TWO UNIQUE STREAMS OF JAPANESE ORGANIZATION THEORY STUDIES DURING THE 1970S AND 1980S: A VIEW OF MANAGEMENT

SHINICHI MURAKAMI

INTRODUCTION

Internationalization is a never-ending process. It brings us homogeneity in institutions, culture, life style, and values in the world. At the same time, it also makes us to acknowledge heterogeneity among nations. How does the world of scholarship progress in each nation where internationalization goes on?

This paper was originally motivated by the intent to clarify the unique features of Japanese organization theory studies compared with American studies. The discussion of this paper is limited to the works of management theorists of the 1970s and 1980s. The works I focus on are parts of literature on organization and management theory in both the U.S.A. and Japan.

Although Japanese studies of management theory history existed before the 1980s (Yoshida, 1992), few studies have so far been made of contemporary theories. Within the limits I mentioned above I think that we have at least two unique streams of leading organization theory studies in Japan. The purpose of this paper is to review these two unique streams of Japanese organization theory studies and clarify the reasons and processes of their development. At first, I describe the general features of Japanese organization theory studies after the Second World War. Secondly, I discuss the two streams of theory. Finally, I point out some factors which serve to predict the future direction of Japanese organization studies based on this discussion.

JAPANESE ORGANIZATION THEORY STUDIES AFTER THE SECOND WORLD WAR AS A REFLECTION OF THE TREND OF ORGANIZATION THEORY STUDIES IN THE U.S.A.: THE GENERAL FEATURES OF JAPANESE ORGANIZATION THEORY STUDIES AFTER THE SECOND WORLD WAR

Organization theory studies in Japan have been produced by scholars of management theory, sociology, public administration, politics, psychology, law, economics, industrial engineering, and so on. Fifty percent of the members of the Academic Association for Organizational Science in Japan are management theorists. This percentage means that management theorists are the most numerous and probably influential type of scholars for organization studies in Japan. Most objects of their studies are enterprises, especially stock companies.

Enterprises are acknowledged as units of individual capital which seek profits to increase the value of their capital. At the same time, they are also independent organizational units which comprise the economy and society of the nation. Therefore we have two major theoretical streams: capital-focussed and organization-focussed (Urabe, 1980: 130). It is often argued that we have management theory originating in the U.S.A.; German business administration theory; and "critical business administration theory" or "individual capital theory" based on the economics of Karl Marx in Japan. Management theory is thought to be included in the organization-focussed stream, critical business administration theory is thought to be included in the capital-focussed stream, and German business administration theory is thought to be included in both streams.

Before considering the general characteristics of organization theory studies after the Second World War, we will begin with a simple review of the works of representative scholars before the Second World War.

Japanese Organization Theory Studies before the Second World War

In Japan before the Second World War, German business administration theory was the major emphasis and both management theory and critical business administration theory were less developed (Morimoto, 1978).

The organization-focussed stream has been a dominant position in Japan since the origin of business administration theory. The first Japanese scholar to develop business administration was Teijiro Ueda in 1904 (Mano, 1978). He insisted that we should acknowledge enterprises as organizations. His two students, Youjiro Masuchi who studied under H.Nicklisch at Berlin, and Yasutaro Hirai, who studied under F.Schmidt at Frankfurt and also under H.Nicklisch, were the major force in creating the second generations in Japanese management studies (Yoshida, 1992). Hirai, who concentrated on the diffusion of business administration, established the Faculty of Business Administration at Kobe University in 1949. This was the first business administration faculty in Japan. He also thought that our object of studies was enterprises as organizations (Urabe, 1980: 130).

The Japan Society of Business Administration was established in 1926. The first president was Zenichi Takiya, and the second president was Hirai. Both professors were at Kobe University. The Academic Association for Organizational Science was established in

1959. The founder was Keiji Baba at Tokyo University, who was one year younger than Hirai. Baba thought that we should study organizations under unified control. Although he discussed the scientific management school critically in 1924, he was influenced by German business administration as well as American management theory. In this period when German business administration theory was dominant, his stronger organization-focussed was unique in Japanese academy (Okamoto, 1980).

Japanese Organization Theory Studies after the Second World War

Organization-focussed studies formed a mainstream from the beginning, as I have mentioned, and this trend became stronger as American management theory diffused after the Second World War. Management theory formed a mainstream by the 1970s, to which this paper restricts its discussion. As I have noted, the Academic Association for Organizational Science was established in 1959. Susumu Takamiya became a second president in 1963 after the death of Baba.

