

Provincial Leaders in China: 1988 and 2011

Xiaowei Zang and Rongrong Lin

The massive leadership transition in the post-1978 era led to a major surge in elite studies among China scholars, which has greatly improved our understanding of elite mobility in the People's Republic of China (PRC).¹ Nevertheless, there are few studies of the leaders at the subnational levels (e.g., the provincial elite).² This paper partly narrows this knowledge gap by studying a dataset on two groups of provincial leaders (one held provincial leadership positions in 1988 and the other in 2011). It asks who these provincial leaders are and examines the similarities and differences in key personal attributes between them. For example, were the 2011 provincial leaders younger and more educated than their counterparts in 1988? Were there more women among the provincial elite in 2011 than in 1988? Was there an increase in minority representation in the provincial elite in 2011 compared with that in 1988? Were there more technocrats among the provincial elite in 2011 than in 1988? Were there fewer local leaders who worked in their birth province in 2011 than in 1988? Did the 1988 provincial elite and the 2011 provincial elite differ from each other in party membership seniority?

¹ Bo Zhiyue, *Chinese Provincial Leaders: Economic Performance and Political Mobility since 1949* (Armonk: M.E. Sharpe, 2002); Bo Zhiyue, *China's Elite Politics: Political Transition and Power Balancing* (Singapore: World Scientific, 2007); Bo Zhiyue, *China's Elite Politics: Governance and Democratization* (Singapore: World Scientific, 2010); Shi Chen, "Leadership Change in Shanghai: Toward the Dominance of Party Technocrats." *Asian Survey* 38/7 (1998), Pp. 671-87; Cheng Li and David Bachman, "Localism, Elitism, and Immobilism." *World Politics* 42/1 (1989), Pp. 64-94; Cheng Li and Lynn White, "Elite Transformation and Modern Change in Mainland China and Taiwan." *The China Quarterly* 121 (1990), Pp. 1-35; Victor Shih, Wei Shan and Mingxing Liu, "Gauging the Elite Political Equilibrium in the CCP." *The China Quarterly* 201 (2010), Pp. 79-103; Xiaowei Zang, *Elite Dualism and Leadership Selection in China* (London: Routledge, 2007); For Chinese publications, see 窦建文 (著), 《中共精英政治的演变: 制度化与权力转移 1978-2004》, (台北市: 无南图书出版公司, 2005); 陈德升 (编), 《中共十七大 : 政治精英甄选与地方治理》, (台北市: 印刻出版公司, 2008).

² Exceptions are Bi 2002 (footnote 1), Chen 1998 (footnote 1); Li and Bachman 1989 (footnote 1); and Xiaowei Zang, "Provincial Elite in Post-Mao China." *Asian Survey* 31/6 (1991), Pp. 512-525.

These questions are important because they help us understand the continuities and changes in leadership selection and their potential impacts on Chinese politics. We focus on the provincial elite partly because of data availability and partly because the provincial elite are a key component of the PRC political leadership³ linking central authorities with local governments in China. The governors and party secretaries of economically powerful provinces and municipalities (e.g., Guangdong and Shanghai) are major contenders for top national leadership posts in China. Indeed, the majority of the top national leaders including PRC President Xi Jinping (and his predecessors Hu Jintao and Jiang Zemin) and Premier Li Keqiang (and his predecessors Wen Jiabao and Zhu Rongji) have experience in governing provinces or municipalities of provincial rank. Finally, a study of China's provincial elite can provide evidence for an evaluation of some theoretical arguments about the nature of elite recruitment and stratification in the PRC.

Method and Data

We adopt a positional approach to identify China's provincial elite, using leadership posts within the provincial party system or the provincial government hierarchy as the criterion for inclusion in the following data analyses. We identify the provincial elite as (1) secretaries and deputy secretaries of the provincial, municipal, and autonomous regional committees of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP); and (2) governors and vice-governors of the provincial, municipal and autonomous regional governments. Only municipalities (such as Beijing and Shanghai) and autonomous regions (such as the Ningxia Hui Autonomous Region and the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region) that hold provincial rank are included. Accordingly, there are a total of 130 provincial party secretaries and deputy party secretaries and 144 governors and vice-governors

³ Zang 1991 (footnote 2), pp. 513-4.

in 1988 and 103 provincial party secretaries and deputy party secretaries and 281 governors and vice-governors in 2011, respectively.

