that Shanghai is a first-tired metropolitan city and may not represent the other cities in China, further research can be done to investigate in other cities in China as well as in other countries.

### 6.3 Suggestions for further studies

For further study, here provide some suggestions. Firstly, involve more independent variables in the research. Although we design personal information questions in the questionnaire, we didn’t focus on these variables such as age, position etc. In the paper, some of the hypotheses are reject, more variables will help to analyze the relationship and reason for the conclusion. Secondly, narrow the research range in industry and do the research in a specific industry. In this research, we didn’t have a specified industry for questionnaire distribution. A specific industry will help the analysis with more pertinence. Just as the study by Zander choose an
international pharmaceutical company as research object. Thirdly, enlarge the research range in geography and do the research all over China instead of only in Shanghai. As Shanghai is an international cosmopolis with fast development and lead the economic development in China, just do the research in Shanghai can’t represent the condition in China. Fourthly, apply the research in different countries like what Zander did in her study to analyze if there is any different in leadership in different kinds of enterprises in different countries.

6.4 Limitations for this study

There are three factors may result in the limitation of the data collection and results. Firstly, the sample amounts of different ownership types of firms are not big enough in this investigation. As we described in the data collection section, employees from SOEs occupied the most. However, the respondents from POEs are fairly fewer than the respondents from SOEs. Secondly, as the study is limited by the time, we just collected 144 respondents for the paper. Furthermore, a large amount of the respondents are MBA students in Shanghai University, they have been well educated and have already had the knowledge about the cutting-edge leadership styles. They have been affected by the theories they learned so it diminished their different preferences on leadership style even they are working in different ownership types of enterprises. It might be the reason why there is no significant difference between the employees working in different enterprises.
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企业文化研究项目

本问卷的目的在于收集数据，用计算机程序分析总结我国各类型企业文化差异，从而为企业管理方面提供借鉴与科学依据。

您在此问卷中提供的任何信息将只用于学术研究目的。我们通过以下三种方式来保证其私密性：

第一，您不必填写姓名；

第二，除了负责本研究项目的研究员，任何他人包括您所在公司的人，不可能看到这份问卷。我们承诺不将问卷的信息透露给任何第三方；

第三，本项学术研究将只使用基于所有问卷的总量指标，不使用个体的具体信息。

本问卷需要 5 分钟填写完成，请您尽可能准确与完整地填写这份问卷，填完之后请检查是否回答了所有的问题。

感谢您对本研究项目的支持与配合！

乌普萨拉大学商学院：曹燕婷，陈奕欢

一、请提供以下员工个人基本信息：

您的性别是______：1=男性；2=女性，年龄为______岁

您的学历______：1=大专以下；2=大专；3=本科；4=硕士；5=博士

您所在公司的性质______：1=政府单位；2=国有企业；3=中国私营企业；4=外资企业（______国家）很重要，请务必填写具体所属国家；5=其他______

您现在公司的服务年限______年

您目前在公司担任的职位______：1=高层管理者；2=中层管理者；3=普通员工；4=其他______
二、您是否同意以下这些说法呢？请在右边一栏填上相应的数字。其中“1=非常不同意；2=不同意；3=不能决定；4=同意；5=非常同意”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>非常不同意——非常同意</th>
<th>您的选项</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 领导应该充分授权给员工</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 领导应该避免太过频繁的评估员工绩效</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 员工与领导应该共同分享决策权</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 员工的主动性应该受到领导的欣赏与欢迎</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 领导应该采纳员工的建议</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 领导应该鼓励员工团队协作，使自己感到是团队中的一员</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 领导应该保证员工的信息获取</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 领导应该关心员工的绩效及职业发展</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 领导应该关心员工的个人问题</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 领导应该使员工对自己的工作感到自豪</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 本公司领导充分授权给员工</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. 本公司领导避免太过频繁的评估员工绩效</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 本公司员工与领导共同分享决策权</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. 本公司员工的主动性受到领导的欣赏与欢迎</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. 本公司领导采纳员工的建议</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. 本公司领导鼓励员工团队协作，使自己感到是团队中的一员</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. 本公司领导保证员工的信息获取</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. 本公司领导关心员工的绩效及职业发展</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. 本公司领导关心员工的个人问题</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. 本公司领导使员工对自己的工作感到自豪</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

问卷到此结束，非常感谢您的支持与配合！
Questionnaire

The aim of the questionnaire is to collect data for our study. All the responds will be used in data analyzing. All the information you provided will only be used in research. We ensure that your information will be kept secretly through:

1. You don’t need to fill in your name;
2. No one can see the questionnaire except the researchers. We promise that we will not disclose the questionnaire to any other organizations or individuals;
3. The research will only reveal the statistic analysis based on the data, instead of specific individual information.

Please ensure that you fill in the questionnaire correctly and completely.

Thank you for your support on the research!

Uppsala University Department of Business Studies: Yanting Cao & Yihuan Chen

Please provide your basic information:

Your gender_______: 1=Male; 2=Female

You are _____ years old

Your current education background_______: 1=Below college; 2=College; 3=bachelor; 4=master; 5=PhD

The type of company you are working in_______: 1=Government; 2=State-owned enterprise; 3=Chinese private enterprise; 4=Foreign owned enterprise (______country) Very important, please make sure to fill in the country that your company belongs to; 5=Others______

You have worked in the company for _______ year(s)

Your position in the company_______: 1=Top level management; 2=Middle level management; 3=General staff; 4=Others______
For each of the questions, rate your answer on a scale where "1=completely disagree; 
2=disagree; 3=neutral; 4=agree; 5=completely agree"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Completely disagree→ Completely agree</th>
<th>Your choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The boss should delegate responsibility to employees</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The boss should avoid reviewing employees’ work too frequently</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Decision-making should be shared between the boss and employees</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Employee initiative should be appreciated and welcomed by the boss</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The boss should take advice from employees</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The boss should encourage employees to co-operate and feel part of the team</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The boss should keep employees informed</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The boss should care about employees’ performance and their career development</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The boss should care about employees’ personal issues</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The boss should make employees feel proud of their work</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Your boss delegates responsibility to employees</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Your boss avoids reviewing employees’ work too frequently</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Decision-making is shared between your boss and employees</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Employee initiative is appreciated and welcomed by your boss</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Your boss takes advice from employees</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Your boss encourages employees to co-operate and feel part of the team</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Your boss keeps employees informed</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Your boss cares about employees’ performance and their career development</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Your boss cares about employees’ personal issues</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Your boss makes employees feel proud of their work</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That is the end of the questionnaire. Many thanks for your support and cooperation!