SOCIAL ASPECTS OF JAPAN'S RAPID
DEVELOPMENT AND JAPANESE MANAGEMENT

Yoshiko Taniguchi

I Purpose

At the time of the recent Fifth Summit Meeting in Tokyo, many articles and televised news reports on Japan appeared in the United States and European countries. Although the basic tone of these reports was not as emotional as reports would have been ten years earlier, Japan still seemed to be an object of a compounded feeling of amazement and uneasiness. The amazement stems from the manner in which Japan has recovered from the bare subsistence level of hunger and desert-like debris of air-raided cities immediately after World War II, to become one of the world's most advanced economies. Intensive study programs and seminars to isolate distinguishing traits in Japanese society have flourished in recent years both inside and outside Japan, especially in the economic and management field. On the other hand, the uneasiness stems not only from the impact which Japanese economic growth has had on the American and EC economies, but from the feeling that Japan may be playing the economic "game" under a different set of rules than those prevailing in Western countries.

Setting aside the evaluation of differences — whether they are regarded as the key for the exceptional success of Japanese economy or as mysterious nationalistic customs — the essence of those differences is usually regarded as being derived from "traditional" characteristics which seem to persist in the most "modern" Japanese social organizations. Besides, the economic growth in post-war Japan undoubtedly provides us with a unique example of extremely rapid and extensive social change in the direction of what is variously called industrialization,

modernization, or urbanization[1] in a non-Western setting.

The subject of this paper is to examine the relationship between "traditional" and "modern" aspects of Japanese social structure, mainly in the setting of large companies which have played the leading role in this unique process of extremely rapid and extensive social change in which modernization, industrialization and urbanization are in interaction each other. The conclusion of the analysis is that most of the studies in the past have exaggerated the distinction between "traditional" and "modern", and stressed only either one of the two aspects of the same social organizations, and that the main problem to be studied is not the distinction but the unique social structure itself in which the two aspects interact and are integrated with each other. (This process has also promoted or distorted the rapid changes through this interaction and integration.)

In this context, the analysis of Japan's industrial and managerial systems in terms of her socioeconomic environment in the postwar period gives us a useful insight into this problem.

Japanese business organization and its management is a good example of showing how a formal business organization, the idea of which is basically of Western birth, has been imported and transformed into a Japanese style of management peculiar to its business environment. In the light of Japan's managerial system, the relation between the two aspects of Japanese society will be shown rather clearly and there emerges a possibility of extracting from it the principles of a unique social structure.

The results of case studies concerning Japanese multinational corporations operating in the United Kingdom are given in the last part of this paper as examples of interactions of Japanese managerial system with Western environment. These cases illustrate how Japanese business organization, in such circumstances, reveals its structural balance between "traditional" and "modern" elements and how this balance is transformed through the interaction with "modern" i.e. Western environment.

II Divergent views on Japanese industrialization

Social scientists are in general agreement that significant changes have occurred in post-war Japan, in accompaniment to economic growth — e.g. political reforms, emergence of the new middle class, changes in value orientations, the remarkable progress of mass communication — and that contemporary Japanese society is not merely a continuation of its prewar counterpart.

But what is the nature of change? What is the impact of rapid industrialization and urbanization on the basic characteristic of Japanese society? On these points, divergent views are found but can be classed into the two leading schools of opposing views on Japan's industrialization.

The first view, in its simplest form, regards modernization as a universal evolutionary process basically common to any kind of society. It accompanies industrialization and adheres to Western models. According to this view, Japan's rapid development was brought about through active importation of industrial production methods and the successful transformation into modern form of social organizations. And as a corollary, the main problem that hinders "efficiency", "equity" and further development is the persistence of traditional, i.e. retarded or underdeveloped aspects. Everything will be fine if these traditional remnants are overcome or eliminated. This view, a sociologists' favorite employed with varying sophistication is, or at least has been until recently, dominant in the Japanese academic world,[2] which is under strong influence of both Karl Marx and Max Weber.

The second view has been developed mainly in the United States since the 1950's by sociologists, anthropologists and lately by busisness schools. This view regards every development process as specific to the organization and culture of the society in which it takes place. According to this view, the traditional aspects of Japan's social organization do not indicate a retardation obstructing modernization, but, on the contrary, they facilitate rapid development. This view is probably motivated by the search for the secrets of the "exceptionally successful" development of a non-Western country and its main interest is in finding out positive things about "tradition". It contrasts sharply with the first view

which is aiming at criticizing or denying the propriety of the present regime.