I refrain from naming those who formed the mainstream because of their large number. Representative theories before the appearance of contingency theory (Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967) are, for example, as follows: the human relation theory, management process theory, organizational behavior or micro organization theory, and "modern organization theory" which was formed by Barnard (1938), Simon (1945), and March and Simon (1958) and their followers.

Although these theories have continued to be studied by many scholars, it is no exaggeration to say that contingency theory had a major influence on our academy in the 1970s.[1] Theories under the influence of contingency theory, such as information processing view(Galbraith, 1973) or neocontingency approach (Miles & Snow, 1978), were also influential on the works of Japanese contingency theorists.

In the 1980s, there has developed a great variety of studies. For example, these are the theories or theoretical models such as transactions costs, organizational learning, organizational culture, organizational ecology, garbage can processes, organizational cognition, and organizing as sense-making.[2] Although these theories were introduced from the U.S.A., work from other countries is also of interest, for example, N. Luhmann (in Germany), H. Maturana, or F. Varela (from Chile).

The study of German business administration continued, and the studies of the countries of Western Europe except Germany or Soviet Union were introduced to Japanese academy after the Second World War. But their impact on Japanese academy was much smaller than that of American management theory. One can safely state that the politics, economy, and even culture in Japan were under the influence of the U.S.A. after the Second World War. It seemed that Japanese studies of organization theory also reflected this situation.

I think that the general characteristics of Japanese organization theory studies are acknowledged to be a reflection of the studies of American organization theories after the Second World War, although the degree of reflection is different among periods and scholars. This model for observations on Japanese studies after the Second World War is not different from the views of most Japanese scholars (e.g., Yamamoto, 1977).

It is often heard that life time employment, seniority system, and unions based in each company are three distinctive factors of Japanese management. We may say that the studies of Japanese management are literally a characteristic field for Japanese scholars. But the studies of Japanese management were begun by Abegglen (1958) (Urabe, 1980: 489-490). The valuation on Japanese management was swinging like a pendulum according to the economic state and enterprise performance of different countries. Many Japanese scholars have studied Japanese management. Among them Koike

(1984, 1988) proposed critical questions toward traditional arguments and innovative findings and discussion. In addition to many Japanese works, such American works as Pascale and Athos (1980) and Ouchi (1981) also contributed to Japanese management studies. Thus even in the syudy of Japanese management, we cannot ignore the influence and contribution of American researchers.

Our model for observations on the Japanese academy does not deny the value of many Japanese discussions and sharp analysis of American organization theories after the Second World War. Most of us would accept the view that organization studies in the U.S.A. has led those of any other country in both quality and quantity. But the insightful discussions of Japanese scholars have informed American organization theory, which has led the world.

TWO UNIQUE STREAMS OF JAPANESE ORGANIZATION THEORY STUDIES DURING THE 1970S AND 1980S

Among Japanese organization theory studies during the 1970s and 1980s, we can acknowledge at least two unique, leading streams which are a little different from general Japanese streams. Two streams on which I focus are the study of Chester I. Barnard's organization theory and the study of organizational evolution proposed by Tadao Kagono or Ikujiro Nonaka. We have other Japanese unique studies such as Koike's works among Japanese management studies and Misumi's PM theory of leadership. However, this paper focuses on two streams. It should be noted that my object is not to emphasize individual scholar's works but "streams" of studies: the studies of more than two scholars on a common subject.

The Study of Chester I. Barnard's Organization Theory

Recently, the Barnard Society had their annual meeting in conjunction with the annual meeting of the Academy of Management in the U.S.A. The seminar on Barnard theory was held by O. E. Williamson, at the University of California, Berkeley in 1988 when we celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of the publication of his major book (see, Williamson, 1990). Therefore, it may be that contemporary American scholars are not surprised at intensive Barnard theory studies in Japan, where it is not rare for "Barnardian" scholars to devote themselves exclusively to Barnard theory studies. Let me look briefly at intensive Barnard theory studies in Japan.

Yasujiro Yamamoto translated Barnard's main book *The Functions of the Executive* into Japanese in 1968. This translation was the second in Japan. He described in the translator's preface that we could call the strong impact of Barnard's theory a "Barnardian revolution" in organization and management theory like the Keynesian revolution in economics. Barnard's work became widely known in Japan because of the first translation by Sakae Tasugi and others in 1956. When citing the passage of Baba in the translator's preface in 1956, Tasugi supposed that Barnard's classic was too innovative for American scholars, except H. A. Simon, to follow him.

