



**CAN ABSENT LEADERSHIP BE POSITIVE IN TEAM
CONFLICTS? AN EXAMINATION OF LEADERS' AVOIDANCE
BEHAVIOR IN CHINA**

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Conflict Management</i>
Manuscript ID	IJCMA-12-2015-0083.R2
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Leadership, Avoidance, Justice, Trust, Well-being, China

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

ew Only

Can absent leadership be positive in team conflicts?

An examination of leaders' avoidance behavior in China

Abstract

Purpose – Although conflict avoidance is one of the most commonly used conflict resolution styles in China, there has surprisingly been no explicit investigation of the effects of leaders' avoidance. This paper therefore examines how leaders' avoidance influences followers' attitudes and well-being in China.

Design/methodology/approach – Data was collected from 245 subordinates in three large companies in the People's Republic of China through an online survey. Multiple regression analysis was adopted to test three sets of competing hypotheses.

Findings – Leaders' avoidance behavior is positively related to followers' perception of justice, supervisory trust and emotional well-being in Chinese organizations.

Originality/value - Our paper joins growing attempts to consider conflict management in the context of leadership. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to examine empirically the relationships between a team leader's avoidance behavior and his or her subordinates' perceptions of justice, supervisory trust, and emotional well-being in a single study. The findings are provoking by illustrating positive effect of leader's conflict avoidance behavior in China. Our paper supports that conflict avoidance could be a sustainable rather than one-off strategy by a leader, and that identifying conditions (e.g. culture) that affect the outcomes of conflict avoidance is important.

Keywords: Leadership, Avoidance, Justice, Trust, Well-being, China

Article Type: Research paper

Introduction

Conflict is one of the most common phenomena in team interactions (Rahim, Magner, & Shapiro, 2000; Zhang, Cao, & Tjosvold, 2011). Given the information asymmetry between supervisors and subordinates (Restubog, Hornsey, Bordia & Esposito, 2008), team members expect the team leader or manager to take charge of a conflict situation. Managers spend substantial amounts of their time (around 25%) dealing with conflicts (Bass & Bass, 2008), which indicates the important role played by team leaders in team conflict situations. Since conflict management is useful for helping employees to develop high quality leader relationships with their foreign managers, studies have suggested that a leader's avoidance or non-involvement could be detrimental in a wide range of situations, including team conflicts (Chen, Tjosvold, & Fang, 2005; Tjosvold, 2008).

However, it is worth noting that most leadership and conflict research cautioning against conflict avoidance by leaders has been based in Western contexts. Different cultures lead individuals to prioritize different sets of values and behaviors; therefore, the globalization of management prompts the question of whether particular leadership styles and behaviors remain positive or negative across cultures. For example, it is still unclear whether a leader's avoidance has a negative impact on subordinates' attitudes in Eastern cultures such as China in the same way as it does in Western cultures. Despite the common understanding about conflict avoidance in China (Ohbuchi & Atsumi, 2010; Tjosvold & Sun, 2002), there has surprisingly been no explicit investigation of the effects of leaders' avoidance. The aim of this paper, therefore, is to explore how leaders' avoidance influences followers' attitudes in China.

The reason for focusing on leaders' avoidance behavior in China is twofold. First, while most leadership and conflict literature points to the detrimental effects of leadership avoidance in team affairs, including in conflict situations, this paper addresses the question "Does leaders' avoidance in China negatively influence followers?". Second, by considering a

1
2
3
4 leader's avoidance in conflict situations, where his or her involvement seems to be required,
5
6 this paper's research question is extended to the broader inquiry of whether laissez-faire
7
8 leadership is one of the least effective leadership styles across different cultures. Connecting
9
10 with leadership theory, to explore the effects of leaders' avoidance behavior on followers'
11
12 attitudes, is justifiable given the importance of the leader's role in team conflicts as well as the
13
14 conceptual and behavioral link between leadership avoidance and laissez-faire leadership
15
16 (Saeed, Almas, Anis-ul-Haq, & Niazi, 2014).
17

18
19
20 During this investigation, competing hypotheses are presented that match the different
21
22 approaches to leadership found across different cultures (e.g. the global appreciation of certain
23
24 leadership styles as opposed to culturally-specific implicit leadership). There is evidence for
25
26 both generalizability and culture-specificity in leaders' behavior and/or leadership (Gelfand,
27
28 Erez, & Aycan, 2007). The Global Leadership and Organizational Effectiveness (GLOBE)
29
30 project, for example, has found that followers in all of the cultures studied appreciate
31
32 transformational (charismatic/inspirational) leadership (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, &
33
34 Gupta, 2004). At the same time, some styles of leadership that are perceived as negative or
35
36 detrimental to performance in a North American context are perceived as neutral or even
37
38 positive in other cultures (Dorfman, Hanges, & Brodbeck, 2004). On the other hand, extant
39
40 leadership and conflict research in China is also unclear in its conclusions about the possible
41
42 effects of a leader's avoidance behavior on followers' attitudes. The cultural expectation of
43
44 paternalistic leadership, where the leader is strongly involved in the follower's affairs, may
45
46 lead to disapproval of the leader's avoidance; however, studies show that avoidance is one of
47
48 the most commonly used conflict resolution styles in China (Ohbuchi & Atsumi, 2010;
49
50 Tjosvold & Sun, 2002).
51
52
53

54
55 This paper aims to contribute to the literature on conflict management, leadership, and
56
57 cross-cultural management. Firstly, it contributes to the leadership literature as it joins the
58
59
60

growing attempts to consider conflict management in the context of leadership. In doing this, the paper also challenges the traditionally one-dimensional view of laissez-faire leadership, which has mostly been negative. Secondly, this paper aims to contribute to the conflict management literature, especially in relation to avoidance. The findings in this paper indicate whether or not avoidance could be a sustainable choice by a leader rather than a one-off strategy, and show that identifying conditions that affect the outcomes of conflict avoidance, such as culture, may be important. Finally, this paper contributes to the cross-cultural management literature. The investigation of leaders' conflict avoidance in this paper illustrates that a high power distance culture may offer important insights in terms of a leader's level of (non)involvement in his or her team.

Theoretical background and hypotheses

The notion of conflict is quite broad, since there is an extensive list of possible causes including, but not limited to, incongruent goals, attitudes, values, or beliefs (Jehn & Mannix, 2001) or incompatible activities (Deutsch, 1973). The words for conflict in Chinese (*maodun*: 矛盾; *Chongtu*: 冲突) also have very subtle meanings and this is even more the case in organizational contexts. Chinese people often relate conflict to relationship (*guanxi*: 关系). Conflict may mean a difference or disagreement over interests or loyalty; an argument, dispute, or fight; or a clash or contrast. Given such broadness and subtlety, the fact that conflict is common in the interpersonal context of teams (Rahim et al., 2000), and the various team affairs that a team leader is expected to manage, it would be challenging to constrain or limit the scope of conflicts that a leader should deal with (or avoid). Conflicts perceived by followers in a team could be caused by the leader directly (in one-to-one tensions with the leader or by negligence or lack of concern for the follower's affairs) and/or by other team members indirectly (as a result of competition over the limited resources for career

1
2
3
4 progression, or differences based on dissimilar professional and personal points of view) (e.g.
5
6 Aquino, Tripp, & Bies, 2006).
7

8
9 As one of most popular conflict resolution theories, the Dual Concern Model suggests
10 that people's choice between the different types of resolution (e.g. collaboration, compromise,
11 accommodation, domination, or avoidance) depends on the combination of their concern for
12 themselves and their concern for others (Blake & Mouton, 1964; Rahim, 1983). Of the
13 different types of resolution, avoidance is said to be a particularly passive style, with low
14 concern for both oneself and others. Consequently, avoidance as a means of dealing with
15 conflict is seen as counterproductive – it communicates mistrust, resulting in closed-
16 mindedness (cf. Folger & Skarlicki, 1998) and sub-optimal and ineffective decisions (De
17 Dreu & Gelfand, 2007; Tjosvold & Sun, 2002). This view is in line with the axiom “some
18 solution is better than no solution” of certain cultures (e.g. in North America) that show a
19 tendency to close a deal in negotiations (Cohen, 1991).
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 However, much of the conflict research from China argues that avoidance is a commonly
34 used style for handling conflict in Chinese organizations. The collectivism culture in China,
35 which emphasizes interpersonal harmony and long-term relationships, is suggested as the
36 main reason why people engage in avoidance (Ohbuchi & Atsumi, 2010; Tjosvold & Sun,
37 2002). Given such cultural differences towards conflict avoidance, a natural question would
38 be what the outcome of leaders' avoidance behavior is in China. To answer this question, this
39 paper examines the relationship between a leader's avoidance, two attitudes of followers
40 (supervisory trust and justice) and followers' emotional well-being, because studies show that
41 trust and justice are important followers' attitudes that are influenced by the leader's behavior
42 (cf. Tremblay, Vandenberghe, & Doucet, 2013) and that leaders also influence followers'
43 emotions (De Cremer, 2006).
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Leader avoidance as ineffective leadership behavior

Bass and Avolio (1997) identify three general forms of leadership: transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership. It is suggested that the presence, rather than absence, of leadership is important in conflict situations. For example, a transformational leader encourages subordinates to move beyond individual interests in conflict situations and to build a cooperative approach to conflict resolution (Dionne, Yammarino, Atwater, & Spangler, 2004). Transactional leaders resolve conflict situations and their accompanying ambiguity and uncertainty (Lind & Van den Bos, 2002; Tremblay et al., 2013). In a similar vein, the functional approach to leadership emphasizes the leader's instructional and regulatory nature (Kozan, 1997; Kozlowski & Ilgen, 2006), and a team leader is expected to "manage" rather than "avoid" the affairs of the team, including team conflicts.