In the field of business administration, the opposing attitudes are focused on the study of methods of evaluating "Japanese management". Scholars in the first school, who believe the assumption made about the inevitable convergence of all industrial societies toward a common pattern claim a basic reassessment of traditional managerial practices is necessary that "the very success that the Japanese economy has achieved, to which Japanese management has contributed so importantly, has reduced the effectiveness of precisely the same managerial policies and practices that helped bring about this success."[3] On the other hand, scholars in the second school issue warnings against the recent trend to take little cognizance of Japanese management and try to get rid of traditional managerial practices that are deeply rooted in Japanese society.[4]

There are, as a third possibility, scholars who propose a synthesis of the opposing views. Significant efforts are being done in this direction. Their efforts, however, may not be successful enough and their views seem to be still fragmentary and ill-organized.[5] Therefore, a really synthetic view treating Japan's rapid social change in its totality as a unique process is in its embryonic stage and its development is much wanting.

III Continuity and change in Japanese society

From these viewpoints, what does the social structure in which the rapid change is taking place look like? Is the structure changing too or is it facilitating the change? If so, how? As far as available literature in English is concerned, almost all the works seem to share the second view, (except R. P. Dore who, with an eclectic view, has developed an alternative version of the convergence thesis, despite of the recognition of radical differences between British and Japanese patterns of industrial organization.)[6]

After six-month's stay in Japan in 1971, with limited familiarity with the country, preceded by a half year of background reading and visits to

several surrounding countries, Brzezinski states,

"In observing the Japanese at work and at play, one is struck by the peculiar combination of an essentially feudal structure with early industrial values."[7]

Then he characterizes the "feudal structure" (1-4) and "early industrial values" (5-8) of Japanese society by:

1) high deference to established authority
2) widespread acceptance of the legitimacy of the very hierarchical order
3) an entrenched system of seniority in large corporation
4) an extraordinary cliquishness
5) a strikingly high degree of personal motivation in work habit
6) great discipline
7) extraordinary loyalty to one's firm or business
8) a very high rate of personal saving[8]

Quite similar characteristics are identified and examined in more detailed analysis by J. C. Abegglen in the case of large factories he studied nearly fifteen years before the publication of Brzezinski's book. He summarizes the general features of Japanese organization as follows:

1) Membership in the Japanese productive group is a permanent and irrevocable membership. Workers at all levels of the factory customarily work in but one company.
2) Recruitment into the productive group is based on personal qualities without reference to a particular work or set of skills. Selection is primarily on the individual's education, character, and general background.
3) Status in the group is a continuation and extension of status held in the society at the time of entrance to the group.
4) Reward in the productive group is only partly in the form of money, and is based primarily on age, education, length of service, and family size, either job rank or competence only a small part of the criteria for determining work reward.
5) Formal rank and title in the hierarchy are elaborate and well de-

fined, but authority and responsibility of ranks are not. The decision-making function is exercised by groups of persons, but responsibility for the decision is not assigned to individuals.

6) The penetration of the company into the non-business activities of the worker and the responsibility taken by the company for the worker are extensive.[9]

A comparison between Brzezinski's observations in 1971 and Abegglen's research in 1956 shows extremely strong persistence or tenacity in the "traditional" or "feudal" or "early industrial" elements in Japanese social organization or at least in a basic structure supporting them. There appears to be appreciable evidence showing that these "traditional" factors have not changed and some have even been strengthened during the period.

The Boston Consulting Group carried at under Abegglen's guidance, a survey of the changes of Japanese business organizations in ten years after 1956 as an extension of his original study.[10] Comparison between the data of 1956 and 1966 concerning 25 big companies shows that the general features which Abegglen originally pointed out have not changed basically and such features as permanent employment, recruitment directly from school and the seniority system have been much strengthened.[11] The ratio of temporary employees as a buffer against business fluctuations has also decreased substantially.[12]

Remarkable continuity in Japanese society outside the business organization is illustrated by Ezra F. Vogel's field work in "Mamachi" from 1958 to 1960 on Japan's new middle class (i.e. people working in big business who are often called "salary men"), which gives very detailed observation on the life of the salary man and his family in a Tokyo suburb. He says in this book:

"In spite of all these changes, the picture that emerges from this study of Mamachi, as other studies of Japanese society, presents a relatively orderly and controlled life. — Although Japanese themselves have been conscious of the strains of adjusting to rapid change, they have not experienced the massive social disorganization so characteristic of many Western cities and of developing countries during the rapid migration to cities."[13]

He identified the stem-family kinship system and the strong group orientation as the important features of Japanese social structure which have helped to maintain order at the time of the transition to urban industrial society.