The data on the 1988 provincial leaders were drawn from *Who's Who in China: Current Leaders*, compiled for 1989.⁴ Other sources were employed to cross-examine the data presented in *Who's Who in China*.⁵ Information about the 2011 provincial elite were collected between 2011 and 2012 from a wide range of data sources, including the official websites of each province in the PRC, *People's Daily* and Xinhuanet (<http://www.xinhuanet.com/english/>), and were cross-examined with those from the *Chinese Political Elites Database* (<http://ics.nccu.edu.tw/chinaleaders/index.htm>) set up and maintained by the National Chengchi University in Taiwan.

By studying provincial leaders' biographies in 1988 and 2011, we code four sets of information for this study: (1) age, sex, nationality, and provincial origins; (2) educational attainment; (3) date of joining the party, and (4) major career patterns. We are primarily concerned with these personal attributes and career patterns of the provincial elite in both 1988 and 2011. We also compare these provincial leaders with their predecessors in Mao's China whenever it is possible to do so.

To be consistent with Zang's 1991 study of the 1988 provincial elite,⁶ we exclude the following provincial leaders from this study: secretaries of the CCP Provincial Discipline Inspection Commissions, chairman and vice-chairmen of the People's Provincial Congresses, chairman and vice-chairmen of the Chinese People's Consultation Councils, presidents of the Provincial People's Courts, provincial chief procurators, and leaders of various mass organizations (such as the Communist Youth

⁴ *Who's Who in China: Current Leaders* (Beijing: Foreign Languages Press, 1989).

⁵ The following sources were used to check the data presented in Who's Who: Li Zhong Lou, *The Dictionary of Leaders in the Party, the Government, and the Army in China* (Hong Kong: Guangjiaojing Press, 1989); David S. G. Goodman, "China's Provincial Leaders, 1949-1985." vol. 1 (Atlantic Highlands, N. J.: Humanities Press International, Inc., 1986).

⁶ Frederick C. Teiwes, *Provincial Leadership in China: The Cultural Revolution and Its Aftermath* (Cornell University, East Asia Papers, No. 4, 1974); Zang 1991 (footnote).

League and the Women's Federation). These leaders are not included also because of data limitation. They possess less political power and less public/media exposure as governors and provincial party secretaries, and this is part of the reasons for the notorious difficulty to gather sufficient information on them.

Findings

Demographic characteristics. There are 56 nationality groups in China, with Han Chinese as the majority group (91% of China's population). As expected, the vast majority of the provincial leaders are of the Han nationality, although the political position of China's minorities has improved compared with that in Mao's China. Before and during the Cultural Revolution of 1966-1976, 4% to 5% of the provincial party secretaries were from ethnic minority groups—slightly less than the minority share of China's population in 1976. In 1988 the minority share of the population was about 6%, but ethnic minorities made up 15.4% of the provincial party secretaries. Tibetans alone provided 4.6% of the 1988 provincial party secretaries (Table 1).⁷ However, there was a retreat by 2011: the minority share of the population was less than 9%, whereas ethnic minorities made up 9.7% of the provincial party secretaries. The Han share went up considerably from 84.6% in 1988 to 90.3% in 2011. Nevertheless, there did not seem to be a similar retreat in the selection of provincial governors and deputy governors from ethnic minority groups: ethnic minorities consisted of 16.7% of the provincial governors and deputy governors in 1988 (24 out of 144), whereas the corresponding figure for 2011 was also 16.7% (47 out of 281). Because of this, there were few changes in the overall share of the provincial leadership posts for each ethnic minority group between 1988 and 2011. The CCP is

⁷ Zang 1991 (footnote), p. 514.

able to increase or maintain the proportion of ethnic minority presentation in the government system but not in the party hierarchy.

Table 1 shows that in 1988, leaders in the age group of 50-54 represented 14.6% of the provincial elite; those in the age group of 55-59, 48.5%; and those in the age group of 60-64, 23.3%. The corresponding figures for 2011 were 21.9%, 50.3%, and 14.3% respectively. The average age of the 1988 provincial party secretaries was 55.4 years, compared with an average age of 56 years for those in 1965 and those in 2011.⁸ This relative stable pattern suggests that the mid-50s is the age norm for becoming a provincial leader in China, i.e., everything going well, one shall spent at least 33 years to reach a provincial leadership post in the PRC bureaucracy. Of course, it takes more time to be a party secretary than to be a provincial governor.