Laissez-faire leadership implies an absence of feedback and involvement, and hence a lack of supportive leadership, and this may lead to a lack of conflict management (Skogstad, Einarsen, Torsheim, Aasland, & Hetland, 2007) or to leader avoidance. Put differently, if a leader fails to respond to team conflicts, by using avoidance tactics, the leader may be perceived as being absent and failing in his or her responsibility. Conflict research also shows that subordinates generally prefer problem-solving conflict management styles (e.g., De Dreu, 1997) and that they are even willing to comply with dominant behavior by a formal leader or manager (cf. Tost, Gino, & Larrick, 2013). Overall, studies on conflict management styles illustrate that avoidance has a negative impact on followers' perceptions (e.g. Desivilya & Yagil, 2005; Roloff & Ifert, 2000).

Looking at the case of China, paternalistic leadership has been considered as the indigenous, pervasive, and effective leadership style in Chinese organizations (Cheng, Chou, Huang, Wu, & Farh, 2004; Farh & Cheng, 2000) affected by Confucian values. Paternalistic leadership, based on the prevalent notion of the "work family", (Farh & Cheng, 2000; Farh,

1
2
3
4 Liang, Chou, & Cheng, 2008; Wong, 2012; Wu, Huang, Li, & Liu, 2012), blurs personal and
5
6 work domains for most of the Chinese workforce, and leads to a natural deference to authority.
7
8 This would mean that it is natural for the leader in China to be strongly involved in a wide
9
10 range of affairs, including handling conflicts. Therefore it would not be considered effective
11
12 in China for a leader to show an avoidance approach to conflicts.
13
14

15 *Leader avoidance as an effective form of leadership behavior in China*

16
17 On the other hand, the collectivism culture, which emphasizes interpersonal harmony
18
19 and long-term relationships, is suggested as the main reason why people engage in avoidance
20
21 behaviors in China (Ohbuchi & Atsumi, 2010; Tjosvold & Sun, 2002). Despite being
22
23 common in China, empirical studies show that avoidance is sub-optimal for an individual's
24
25 co-workers because the individual chooses to avoid conflict represses his or her true feelings
26
27 and ignores hidden problems between them (e.g. Tjosvold, 2008; Tjosvold & Sun, 2002).
28
29 Therefore, while collectivism may explain why avoidance behavior is chosen when amongst
30
31 colleagues, it does not seem to suggest that avoidance is effective in Chinese organizations.
32
33 This paper thus considers whether another cultural value prevalent in China, high power
34
35 distance, may explain how leader avoidance influences followers' attitudes. Power distance is
36
37 the degree of power that authorities have over subordinates, and it is closely related to the
38
39 followers' attitudes towards authority and leadership (Hofstede, 1991; Kirkman, Chen, Farh,
40
41 Chen, & Lowe, 2009; Schaubroeck, Lam, & Cha, 2007). When someone holds a high-status
42
43 position, the position itself affects expectations about that individual's behavior in group
44
45 contexts (Ridgeway & Berger, 1986), and this would be even more evident in high power
46
47 distance cultures like China (Farh & Cheng, 2000; House et al., 2004).
48
49
50
51

52
53 Implicit leadership theories suggest that contextual/cultural influences determine
54
55 leadership dynamics (e.g., Dvir & Shamir, 2003; Howell & Shamir, 2005). A revisiting of the
56
57 notion of paternalistic leadership may help to illustrate the delicate issue of the effects of
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 power on subordinates. Farh and colleagues argue that paternalistic leadership (Farh et al.,
5
6 2008; Farh & Cheng, 2000) combines strong discipline and authority (authoritarianism) as
7
8 well as fatherly benevolence and moral integrity (morality), which could be quite paradoxical.
9
10 Authoritarian leadership refers to a style of behavior in which the leader asserts absolute
11
12 authority and control over subordinates and demands unquestioning obedience from them. In
13
14 benevolent leadership, the leader's behavior demonstrates individualized, holistic concern for
15
16 subordinates' personal or familial well-being. Moral leadership can be broadly depicted as a
17
18 leadership style that demonstrates superior personal virtues, self-discipline, and unselfishness
19
20 (Farh & Cheng, 2000).
21
22
23

24 Of these different leadership behaviors, the moral features of paternalistic leadership
25
26 could have important implications for perceptions of a leader's conflict avoidance. In contrast
27
28 to the view of leaders in the West, who are expected to be exceptional individuals or heroes
29
30 who lead the way, make key decisions, and energize subordinates (Kuttner, 2011), moral
31
32 paternalistic leadership places a leader in a more humble position that is centered on others.
33
34 Moral leadership behavior in the Chinese context is even more important for employees,
35
36 because of the long history of autocratic rule and substantial power asymmetry between
37
38 supervisors and subordinates (Yang, Mossholder, & Peng, 2009). The *junzi* (moral) leader
39
40 wins others over by his or her virtue (Ip, 2009), and being *junzi* means demonstrating self-
41
42 discipline by treating subordinates politely and by not abusing one's power (Wu et al., 2012).
43
44
45

46 "Face" (or self-image) is another cultural notion that should be considered in connection
47
48 with the perception of a leader's conflict avoidance. Face represents the positive social value a
49
50 person effectively claims for himself or herself (Goffman, 1959) and it becomes a particularly
51
52 salient concern in conflict (Peng & Tjosvold, 2011). Contrary to conventional claims that
53
54 avoidance behaviors are caused by a low concern for others, high concern for the other's face
55
56 and for mutual face could result in the "facework" that is avoidance in China (Ohbuchi &
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Atsumi, 2010; Tjosvold & Sun, 2002). Similarly, Peng and Tjosvold (2011) conceptualize
5
6 conflict avoidance: obliging and accommodating are viewed as sub-strategies of avoidance,
7
8 highlighting their commonality with other concerns. Hence leaders' conflict avoidance
9
10 behaviors in China are considered to be effective.
11

12
13
14
15 The parallel arguments illustrated so far are in favor of both negative and positive
16
17 connotations of leaders' avoidance behavior in China. Since individuals attribute the causes
18
19 underlying another person's behavior by observing that behavior (Kelley, 1972), the effects of
20
21 a leader's avoidance behavior may be determined by how it is observed and perceived by his
22
23 or her subordinates (cf. Gardner, Avolio, & Walumbwa, 2005). Depending on the follower's
24
25 causal attributions, leader avoidance may be viewed as the result of negligence/ignorance or
26
27 as the result of concern/respect; we therefore now present competing hypotheses associating
28
29 leaders' avoidance behaviors with followers' attitudes and well-being, without making any
30
31 assumption about which attribution a follower might make.
32
33
34
35
36

37 *Leader avoidance behavior and subordinates' attitudes in China*

38
39 Conflict management relates to justice, which is a central concern in China (Fields, Pang
40
41 & Chiu, 2000; Greenberg, 1990). The negative consequences of a manager's avoidance may
42
43 be due to the accompanying uncertainty and ambiguity (cf. Desivilya & Yagil, 2005; Roloff
44
45 & Ifert, 2000). This state of uncertainty prompts an increased desire on the part of the
46
47 employee to seek justice-related information (Strom, Sears, & Kelly, 2014; Yang, 2015a). For
48
49 example, when employees experience high levels of role ambiguity (e.g. a high level of
50
51 conflict), they are highly attuned to cues from their supervisors (Ashford & Cummings, 1983).
52
53 A leader's avoidance may amplify, rather than decrease, the initial ambiguity caused by the
54
55 conflict, and the subsequent increased uncertainty induces anxiety and leads the follower to
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 question the fairness and trustworthiness of the authority figure (Lind & Van den Bos, 2002).
5
6 Similarly, perceptions of fairness are significantly related to whether the decision maker gives
7
8 consideration to others' input or voice, regardless of the degree of control those individuals
9
10 have over the decision outcome (Bobocel & Zdaniuk, 2005). Subordinates' voices are most
11
12 likely to be heard via accommodation and compromise in conflict-handling, whereas leader
13
14 avoidance may not allow followers the opportunity to react and express their voices.
15
16