The first scholar who discovered and attempted to develop Barnard's theory in Japan was Baba (Yoshida, 1992). He discussed and valued highly the theory of Barnard and Simon in 1950. He designed business administration as organization theory, and thought that cooperative system as defined by Barnard was organization in a wide sense while formal organization was organization in a narrow sense(Yamamoto, 1986; Iino, 1988). Following his student Yasuo Okamoto (1980), the third president of the Academic Association for Organizational Science, however, many studies on Barnard in Japanese academy was far behind Baba and finally began in the 1960s.

Most of us would accept the view that Kuniyoshi Urabe's works are necessary in Barnard and Simon theory studies in Japan. He called the theoretical stream which was formed by Barnard (1938), Simon (1945), and March and Simon (1958) and their followers works "modern organization theory" and investigated such theoretical fields as organizational equilibrium and decision-making.

Yamamoto, who was advised by Baba, began to study Barnard theory earnestly in 1956. He understood that he underestimated American management although he had studied German business administration. He found some similarities between Barnard theory and his business administration theory, and called Barnard theory "structural theory of three layers" formed by cooperative system, organization, and management. He translated Barnard (1938) with Tasugi and Iino in 1968, and edited the volume *Barnard no Keiei Riron* (Barnard's Business Administration) with Tasugi in 1972.

The Japanese Barnard Society was established in 1974 with Tasugi as president. The Society had 70 members in 1988. So far, seven books have been published. Two of them are Japanese translations of Wolf (1973, 1974). Four books were published to celebrate the one hundred anniversary of his birth in 1986: those are Wolf and Iino (1986) and its Japanese translation, Kato and Iino (1986), and Iino (1988). Further, the new translation (Iino, 1990) of Barnard (1948) was published to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of Barnard (1938).

To echo Yamamoto (1988), Japanese Barnard theory studies are astonishing in their quality and quantity. We can show some examples. A special issue on Barnard theory was published by *Soshiki Kagaku* (Organizational Science), Quarterly of the Academic Association for Organizational Science, in 1975. The key words of articles of this special issue are responsibility and authority (Iino), morals (Sakai), communication (Taira), organizational equilibrium (Kawabata), criticism (Gon), and a bibliographical explanation (Takazawa). In Kato and Iino (1986), seventeen scholars debated Barnard theory from various points of view, such as social sciences (Okamoto, Simon, Shiobara, Yamamoto, T. Yoshida), methodology (Kato, Kitano, Murata), organizational morals and organizational culture

(Iino), organization economy (Mano), decision making (Niwamoto), scientific philosophy (Yoshihara), and modern society (Mito, Tsuchiya, Uemura, Wolf).

The literature I have referred to above are only a portion of the publications. We have also heard scholars who value Barnard highly act as if they believed Barnard theory was a religion (Iino, 1988). Yamamoto (1986) described that he was not a scholar who devoted himself to Barnard theory study because Japanese Barnard Society was established, and specialists called Barnardian studied Barnard's passages in great detail. Typical Barnardian specialists are Iino and Kato. Iino, Kato, and Mano collected materials, including his letters with Wolf's support, and developed the studies further.

Thus, I believe that one unique characteristic of organization theory in Japan is the stream of Barnard theory studies. I think that the energy that many Japanese Barnardians devote is much greater than that of Barnardians of any other country, and that their influence on the academy in Japan is much larger than that in any other country.

What accounts for this Japanese unique stream of Barnard organization theory studies?

First, Japanese scholars earnestly sought to obtain certain concepts or definitions of organizations. For example, March and Simon (1993: 20) suggested that "it is easier, and probably more useful, to give examples of formal organizations than to define the term." However, many Japanese scholars insisted on the development of concise definitions of organizations as the foundation of studies. It may be that this pursuit reflects a Japanese style of work. Barnard theory gave them a valuable base for their studies.

Secondly, Barnard's writings are difficult to understand. I suppose that the difficulty is a large obstacle for American scholars who value pragmatism. However, the reverse is true for the academy of Japan. In Japan, people dismiss books that are easy to read or entertaining, and value difficult books. Recently this trend is changing in Japan.

Thirdly, I point out the orientation for authority and identification. When people can't judge for themselves, they depend on authority or identification. The first scholar who introduced and valued Barnard (1938) was Baba, the founder of the Academic Association for Organizational Science. Barnard (1938) was translated by scholars at Kyoto University. Urabe at Kobe University evaluated Barnard highly as the founder of "modern organization theory." Mito, who appeared in the new age of individual capital theory, also valued Barnard highly. Most leading scholars in Japan evaluated Barnard highly, although they acknowledged his limits. Thus, the number of Japanese scholars who studied Barnard's works increased.