Table 1 also shows that only 16 provincial leaders in 1988 were women (5.8%). There was hardly any improvement of women's political position between 1968 and 1988. In 1967-68, 14 women were appointed vice chairpersons of the provincial revolutionary committees that replaced the provincial party committees and provincial governments during the Cultural Revolution.⁹ There have been progresses in the CCP's effort to increase women's representation in Chinese politics since then. In 2011, 9.1% provincial leaders were women (35 out of 384). Needless to say, the CCP is still far away from achieving gender equality in leadership selection.

Table 1 about here

Provincial origins. The vast majority of the 1956-66 provincial leaders were from the two historical centers of the Chinese revolution—the central-south provinces (Hubei, Hunan, Jiangxi, Guangdong, and Guangxi) and the northern provinces (Gansu, Shaanxi, Shanxi, Henan, Hebei, and Shandong). By 1988 however, Gansu, Hubei, and

⁸ Zang 1991 (footnote), p. 515.

⁹ Zang 1991 (footnote), p. 515.

Guangxi—three provinces with a strong pre-1949 revolutionary tradition—provided only 5.47% of the provincial elite (see Table 2). In contrast, Jiangsu, Liaoning, and Zhejiang—three provinces without a pre-1949 revolutionary history—produced 20.77% of the provincial party secretaries and 24.08% of the provincial governors. By 1988, the overall proportion of the elite in these provincial offices from the central-south and the northern provinces had decreased.¹⁰

Table 2 also shows small changes in the distribution of provincial origins among the provincial elite between 1988 and 2011. Zhejiang province and Shandong province are two notable exceptions: 4.6% of the 1988 party secretaries and 7.3% of the 1988 provincial elite were from Zhejiang province; the corresponding figures for 2011 were 9.7% and 9.1% respectively. Shandong province did a better job as it produced 6.9% of secretaries and 6.2% of the provincial elite in 1988 and 14.6% of secretaries and 13.5% of the provincial elite in 2011 respectively. It is difficult to argue that they achieved outstanding performances because they were economically prosperous provinces because other economic heavyweights such as Beijing, Jiangsu, Guangdong, Shanghai, and Tianjin did not do an equal good job. Future studies shall investigate the reasons for their successes in elite recruitment in China.

Native provinces. About 34% of the 1965 provincial party secretaries were natives of the provinces where they held office, and the percentage of natives among the 1967-68 provincial elite was even lower. It went up in the 1980s: Table 3 shows that 40.8% of the 1988 provincial party secretaries were natives and the percentage of natives among party secretaries and governors combined was even higher (43.8%).¹¹ Table 3 also shows a reduction of the percentage of natives among the 2011 provincial elite: only 18.4% of party secretaries and 38.5% of the provincial elite were the natives in

¹⁰ Zang 1991 (footnote), p. 517.

¹¹ Zang 1991 (footnote), p. 518.

the provinces where they worked. It appears that the CCP has promoted cadre circulation/mobility in its personnel policy. Outsiders are more likely to follow central policies since they tend to have fewer local ties than natives, and their main source of power comes from the central authorities.

Tables 2 & 3 about here

Educational attainment. Table 4 shows that the 1988 provincial leaders were better educated than their predecessors of the Mao era. Teiwes states that “sketchy data tentatively suggest a greater proportion of leaders whose only known pre-1949 training was in Party and Red Army schools.”¹² In comparison, 47.1% of the 1988 party secretaries and governors had a college education. The percentage of college-educated cadres among party secretaries was a bit lower (40%). Since 1988, the CCP has greatly enhanced the levels of educational attainment among its officials. In 2011, nearly every party secretary and governor was college educated (or received some university education).

However, it is important to point out that 32.8 percent of the 2011 provincial leaders received their degrees from party schools or similar institutions, and 5.2 percent of the 2011 provincial elite majored in CCP history or Marxism. It is debatable whether their schooling experience is worthy of a university education and whether their educational experiences/credentials can qualify them as technocrats.