With reference to this point, an effort to clarify the basic structural principles of Japanese society has been made by a Japanese social anthropologist, Chie Nakane. She represents the basic social structure of Japan by a simple model based on "vertical" human relationships and on group orientation ("frame orientation" in her terminology), as opposed to the "horizontal" relationships and "attribute orientation" of Western and Indian societies.

In most other countries, she says, people tend to feel a sense of community with other people who are like themselves, who have the same personal "attributes" — i.e. who do the same sort of work and have the same set of skills, or are considered to belong to the same class. Such organizations as trade unions and veteran's association, are all "horizontal" in the sense that they cut across the different places where people live and the different organizations they work for.

On the contrary, in Japan the feeling of belonging to the same group does not come from people of the same sort banding together. The sense of belonging is provided by "frame", which is the basis of living in the same place or working for the same company or being involved in any relationship in which people of different sorts are linked to each other vertically serving a common well-defined purpose.

Both the feeling of belonging and the principle of group formation (i.e. "frame" orientation and "vertical" relationship) are best shown in the stem-family system (ie) which is the root of Japanese society, and it is why Japanese political and economic organization borrow terms and behavioral patterns from those of the ie system. She contrasts the Japanese family in which members are not exclusively defined in terms of genetic ties but in terms of the fact of co-residence and cooperation of activities towards the goal of ie, with the Indian family in which membership is automatically ascribed at the time of one's birth.[10]

Thus although her model is too simplified and too generalized to be applicable to varieties of concrete cases, it explains fairly well, most of the "traditional" features in industrial firms such as their authoritarianism, employee's acceptance of hierarchy, cliquishness, group loyalty, collective responsibility, evaluation of personal qualities without reference to a particular work and intertwining of business with family affairs.

Another effort to explain Japanese society in a unified manner is demonstrated in R. N. Bellah's essay, "Continuity and Change in Japanese Society."[19]

In this essay, Bellah states that continuity in the Japanese social systems appears mainly in values and the structure of group life and that change is in mainly cultural content and in institutional and organizational forms.

According to him, "the universal activism", which allows long-term continuity at the level of value orientations accompanying great structural change in the West, are extremely weak in Japan, where nevertheless "the continuities are by no means limited to the highest level of value orientations" but they extend to structural principles. Instead of the "universalism", the value of the "particular groupism" and "performance" has been the basis of continuity since the beginning of the Japanese state in the seventh century to the present. By the words "particular groupism" he indicates the value system summarized as follows:

1) Value is realized in groups which are thought of as natural entities. The community — is the locus of value.
2) These groups are thought to be integrated with the structure of reality and thus endowed with a sacred quality.
3) There is a divine-human continuity in which the symbolic heads of group have an especially important place, being especially endowed with a sacred quality. One of their functions is to relate the group to the devine ancestors and protective deities. This pattern applies at many levels.
4) Individuals exist because of a continuous flow of blessings from spirits and ancestors through the symbolic heads of groups. The individual obligated to work in order to repay in small measure the blessings he has received and to sacrifice himself for the group if necessary.
5) Science, ethics, philosophy, virtually all aspects of culture are

valuable only insofar as they contribute to the realization of value in the group, not as ends in themselves. Ethics consist mainly in acting as one should in one's group — there is no universal ethic.
6) In spite of how completely the individual is merged in group life there is one place where he can be relatively independent: the realm of personal expressiveness including art, mysticism, recreation, skill. But this sphere does not legitimize failure to fulfill group expectations. It actually helps reconcile the individual to group demands.[16]

As for such values as group loyalty, group conformism, and authoritarianism mentioned earlier, their relationship with Bellah's characterizations is obvious. In addition, he tries to illustrate the same value patterns throughout Japanese history from *uji* and *be* system, through the following *bushi* groups, especially the *samurai* in the Tokugawa period, through to the present government ministries and industrial firms.