Fourthly, there is no single orthodox interpretation of Barnard's works. Barnard theory was thought to be valuable; and certainly studies of his works became also valuable. However, unified and orthodox interpretations of Barnard's works are lacking. Therefore many arguments took place among Japanese scholars. Controversies between Iino and Taira or between Kato and Iino are good examples.

Finally, related to the first reason, the traditional Japanese style of studies may be pointed out. Although Japanese business administration introduced German business administration in the beginning, as I have mentioned, it had a style of the interpretation of literature. In the period of American management after the Second World War, the Barnard studies accepted the traditional style of German business administration studies completely. It is not too far from the truth to say that this traditional style promoted the Japanese unique stream of Barnard organization theory studies at the same time that organization studies in the U.S.A. moved toward the statistical analysis of large scale empirical data.

The Study of Organizational Evolution Theory

Next, I discuss the stream of organizational evolution theory studies developed by Kagono and others during the first half of the 1980s. While the scholars may not have been the only students of organizational evolution in this period, it is certain that their study led the discussion in Japan. The *stream* of studies I consider is restricted to their study.

One of the members who formed this stream of studies in Japan is Ikujiro Nonaka. He acquired his Ph. D by the research on contingency theory at University of California, Berkeley in 1972 and issued the work in Japan in 1974. In 1977, a study group was formed to research and build a theory on Japanese organizations. The members of this group were Nonaka, Kagono, Komatsu, Sakashita, and Okumura. Nonaka et al. (1978) reviewed much of the literature of organization studies and proposed "an integrated contingency model."

What formed this stream was contingency theory. Let me look briefly at the study of contingency theory in Japan through articles and book reviews published in *Soshiki Kagaku* (Organizational Science). Inaba (1968) reviewed Thompson (1967), Kitano (1970) reviewed Lawrence and Lorsch (1967), and Kitano (1974) discussed the direction of the development. Futamura (1975) reviewed Lorsch and Morse (1974). And the special issue on contingency theory including Kitano's, Nonaka's and others' papers was published in 1976.

Kagono studied at Harvard Business School in 1981. His study led the study group to comparative management research. Kagono, Nonaka, Okumura, and Sakakibara (1983) researched management in the U.S.A. and Japan comparatively.[3] At the same time, they attempted to develop contingency theory by applying it to comparative management. They thought that they could contribute to the development of contingency theory if it could be applied to Japanese management. Thus, their theoretical orientation in 1983 was still to develop contingency theory.

Kagono et al. (1983: 103) showed the difference of strategic orientations of enterprises in the U.S.A. and Japan by dividing them between the *product orientation* in the U.S.A. and the *operations orientation* in Japan. The product orientation, American type, has the following features. Managers analyze the opportunities and risk of the environment completely, develop their resources flexibly, attach importance to the financial resources which are the most flexible, and define a more specific domain. The approach to establishing competitive advantages in each business field is usually deductive and logical, and the certain forecast of profit in each business field is needed. The operations orientation, Japanese type, is explained as follows. Managers attach weight to the accumulation of resources based on accumulation of experience in operations, define a flexible domain, and develop the survival-oriented resources considering the impact on human resources to activate learning at all levels. The approach to establishing competitive advantages in each business field is usually inductive and incremental.

Kagono et al. (1983: 103) also explained the difference of organizing principles of enterprises in the U.S.A. and Japan by dividing them between the *bureaucratic dynamics* in the U.S.A. and the *group dynamics* in Japan. The bureaucratic dynamics, American type, is an organizing principle which integrates an organization by rule and plan under the formalized hierarchy and responds to the environmental variety. The group dynamics, Japanese type, is an organizing principle which integrates an organization often by interactions among members and groups based on shared information and values and responds to the environmental variety.

Of course, they also point out that there are the differences of patterns in the adaptation of enterprises to their environment in both the U.S.A. and Japan. Two dimensions, strategic orientation and

Figure 1 Four Types of Adaptation to Environment

	Group Dynamics	Bureaucratic Dynamics
Operations Orientation	H Type	B Type
Product Orientation	V Type	S Type

Source: Kagono et al., 1985, Figure 7-2, p.231.

organizing principle, can show the difference among enterprises in each country. They develop four types of adaptation of organizations to environment (Figure 1). They argued that the adaptation of H type and V type was considered to be irrational from the view of contingency theory and information processing model. They thought that contingency theory should develop into more general theory and must explain the rationality of the adaptation of H type and V type.