Table 4 about here

Party seniority. Party membership is an important qualification for elite status. Of the 274 provincial leaders in 1988, only eleven are not identified as party members. The average seniority of party members for the 263 remaining leaders is 32 years. The corresponding figure for the 2011 provincial elite is 32.8 years. Also, Table 5 shows

¹² Frederick C. Teiwes, *Provincial Leadership in China: The Cultural Revolution and Its Aftermath* (Cornell University, East Asia Papers, No. 4, 1974); p. 48.

that 73.4% of the 1988 party secretaries and governors joined the CCP after 1949. Only 9.2% of them became a CCP member in or after 1970. In comparison, 97.6% of the 2011 provincial leaders joined the CCP in or after 1970. It can be argued that most of the 1988 provincial elite joined the CCP when the belief in communism ran deep and wild in Mao's China, whereas most of the 2011 provincial elite became CCP members when revolutionary ideology was forever replaced by pragmatism during market reforms. It seems that the 2011 provincial leaders are less ideological and more instrumental than the 1988 provincial leaders. This possibility can be strengthened with reference to the fact that 51.3% of the 2011 provincial leaders joined the CCP during the Cultural Revolution of 1966-1976 when clientelism was prevalent,¹³ which engenders a strong suspicion that some of them were political opportunists who became a CCP member and began their political careers thanks to the ill-reputed exchanges of favors between their supervisors and them. They can be called as the Cultural Revolution generation and may be part of the reasons for rampant cadre corruption in China today.

Table 5 about here

Career patterns. Career patterns of Chinese leaders tend to overlap into several occupations. Political leaders often shift from one position to another and their career patterns are thus difficult to classify. The governor of Guizhou Province in 1988, Wang Chaowen, for example, was also a deputy secretary of the CCP Guizhou Province Committee. He served as deputy secretary of the Zhenyuan Prefectural Working Committee of the Youth League in 1955-56, was promoted in 1958 to the Secretariat of the CCP Committee of Southeastern Guizhou Miao and Dong Autonomous Prefecture, became secretary of the Youth League Guizhou Province

¹³ Andrew Walder, *Communist New-Traditionalism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986).

Committee in 1973-74, served as second secretary of the Committee of Southeastern Bouyei and Miao Autonomous Prefecture in 1974-77, and in 1980 was appointed Guizhou Province Committee secretary. In 1983, Wang was elected a member of the party's Central Discipline Inspection Committee, and he assumed his present post as governor in the same year. Nevertheless, many cadres are mainly engaged in one type of work. Thus, provincial leaders' career patterns are determined by the length and frequency of their work experience. While Wang Chaowen worked both in the party and the youth league system, he spent most of his time in the party system. His tenure in the Youth League amounts to only four years—from 1955 to 1956 and from 1973 to 1974. He therefore is defined as a party worker for this study.

As another example, Feng Jianshen worked in Harbin Financial Bureau of Heilongjiang Province in 1978-1993. From May 1993, he was promoted to vice director of Budget Department and held leading posts in Ministry of Finance for eight years by 2001. In 2001, Feng served as vice chairman of National Council for Social Security Fund. After gaining work experience in finance at both central and local levels, he became vice governor of Gansu Province in 2004-2011 and was elected chairman of the People's Political Consultative Conference of Gansu Province in 2011. According to Feng's profile, he primarily worked in the systems of finance and government administration. However, his main career pattern is obviously identified as finance, because he spent twenty-six years in the financial domain and only seven years in the provincial government.

Table 6 shows the lack of army officers in the provincial posts. The Military Region leaders were an important political force in provincial politics before and during the Cultural Revolution. In 1971, for example, 22 of China's 29 provincial first party secretaries were military, and 98 (62%) of the 158 members of the provincial-

level party committee secretariats were military officers. In 1988, none of the provincial leaders was an army cadre although there were 3 police officers. The same is true for the 2011 provincial elite.

Table 6 shows that the most important avenue to provincial leadership posts in both 1988 and 2011 was party work. In 1988, party work accounted for 47.7% of the party secretaries and 32.9% of the provincial leadership. The corresponding figures for 2011 were 71.8% and 49.7% respectively. The importance of party work in elite mobility in the PRC increased significant from 1988 to 2011, partly reflecting the consolidation of party bureaucrats in the power hierarchy in China. This finding may be explained by the finding about the dates of joining the CCP for the 2011 provincial leaders. The Cultural Revolution generation could not be effectively placed in any professional route of career development except that of party work since they were experts in politics.