He then tries to explain the Japanese processes of importing foreign culture and accommodating or "indigenizing" them without changing the basic value system and the group structure previously described. He says that until recent times, they have replaced, not the basic core, but the superficial forms of institutions and have left the possibility of expressing incongrous foreign elements in the realm of art, etc. which in fact have helped reconcile the individual to group demands.

Both of the two scholars, Bellah and Nakane, adequatedly identify the existence of a unique social structure in Japanese society, but the further development of their models both theoretical and empirical is still wanting.

All the preceding critiques appear to strongly support the view that there exists in Japan a unique social structure stable and mature enough to persist through the extremely rapid and extensive social change accompanying industrialization and urbanization. In other words, the features often referred to as "feudal" or "traditional" in Japanese society are aspects of deep-rooted social structure and have persistence too strong to be regarded as transitory or to be replaced by "modern" ones. Modern features such as industrialization and urbanization in Japanese society are rather incorporated or united into the original basic

structure. As a stable core and a basis of the society, this persistent structure played a vital role in facilitating and promoting extremely rapid social change by providing basic continuity and order throughout the transition to a "modern" society.

> "the very success of the Japanese experience with industrialization may well have been a function of the fact that, far from undergoing a total revolution in social structure or social relationship, the hard core of Japan's system remained intact, allowing an orderly transition to industrialization continuous with her earlier social forms. The exceptional durability of Japan's social system — is not the result of mystic ability of Japanese to adapt but rather the consequence of the fact that through change a basis for social continuity has remained intact." [17]

Industrialization and urbanization without accompanying modernization toward Western patterns of society, is not only possible but also easier in certain cases, because it creates less disruption and less disorganization in the society. Grafting new shoots is much easier than supplanting a whole tree when the tree is big and deep rooted.

IV Characteristics of Japanese industrial organization

I agree with the fundamental viewpoints of these writers that the processes of social change have been different in Japan than in the modern West, and that social change is consistent with the continuity provided by the basic structure. However, it must be emphasized here that this agreement is made with the following reservations.

1) Western observers call "traditional" everything which looks different from the pattern in the United States or Europe, and try to explain the origin of these "traditional" features rather unsystematically in relation to old customs such as the *samurai* tradition and the Japanese stem-family ideology. These efforts do not contribute to the clarification of the meaning of the term.

2) Historically the way in which factories have been organized in Japan has varied in different periods. In the early and mid-Meiji period, factory projects were initiated by state bureaucrats and workers were contracted through labor bosses for short periods,

while traditional managerial practices based on the *"Dozoku"* ideology of the Tokugawa period continued to operate in *"Zaibatsu"*– owned organizations. From Meiji to the Taisho period before World War I, workers were clearly demarcated into temporary and skilled permanent employees in consumer industries such as cotton manufacturing. During the 1930's workers in the coal mines in central Japan were only regarded as expandable labour in the best capitalist exploitative tradition.[18] These and other differences in organizations were all "Japanese" i.e. a number of "Japanese" forms of organization have existed historically. The main problem then is not whether a particular form of organization is Japanese or not, but rather which particular form of management is selected for a particular organization at a particular time.

3) It is noteworthy that many elements that American observers name "traditional" or "feudal" as seniority system and life-long employment system were developed or adopted not so long ago. They were first introduced for factory workers after World War I by the shortage of trained workers and developed especially through the World War II and were widely permeated by the demand of the labor movement after the war. And these systems are even today applicable only to big business and government, not to small and medium size business that compose a larger segment of Japanese industry than in Western countries.[19]

4) It should also be noted that the structures and elements observed by Dore, Vogel, Abegglen *et. al.* are mainly related to big business which is not only a minority share of total industry in terms of number of companies but also newly developed one occupying privileged positions in the country. They have developed extremely accommodating organizations not only to the demands of industrial technology but also to the demands of ambitious people in order to recruit and maintain high quality personnel in competition with each other, and they can afford this because this is exactly how and why they grew big. Therefore, they should be

regarded as representing a new development in accordance with both industrial technology and the desires of privileged and ambitious people.