17
18 Trust can also be affected by conflict (Porter & Lilly, 1996), as it involves perceptions of
19
20 risk and issues of dependency (Kramer & Tyler, 1996). Trust in a supervisor reflects
21
22 subordinates' evaluations of their manager's trustworthiness on the basis of their interactions
23
24 with the manager (Hempel, Zhang, & Tjosvold, 2009). Treating conflict as a mutual problem
25
26 that needs to be solved can promote leadership trust (Hempel et al., 2009), whereas feelings of
27
28 anxiety and uncertainty are associated with low levels of trust (Kenworthy & Jones, 2009). In
29
30 addition, despite it being common in China, avoidance behavior has been found to be
31
32 ineffectual in strengthening interpersonal relationships (Tjosvold, 2008). Following these
33
34 lines of argument, we present our first set of hypotheses:
35
36

37
38 *Hypothesis 1a: Leaders' avoidance is negatively associated with justice perception in*
39
40 *Chinese organizations.*

41
42 *Hypothesis 2a: Leaders' avoidance is negatively associated with supervisory trust in*
43
44 *Chinese organizations.*

45
46
47
48 By contrast, if we rely on the earlier culture-based arguments about the morality of
49
50 leadership in China, the power distance dimension is the most relevant in considering justice
51
52 given the role of justice in authorities and organizations in China (Lee, Pillutla, & Law, 2000).
53
54 A negative correlation has been found between authoritarianism and justice (Aryee, Budhwar,
55
56 & Chen, 2002), since authoritarian leaders are less likely to show respect for subordinates
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 (Wu et al., 2012). Power dependence (Emerson, 1972) restrains people from expressing
5
6 themselves freely to the party with more power (cf. Huo, Lam, & Chen, 2012). In this vein,
7
8 even a low degree of assertiveness by a leader, including accommodation or integration, could
9
10 be considered by the subordinates to be the leader imposing his or her views, which is not fair
11
12 or just for Chinese subordinates. In comparison, avoidance by a leader could be seen as
13
14 deference towards subordinates and as a gesture triggered by face concerns for them. This
15
16 could be perceived as a sign of the leader's integrity and self-discipline, because the leader
17
18 restrains himself or herself from imposing on his or her subordinates (as an authoritarian
19
20 leader would do), and consequently as justice.
21
22
23

24 Leaders' moral behavior is a critical determinant of their trustworthiness and thus also of
25
26 subordinates' trust in their leaders (cf. Cheng et al., 2004; Farh & Cheng, 2000; Wu et al.,
27
28 2012). There are three antecedents of trustworthiness in the organizational setting: integrity
29
30 (adherence to a set of acceptable principles), benevolence (empathy), and ability (Mayer,
31
32 Davis, & Schoorman, 1995). Integrity and unselfishness (benevolence) are key characteristics
33
34 of moral and ethical leaders (Brown, Treviño, & Harrison, 2005). By contrast, absolute
35
36 authority and control over subordinates may make subordinates feel uneasy and oppressed (cf.
37
38 Wu et al., 2012), and this has been shown to be associated with low levels of trust (Farh &
39
40 Cheng, 2000; Farh, Cheng, Chou, & Chu, 2006). The challenge of balancing pervasive
41
42 authoritarian leadership with trust in China is also supported by various surveys illustrating a
43
44 low level of trust (lower than 10%) in supervisors who typically engage in authoritarian styles
45
46 (Li, 2005; Wu & Xiao, 2011). A leader's avoidance or an unimposing style by a leader on the
47
48 other hand, could be perceived as a sign of respect and of sensitivity to the subordinate's face.
49
50 Such perceived sensitivity and integrity can build faith, and subsequently trust, in
51
52 subordinates. Our second set of hypotheses is:
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 *Hypothesis 1b: Leaders' avoidance is positively associated with perceptions of justice in*
5
6 *Chinese organizations.*

7
8 *Hypothesis 2b: Leaders' avoidance is positively associated with trust in supervisors in*
9
10 *Chinese organizations.*

11 12 13 14 15 ***Leader avoidance and subordinates' emotional well-being in China***

16
17 Emotion occurs from judgment about how the environment affects an individual
18
19 (Lazarus, 1991). A situation where there is a potential for conflict could be emotionally laden
20
21 with negative emotions of frustration, fear, and anxiety (Bodtker & Jameson, 2001). There are
22
23 significant correlations between (interpersonal) conflicts and frustration, depression, and job
24
25 dissatisfaction in both China and the US (Liu, Spector, & Shi, 2007), and prolonged conflicts
26
27 for which the leader exhibits avoidance behavior may not resolve these negative feelings.
28
29 Research also indirectly shows the challenges of containing negative emotions when the
30
31 leader adopts avoidance or laissez-faire leadership in situations of team conflict. For example,
32
33 a self-managed group and/or a group where the leader shows hands-off leader behavior may
34
35 not be well equipped for containing conflict once a relationship conflict is sparked (e.g.
36
37 Langfred, 2007). In fact, laissez-faire leadership itself could be a root cause of specific
38
39 workplace stressors including frustration, psychological distress, and burnout within the
40
41 workgroup (Kelloway, Francis, & Montgomery, 2005; Skogstad et al., 2007).
42
43
44
45

46 Emotional leadership as a component of the transformational leadership style also
47
48 encourages a leader to become involved in conflict management and the management of
49
50 emotions in team processes (Ayoko & Callan, 2010). Effective team leaders are good at
51
52 managing negative events, including conflicts (Pirolo-Merlo, Hartel, Mann, & Hirst, 2002). In
53
54 a similar vein, many studies have illustrated the challenges of unresolved conflicts, which lead
55
56 to reduced interaction and to behavioral disintegration (Jehn, 1994; Li & Hambrick, 2005). If
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 avoidance means that bad news is unexplained, it may lead employees to withdraw and
5
6 engage in retaliatory behavior (e.g. Aquino, Tripp, & Bies, 2001). This may be the result of
7
8 negative emotions not only from the unresolved conflict itself but also from the leader's
9
10 avoidance behavior. As emotional status is an important reflection of emotional well-being,
11
12 the first of our final set of hypotheses is:

13
14
15 *Hypothesis 3a: Leaders' avoidance is negatively associated with the emotional well-*
16
17 *being of subordinates in Chinese organizations.*
18
19

20
21
22 On the other hand, uncertainty management theory (Lind & Van den Bos, 2002) suggests
23
24 two different sources of uncertainty: informational (cognitive) uncertainty, and personal (self)
25
26 uncertainty (See, 2009). While both types of uncertainty may cause negative emotions,
27
28 personal uncertainty exerts a stronger influence on subordinates as it stems from self-doubt (cf.
29
30 See, 2009). Studies illustrate that authoritarian leadership is likely to induce fear and anxiety
31
32 (Farh & Cheng, 2000; Farh et al., 2006), even though an authoritarian leader may reduce
33
34 subordinates' cognitive uncertainty because of his or her clear direction and orders (Wu et al.,
35
36 2012). The fear and anxiety may arise because the authoritarian leader adversely triggers
37
38 subordinates' self-uncertainty and threatens their sense of self-determination and personal
39
40 control. Conversely, the fact that Chinese workers tend to be at ease with ambiguity
41
42 (Westwood, Sparrow, & Leung, 2001) could suggest that a leader's avoidance may reduce
43
44 self-uncertainty and may be in line with subordinates' desire for autonomy (cf. Deci & Ryan,
45
46 1985). Free from control or a sense of external pressure by the leader's non-involvement,
47
48 subordinates are free to exercise some control and to enhance their efficacy and self-belief
49
50 when handling challenges (cf. Gagné & Deci, 2005). Therefore, the leader's avoidance may
51
52 reduce the negative emotions associated with self-uncertainty. The second of this final set of
53
54 hypotheses is:
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 *Trust.* We used the 3-item measurement from Schoorman and Ballinger (2006) to
5
6 measure trust. Each item was scored on a 7-point Likert scale from “1=strongly disagree” to
7
8 “7=strongly agree”. Sample items included “My supervisor keeps my interests in mind when
9
10 making decisions”. The scale showed an internal consistency value of .65.

