

5-1972

# Corporate Warfare or Corporate Kinship? The Effects of Military & Familial Metaphors on Japanese & American Organizational Culture

Joan Flora

*Western Kentucky University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.wku.edu/theses>



Part of the [International and Intercultural Communication Commons](#), [Organizational Communication Commons](#), and the [Social Influence and Political Communication Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Flora, Joan, "Corporate Warfare or Corporate Kinship? The Effects of Military & Familial Metaphors on Japanese & American Organizational Culture" (1972). *Masters Theses & Specialist Projects*. Paper 2328.  
<https://digitalcommons.wku.edu/theses/2328>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by TopSCHOLAR®. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses & Specialist Projects by an authorized administrator of TopSCHOLAR®. For more information, please contact [topscholar@wku.edu](mailto:topscholar@wku.edu).

Flora,

Joan Elizabeth

1992

CORPORATE WARFARE OR CORPORATE KINSHIP?  
THE EFFECTS OF MILITARY AND FAMILIAL METAPHORS  
ON JAPANESE AND AMERICAN ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

A Thesis  
Presented to  
the Faculty of the Department of Communication  
Western Kentucky University  
Bowling Green, Kentucky

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Arts

by  
Joan Elizabeth Flora  
May, 1992

**AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF THESIS**

Permission is hereby

- granted to the Western Kentucky University Library to make, or allow to be made photocopies, microfilm or other copies of this thesis for appropriate research for scholarly purposes.
- reserved to the author for the making of any copies of this thesis except for brief sections for research or scholarly purposes.

Signed: *Jan Elizabeth Flone*

Date: *April 23, 1992*

Please place an "X" in the appropriate box.

This form will be filed with the original of the thesis and will control future use of the thesis.

CORPORATE WARFARE OR CORPORATE KINSHIP?  
THE EFFECTS OF MILITARY AND FAMILIAL METAPHORS  
ON JAPANESE AND AMERICAN ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

Date Recommended April 14, 1992  
Allen W. Farmer

Director of Thesis  
Samuel J. Ray  
Judith D. Hoover

Date Approved April 23, 1992  
Elmer Gray  
Dean of the Graduate College

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the members of my committee for their guidance, support, and practical advice throughout this project and Dr. Larry Winn, the "metaphor man," for his inspiration. For information on Japanese culture, I am indebted to Dr. Kathleen Kaleb, Department of Sociology, Western Kentucky University, and for information on Japanese business, Dr. Esther Millon Seeman, the Japan Center of Tennessee. I would also like to extend my sincere appreciation to Joyce Whiting and Edwin "Pete" Gritton of Toyota Motor Manufacturing, U.S.A., Georgetown, Kentucky for their hospitality and generosity. Finally, my deepest thanks go to my family for taking the problems of everyday life off my hands, allowing me to devote all my time and energy to this study.

## PREFACE

### Author's Note On the Terms Used in Text

All Japanese terms cited in the text will be translated and defined by the source. For example, Dollinger (1988) defines the Japanese concept of "ringi" simply as "consensus decision-making" (p. 580); Ouchi (1981) sees it in more concrete terms as "a collective decision making in which a document passes from manager to manager for their official seal of approval" (p. 35); J. Whiting's definition agreed with Ouchi's but became even more specific; at Toyota, apparently, the process of "ringi" involved expenditures of over one thousand dollars; the process dealing with any lesser amount was called "nemawashi" (personal communication, February 27, 1992). Such differences in translation appear throughout the study.

In addition, please note that all Japanese names used in both the body of the work and all appendices and references appear in the traditional Western format unless otherwise noted. Thus, the Japanese author Kamata Satoshi ("Kamata" being the family name and "Satoshi" being the given name) appears as Satoshi Kamata throughout this work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . . iii

PREFACE . . . . . iv

ABSTRACT . . . . . vii

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS . . . 1

    Introduction . . . . . 1

    Organizational Culture Defined . . . . . 2

    The Role of Metaphor Explained . . . . . 5

    Sample . . . . . 9

    Research Questions . . . . . 10

    Hypotheses . . . . . 10

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND THEORETICAL  
    PERSPECTIVES . . . . . 12