5) Finally even in regard to the basic values and the fundamental structure of group life asserted as the basis on which the continuity of Japanese social system resides, the facts are not so simple as imagined from these authors. For instance, although the desires of ambitious people are strongly influenced by cultural tradition, the choices provided by the system seem more conscious and rationally calculated than is often thought by American observers, a necessity to cope with competitive conditions, ambitions and high standard of education among these people. People stay with their company not only because they are loyal to it but also because they are satisfied with it or they prefer it by rational calculation in terms of their social environment and their further career. As long as the system works tolerably, it must have enough flexibility for adaptation and give enough scope and satisfaction to active and ambitious people. Wider participation in decision making in both vertical and horizontal hierarchical spans, opportunities for venture without much personal risk, high mobility and frequent re-training within a company, assured job security, an identity with organizational activities are the examples of popular elements in Japanese business and government organizations.

In this connection, one of Vogel's statements is very interesting in understanding Japan's success. He says:

" — the more I became convinced Japan's success in a variety of fields, the more I became convinced that given its limited resources, Japan has dealt more successfully with more of basic problems of postindustrial society than any other country."[20]

"My first inclination was to examine how such Japanese virtues as hard work, patience, self-discipline and sensitivity to others contributed to their success. But the more I examined the Japanese approach to modern organization, the business community, and the bureaucracy, the more I became convinced that Japanese success had less to do with traditional character traits than with specific organizational

structures, policy programs, and conscious planning."[21]
"If any single factor explains Japanese success, it is the group-directed quest for knowledge."[22]

Thus according to him, Japan's success is not brought about by traditional virtues but by intentionally planned efforts. He further explains how accumulated knowledge functions in bureaucratic organizations and industrial organizations as well as in the political world and how it facilitates bringing success in the sphere of education, welfare and prevention of crime.

V Japanese management

As mentioned in the beginning of this paper, management practices prevailing commonly in one culture are, in most cases, a composite product of both what the principles of modern business management require for running the large business organization and the various heritages of the culture which have historically, culturally and politico-economically been molded in that culture. The former element, i.e. the modern management principle, in any country universally applicable to any business firms, usually stands for the formal, impersonal, and rational aspect of management, the objective of which is to maximize the efficiency of business organization, while the latter, i.e. the heritage of a culture, represents specifically the people's way of thinking and life itself, rather informal and sometimes even irrational, without which the cohesiveness of a business organization as a human group cannot be fully developed. A well-balanced integration of these two elements, formal and informal, is thus absolutely necessary for the successful operation of modern business organization and the Japanese industrial organization has been until recent times one of the most successful models of integration of these two aspects in the world.

As we have noted in the preceding section, however if the characteristics of Japanese industrial organization are, in fact, newly adopted and rationally developed, then there is a problem of the degree to which those "different" characteristics have their origins in "different" cultural origins, or the degree to which they are adaptations to a "different"

present-day situation. Probably no definitive answer to this is possible, but one may be able to make some progress towards an answer by looking at the problem a) historically – how did the institutions evolve? and b) in terms of the problems which the institutions seem to address and their efficiency in doing so.

This kind of historical and socioeconomical analysis concerning Japanese management has been done by a Japanese industrial sociologist, Hiroshi Hazama and some other scholars in the field of business administration.[23] (The results of these studies are partly introduced in my argument.) The origin and the development of institutional characteristics such as life-long employment, a seniority-based reward system, a bottom-up decision making process, the intertwining of business with family affairs can be demonstrated rather clearly but this kind of approach does not really explain or answer the question about what the essence of Japanese management is.

An alternative way of solving that question, seems to lie in a comparison of management practices in various countries, based on close observation of them in each country. For example Hazama, in cooperation with Dore has tried to identify the essential characteristics of Japanese management, comparing labor relations in a British factory with those in a Japanese factory.[24]

Another slightly different approach would be possible in this connection; i.e. examination of managerial operations of a multinational enterprises of a Japanese origin in a country outside Japan. In other words, studies on adaptability of Japanese management to other business environments will contribute to clarifying the relationship between universal principles of modern management and the essential principles of Japanese management as well as basic values and structure in the Japanese society.