11
12 *Justice.* We employed the 6-item measurement developed by Niehoff and Mooreman
13
14 (Niehoff & Moorman, 1993) to measure procedural justice. Each item was noted on a 7-point
15
16 Likert scale from “1=strongly disagree” to “7=strongly agree. Sample items included “Job
17
18 decisions are made by my supervisor in an unbiased manner”. The scale showed an internal
19
20 consistency value of .83.
21
22

23
24 *Emotional well-being.* Emotional well-being can be measured by evaluating the absence
25
26 of negative emotions including anxiety and depression. The 6-item measurement for anxiety
27
28 and 6-item measurement for depression from Spell and Arnold (2007) were used to measure
29
30 anxiety and depression respectively. Respondents were asked to rate each item in terms of
31
32 how their jobs had made them feel in the past few weeks based on a 5-point Likert scale:
33
34 1=Never, 2=Some of the time, 3=Much of the time, 4=Most of the time, and 5=All of the time.
35
36 Sample items for anxiety included “relaxed”, “anxious” and “worried”, and the scale showed
37
38 an internal consistency value of .83. Sample items for depression included “enthusiastic”,
39
40 “depressed” and “miserable”, and the scale showed an internal consistency value of .84.
41
42
43

44 *Control variables.* Older people may tend not to avoid conflict. Women are more
45
46 sensitive to perceptions of procedural justice than men (Sweeney & McFarlin, 1997). On the
47
48 other hand, the results of Farh and colleagues (Farh, Earley, & Lin, 1997) showed that the
49
50 relationship between procedural justice and citizenship behaviors was weaker for women than
51
52 for men. People who work in the same company for longer may become less conflict-avoiding.
53
54 Team size may also influence conflict avoidance behavior, trust, and justice. Hence age,
55
56 gender (1=male, 0=female), length of service in the company, and team size were included as
57
58
59
60

control variables in the analysis. To check whether different functions and industries influence the results, function and industry were also included in the control variable. Job function is measured by assigning a code for each job function (1 – general management, 2 – public relations, 3 – finance/accounting, 4 – human resources, 5 – information management, 6 – legal , 7 – manufacturing/operations, 8 - marketing, 9 – research and development , 10 - sales, 11 – supply chain, 12 - other). Industry is measured by assigning a code for each industry (1 - manufacturing, 2 – service, 3 - retail, 4 - other).

Results

Means, standard deviations and correlations are reported in Table 1. Multiple regression analysis was used to test the hypotheses using SPSS software. Table 2 presents our multiple regression analysis results. As shown in Table 2, subordinates' perceptions of their managers' conflict avoidance were positively related to justice ($b=0.331$, $p<.001$) providing support for Hypothesis 1b but not for Hypothesis 1a. Subordinates' perceptions of their managers' conflict avoidance were positively related to trust ($b=0.198$, $p<.001$) providing support for Hypothesis 2b but not for Hypothesis 2a. Subordinates' perceptions of their managers' conflict avoidance were negatively related to anxiety ($b=-0.158$, $p<.05$) and depression ($b=-0.221$, $p<.001$) providing support for Hypothesis 3b but not for Hypothesis 3a.

Insert Table 1 and 2 about here

In addition, we found that one of the control variables – team size – is positively related to both trust ($b = 0.322$, $p<.001$) and justice ($b = 0.256$, $p<.001$). In other words, the larger the team, the higher the level of justice and trust for subordinates. The positive association between larger team size and subordinates' attitudes is in line with our finding suggesting the positive effects of leader avoidance or laissez-faire leadership: when the team is larger, it is

1
2
3
4 harder for the leader to be involved and control each member of the team. Length of service in
5
6 the company is negatively related to justice ($b = -0.226, p < .05$) and positively related to
7
8 depression ($b = 0.311, p < .01$). These findings suggest that as employees' length of service
9
10 with their company grows, they tend to develop cynical attitudes about organizational justice.
11
12 This could be because the more the employee knows about the system, the more critical he or
13
14 she becomes. Despite years of research on the effects of gender on reactions to injustice, there
15
16 is no agreement on the direction of these effects (cf. Lee et al., 2000). In our study, gender is
17
18 not found to relate to justice or trust, but is negatively related to depression ($b = -0.260,$
19
20 $p < .05$), indicating that male respondents tend to have lower levels of depression compared to
21
22 their female counterparts.
23
24

25 26 **Discussion**

27
28 The main purpose of this research is to examine the effects of leaders' conflict avoidance
29
30 on followers' attitudes and followers' emotional well-being in Chinese organizations.
31
32 Competing hypotheses are presented as a result of the (implicit) inconsistent positions
33
34 concerning leaders' avoidance behavior in China. The findings in this paper are intriguing, in
35
36 that they suggest there are positive relationships between leaders' avoidance and followers'
37
38 attitudes and emotional well-being, which are different from the conventional negative view
39
40 about leadership avoidance in a Western context. The findings suggest that, in China, a team
41
42 leader's avoidance or lack of intervention in a conflict situation can be effective in achieving
43
44 positive attitudes and emotions among subordinates.
45
46
47

48
49 Among the different cultural values in China, the value that is the most pertinent in
50
51 relation to leadership and leader behavior is high power distance since the clear hierarchical
52
53 distinctions between a manager and his or her subordinates in China influence the attribution
54
55 process of the subordinates and consequently shape their attitudes toward certain leadership
56
57 behaviors. Because leaders in China have more power, they could use their power in their
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 own favor in conflict situations. By contrast, a team leader's avoidance behavior in a conflict
5
6 situation may suggest that the leader is neutral (there is positive procedural justice), and that
7
8 s/he is demonstrating integrity and morality, restraining himself or herself from the possible
9
10 abuse of power (there is positive supervisory trust), and there is therefore a low level of
11
12 negative emotions associated with the leader's avoidance. The findings from our study
13
14 suggest that leaders' avoidance is effective in China, a culture where the power distance is
15
16 high.
17

18
19 To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to examine empirically, in a single
20
21 study, the relationships between a team leader's avoidance behavior and his or her
22
23 subordinates' perceptions of justice, supervisory trust, and emotional well-being. This is
24
25 rather surprising given the widespread of avoidance behavior in China (Ohbuchi & Atsumi,
26
27 2010; Tjosvold & Sun, 2002). The positive effects of a leader's avoidance found in this paper
28
29 are intriguing, as it has been suggested that avoidance behavior amongst team members has
30
31 negative consequences at work (De Dreu & Gelfand, 2007) despite being a culturally
32
33 accepted behavior in China (Ohbuchi & Atsumi, 2010; Tjosvold & Sun, 2002).
34
35
36

37 *Theoretical implications*

38
39 This paper contributes to the literature on conflict management, leadership, and cross-
40
41 cultural management. First of all, it joins the growing attempts to consider conflict
42
43 management in the context of leadership. About four decades ago, Burns (1978) stated that
44
45 conflicts offer managers the opportunity to display leadership, as managers can exploit
46
47 conflicts to improve both relationships and efficiency at work. The "conflict-specialist-as-
48
49 leader" theory has a prominent role in shaping leadership dynamics (Kuttner, 2011), and
50
51 therefore conflict management research could inform our understanding of effective
52
53 leadership (Chen et al., 2005; Tjosvold, 2008). However, until now the relevance of leaders'
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 conflict avoidance to leadership remains uncharted territory. Our paper sails into this territory
5
6 and sheds some light on the understanding of leadership avoidance in team conflict situations.
7

8
9 Our findings challenge the one-dimensional view of laissez-faire leadership. Although
10 very few studies have addressed this leadership style, they have mostly found its effect to be
11 negative (Hinkin & Schriesheim, 2008; Judge & Piccolo, 2004). The positive relationship
12 found in this study between a leader's avoidance behavior and the attitudes of his or her
13 followers suggest the possible effectiveness of laissez-faire leadership and the need for a
14 context-dependent application of theories on leadership and leadership behaviors (Yang,
15 2015b). Our findings reveal the possible benefits of a "non-involved" leader, while most
16 leadership research has emphasized the importance of the leader's involvement, especially in
17 team conflict situations (Bass, 1990).
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 This paper contributes to the understanding of the intricate influence of cultural values
29 on conflict avoidance in the context of leadership by considering power distance and its
30 relevance to leadership and leader behavior in China. To date, cross-cultural studies have
31 argued that avoidance is a common conflict resolution style in China because of the country's
32 collectivist values (e.g. Tjosvold & Sun, 2002). However, empirical evidence has shown the
33 negative consequences of conflict avoidance, especially in team conflict situations (e.g.
34 Tjosvold, 2008). Along with an understanding of the cross-cultural leadership literature
35 discussing individualism and collectivism (e.g. Schaubroeck et al., 2007), the investigation of
36 leader avoidance in this paper shows that high power distance value, which is closely related
37 to the leadership process (e.g. as a moderator: Kirkman et al., 2009; Schaubroeck et al., 2007),
38 may offer interesting insights for a leader in terms of his or her level of (non)involvement in a
39 team.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54
55 This paper also contributes to the growing body of research that takes a balanced
56 approach to understanding the motivations for conflict avoidance (e.g. Roloff & Ifert, 2000;
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Tjosvold & Sun, 2002). This paper appreciates the complexity of avoidance as a conflict-
5
6 handling style (cf. Peng & Tjosvold, 2011; Tjosvold & Sun, 2002; Wang, Fink, & Cai, 2012)
7
8 by illustrating the positive outcomes of leader avoidance. We highlight the benefits of moving
9
10 away from the conventional view of avoidance, which has mainly negative connotations. The
11
12 findings in this paper also indicate that avoidance could be a sustainable choice for leaders
13
14 rather than merely a one-off strategy for cooling-off and dealing with trivial issues. Extending
15
16 the positive findings in this paper by identifying the conditions that affect the outcomes of
17
18 conflict avoidance may have important practical as well as theoretical value (cf. Roloff & Ifert,
19
20 2000).
21
22