In comparison with the increasing role of party work in leadership selection in the PRC, the change in the role of government work in elite recruitment during the same period was insignificant: government work accounted for 6.2% of the party secretaries and 12% of the provincial leadership in 1988; whereas the corresponding figures for 2011 were 7.8% and 11.7% respectively. The rising role in party work in elite recruitment seems to take places at the expense of the roles played by careers in engineering and industry experience: engineering and industry experience accounted for 8.8% and 19.7% of the provincial leaders in 1988, the corresponding figures for 2011 is 0.3% and 5% respectively. There was a slight increase in the role of experience with economic bureaus/planning (from 9.1% in 1988 to as.8% in 2011). Overall, there was a major decline in the number of technocrats in the provincial elite

from 1988 to 2011 as cadres with experiences in engineering, industry, and economic bureaus/planning are commonly defined as technocrats.¹⁴

Table 6 about here

Finally, many observers have noted the importance of guanxi (personal connection) in Chinese politics, and this has a great impact on provincial elite recruitment. Some provincial leaders are the children of high-ranking cadres—for example, the vice-governor of Henan Province, Liu Yuan, who was the son of former PRC President Liu Shaoqi. Liu Yuan graduated from Beijing Teachers College in 1982 and assumed his current post in 1988. He was the youngest and the fastest runner among the 274 provincial leaders. Also in 1988, the governor of Guangdong, Ye Xuanping, was the son of former CCP Vice-Chairman Marshal Ye Jianying, and the governor of Inner Mongolia, Buhe, was the son of Ulanhu, former vice-president of the PRC.

Taizidang was also an important component of the 201 provincial elite. Li Xiaopeng, for example, is currently working as provincial governor and deputy secretary of the CCP Committee in Shanxi. He is the son of Li Peng, former chairman of Standing Committee of the 9th National People's Congress. Li Xiaopeng seems to be a fast runner along the career ladder. He spent five years in promoting his political position as vice governor to governor of Shanxi Province in 2008-2012. Besides, Bo Xilai, former secretary of the CCP Chongqing Province Committee, worked in the Secretariat of the CPC Central Committee after graduating from Chinese Academy of Social Sciences in 1982. He is the son of Bo Yibo, former vice premier of the PRC in the 1950s. Bo Yibo took a leading role in military, industry and economics in the Chinese revolutionary and reforming history. Yu Zhengsheng, secretary of the Shanghai CCP Committee from 2007 to 2012, is the son of Huang Jing (also called

¹⁴ Li and White 1990 (footnote 1).

Yu Qiwei), the first minister of Ministry of Industry. His mother, Fan Jin, was the former vice mayor of Beijing. Yu is said to be a close friend with China's former leader Deng Xiaoping and his family.

Summaries and Discussion

We present one of few longitudinal studies of sub-national political elite in China and examine the similarities and differences in key personal attributes between the 1988 provincial elite and the 2011 provincial elite. The findings from our study suggest both continuities and changes in provincial leadership selection in the PRC between 1988 and 2011. For example, there was no major difference in age between the 1988 provincial elite and the 2011 provincial elite, although the latter were more educated than the former. There were more women among the provincial elite in 2011 than in 1988, but there was not an increase in minority representation in the provincial elite from 1988 to 2011. There were fewer local leaders who worked in their birth province in 2011 than in 1988. The majority of the 1988 provincial leaders joined the CCP before the Cultural Revolution, whereas the majority of the 2011 provincial leaders became CCP members during the Cultural Revolution. Finally, there were far fewer technocrats among the provincial elite in 2011 than in 1988.

We elaborate two key findings from this paper below. The first is the decline of localism in provincial politics. Localism is often measured with the ratio of native leaders vs. outsiders in the provincial elite. The central government has had a strong dislike for localism because it can lead to the conflict of interests between local governments and the center over the distribution of political power and economic resources. Prior to the 1980s, the CCP strove to curb localist tendencies within a provincial government by appointing local leaders who were non-natives. The provincial elite composition in 1967-68 showed non-natives outnumbering natives

two-to-one. During the 1980s, birthplace ceased to affect negatively an official's political future in his birth province. Natives were more likely than non-natives to hold the highest positions and native-born cadres became the most important source for provincial elite recruitment. The localist tendency in provincial elite recruitment in the 1980s could be the result of the Cultural Revolution which has weakened the center's resources and ability to control local governments. Alternatively, the localist tendency could be the result of the CCP's interest in promoting local initiatives in the post-1978 economic reform, which called for leaders with local support and knowledge of local conditions and attitudes. Natives naturally become the best candidates for provincial leadership under such circumstances. Each of the above two possible scenarios suggests a weak center vis-à-vis a strong local elite and a transfer of power from the center to local governments.