    Review of Literature . . . . . 12

    Organizational Culture and Metaphor. . . . . 12

    The American Approach to Organizational  
        Culture . . . . . 15

    The Japanese Approach to Organizational  
        Culture . . . . . 22

    Theoretical Perspectives . . . . . 29

        Archetypal Metaphors . . . . . 29

        Minimetaphors . . . . . 31

        Major Triad . . . . . 31

III. METHODOLOGY . . . . . 32

    Artifacts . . . . . 32

    Field Research . . . . . 33

    Procedures . . . . . 33



IV.	ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION . . . . .	35
	Analysis . . . . .	35
	Archetypal Metaphors . . . . .	35
	Minimetaphors . . . . .	39
	Major Triad . . . . .	40
	Discussion . . . . .	41
V.	CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	49
	Limitations . . . . .	49
	Recommendations for Future Study . . . . .	50
	Implications for Intercultural Communication . . . . .	52
	APPENDICES . . . . .	54
	REFERENCES . . . . .	67
	BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	74

CORPORATE WARFARE OR CORPORATE KINSHIP?  
THE EFFECTS OF MILITARY AND FAMILIAL METAPHORS  
ON JAPANESE AND AMERICAN ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

Joan Elizabeth Flora      May, 1992      77 Pages  
Directed by: Cecile W. Garmon, Judith D. Hoover, and  
                  Sally J. Ray  
Department of Communication  
  Western Kentucky University

This study was undertaken to determine the dominant cultural metaphors at work in American and Japanese organizational culture, to examine the ways in which each society interprets these metaphors, and to assess the importance of the metaphors relative to intercultural communication. Using a combination of qualitative content analysis, rhetorical criticism, contextual analysis, and non-participant observation, two of the most dominant metaphors in both cultures, business-as-war and business-as-family, were discovered and examined. The research data comes from a variety of books, scholarly and popular articles, pamphlets, unpublished papers, films, and miscellaneous documents. These materials cover many disciplines: communication, history, popular culture, sociology, psychology, business, management, and literature. Additional written and verbal information obtained from personal interviews conducted at a Japanese-owned American-staffed manufacturing facility supplements these materials.

By applying Osborn's (1967) theory of "archetypal metaphors," or metaphors which strike deep into the human subconscious; Gozzi's (1990b) concept of "minimetaphors" which arise from these archetypal

metaphors; and Hall and Trager's (Hall, 1973) "major triad" (formal, informal, and technical) of behavioral modes, the following conclusions were derived:

(1) many metaphors appear in both societies, but the familial and military metaphors dominate the business cultures; (2) viewing business as a war developed out of the violent histories of both cultures and perpetuates harmful attitudes; (3) viewing business as a family developed out of the homogeneity of the Japanese culture, but it did not develop as readily in the more heterogeneous United States; (4) each society interprets these metaphors in different ways, making them culturally unique but not culturally exclusive; (5) different interpretations may arise from the ways in which the cultures transmit the metaphors; (6) many of the metaphors associated with both of these archetypes no longer refer to their original meanings; and (7) multinational corporations will transmit their own unique cultural metaphors to their foreign employees.

## CHAPTER I

### Introduction and Research Questions

Oh, East is East, and West is West, and never  
the twain shall meet,  
Till Earth and Sky stand presently at God's  
great Judgement Seat . . . .

Kipling (1889/1912), like many others, abandoned the effort to solve the great mystery of the differences between Caucasian and Asian thought and culture. With global interdependence increasing since World War II (Miller & Kilpatrick, 1987, p. 1), however, we can no longer postpone the inevitable examination of our fear and distrust. Many theories proposed in the last four decades purportedly explain the ever-widening gulf between the United States and Japan in business and culture. These theories range from a physiological explanation that the structure of an Asian brain does not allow it to function like a Western brain to a psychological tenet which maintains Asians will never communicate well with Westerners since Westerners do not share the same regard for the group, the family, etc. Some even rely on the illogical: "we" cannot associate with them because they are not like "us." Since many theories arise from xenophobia or prejudice, they have proven untenable.

This study takes a very different path by exploring the metaphorical language used to define organizational culture in the United States and Japan. Enduring cultural metaphors develop slowly over time in the hearts and minds of the members of a culture and permeate every aspect of living. What American does not know that the phrase the "father of his country" can only refer to George Washington? In Japan, everyone knows that "sempai-kohai" or "elder brother-employee" refers to apprenticeships (Ruch, 1984, 39). Such metaphors appear with great frequency in both the American and the Japanese civilizations. They influence and, indeed, create the fundamental ideas of home, family, life, and survival. Naturally, the realm of business and economics cannot remain isolated from this influential language and thought. If these metaphors form the basis for everyday behavior, they have a profound impact on everything from the office decor to the employment policies to the international investments made by the firm or corporation. These persistent metaphors become embedded in tradition and help to prevent change. If and when incompatible cultural metaphors meet, dramatic and devastating communication breakdowns can occur.