23 24 *Practical implications*

25
26 Various surveys continue to reveal that managers perceive dealing with conflict as one of
27
28 their most difficult tasks (Skjorshammer, 2001), and the challenge of this task is multiplied
29
30 when managers and employees have different cultures and values (cf. Geddes & Konrad,
31
32 2003). The findings from our study suggest possible ways for non-Chinese managers to
33
34 handle conflicts in a way that establishes trust with their Chinese subordinates, fosters their
35
36 positive attitudes and cultivates their emotional well-being.
37
38

39
40 First, they need to be sensitive about cultural values, particularly the value of high power
41
42 distance. An understanding of the influence of this cultural value on the perception of Chinese
43
44 people regarding conflict and justice, and consequently on their trust and emotional well-
45
46 being, informs managers of the leadership behaviors that can be effective in China. Our
47
48 results show that avoidance of conflict could be perceived to be effective by Chinese
49
50 subordinates because it could mean the leader not imposing his or her own position, show his
51
52 or her concern for face, and could be a sign of respect. Managing conflict effectively in
53
54 different cultures requires managers to have strong cultural agility (Caligiuri, 2013).
55
56

57
58 Second, managers need to be aware of how their style influences their approach to
59
60

1
2
3
4 managing conflict. Knowledge of their leadership style helps leaders to be aware of their
5
6 natural tendencies when faced with a conflict situation, and of how they can adapt their style
7
8 to different situations. Similarly, our findings suggest the possibility that a laissez-faire
9
10 leadership style and/or avoidance approach to conflict could be effective in China. Foreign
11
12 managers could, therefore, skillfully use avoidance or non-intervention in their management
13
14 to be effective in managing their Chinese subordinates. Conflict avoidance could be a
15
16 sustainable rather than a one-off strategy by a leader.
17

18
19
20 Third, it is possible that conflict avoidance and laissez-faire leadership could also work
21
22 in cultures other than China. Indeed, a very recent survey among the readers of *Harvard*
23
24 *Business Review* revealed that 10% of them *never* ask colleagues to either stop or change
25
26 behavior that bothers them; 24% of them said that when they were upset with someone at
27
28 work, they *rarely* let the person know; 26% of them said that when they disagreed with
29
30 someone, they *often hint* at it, rather than objecting outright. Only 28% of them said they
31
32 *always spoke up* when they felt that they had been misunderstood (Goulston, 2015). The
33
34 readers of *Harvard Business Review* come from all over the world. The fact that 34% of them
35
36 never or rarely communicate about conflict is quite intriguing, as it suggests that avoidance is
37
38 very common at work. In this regard, avoidance could be adopted by managers in many
39
40 places outside China, especially in countries with a high power distance culture.
41
42
43

44
45 Lastly, a leader should understand how his or her behavior in general influences the trust,
46
47 the perception of justice and the well-being of his or her subordinates. Organizations whose
48
49 managers and leaders create an atmosphere of fairness and trust have reported positive
50
51 organizational outcomes such as reduced turnover and absenteeism, increased employee
52
53 motivation, and greater organizational commitment (e.g. Padgett & Morris, 2005).
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Limitations and future research

Since the constructs that were examined in our study are individual perceptions, attitudes and emotions, the data were collected using a self-report questionnaire. According to self-perception theories, people are often active observers of their own attitudes, emotions, and behaviors and can more accurately measure their own attitudes than those of other people (Shrauger & Osberg, 1981). However, common method variance can be a concern when self-report questionnaires are used to collect data from the same participants at one-point time (Chang, Van Witteloostuijn, & Eden, 2010). To minimize common method variance, we carefully designed our study in line with the suggestions made by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, and Podsakoff (2012). For this study, conflict avoidance, trust, and procedural justice are very different constructs, and their measurements also differ. To control common method variance, the questions in the survey were randomly ordered (Murray, Kotabe, & Zhou, 2005), and some items were negatively rated. The questionnaire was designed to be as short as possible, by including only necessary questions, in order to avoid respondent fatigue. In addition, respondents were assured of the anonymity and confidentiality of the study, that there was no right or wrong answers, and that they should answer as honestly as possible. Finally, a post hoc Harman one-factor analysis was used to check whether the variance in the data could be largely attributed to a single factor, which was not the case. Some scholars believe that properly developed multi-trait, self-report instruments are resistant to the method variance problem (e.g., Spector, 1987), but others are less supportive of this view (e.g., Williams, Cote, & Buckley, 1989). Nonetheless, future research could collect data from different sources to better manage common method variance.

This study has adapted scales of conflict avoidance, procedural justice, and supervisory trust that have been developed in Western settings. However, the internal consistency value for the conflict avoidance scale is only moderate (although it is within an acceptable range).

1
2
3
4 This may be due to the use of non-indigenous scales, with the cultural and translation
5
6 challenges of capturing the full meaning in a Chinese context. The survey also revised the
7
8 wording to reflect the broad nature of conflicts at team level that were avoided by a leader
9
10 (e.g. 'My supervisor tries to avoid unpleasant exchanges with our team'), which is different
11
12 from the original measure at dyad level (e.g. 'I try to avoid unpleasant exchanges with my
13
14 supervisor'), and this may be the cause of the moderate reliability. Even though we believe
15
16 this approach allows us to explore leaders' avoidance in the context of leadership, a future
17
18 study would benefit from a survey that gave more focused attention to particular types and
19
20 levels of conflicts and subsequent conflict avoidance, as well as refining the concepts to suit a
21
22 Chinese setting better (cf. Wong, 2012).
23
24

25
26 Moreover, since this paper has referred to laissez-faire leadership, a future study could be
27
28 conducted with the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-5X) for the laissez-faire
29
30 leadership scale (Bass & Avolio, 1997; Antonakis, Avolio & Sivasubramaniam, 2003). At the
31
32 same time, adapting the MLQ scale should also be done with caution, given its current
33
34 condition that places laissez-faire leadership at the opposite end of the spectrum from
35
36 transformational and/or transactional leadership, in addition to describing it as the absence of
37
38 leadership and as counterproductive leadership (Bass and Avolio, 1997; Hinkin &
39
40 Schriesheim, 2008; Judge & Piccolo, 2004). On this basis, most studies on laissez-faire
41
42 leadership have found it to have negative effects on followers, and there have been only a
43
44 limited number studies exploring it (e.g. Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & van Engen, 2003;
45
46 Kelloway et al., 2005). Therefore, some urge the need for a more balanced and neutral
47
48 approach as well as new instruments for measuring laissez-faire leadership, to gain a better
49
50 understanding of it (Yang, 2015b). Nonetheless, measuring both a leader's conflict avoidance
51
52 and laissez-faire leadership in a single study would offer initial insights.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Finally, it is worth noting that although our logic was built on paternalistic Chinese
5 leadership, especially moral leadership, in relation to leaders' avoidance, the paper did not
6 directly measure these relationships. Although this reasoning helps us to build the relationship
7 between leaders' avoidance and subordinates' attitudes, future research should explore the
8 association between the leader's avoidance and moral paternalistic leadership directly.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 **Conclusion**

18
19 Our empirical findings show that, in China, leaders' conflict avoidance behavior is
20 positively related to their subordinates' attitudes and emotional well-being. The possible
21 explanation of these relationships is the high power distance culture in China. Our findings
22 highlight the importance of cultural contingency when considering leaders' behavior, by
23 illustrating the possible benefits of a leader's conflict avoidance, or laissez-faire leadership, in
24 team conflicts, situations in which the leader's involvement is traditionally suggested to be
25 important.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Reference

- Alexander, S. and Ruderman, M., (1987), "The Role of Procedural and Distributive Justice in Organizational Behavior", *Social Justice Research*, Vol. 1, pp. 177-198.
- Antonakis, J., Avolio, B. J. and Sivasubramaniam, N., (2003), "Context and leadership: An examination of the nine-factor full-range leadership theory using the multifactor leadership questionnaire", *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 14, pp. 261-295.
- Aquino, K., Tripp, T. M. and Bies, R. J., (2001), "How employees respond to personal offense: The effects of blame attribution, victim status, and offender status on revenge and reconciliation in the workplace", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 86, pp. 52-59.
- Aquino, K., Tripp, T. M., and Bies, R. J., (2006), "Getting even or moving on? Power, procedural justice, and types of offense as predictors of revenge, forgiveness, reconciliation, and avoidance in organizations", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 91, pp. 653-658.
- Aryee, S., Budhwar, P. S., and Chen, Z. X., (2002), "Trust as a mediator of the relationship between organizational justice and work outcomes: Test of a social exchange model", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 23, pp. 267-286.
- Ashford, S. J. and Cummings, L. L., (1983), "Feedback as an individual resource: Personal strategies of creating information". *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, Vol. 32, pp. 370-398.
- Ayoko, O. and Callan, V. J., (2010), "Teams' reactions to conflict and teams' task and social outcomes: The moderating role of transformational and emotional leadership", *European Journal of Management*, Vol. 28, pp. 220-235.
- Bass, B. M. and Avolio, B. J. (1997), "*Full range leadership development: Manual for the*

1
2
3
4 *multifactor leadership questionnaire*”, Mind Garden, CA.