If a high percentage of natives in the 1988 provincial elite is a sign of the center's weakness, a low percentage of natives in the 2011 provincial elite can be plausibly viewed as a sign of a strong center that is able to control local governments. The change does not come as a surprise if we remember that the central government has amassed a huge amount of revenues since 1978 and has the largest foreign currency reserves in the world (more than \$3.3 trillion by December 2012). Today, local initiatives are not as critical as they were in 1988 when the center was plagued with poor resources and had to rely on provinces to develop the economy. The center has been able to enhance its position vs. local governments with its financial resources, and has been able to promote cadre mobility and appoint outsiders to leading positions in provinces. Outsiders are more likely to follow central policies since they have fewer local ties than natives, and their main source of power comes from the central authorities.

Secondly, it is surprising that the Cultural Revolution generation has come to prominence in provincial politics. In the 1980s, CCP General Secretary Hu Yaobang carried out campaigns in the 1980s against the “three kinds of people”, purging those who had been identified with radical factions, joined the CCP, and were promoted to leadership posts during the Cultural Revolution. It is reported that 33,896 individuals were expelled from the CCP, 90,069 individuals were barred from party membership registration, 145,456 individuals suspended from party membership registration until further notice, and 184,071 individuals received various disciplinary sanctions from the CCP.¹⁵ In general, those who joined the CCP during the Cultural Revolution were not considered politically reliable and could not be trusted with senior posts in the Chinese bureaucracy. Although some of the Cultural Revolution generation escaped the purge, they should not have a political career in the post-1978 era, just like those who attended university during the Cultural Revolution did not have a great academic career after 1978. Today, most of the academic leaders in China are those who entered university after 1977. Yet there seems to be a different ballgame in politics as the Cultural Revolution generation has shown extraordinary resilience and climbed the political ladder despite the odds.

The success of the Cultural Revolution generation in the Chinese bureaucracy cannot be understood without reference to the nature of the political system in China. The Chinese bureaucracy is a hierachal political machine and embedded in party politics and personal connections.¹⁶ Indeed, in the 1980s top Chinese leaders stated publicly that people without professional expertise and educational credentials were not eligible for positions in the Chinese bureaucracy, and some scholars have been motivated by political rhetoric to think that elite recruitment represents the emergency

¹⁵ Yanlai Wang, *China's Economic Development and Democratization* (Surrey: Ashgate Publishing, 2003), p. 104.

¹⁶ Zang 2004 (footnote 1).

and working of a technocracy in China.¹⁷ We agree that professional expertise and educational credentials are useful because they function as a gatekeeper and are a ticket into the system.¹⁸ Nevertheless, we contend that professional expertise and educational credentials are necessary but not sufficient conditions for promotion in the political hierarchy in China: a cadre has also to rely on his or her political acumen and people skills for career advancement. These happen to be the strengths of the Cultural Revolution generation and explain why they have done well in the Chinese bureaucracy after 1978 although they should not according to the official rhetoric. They were already embedded in the system before the leadership transition started in the early 1980s, and were able to find solutions to deal with their deficiencies in education and professional credentials. One measure, as mentioned above, is to get a degree from a CCP party school. Once armed with this kind of degrees, they become unstoppable in their quest for high posts in the bureaucracy because they are the experts of party politics. This account is consistent with the findings on educational experience and the important role of party work in leadership selection reported above. The careers of the Cultural Revolution generation challenge technocracy thesis that Chinese leaders are chosen because of their educational attainment and professional careers. Clearly, the study of leadership selection in China is productive only when it is embedded in research on China's political system. It is not the political rhetoric but the political system that selects leaders in the PRC.

¹⁷ Li and White 1990 (footnote 1); Cheng Li and Lynn White, "Chinas Technocratic Movement and the World Economic Herald." *Modern China* 17/3 (1991), Pp. 342-88; Cheng Li and Lynn White, "The Fifteenth Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party: full-pledged technocratic leadership with partial control by Jiang Zemin." *Asian Survey* 38/3 (1998), Pp. 231-64.

¹⁸ Zang 2004 (footnote 1).