As a staff member of "Study of Potential Direct Investment in the United Kingdom by Japanese Enterprises" sponsored by the U.K. Department of Industry, I have had an opportunity to interview with managers of Japanese multinational companies operating there. The following description of particular companies seems to be useful in

investigating the above-mentioned questions though it does not lead us to a final conclusion. *vis.,*

A) Based on the business ideology of "one factory in each country" or "production on the spot" wherever market needs exist, this company inaugurated its production of zippers in 1971 in the special development area near Liverpool. It set up a factory which has now 500 employees almost all of whom are blue collar. It is now the top manufacturer in the U.K. zipper market. This remarkable success has been brought by both taking away market share from other British companies and at the same time by enlarging the size of zipper market itself in the United Kingdom by introducing especially high quality zippers that had been unknown to them before.

Generally speaking, three main characteristics of the Japanese management are said to be 1) life-long employment system, 2) loyalty to the firm, and 3) bottom-up process in decision making.

So far as its management in the United Kingdom concerned, the company is characterized by the peculiar reward system, a compound of both the traditional Japanese system and the merit system. Annual wage increases are automatically assured to every worker for the first five years after his entry to the firm while aspects of merit and performance by an individual or by a section or by a factory as a unit also used and competent men are given opportunities of promotion within the firm.

Thanks to the above-mentioned grading and reward system which functions very well, employees seem to acquire a sense of loyalty to the firm. Turn-over rate is very low and no strikes ever occurred. (There is only one labor union in the company.)

With reference to its decision-making process, both bottom-up and top-down processes are observed case by case.

The Japanese manager interviewed underlines the importance of its well functioning grading and reward system in avoiding strikes and other labor disputes and in maintaining smooth and successful operations. He said:

"The British reward system of 'the same wage for the same labor'

does not guarantee lives of middle-aged workers and that's why they have to recourse to strikes to get enough wages to secure lives under inflation."

B) Another case of successful business operations in the United Kingdom is that of an electric company which produces color T.V. sets. It has 500 employees working in a factory in a development area in Wales. The fundamental business ideology is that industrial manufacturers have to sell their high technology products with high values added directly to their consumers. The manager interviewed summarizes its management policy in the following:

"If we adopt the same managerial practices as those commonly prevailing in the United Kingdom, the only result can be equal productivity, the same quality of products and the equal level of profit compared with companies in the United Kingdom. In order to attain higher productivity, better quality and higher profit, we must combine good things in the Japanese management techniques with the local management practices. In this respect, we have developed three kinds of communication channels within the factory, i.e. communication between production section and sales section, weekly management meeting participated by both managers and foremen, and an every morning section meeting. Through this improvement of the communication channels, mutual understanding and reliance between Japanese and British workers have been fostered in the long run."

The company has no exceptional reward system other than its British counterparts, but the wage levels in general are much higher than others by virtue of high standard of technology and resulting high value added.

C) In contrast with the preceding two companies, the third case of business operations of a textile company seems to be a failure. It has two affiliated companies in the United Kingdom, one is a joint venture, the other is a take-over case. The manager explained its unsuccessful business operations mainly by the following reasons: 1) increase of production cost under inflation, 2) decreasing demand for high quality products, 3) entry barrier into the local market due to ethnic reasons, 4) low quality of manpower, particularly individualism among workers, 5) unreliable procurement of parts and components, 6) no definite long

term business perspective, and 7) 50% ownership (in case of the joint venture.)

He summarizes the following four important items to consider at the time of decision-making to go into an overseas production operation.

1) Products should have a strong brand image and high technological advantages which assure significantly high profits.
2) Investment plan should be accompanied with long term policy and perspectives.
3) 100% ownership.
4) Japanese managers should be encouraged to stay for a lengthy period in the host country.

The following conclusions can be drawn from the preceding cases concerning the problem of Japanese management and its adaptability in the U.K. business environment.

Distinctive features of Japanese personnel practices such as the permanent employment system, the seniority-based reward system and the heavy involvement of management with personal life of each employee, have undergone significant changes in the United Kingdom. However, the paternalistic approach treating workers as human beings and not as means of production, which would be the essence of fundamental ideology of Japanese management style, can be smoothly transferred to the United Kingdom under the following conditions.

1) Size of operation − number of employees less than 500
2) Type of operation − 100% ownership
3) Type of products − products with a strong brand image and high technological advantage

Although all these conditions are indispensable to successful business operations, the third condition that enables high wage level, is of particular importance as the rational organizational basis on which group solidarity and intimate relations can be established.