Here Kagono et al. (1983) noticed and admired Weick's (1979) organizational evolution model, but could not incorporate his model. The literature that incorporated and developed Weick's (1979) organizational evolution model was Kagono (1983).

Kagono (1983) depended on Weick's (1979) organizational evolution model, which introduced D. Campbell's sociocultural evolution model to organization theory. Kagono thought that organizational evolution implied behavioral patterns in addition to knowledge which were changing in the process of variation, selection, and retention. The word *evolution* does not imply development or progress, but only change. Although evolution sometimes means incremental change in contrast to revolution (e.g., Miller, 1982), he includes both meanings in the term. He insisted that a variety of phenomenon in organizations are related with this process.

In the process of variation, new knowledge and behavioral

Figure 2 Characteristics of the Types of Organizational Adaptation

H: (1) Frequent interaction, sharing of values and information, generation of tension, very strong interpersonal networks. (2) Loosely-coupled linking-pin form: diffusion of decision-making power throughout the organization. (3) Priest-type leadership. (4) Broad learning through interaction, and sharing knowledge throughout the organization. (5) Day-to-day operational information much through direct contact with customers and clients. (6) Cohesion, harmony. (7) Reactive, inductive, and incremental adaptation. (8) Efficiency of operations, small differences in product characteristics, synergy, speed of adaptation to relatively continuous environmental change.	B: (1) Rules, problem-reactive, hierarchy, functional division of labor, extrinsic reward system tied to job. (2) Functional organization; concentration of power among top management and staff. (3) Technocratic leadership. (4) Learning by an "elite"; transfer of knowledge through policies, manuals, and rules. (5) Quantitative information. (6) Adherence to policies, jobs, procedures, rules. (7) Reactive adaptation geared toward higher quantitative output and defense of existing domain. (8) Operating efficiency, cost-leadership.
V: (1) Frequent interaction, sharing of values and information, emphasis on teams/task-forces; commitment to technology and product. (2) Coalitions of small teams; diffusion of decision-making power among them. (3) Entrepreneurial leadership. (4) Individual and team learning/learning by modelling and observation. (5) Fresh information concerning customers and technology. (6) Willingness to accept risk, venture spirit. (7) Pro-active and experimental; sometimes, adaptation in major strides. (8) Uniqueness of product, industry leader in innovation.	S: (1) Hierarchy, vertical information channels, plans, goals, self-containment, and appraisal of performance by results. (2) Divisional organization; concentration of power (especially for resource allocation) at the top. (3) Military general type leadership. (4) Learning by an "elite"; transfer of knowledge by highly institutionalized methods. (5) Systematic forecasting. (6) Consistency, adherence to plan, and goal-attainment. (7) Deductive, analytical, planned adaptation. (8) Strategic consistency.

MAJOR CHARACTERISTICS OF ADAPTATION

Each numbered item of the Table describes the dominant characteristics for organizations of the given type with respect to the following dimensions:
(1) MEANS OF ORGANIZATIONAL INTEGRATION AND INFORMATION PROCESSING.
(2) ORGANIZATIONAL FORM, AND DISTRIBUTION OF POWER.
(3) TOP MANAGEMENT LEADERSHIP.
(4) ACCUMULATION OF INFORMATION AND TRANSFER OF KNOWLEDGE.
(5) INFORMATION ORIENTATION.
(6) VALUE ORIENTATION.
(7) ADAPTIVE ORIENTATION TOWARD OPPORTUNITY AND RISK.
(8) KEY FACTORS FOR ADAPTATION AND GAINING COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE.

Source: Kagono et al., 1985, Figure 7-3, p.236.

patterns take place in a variety of ways, which makes organizations unstable. It is necessary for organizational evolution to make organizations unstable by incorporating tension or equivocality to organizations. Next, adaptive knowledge and behavioral patterns must be selected among many variable ones, instability or equivocality must be reduced, and organizations must recover their stability. Organizations accumulate the useful knowledge and behavioral patterns and make them their wisdom in the process of retention. Organizations evolve through this process.[4]

Kagono (1983) discusses the types of evolution process to clarify the relation between organizational adaptation and organizational evolution process. He adopts four types of organizational adaptive process (Kagono, et al., 1983) in discussing them. In short, he understands that his four adaptive types are also evolution types.