#### Organizational culture defined

Countless scholarly and popular works exist which purport to enumerate and explain the differences between the way Japanese and American companies work. Many of these hinge on rules of etiquette or popular culture. They tend to advocate a patterned approach to solving the problems of intercultural communication: when in situation "x" exhibit behavior "y," but never say "z." De Mente, a journalist and student of Japanese business and culture, skillfully avoids

falling into this trap. His books appeal to the deeper roots of cultural diversity and strive for understanding beyond mere superficial differences. In one of his most prominent works, How to do business with the Japanese: A complete guide to Japanese customs and business practices (1987), De Mente writes:

. . . generally in the West the conduct of business creates tension in an atmosphere of personal competition, while the main theme of the Japanese way is to eliminate or reduce tension and individual responsibility . . . . (p. 2)

De Mente's "atmosphere" or "theme" forms the basis for what theorists call the "organizational culture" of a company. Bolman and Deal (1991) define organizational culture as "distinctive beliefs and patterns" that develop in every organization over time (p. 268). Carbaugh (1985) refers to the organizational culture as "a system of meaning or process of sense-making" (p. 32). Additionally, Smircich (1985) believes theorists view organizational culture as ". . . a possession--a fairly stable set of taken-for-granted assumptions, shared beliefs, meanings, and values that form a kind of backdrop for action" (p. 58). From the above, anyone can see that organizational culture remains difficult to define or measure; it combines the areas of sociology, psychology, and anthropology in a less-than-exact and, perhaps, less-than-scientific fashion. Nonetheless, researchers (cf. Ouchi, 1982; Louis, 1985; Naisbitt & Aburdene, 1985; Bolman & Deal, 1991) agree organizational culture exists in the workplace and affects every aspect of the operation.

The purpose of the creation of a corporate or organizational culture, according to Carbaugh (1985), involves the "aligning" of workers' "meanings and

actions" (p. 31)--if, indeed, one can create a culture at all (see Martin, 1985, p. 95). All of this implies that somehow the appropriate "beliefs and patterns" or the "meanings and actions" for a particular organization transfer from the management, or those in control of the meanings and symbols, to the current employees and any future employees as well. The tremendous power over human lives this implies occurred to Duncan (1968) who states, "Whoever creates and controls the sociodramas of everyday life controls our lives" (p. 236). Brand's (1989) perspective seems slightly different from Duncan's, but he agrees: "The party to the debate which [sic] can capture and control the symbols . . . [is] likely to control the responses of the people to them" (p.15). Mansfield and Zeffane (1983) eloquently describe this transferal of meaning between "generations" of employees: ". . . it is clear that organizations in particular, and individual managers to an extent, carry history forward into the present" (p. 10). Such a process naturally involves communication where a symbol exchange occurs in order to create reality within the work environment (Carbaugh, 1985, p. 37).

One of the latest catch-phrases in organizational communication describes just such an exchange of symbols: the corporate "vision." As Naisbitt and Aburdene (1985) see it, the creation of a vision establishes ". . . a whole new sense of where a company is going and how to get there" (p. 20). Many American companies, concerned with declining market shares and disintegrating employee morale, recently decided to establish a formal "mission statement" for their organizations which contain a "vision" of the company's future in three or five years (Naisbitt & Aburdene, 1985, pp. 24-27). A common metaphor for a way of doing

business might be another way to define the company's vision.

#### The role of metaphor explained

Increasingly, scholars look to the metaphor to explain and illuminate numerous phenomena in the study of communication. Aristotle praises the metaphor as "'the greatest thing by far' for poets" (Holman, 1980, p. 265), and throughout much of the modern period, rhetoricians and philosophers remained content to leave the study--and the admiration--of the device to literary scholars. In the early 1970s, however, a movement by many noted rhetoricians released the metaphor from the literary community's exclusive domain and explored its usefulness as a vehicle of information transfer in many aspects of life. Osborn spearheaded the movement in the 1960s, a movement which culminated in his resounding 1967 article "Archetypal Metaphor in Rhetoric: The Light-dark Family," which remains a rhetorical touchstone today. In this article, Osborn states the revolutionary idea that the study of metaphors used by orators might "permit a more precise focusing upon whatever values and motives are salient in society at a given time" (p. 248). Later scholars, expanding on his observations, supported the study of metaphor even more strongly. For example, Ortony (1975) declares, ". . . [The] metaphor is an essential ingredient of communication and consequently of great educational value" (p. 45). Not to be outdone, Maas (1990) suggests "[a]nalogy or metaphor . . . is actually more central to critical thinking and creative problem solving than is the study of formal logic" (p. 164).