Table 1: Distribution by Sex, Nationality, and Age Group: 1988 and 2011

Demographics	Secretaries only		Secretaries & governors	
	1988	2011	1988	2011
<i>Sex</i>				
Men	125 (96.2%)	98 (95.1%)	258 (94.2%)	349 (90.9%)
Women	5 (3.9%)	5 (4.9%)	16 (5.8%)	35 (9.1%)
<i>Nationality</i>				
Han	110 (84.6%)	93 (90.3%)	230 (83.9%)	327 (85.2%)
Hui	1 (0.8%)	2 (1.9%)	6 (2.2%)	7 (1.8%)
Manchurian	1 (0.8%)	1 (1.0%)	3 (1.1%)	5 (1.3%)
Mongolian	3 (2.3%)	2 (1.9%)	5 (1.8%)	7 (1.8%)
Uygur	2 (1.5%)	1 (1.0%)	4 (1.5%)	5 (1.3%)
Zhuang	2 (1.5%)	1 (1.0%)	3 (1.1%)	6 (1.6%)
Tibetan	6 (4.6%)	2 (1.9%)	13 (4.7%)	13 (3.4%)
Others	5 (3.6%)	1 (1.0%)	10 (3.7%)	14 (3.6%)
<i>Age group</i>				
39 & younger	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.4%)	0 (0.0%)
40-44	8 (6.2%)	0 (0.0%)	11 (4.0%)	2 (0.5%)
45-49	11 (8.5%)	4 (3.9%)	38 (13.9%)	36 (9.4%)
50-54	28 (21.5%)	15 (14.6%)	76 (27.7%)	84 (21.9%)
55-59	59 (45.4%)	50 (48.5%)	122 (44.5%)	193 (50.3%)
60-64	19 (14.6%)	24 (23.3%)	21 (7.7%)	55 (14.3%)
65-69	5 (3.9%)	10 (9.7%)	5 (1.8%)	14 (3.6%)
Total	130 (100.0%)	103 (100.0%)	274 (100.0%)	384 (100.0%)

Sources: Xiaowei Zang, "Provincial Elite in Post-Mao China." *Asian Survey* 31/6 (1991), p. 515.

Table 2: Distribution by Birthplace of Provincial Leaders: 1988 and 2011

Province	Secretaries		Secretaries & governors	
	1988	2011	1988	2011
Beijing	3 (2.3%)	1 (1.0%)	6 (2.2%)	4 (1.0%)
Tianjin	3 (2.3%)	2 (1.9%)	4 (1.5%)	8 (2.1%)
Shanghai	1 (0.8%)	1 (1.0%)	4 (1.5%)	3 (0.8%)
Heilongjiang	2 (1.5%)	3 (2.9%)	7 (2.6%)	8 (2.1%)
Jilin	5 (3.9%)	2 (1.9%)	10 (3.7%)	8 (2.1%)
Liaoning	8 (6.2%)	4 (3.9%)	17 (6.2%)	23 (6.0%)
Hebei	13 (10.0%)	10 (9.7%)	23 (8.4%)	28 (7.3%)
Henan	7 (5.4%)	8 (7.8%)	10 (3.7%)	18 (4.7%)
Shanxi	4 (3.1%)	2 (1.9%)	9 (3.3%)	13 (3.4%)
Shaanxi	6 (4.6%)	4 (3.9%)	9 (3.3%)	12 (3.1%)
Gansu	1 (0.8%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (1.1%)	2 (0.5%)
Shandong	9 (6.9%)	15 (14.6%)	17 (6.2%)	52 (13.5%)
Hubei	2 (1.5%)	5 (4.9%)	6 (2.2%)	13 (3.4%)
Hunan	5 (3.9%)	5 (4.9%)	13 (4.7%)	12 (3.1%)
Jiangxi	2 (1.5%)	2 (1.9%)	6 (2.2%)	9 (2.3%)
Anhui	6 (4.6%)	7 (6.8%)	10 (3.7%)	15 (3.9%)
Jiangsu	13 (10.0%)	7 (6.8%)	29 (10.1%)	26 (6.8%)
Zhejiang	6 (4.6%)	10 (9.7%)	20 (7.3%)	35 (9.1%)
Fujian	1 (0.8%)	4 (3.9%)	7 (2.6%)	15 (3.9%)
Guangdong	6 (4.6%)	1 (1.0%)	9 (3.3%)	8 (2.1%)
Guangxi	3 (2.3%)	2 (1.9%)	6 (2.2%)	8 (2.1%)
Hainan	1 (0.8%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.4%)	3 (0.8%)
Sichuan	9 (6.9%)	2 (1.9%)	16 (5.8%)	10 (2.6%)
Guizhou	2 (1.5%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (1.1%)	6 (1.6%)
Yunnan	3 (2.3%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (1.8%)	8 (2.1%)
Xizang	3 (2.3%)	2 (1.9%)	8 (2.9%)	11 (2.9%)
Qinghai	1 (0.8%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (1.1%)	2 (0.5%)
Ningxia	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.0%)	2 (0.7%)	5 (1.3%)
Xinjiang	2 (1.5%)	1 (1.0%)	6 (2.2%)	6 (1.6%)
Neimenggu	3 (2.3%)	2 (1.9%)	5 (1.8%)	5 (1.3%)
Chongqing	---	0 (0.0%)	---	8 (2.1%)
Total	130 (100.0%)	103 (100.0%)	274 (100.0%)	384 (100.0%)

Sources: Xiaowei Zang, "Provincial Elite in Post-Mao China." *Asian Survey* 31/6 (1991), p. 517.