Kagono (1983) points out the significance of his evolution model as follows. First, this model can view different dynamic processes of organizational adaptation. Secondly, it criticizes the excessive emphasis of equilibrium, coalignment, or unification in traditional organization theory. Thirdly, it can clarify the positive meaning of confusion or instability in organizations. Fourthly, it insists the importance of social cognitive process. Finally, it can clarify the dualism of organizational learning. Further, he says that his model has some practical implications. First, this model implies the usefulness of experimental behavior under turbulent environments. Secondly, it suggests the utility of loose coupling. Thirdly, it suggests the effectiveness of indirect management. Finally, it suggests the significance of conscious creation of equilibrium.

After Kagono (1983), Nonaka (1985) followed. I think that Nonaka (1985) has similarity with Kagono (1983) in the essence. I value their organizational evolution theory studies as one of the Japanese unique studies. I clarify the reasons as follows.

There are important criticisms of contingency theory. It can not view the dynamic process of organizational adaptation, which is the core criticism. Organizational ecology (e.g., Hannan & Freeman, 1989), depending on C. Darwin's framework, is one of the most influential paradigms to try to respond to the core criticism of contingency theory. The main level of analysis is not individual organizations but populations of organizations. According to organizational ecology, adaptation of populations of organizations occurs through the mortality of individual organizations and the birth of new organizations.

Kagono's (1983) model explained the dynamic process of individual organizational adaptation in a logic which was different from that of organizational ecology or Tushman and Romanelli (1985). From the study of comparative management between the U.S.A. and Japan, he acknowledged the limit of contingency theory and developed Weick's evolution model to his model. Some suggestions proposed by his discussion have some similarity with Tushman and Romanelli (1985), I think, which is a kind of proof that shows the significance of his model.

In the U.S.A., Singh (1990) and Baum and Singh (1994) have proposed an organizational evolution view which developed out of organizational ecology. It seems that arguments on organizational evolution have developed actively in the U.S.A. in the 1990s. Kagono selected the subject of organizational evolution earlier and developed his model in 1983. This is enough to value Kagono's study on organization evolution highly. His study has formed a leading stream of organizational evolution studies in Japan in the 1980s.

CONCLUSION

Such American scholars as C.I.Barnard and K.Weick are necessary for these two unique streams of Japanese organization theory studies discussed in this paper. Some people may question whether the two streams of Japanese organization theory studies discussed in this paper are unique compared with general features of Japanese studies after the Second World War. It is clear that these two streams of studies were not formed without the influence of American scholars. However, as I have clarified above, we should notice that these two streams of studies in Japan were unique when compared with organization studies in the U.S.A. during the 1970s and 1980s.

In Japan, American management theory formed major streams after the Second World War, and the Academic Association for Organizational Science (the founder and half of the members are management theorists) was established in 1959. Let me say again that I value Japanese useful discussions and sharp analysis of American organization theories after the Second World War. I believe that such insightful discussions are necessary. I think that studies which are different from American or other countries' studies are not always valuable. I think we have much room for considering the relation between differences and values in studies.

One of the two streams of studies identified is Barnard study, and Barnard Society was established in the U.S.A. recently behind the Japanese Barnard Society. And streams of organizational evolution studies which were different in logic from studies in Japan were formed in the U.S.A. in the almost same period as formed in Japan. The two streams of studies discussed in this paper were unique, but they were suited to similar streams of organization studies in the U.S.A. Although I mentioned "at least two streams of studies in Japan," there may be others. Further, the development of a measure that shows the degree of uniqueness clearly is also the task ahead of our study.

Yoshida (1992) described that Japanese studies of management theory history were established at last by Yamamoto (1977) and Kobayashi (1971, 1977). Naturally, few studies of management theory history discussed contemporary theories. Kagono is one of the fourth generations behind the third, Urabe or Ichihara, the second, Masuchi or Hirai, and the first, Ueda. The latest contemporary theories discussed by Japanese studies of management theory history are those of the third generations. Therefore, this paper may contribute to Japanese studies of management theory history by discussing newer generations' studies.

In the respect of the generations of scholars as mentioned above, it seemed that major scholars of Barnard theory studies were in the third generations. Japanese scholars who study organizations will shift from the third generations to the fourth gradually. Although this year is over fifty years after the Second World War, I acknowledge that Japanese studies which reflect American theory studies are decreasing gradually in recent organization studies. To take an example, only a few Japanese researchers have studied organizational ecology that has provoked a great deal of controversy in the U.S.A.[5] Recently, it seems that empirical studies on Japanese organizations are increasing.