5
6
7 Bass, B. and Bass, R., (2008), “*The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and*
8 *managerial applications*”, Free Press, New York, NJ.

9
10
11 Blake, R. R. and Mouton, J. S., (1964), “*The Managerial Grid*”, Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing
12 Company.

13
14
15
16 Bobocel, D. R. and Zdaniuk, A., (2005), “How can explanations be used to foster
17 organizational justice? ”, in J. Greenberg and J. A. Colquitt (Eds.), *Handbook of*
18 *organizational justice*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, NJ, pp. 469-498.

19
20
21 Bodtker, A. M. and Jameson, J. K., (2001), “Emotion in Conflict Formation and Its
22 Transformation: Application to Organizational Conflict Management”, *International*
23 *Journal of Conflict Management*, Vol. 12 No. 3, pp. 259 – 275.

24
25
26 Brown, M. E., Treviño, L. K. and Harrison, D., (2005), “Ethical leadership: A social learning
27 perspective for construct development and testing”, *Organizational Behavior and Human*
28 *Decision Processes*, Vol. 97, pp. 117–134.

29
30
31 Burns, J. M., (1978), “*Leadership*”, Harper and Row, New York.

32
33
34 Caligiuri, P., (2013), “Developing culturally agile global business leaders”, *Organizational*
35 *Dynamics*, Vol. 42 No. 3, pp. 175-182.

36
37
38 Chang, S. J., Van Witteloostuijn, A. and Eden, L., (2010), “From the Editors: Common method
39 variance in international business research”, *Journal of International Business Studies*,
40 Vol. 41 No. 2, pp. 178-184.

41
42
43 Chen, C. C., Chen, Y. and Xin, K., (2004), “Guanxi Practices and Trust in Management: A
44 Procedural Justice Perspective”, *Organization Science*, Vol. 15, pp. 200-209.

45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 Chen, Y., Tjosvold, D. and Fang, S., (2005), "Working with foreign managers: Conflict
5 management for effective leader relationships in China", *International Journal of Conflict*
6 *Management*, Vol. 16, pp. 265-286.
7
8
9
10
11 Cheng, B. S., Chou, L. F., Huang, M. P., Wu, T. Y. and Farh, J. L., (2004), "Paternalistic
12 leadership and subordinate reverence: Establishing a leadership model in Chinese
13 organizations", *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 7, pp. 89-117.
14
15
16
17
18
19 Cohen, R. (1991). "*Negotiation across cultures: Communication obstacles in international*
20 *diplomacy*", U.S. Institute of Peace Press, Washington, DC.
21
22
23
24 De Cremer, D., (2006), "When authorities influence followers' affect: The interactive effect of
25 procedural justice and transformational leadership", *European Journal of Work and*
26 *Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 15, pp. 322 – 351.
27
28
29
30
31 De Dreu, C. K. W. and Gelfand, M. J., (2007), "*The Psychology of Conflict and Conflict*
32 *Management in Organizations*", Lawrence Erlbaum, New York.
33
34
35
36 De Dreu, C. and Van de Vliert, E. (Eds.), (1997), "*Using conflict in organizations*", Sage,
37 Thousand Oaks, CA.
38
39
40
41 Deci, E. L. and Ryan, R. M., (1985), "*Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human*
42 *behavior*", Plenum, New York.
43
44
45
46 Desivilya, H. S. and Yagil, D., (2005), "The Role of Emotions in Conflict Management: The
47 Case of Work Teams", *International Journal of Conflict Management*, Vol. 16, pp. 55 –
48 69.
49
50
51
52
53 Deutsch, M., (1973), "*The resolution of conflict*", Yale University Press, New Haven, CT.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

management, Vol. 17 No. 2, pp. 177-193.

Dorfman, P., Hanges, P. J. and Brodbeck, F. C., (2004), "Leadership and cultural variation: The identification of culturally endorsed leadership profiles", in R. J. House, P. J. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman, and V. Gupta (Eds.), *Leadership, culture, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*, Sage Publications, Inc Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 667-718.

Dvir, T. and Shamir, B., (2003), "Follower developmental characteristics as predicting transformational leadership: A longitudinal field study", *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 14, pp. 499 - 524.

Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C. and van Engen, M. L., (2003), "Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and men", *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 129, pp. 569-591.

Emerson, R. M. (1972). "Exchange theory. Part I: Apsychological basis for social exchange", in Berger J, Zelditch M, Anderson B (Eds.), *Sociological theories in progress*, Vol. 2, Houghton-Mifflin, Boston, MA, pp. 38-57

Erdogan, B. and Liden, R. C., (2006), "Collectivism as a moderator of responses to organizational justice: Implications for leader-member exchange and ingratiation", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 27, pp. 1-17.

Farh, J. L. and Cheng, B. S., (2000), "A cultural analysis of paternalistic leadership in Chinese organizations", in J. T. Li, A. S. Tsui, and E. Weldon (Eds.), *Management and organizations in the Chinese context*, Macmillan, London, pp. 84-127.

Farh, J. L., Cheng, B. S., Chou, L. and Chu, X. P., (2006), "Authority and benevolence: employees' responses to paternalistic leadership in China", in A. S. Tsui, Y. Bian, and L.

1
2
3
4 Cheng (Eds.), *China's Domestic Private Firms: Multidisciplinary Perspectives on*
5
6 *Management and Performance*, M.E. Sharpe, New York, NY, pp. 230-260.
7

8
9 Farh, J. L., Earley, P. C. and Lin, S. C., (1997), "Impetus for Action: A Cultural Analysis of
10
11 Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Chinese Society", *Administrative*
12
13 *Science Quarterly*, Vol. 42, pp. 421-444.
14

15
16 Farh, J. L., Liang, J., Chou, L. and Cheng, B. S., (2008), "Paternalistic leadership in Chinese
17
18 organizations: Research progress and future research directions", in C. C. Chen, and Y. T.
19
20 Lee (Eds.), *Business leadership in China: Philosophies, theories, and practices*,
21
22 Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, pp. 171-205.
23

24
25 Fields, D., Pang, M. Y. N. and Chiu, C., (2000), "A Comparative Field Study of the Effects of
26
27 Distributive and Procedural Justice in Hong Kong", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*,
28
29 Vol. 21 No. 5, pp. 547-562.
30

31
32 Folger, R. and Skarlicki, D. P., (1998), "A popcorn metaphor for employee aggression", in R.
33
34 W. Griffin and A. O'Leary-Kelly (Eds.), *Dysfunctional behavior in organizations: Violent*
35
36 *and deviant behavior*, JAI Press, Greenwich, CT, pp. 43-81.
37

38
39 Gagne', M. and Deci, E. L., (2005), "Self-determination theory and work motivation", *Journal*
40
41 *of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 26, pp. 331-362.
42

43
44 Gardner, W. L., Avolio, B. J. and Walumbwa, F. O. (Eds.), (2005), "*Authentic leadership*
45
46 *theory and practice: Origins, effects, and development*", Elsevier, San Diego, CA.
47

48
49 Geddes, D. and Konrad, A., (2003), "Demographic differences and reactions to performance
50
51 feedback", *Human Relations*, Vol. 56, pp. 1-29.
52