Table 3: Distribution of Leaders Who Serve Their Native Provinces: 1988 and 2011

Province	Secretaries		Secretaries & governors	
	1988	2011	1988	2011
Native province	53 (40.8%)	19 (18.4%)	120 (43.8%)	148 (38.5%)
Other province	77 (59.2%)	84 (81.6%)	154 (56.2%)	236 (61.5%)
Total	130 (100.0%)	103 (100.0%)	274 (100.0%)	384 (100.0%)

Sources: Xiaowei Zang, "Provincial Elite in Post-Mao China." *Asian Survey* 31/6 (1991), p. 518.

Table 4: Educational Attainment: 1988 and 2011

Education	Secretaries		Secretaries & governors	
	1988	2011	1988	2011
University & above	52 (40.0%)	101 (98.1%)	129 (47.1%)	377 (98.2%)
Some college	10 (7.7%)	2 (1.9%)	12 (4.4%)	6 (1.6%)
Vocational school	3 (2.3%)	0 (0.0%)	10 (3.7%)	0 (0.0%)
Other/Unknown	65 (50.0%)	0 (0.0%)	123 (44.9%)	1 (0.3%)
Total	130 (100.0%)	103 (100.0%)	274 (100.0%)	384 (100.0%)

Sources: Xiaowei Zang, "Provincial Elite in Post-Mao China." *Asian Survey* 31/6 (1991), p. 518.

Table 5: Date of Joining the CCP: 1988 and 2011

Years	1988	2011
Before 1945	15 (6.0%)	0 (0.0%)
1945-1949	58 (22.01%)	0 (0.0%)
1950-1954	65 (24.7%)	0 (0.0%)
1955-1959	57 (21.7%)	0 (0.0%)
1960-1964	22 (8.4%)	1 (0.3%)
1965-1969	22 (8.4%)	7 (2.0%)
1970-1974	12 (4.6%)	103 (28.9%)
1975-1979	6 (2.3%)	108 (30.3%)
1980-1984	6 (2.3%)	85 (23.8%)
1985-1989	0 (0.0%)	40 (11.2%)
1990-1994	0 (0.0%)	8 (2.2%)
1995-1999	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.6%)
2000-2004	0 (0.0%)	3 (0.9%)
Total	263 (100.0%)	357 (100.0%)

Sources: Xiaowei Zang, "Provincial Elite in Post-Mao China." *Asian Survey* 31/6 (1991), p. 518.

Table 6: Main career patterns: 1988 and 2011

Province	Secretaries		Secretaries & governors	
	1988	2011	1988	2011
Party work	62 (47.7%)	74 (71.8%)	90 (32.9%)	191 (49.7%)
Government	8 (6.2%)	8 (7.8%)	33 (12.0%)	45 (11.7%)
Industry	26 (20.0%)	3 (2.9%)	54 (19.7%)	19 (5.0%)
Engineering	9 (6.9%)	0 (0.0%)	24 (8.8%)	1 (0.3%)
Economic bureau*	8 (.2%)	9 (8.7%)	25 (9.1%)	49 (12.8%)
Culture/education	13 (10.0%)	3 (2.9%)	38 (13.9%)	40 (10.4%)
Public health	0 (0.0%)	0 (2.9%)	4 (1.5%)	3 (0.9%)
Mass organization	2 (1.5%)	5 (4.9%)	3 (1.1%)	17 (4.4%)
Police	2 (1.5%)	1 (1.0%)	3 (1.1%)	8 (2.1%)
Unknown	---	---	---	11 (2.9%)
Total	130 (100.0%)	103 (100.0%)	274 (100.0%)	384 (100.0%)

* This category also includes people with experience in finance.

Sources: Xiaowei Zang, "Provincial Elite in Post-Mao China." *Asian Survey* 31/6 (1991), p. 520.