The scholarship of nations is a large subject, I think. The Japanese economy grew rapidly and the Japanese became wealthy after the Second World War. Many Asian neighbors visited Japan to study organizations and management. Although German studies were major in Japanese academy before the Second World War, American studies became major after the War. Will this Japanese trend of studies change in the future? How will a modern Asian view be formed and the view develop organization theory studies in Japan? Probably the scholars from Asian neighbor nations in Japan will play important roles in replying to this question. Further, we should never overlook the effect of the international networks of scholars on Japanese organization studies.

One more question is, how will the view of women developed in the world widely be formed in the concrete, and be reflected in the organization theory in Japan? Although we have few women who study organization theory in Japan even now, it is noteworthy that Toshiko Futamura, a female scholar, advanced organization theory studies in Japan after the Second World War.

We will be able to see the new characteristic of organization theory studies in Japan as the fifth generation of scholars comes of age. Will the new world of theoretical studies in Japan allow variability to a degree and generate individual uniqueness and free creativity then?

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I thank Professor W.Richard Scott, Professor Osamu Mano, and Professor David C. Huffman for their useful comments on earlier draft of this paper although I could not respond to their comments fully.

[NOTES]

(1) Many studies developed in Britain in the 1950s anticipated Lawrence & Lorsch's (1967) contingency theory. For further details of this point, see Hassard (1993, chap. 2).

(2) Valuable discussions on these theories are contained in Scott (1992).

(3) In the English version (Kagono et al., 1985) of Kagono et al. (1983), several revisions were made.

(4) This paragraph is based on Murakami (1991b).

(5) For example, Murakami (1991a) and Takase (1991) discussed organizational ecology.

[REFERENCES]

Abegglen, J. C. 1958. *The Japanese factory: Aspects of its social organization.* Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Barnard, C. I. 1938. *The functions of the executive.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Barnard, C. I. 1948. *Organization and management: Selected papers*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Baum, J.A.C., & Singh, J. V. (Eds.) 1994. *Evolutionary dynamics of organizations*. NY: Oxford University Press.

Futamura, T. 1975. Review of Lorsch & Morse (1974) (in Japanese). *Soshiki Kagaku* (Organizational Science), 9(3).

Galbraith, J. 1973. *Designing complex organizations*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Hannan, M. T., & Freeman, J. 1989. *Organizational ecology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hassard, J. 1993. *Sociology and organization theory: Positivism, paradigms and postmodernity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Iino, H. (Ed.) 1988. *Ningen kyodo* (Cooperation). Tokyo: Bunshindo.

Iino, H. (Ed.) 1990. *Soshiki to kanri* (Organization and management by Barnard, 1948) Tokyo: Bunshindo.

Inaba, M. 1968. Review of Thompson (1967) (in Japanese). *Soshiki Kagaku* (Organizational Science), 2(1).

Kagono, T. 1983. Bunka shinka no process model to soshiki riron (The process model of cultural evolution and its implications for organization theories). *Soshiki Kagaku* (Organizational Science), 17(3): 2-15.

Kagono, T., Nonaka, I., Sakakibara, K., & Okumura, A. 1983. *Nichibei kigyo no keiei hikaku* (A U.S.-Japan comparison of management). Tokyo: Nihonkeizai Shinbunsha.

Kagono, T., Nonaka, I., Sakakibara, K., & Okumura, A. 1985. *Strategic vs. evolutionary management: A U.S.-Japan comparison of strategy and organization*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Kato, K., & Iino, H. (Eds.) 1986. *Barnard* (in Japanese). Tokyo: Bunshindo.

Kitano, T. 1970. Review of Lawrence & Lorsch (1967) (in Japanese). *Soshiki Kagaku* (Organizational Science), 3(4).

Kitano, T. 1974. Soshiki no jyoken riron (The direction of the development of contingency theory). *Soshiki Kagaku* (Organizational Science), 8(1).

Kobayashi, K. (Ed.) 1971. *Nihon keieigakushi* (Japanese history of business administration theories), vol.1. Tokyo: Nihon hyoronsha (vol.2, 1977).

Koike, K. 1984. Skill formation systems in the U.S. and Japan. In M. Aoki (Ed.), *The economic analysis of the Japanese firm*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Koike, K. 1988. *Understanding industrial relations in modern Japan*. London: Macmillan Press.

Lawrence, P. R., & Lorsch, J. 1967. *Organization and environment: Managing differentiation and integration*. Boston: Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University.

Lorsch, J., & Morse, J. J. 1974. *Organizations and their members: A contingency approach*. NY: Harper & Row.

Mano, O. 1978. *Soshiki keizai no kaimei* (The elucidation of organization economy). Tokyo: Bunshindo.

March, J., & Simon, H.A. 1993. *Organizations* (2nd ed.). NY: John Wiley & Sons (1st ed., 1958).