(Nov. 3, 1979)

Notes

(1) Although these three words — industrialization, modernization and urbanization — have different meanings, their usages are often confused and lack clear distinction because of their interacting and overlapping nature. In the author's understanding, "industrialization" is the basic process which gives rise to the other two. "Urbanization" is at least in the past, the spatial aspect of this process and "modernization" represents the Western version of this process as original cases.

(2) For example, Ohkochi, K., Sumiya, M. et al.

(3) Yoshino, M. Y., *Japan's Managerial System,* Cambridge, Mass., The MIT Press, 1968, p. x (Preface).

(4) Tsuda, M., *Nihon-teki Keiei no Yogo,* Tokyo, Toyo Keizai, 1976.

(5) Odaka, K., *Nihon no Keiei,* Tokyo, 1965 and Dore, R. P., *British Factory-Japanese Factory,* Berkley and Los Angeles, Univ. of California Press, 1973 are representative example.

(6) Dore, R. P., *British Factory and Japanese Factory,* Berkley and Los Angeles, Univ. of California Press, 1973.

(7) Brzezinski, Z., *The Fragile Blossom,* New York, Harper & Row Pub., 1972, p. 3.

(8) *Ibid.,* p. 4.

(9) Abegglen, J. C., *Japanese Factory,* Illinois, The Free Press, 1958, pp. 128-9.

(10) Abegglen, J. C., *Business Strategies for Japan.*

(11) From 53% to 77% in men employee and from 74% to 91% in women.

(12) From 9.2% to 6.3%.

(13) Vogel, E. F., *Japan's New Middle Class,* Berkley and Los Angeles, Univ. of California Press, 1971, p. 255.

(14) Nakane, C., *Japanese Society,* Berkley & Los Angeles, Univ. of California Press, 1970.

(15) Bellah, R. N., "Continuity and Change in Japanese Society" in Barber and Inkeles eds. *Stability and Social Change,* 1971, pp. 377-403.

(16) Bellah, R. N., "Values and Social Change in Modern Japan," *Asian Cultural Studies,* Tokyo, Vol. 3 (1962), pp. 32-33.

(17) Abegglen, *Japanese Factory,* pp. 134-5.

(18) Hazama, H., *Nihon-teki Keiei no Keifu,* Tokyo, Nihon Noritsu Kyokai, 1963.

(19) *Ibid.,* pp. 17-8 & 26-7.

(20) Vogel, E. F., *Japan as No. 1,* Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1979, p. viii (Preface).

(21) *Ibid.,* p. viii-ix.

(22) *Ibid.,* p. 27.

(23) For example, Hazama, H. *op. cit.*
(24) Hazama, H., *Igirisu no Shakai to Roshi Kankei*, Tokyo, Nihon Rodo Kyokai, 1974.

戦後日本の近代化と日本的経営

〈要　約〉

谷　口　佳　子

　戦後日本の急速な産業化・近代化をその社会的側面に焦点をあてて論ずる際に，従来二つの相対立する見解があった。この種の対立は殊に，企業組織に見出される日本的特徴——いわゆる日本的経営と呼ばれるもの——をめぐる評価の対立となってあらわれ，一方ではそれを封建遺制として遅れた発展段階を示すものととらえるのに対し，他方ではそれを日本文化の根底に深く根ざした慣行としてとらえ，むしろ，戦後日本の驚異的経済成長をもたらした鍵として，積極的に評価するものであった。しかしながら両者の見解とも，日本的経営慣行の特異性に注目しその相違を強調するあまり，ややもすれば，経営慣行中に見られる西欧近代的要素と日本固有の要素との関連のあり方を，全体的視野のもとで総合的に把握するという努力に欠けるきらいがあった。

　そこでこの論文では，上述の伝統的要素と近代的要素との相互関係を歴史的および社会文化的フレームの中で考察し，あわせて，戦後日本の近代化ひいては今後の非西欧化社会の近代化の問題を分析する新たな視点を模索した。特に下記の点に焦点をあてて検討を試みている。

　　1．戦後日本の社会変化の特異性——安定した社会秩序を保ちながら，
　　　急激な社会変化を可能にしたメカニズム。

　　2．日本的経営慣行に見られる両要素の相互関係または均衡関係。

　　3．西欧社会に進出した日本の多国籍企業に顕在化された，両要素の
　　　相互関係の分析に関するケース・スタディ。