53
54 Gelfand, M. J., Erez, M. and Aycan, Z., (2007), "Cross-cultural organizational behavior",
55
56 *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. 58, pp. 1-35.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 Goffman, E., (1959), *"The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life"*, New York: Doubleday.
- 5
6 Goulston, M., (2015), "How People Communicate During Conflict", *Harvard Business Review*,
7
8
9 Vol. 93 No. 6, pp. 22-22.
- 10
11 Greenberg, J., (1990), "Organizational justice: yesterday, today, and tomorrow", *Journal of*
12
13
14
15 *Management*, Vol. 16, pp. 399-432.
- 16
17 Hempel, P. S., Zhang, Z. X. and Tjosvold, D., (2009), "Conflict Management Between and
18
19
20
21
22 Within Teams for Developing Trusting Relationships in China", *Journal of*
23
24
25
26
27
28
29 *Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 30, pp. 41-65.
- 30
31 Hinkin, T. R. and Schriesheim, C. A., (2008), "An examination of "nonleadership": From
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 laissez-faire leadership to leader reward omission and punishment omission", *Journal of*
Applied Psychology, Vol. 93, pp. 1234-1248.
- Hofstede G., (1991), *"Cultures and organizations - software of the mind"*, McGraw Hill, New
York.
- House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W. and Gupta, V., (2004), *"Leadership,*
Culture, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies", Sage Publications,
Thousand Oaks.
- Howell, J. M. and Shamir, B., (2005), "The role of followers in the charismatic leadership
process: Susceptibility, social construction, and leader empowerment", *Academy of*
Management Review, Vol. 30 No. 1, pp. 96-112.
- Huo, Y, Lam, Y. and Chen, Z., (2012), "Am I the Only One This Supervisor is Laughing at?
Effects of Aggressive Humor on Employee Strain and Addictive Behaviors", *Personnel*
Psychology, Vol. 65, pp. 859-885.
- Ip, P., (2009), "The challenge of developing a business ethics in China", *Journal of Business*

1
2
3
4 *Ethics*, Vol. 88, pp. 211-224.

5
6
7 Jehn, K., (1994), "Enhancing effectiveness: An investigation of advantages and disadvantages
8
9 of value-based intragroup conflict", *International Journal of Conflict Management*, Vol.
10
11 5, pp. 223-238.

12
13
14 Jehn, K. A. and Mannix, E. A., (2001), "The dynamic nature of conflict: A longitudinal study
15
16 of intragroup conflict and group performance", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol.
17
18 44, pp. 238–251.

19
20
21 Judge, T. A. and Piccolo, R. F., (2004), "Transformational and transactional leadership: A
22
23 meta-analytic test of their relative validity", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 89, pp.
24
25 755–768.

26
27
28 Kelley, H. H., (1972), "*Causal schemata and the attribution process*, General Learning Press,
29
30 New York.

31
32
33 Kim, W. C. and Mauborgne, R. A., (1997), "Fair process: Managing in the knowledge
34
35 economy", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 81, pp. 65–75.

36
37
38 Kirkman, B. L., Chen, G., Farh, J. L., Chen, Z. X. and Lowe, K. B., (2009), "Individual Power
39
40 Distance Orientation and Follower Reactions to Transformational Leaders: A Cross-Level,
41
42 Cross-Cultural Examination", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 52, pp.744-764.

43
44 Kelloway, E. K., Francis, L. and Montgomery, J., (2005), "*Management of occupational health
45
46 and safety*", Thomson Nelson, Toronto, ON.

47
48
49 Kenworthy, B. J. and Jones, J., (2009), "The role of group importance and anxiety in predicting
50
51 depersonalized ingroup trust", *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, Vol. 12, No. 2,
52
53 pp. 227-239.

54
55
56 Kozan, K., (1997), "Culture and conflict management: A theoretical framework", *International
57
58
59
60*

1
2
3
4 *Journal of Conflict Management*, Vol. 8, pp. 38-360.

5
6
7 Kozlowski, S. W. J. and Ilgen, D. R., (2006), "Enhancing the effectiveness of work groups and
8
9 teams", *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, Vol. 7, pp. 77-124.

10
11 Kramer, R. M. and Tyler, T. R., (1996), "*Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and*
12
13 *research*, Sage Publications, Inc, California.

14
15
16 Kuttner, R., (2011), "Conflict specialists as leaders: Revisiting the role of the conflict specialist
17
18 from a leadership perspective", *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, Vol. 29, pp. 103-126.

19
20
21 Langfred, C. W., (2007), "The downside of self-management: A longitudinal study of the
22
23 effects of conflict on trust, autonomy, and task interdependence in self-managing teams",
24
25 *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 50, pp. 885-900.

26
27
28 Lazarus, R. S., (1991), "Progress on a cognitive-motivational-relational theory of Emotion",
29
30
31 *American Psychologist*, Vol. 46, pp. 819-834.

32
33 Lee, C., Pillutla, M. and Law, K., (2000), "Power Distance, Gender and organizational justice",
34
35
36 *Journal of management*, Vol. 26, pp. 685-704.

37
38 Lefkowitz, J., (1994), "Sex-related differences in job attitudes and dispositional variables: Now
39
40 you see them", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 37, pp. 323-349.

41
42
43 Li, J. T. and Hambrick, D. C., (2005), "Factional groups: A new vantage on demographic
44
45 faultlines, conflict and disintegration in work teams", *Academy of Management Journal*,
46
47 Vol. 48, pp. 794-813.

48
49
50 Li, Y., (2005), "*The trust crisis in the organization*",
51
52 <http://www.chinahrd.net/knowledge/info/76342>, Accessed Apr. 2015

53
54
55 Lind, E. A. and Van den Bos, K., (2002), "When fairness works: Toward a general theory of
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 uncertainty management”, in B. M. Staw and R. M. Kramer (Eds.), *Research in*
5
6 *organizational behavior*, Elsevier, Boston, MA, pp.181–223.

7
8 Liu, C., Spector, P. and Shi, L., (2007), “Cross-national job stress: A quantitative and
9
10 qualitative study”, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 28, pp. 209 –239.

11
12 Maslyn, J. M. and Uhl-Bien, M., (2001), “Leader-member exchange and its dimensions:
13
14 Effects of self-effort and other's effort on relationship quality”, *Journal of Applied*
15
16 *Psychology*, Vol. 86, 697-708.

17
18
19
20 Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H. and Schoorman, F. D., (1995), “An integrative model of
21
22 organizational trust”, *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 20, pp. 709–734.

23
24
25
26 Morris, M. W., Williams, K. Y., Leung, K., Larrick, R., Mendoza, M. T., Bhatnagar, D., Li, J.,
27
28 Kondo, M., Luo, J. L. and Hu, J.-C., (1998), “Conflict Management Style: Accounting for
29
30 Cross-National Differences”, *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 29, pp. 729-
31
32 747.

33
34
35 Murray, J. Y., Kotabe, M. and Zhou, J. N., (2005), “Strategic Alliance-based Sourcing and
36
37 Market Performance: Evidence from Foreign firms Operating in China”, *Journal of*
38
39 *International Business Studies*, Vol. 36, No. 2, pp. 187-208.

40
41
42 Niehoff, B. and Moorman, R., (1993), “Justice as a mediator of the relationship between
43
44 methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior”, *Academy of*
45
46 *Management Journal*, Vol. 36, pp. 527-556.

47
48
49 Ohbuchi, K. and Atsumi, E., (2010), “Avoidance brings Japanese employees what they care
50
51 about in conflict management: Its functionality and ‘good member’ image”, *Negotiation*
52
53 *and Conflict Management Research*, Vol. 3, pp. 117–129.

54
55
56 Padgett, M. Y. and Morris, K. A., (2005), “Keeping it "All in the Family": Does Nepotism in
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 the Hiring Process Really Benefit the Beneficiary? ”, *Journal of Leadership and*
5
6 *Organizational Studies*, Vol. 11, pp. 34-45.
7

8
9 Peng, A. C. and Tjosvold, D., (2011), “Social face and avoiding conflict by Chinese employees
10
11 with Western or Chinese managers”, *Human Relations*, Vol. 64, pp. 1031-1050.
12

13
14 Pirola-Merlo, A., Hartel, C., Mann, L. and Hirst, G., (2002), “How leaders influence the impact
15
16 of affective events on team climate and performance in R&D teams”, *Leadership*
17
18 *Quarterly*, Vol. 13, pp. 561-581.
19

20
21 Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B. and Podsakoff, N. P., (2012), “Sources of Method Bias in
22
23 Social Science Research and Recommendations on How to Control It”, *Annual Review of*
24
25 *Psychology*, Vol. 63, 1, pp. 539-569.
26

27
28 Porter, T. W. and Lilly, B. S., (1996), “The Effects of Conflict, Trust, and Task Commitment
29
30 on Project Team Performance”, *International Journal of Conflict Management*, Vol. 7, pp.
31
32 361-376.
33

34
35 Rahim, M. A., (1983), “A measure of styles of handling interpersonal conflict”, *Academy of*
36
37 *Management Journal*, Vol. 26, pp. 368-376.
38

39
40 Rahim, M. A., Magner, N. R. and Shapiro, D. L., (2000), “Do justice perceptions influence
41
42 styles of handling conflict with supervisors?”, What justice perceptions precisely.
43
44 *International Journal of Conflict Management*, Vol. 11, pp. 9-31.
45