Miles, R. E., & Snow, C. C. 1978. *Organizational strategy, structure, and process*. NY: McGraw-Hill.

Miller, D. 1982. Evolution and revolution: A quantum view of structual change in organizations. *Journal of Management Studies*: 131-151.

Morimoto, M. 1978. *Keieigaku no genri* (Principles of business administration). Tokyo: Chuokeizaisha.

Murakami, S. 1991a. Managerial implications of organizational ecology (in Japanese). *Soshi Kagaku* (Organizational Science), 25(1): 67-77.

Murakami, S. 1991b. Organization theory (in Japanese). In S. Kobayashi (Ed.), *Gendai keieigaku soron* (Modern business administration). Tokyo: Soseisha.

Nonaka, I. 1974. *Soshiki to shijyo* (Organization and market). Tokyo: Chikura Syobo.

Nonaka, I. 1985. *Kigyo shinka ron* (The evolution of firms). Tokyo: Nihonkeizai Shinbunsha.

Nonaka, I., Kagono, T., Komatsu, Y., Okumura, A., & Sakashita, A. 1978. *Soshiki gensyo no riron to sokutei* (Theories and measure-

ments of organizational behavior). Tokyo: Chikura Syobo.
Okamoto, Y. 1980. Baba Keiji soshiki riron (Keiji Baba's organization theory). *Soshiki Kagaku* (Organizational Science), 14(1): 54-60.
Ouchi, W. G. 1981. *Theory z*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
Pascale, R. T., & Athos, A. G. 1980. *The art of Japanese management*. NY: Simon & Schuster.
Scott, W. R. 1992. *Organizations: Rational, natural, and open systems* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
Singh, J. V. (Ed.) 1990. *Organizational evolution: New directions*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publication.
Simon, H. A. 1976. *Administrative behavior* (3rd ed.). NY: Macmillan (1st ed., 1945).
Soshiki Kagaku (Organizational Science). 1975. Special issue on Barnard theory (in Japanese). 9(3).
Soshiki Kagaku (Organizational Science). 1976. Special issue on contingency theory (in Japanese). 10(4).
Takase, T. 1991. *An empirical study on structural inertia* (in Japanese). Osaka: Kansai University.
Thompson, J. D. 1967. *Organizations in action*. NY: McGraw-Hill.
Tushman, M. L., & Romanelli, E. 1985. Organizational evolution: A metamorphosis model of convergence and reorientation. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior*, vol.7. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
Urabe, K. 1980. *Keieigaku jiten* (Business administration dictionary). Tokyo: Chuokeizaisha.
Weick, K. E. 1979. *The social psychology of organizing* (2nd ed.). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
Williamson, O. E. (Ed.) 1990. *Organization theory: From Chester Barnard to the present and beyond*. NY: Oxford University Press (expanded ed., 1995).
Wolf, W. B. 1973. *Conversations with Chester I. Barnard*. Cornell University.
Wolf, W. B. 1974. *The basic Barnard: An introduction to Chester I. Barnard and his theories of organization and management*. Cornell University.

Wolf, W. B., & Iino, H. (Eds.) 1986. *Philosophy for managers: Selected papers of Chester I. Barnard*. Tokyo: Bunshindo.

Yamamoto, Y. 1977. *Nippon keieigaku 50 nen* (Fifty years of Japanese business administration). Tokyo: Toyokeizai Shinposha.

Yamamoto, Y. 1986. Barnard riron to keieigaku honkakuka no michi (Barnard theory and the development of business administration). In Kato & Iino (Eds.), *Barnard* (in Japanese). Tokyo: Bunshindo.

Yoshida, K. 1992. *Nippon no keieigaku* (Japanese Business Administration). Tokyo: Dobunkan.

ABSTRACT

TWO UNIQUE STREAMS OF JAPANESE ORGANIZATION THEORY STUDIES DURING THE 1970S AND 1980S: A VIEW OF MANAGEMENT

SHINICHI MURAKAMI

This paper was originally motivated by the intent to clarify the unique features of Japanese organization theory studies compared with American studies. This paper focuses attention on the works of management theorists during the 1970s and 1980s. Within these limits I think we can discern at least two unique streams that are somewhat different from the general characteristics of organization theory studies in Japan after the Second World War. These are C. I. Barnard's organization theory and organizational evolution theory studies. This paper reviews these two unique streams of studies, and clarifies the reasons for and processes of their development. Further, it points out some factors which serve to predict the future direction of Japanese organization studies based on this discussion.