Davidson (1979), however, disagrees. He feels the creation and understanding of metaphors must remain in



the realm of imagination and "dreams." His rationale appears derived from the function of metaphors: they do not function in a precise manner; they can never be exact in either composition or meaning since they follow few rules. According to Davidson, "The concept of metaphor as primarily a vehicle for conveying ideas, even if unusual ones, seems to me as wrong as the parent idea that a metaphor has a special meaning" (pp. 29-30).

Few of today's scholars appear to share Davidson's view. Siltanen (1991) believes the "renewed" interest in metaphor came from ". . . the greater acceptance of the notion that metaphor is a cognitive element rather than or in addition to being a linguistic element" (p. 3). Nelson (1989) agrees, commenting that the term refers ". . . not just to a linguistic device but a manner of looking at reality" (p. 4).

Agreement on the exact nature and function of a metaphor remains more elusive than these statements imply; scholars find it difficult to establish one universal definition. According to Burke (1989), metaphor, in reality, means "perspective": "Metaphor is a device for seeing something *in terms of* something else. Its brings out the thisness of a that, or the thatness of a this" (pp. 247-249). He also examined the relationship of metaphor to language:

Language develops by metaphorical extension, in borrowing words from the realm of the corporeal, visible, tangible and applying them by analogy to the realm of the incorporeal, invisible, intangible; then in the course of time, the original corporeal reference is forgotten, and only the incorporeal, metaphorical extension survives . . . (Burke, 1989, p. 250).

As Ortony (1975) points out, "[t]he view that metaphors are essentially comparisons is perhaps the nearest that we have to an accepted theory of metaphor" (p. 45).

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) define metaphor quite simply: "The essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another" (p.5). They add, ". . . [M]etaphor is not just a matter of language, that is, of mere words. . . . [O]n the contrary, human *thought processes* are largely metaphorical. This is what we mean when we say that the human conceptual system is metaphorically structured and defined" (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 6). This interpretation provides the standard for usage and evaluation of the device throughout my study.

Osborn (1967, 1975, 1976), perhaps the premiere scholar of rhetorical metaphors, agrees with Lakoff and Johnson's functional interpretation, stating:

. . . [M]etaphor is both depiction and something more than depiction. Not only does it organize and influence perception, but it can also disturb the very patterns by which we constitute reality. \* \* \* Metaphor can occur as a diastrophic process within symbolic transformation, destroying and creating, profoundly rearranging the landscape of our minds. (Osborn, 1976, p. 7)

Apparently, some metaphors go beyond the mere transference of emotive qualities to convey a separate, distinct truth. These metaphors, Osborn believes, have turned into "symbols" or "archetypes" which carry ". . . the idea of basic, unchanging patterns of experience" (Osborn, 1967, p. 249).

Such powerful metaphors can help develop and control the world-view of an entire culture. Sackmann (1989) supports this thesis, stating: ". . . [D]epending on the choice and field of origin, . . .

metaphors connote meanings on a cognitive, emotional, and behavioral level in a holistic way" (p. 464). The choice of metaphor leads to a different view of reality and influences an individual's cultural and role perceptions. Schmitz (1978) agrees, designating the metaphor as ". . . a means by which language is used to gain access to reality" (p. 7). Going even further, Ritter and Andrews (1978) believe only through the symbolization of events can they be understood: "[t]he processing of historical phenomena is partly the discovery and exploitation of their symbolic power" (p. 2). Because of this ability to shape reality, then, the choice and use of metaphor profoundly affects communicative behavior and, therefore, plays a major role in the development and maintenance of organizational culture.

Based on this assumption, success in intercultural communication rests, perhaps, on knowledge and understanding of the most pervasive cultural metaphors in any given society. Likewise, success in communication between intercultural business environments could depend upon this same understanding. It follows, then, that Japanese and American business relationships may prosper or fail depending on the participants' use and understanding of the cultural metaphors in their respective organizations. In this study I seek the dominant metaphors at work within the organizational cultures of Japan and the United States. I also assess the importance of the metaphors relative to intercultural communication and predict the potential for communication breakdowns when the metaphors do not agree or when they are interpreted differently by the parties involved in communication. The information and conclusions generated by this study will add much-needed knowledge to the area of

intercultural communication as well as new perspectives for the study of organizational culture.