46
47 Restubog, S.L.D., Hornsey, M.J., Bordia, P. and Esposito, S. R., (2008), “Effects of
48
49 psychological contract breach on organizational citizenship behaviour: Insights from the
50
51 group value model”, *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 45 No. 8, pp. 1377-1400.
52

53
54 Ridgeway, C. L. and Berger, J., (1986), “Expectations, Legitimation, and Dominance Behavior
55
56 in Task”, *Groups, American Sociological Review*, Vol. 51, pp. 603–17.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 Roloff, M. E. and Ifert, D. E., (2000), "Conflict management through avoidance: Withholding
5 complaints, suppressing arguments, and declaring topics taboo", in S. Perronio (Ed.),
6 *Balancing the secrets of private disclosures*, Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ, pp. 151-164.
7
8
9
10
11 Saeed, T., Almas, S., Anis-ul-Haq, M. and Niazi, G., (2014), "Leadership styles: relationship
12 with conflict management styles", *International Journal of Conflict Management*, Vol. 25
13 No. 3, pp. 214-225.
14
15
16
17
18 Schaubroeck, J., Lam, S. S. K. and Cha, S. E., (2007), "Embracing transformational leadership:
19 Team values and the relationship between leader behavior and team performance", *Journal of*
20 *Applied Psychology*, Vol. 92, pp. 1020-1030.
21
22
23
24 See, K. E., (2009), Reactions to decisions with uncertain consequences: Reliance on perceived
25 fairness versus predicted outcomes depends on knowledge", *Journal of Personality and*
26 *Social Psychology*, Vol. 96, pp. 104-117.
27
28
29
30
31 Shrauger, J. S. and Osberg, T. M., (1981), "The relative accuracy of self-predictions and
32 judgments by others in psychological assessment", *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 90 No.2,
33 pp. 322-351.
34
35
36
37
38 Skjorshammer, M., (2001), "Co-operation and conflicts in a hospital: interprofessional
39 differences in perception and management of conflicts", *Journal of Interprofessional*
40 *Care*, Vol. 15, pp. 7-18.
41
42
43
44
45 Spector, P. E., (1987), "Method variance as an artifact in self-reported affect and perceptions at
46 work: Myth or significant problem?", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 72 No. 3, pp.
47 438-443.
48
49
50
51 Spell, C. and Arnold, T., (2007), "An appraisal perspective of justice, structure, and job control
52 as antecedents of psychological distress", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 28,
53 pp. 729-751.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 Skogstad, A., Einarsen, S., Torsheim, T., Aasland, M. S. and Hetland, H., (2007), “The
5
6 destructiveness of laissez-faire leadership behavior”, *Journal of Occupational Health*
7
8 *Psychology*, Vol. 12 No. 1, pp. 80-92.
9
- 10 Spell, C. S. and Arnold, T., (2007), “An appraisal perspective of justice, structure, and job
11
12 control as antecedents of psychological distress”, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*,
13
14 Vol. 28, pp. 729-751.
15
- 16 Spreitzer, G. M. and Mishra, A. K., (1999), “Giving up control without losing control”, *Group*
17
18 *and Organization Management*, Vol. 24, pp. 155-187.
19
- 20 Strom, D. L., Sears, K. L. and Kelly, K. M., (2014), “Work engagement: The roles of
21
22 organizational justice and leadership style in predicting engagement among employees”,
23
24 *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, Vol. 21 No.1, pp. 71–82.
25
26
- 27 Sweeney, P. D. and McFarlin, D. B., (1997), “Process and outcome: Gender differences in the
28
29 assessment of justice”, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 18, pp. 83-98.
30
31
- 32 Tjosvold, D., (2008), “The conflict positive organization: It depends on us”, *Journal of*
33
34 *Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 29, pp. 19-28.
35
36
- 37 Tjosvold, D. and Sun, H., (2002), “Understanding conflict avoidance: Relationship,
38
39 motivations, actions, and consequences”, *International Journal of Conflict Management*,
40
41 Vol. 13, pp. 142–164.
42
43
44
- 45 Tost, L. P., Gino, F. and Larrick, R. P., (2013), “When power makes others speechless: The
46
47 negative impact of leader power on team performance”, *Academy of Management*
48
49 *Journal*, Vol. 56, pp. 1465–1486.
50
51
- 52 Tremblay, M., Vandenberghe, C. and Doucet, O., (2013), “Relationships between leader-
53
54 contingent and non-contingent reward and punishment behaviors and subordinates’
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 perceptions of justice and satisfaction, and evaluation of the moderating influence of trust
5
6 propensity, pay level, and role ambiguity”, *Journal of Business and Psychology*, Vol. 28,
7
8 pp. 233-249.
9

10
11 Wang, Q., Fink, E. L. and Cai, D. A., (2012), “The effect of conflict goals on avoidance
12
13 strategies: What does not communicating communicate?”, *Human Communication*
14
15 *Research*, Vol. 38, pp. 222–252.
16

17
18 Westwood, R., Sparrow, P. and Leung, A., (2001), “Challenges to the psychological contract in
19
20 Hong Kong”, *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 12, pp. 621-
21
22 651.
23

24
25 Williams, L. J., Cote, J. A. and Buckley, M. R., (1989), “Lack of method variance in self-
26
27 reported affect and perceptions at work: Reality or artifact?”, *Journal of Applied*
28
29 *Psychology*, Vol.74 No. 3, pp. 462-468.
30

31
32 Wong, Y. T., (2012), “Job security and justice: Predicting employees' trust in Chinese
33
34 international joint ventures”, *The Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 23, pp.
35
36 4129-4144.
37

38
39 Wu, M., Huang, X., Li, C. and Liu, W., (2012), “Perceived interactional justice and trust-in-
40
41 supervisor as mediators for paternalistic leadership”, *Management and Organization*
42
43 *Review*, Vol. 8, pp. 97-121.
44

45
46 Wu, M. Z. and Xiao, S. N., (2011), “Survey: 86.3% respondents said they once broke their
47
48 promise”, http://zqb.cyol.com/html/2011-04/12/nw.D110000zgqnb_20110412_2-07.htm,
49
50 Accessed Apr. 2015.
51

52
53 Yang, I., (2015a), “Cross-cultural Perceptions of Clan Control in Korean Multi-National
54
55 Companies: A Conceptual Investigation of Employees’ Fairness Monitoring Based on
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Cultural Values”, *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 8 No.
5
6 26, pp. 1076-1097.
7

8
9 Yang, I., (2015b), “Positive effects about laissez faire leadership”, *Journal of Management*
10
11 *Development*, Vol. 34 No. 10, pp. 101-127.
12

13
14 Yang, J., Mossholder, K. and Peng, T. K., (2009), “Supervisory Procedural Justice Effect: The
15
16 Mediating Roles of Cognitive and Affective Trust”, *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 20,
17
18 pp. 143-154.
19

20
21 Zhang, X. A., Cao, Q. and Tjosvold, D., (2011), “Linking transformational leadership and team
22
23 performance: A conflict management approach”, *Journal of Management Studies*. Vol.
24
25 48, pp. 1586-1611.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

**Table 1 Mean, Standard Deviations and Intercorrelations
(n=245)**

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1 Team size	3.28	1.60										
2 Length in company	5.65	7.22	.181**									
3 Gender	.46	.50	.056	-.171**								
4 Age	30.75	7.91	.226**	.792**	-.064							
5 Function	4.56	3.10	-.162*	-.221**	.078	-.180**						
6 Industry	1.68	.62	-.245**	.216**	-.034	-.011	-.069					
7 Conflict avoidance	4.69	.85	.001	.031	-.008	.047	-.033	-.100				
8 Trust	4.91	.96	.353**	-.063	.078	-.035	-.103	-.269**	.212**			
9 Justice	4.98	.89	.267**	-.052	.008	.051	-.060	-.202**	.338**	.671**		
10 Anxiety	21.68	5.45	.068	-.025	-.076	-.073	.163*	-.011	-.165*	-.087	-.205**	
11 Depression	17.41	5.51	-.117	.051	-.037	-.063	.088	.072	-.222**	-.294**	-.429**	.583**

Note: Two-tailed tests.

** $p < .01$. * $p < .05$.

Table 2 Regression Analysis (n=245)

variable	Trust	Justice	Anxiety	Depression
Team size	.322 ***	.256 ***	.113	-.111
Length in company	.014	-.226 *	.099	.311 **
Gender	.056	-.032	-.090	-.003
Age	-.142	.148	-.143	-.260 *
Function	-.084	-.033	.178 **	.082
Industry	-.179 **	-.059	-.012	-.041
Conflict avoidance	0.198 ***	0.331 ***	-.0158 *	-0.221 ***
R^2	.221	.213	.278	.315

Note: Two-tailed tests.

*** $p < .001$. ** $p < .01$. * $p < .05$.