### Sample

The research data comes from a variety of books, scholarly and popular articles, pamphlets, unpublished papers, films, and miscellaneous documents. These materials cover many disciplines: history, popular culture, sociology, psychology, business, management, literature, and, most importantly, communication. The attached reference list contains many works--both primary and secondary sources--which proved helpful to this study. Both Japanese and American perspectives find representation in this list, and the authors of these works claim many nationalities and backgrounds. Additional written and verbal information obtained from personal interviews conducted at a Japanese-owned American-staffed manufacturing facility supplements these materials.

A major problem in conducting the research lies with the acquisition of materials concerning Japanese business written by Japanese scholars. Many of these materials remain unavailable in the United States or, if available, require translation. According to K. Kaleb (personal communication, September 24, 1991), many scholars who could translate Japanese works prefer, instead, to write original works on Japanese organizations and culture. While a natural tendency on the part of writers seeking to perform original research, this means that very few of the works written by Japanese scholars appear in English in the United States. Since I cannot read Japanese, the whole language barrier presented a great obstacle for my study.

Indeed, translations of any kind could have proven harmful to this study. The old cliché "it lost something in the translation" readily comes to mind when dealing with figurative language such as the metaphor. A careless translator may convey the essence but not the subtlety of a passage. In general, however, translations of literary works strive to deliver both the meaning and the style of the original author; this served as an excellent reason to rely to a certain, very limited extent on Japanese works of fiction as sources of cultural metaphors. Only works which aided in the development of the current Japanese consciousness (as determined using secondary sources) merited inclusion.

#### Research questions

Many prominent scholars present theories and assumptions demonstrating the metaphor's power and pervasiveness in American and Japanese business cultures as well as in the societies at large. They also tend to leave the researcher who wishes to focus on the metaphor in corporate culture with more questions than answers. These include:

1. What are the most prevalent metaphors in Japanese and American business cultures at the present time?
2. How did these metaphors develop?
3. How do they create or change a culture?
4. Why do the Americans and the Japanese interpret these metaphors in different ways?

The answers to these and other questions emerged from my research project and form the body of this study.

### Hypotheses

Based on my research, I feel that posing the following hypotheses can be justified:

H<sub>1</sub> The major metaphors at work within the cultures include the competition (games), jungle, machine, and religion metaphors, but the business-as-war and the business-as-family appear as two of the most influential and enduring.

H<sub>2</sub> The business-as-war metaphor developed out of the violent histories of both cultures and perpetuates harmful attitudes.

H<sub>3</sub> The business-as-family metaphor developed out of the homogeneity of the Japanese culture, but it did not develop as readily in the more heterogeneous United States.

H<sub>4</sub> Each society has interpreted these metaphors in their own way making them culturally unique but not culturally exclusive.

H<sub>5</sub> Differences in the use of these metaphors resulted from the ways in which the cultures transmitted them.

H<sub>6</sub> Many of the associated metaphors no longer refer to their original meanings.

H<sub>7</sub> Multinational corporations (MNC) will transmit their own unique cultural metaphors to their foreign employees.

## Chapter II

### Review of Literature and Theoretical Perspectives

#### Review of literature

Until very recently, few researchers approached the study of organizations and intercultural communication from the metaphorical perspective, yet several invaluable works exist and support this study. These range from works on organizational culture to scholarly books and articles on the use and power of metaphor to popular books and magazine articles pertaining to "organizational dynamics." Each of these works have in common--with each other and with this study--the use of metaphor in the development or modification of individual attitudes and beliefs which contribute to a perceptible culture. Most of these works come from no earlier than 25 years ago since, as mentioned above, the potency of metaphor remained underestimated or even undetermined until that time. Some older works merit inclusion in this literature review because they contributed to my understanding of intercultural communication and because they provide insights into the American and Japanese cultures. These works appear in their appropriate categories below.

Organizational culture and metaphor. My organizational culture study falls into an "inter-

pretive orientation" in that I seek to discover the "role of communication in symbol creation and expression" (Sypher, Applegate, & Sypher, 1985, p. 17) in order to discover how the organization perceives itself. The most dominant theories related to this approach underscore the critical importance of metaphor in the communication process. The degree of importance placed upon organizational metaphors may differ with each work, but the message remains the same: metaphor acts as a tool in the development of communication behaviors. Tsoukas (1991) makes an excellent case for the examination of metaphors in organization culture, stating, "[They] . . . constitute an economical way of relaying primarily experiential information in a vivid manner, [and] they can be used as a variety reduction mechanism in situations where experience cannot be segmented and imparted through literal language" (p. 567). In addition, Tsoukas and many others see metaphor as a major force in the creation and continuation of any organizational environment.

Bolman and Deal (1991) feel strongly that metaphors perform vital functions within organizations, especially when the pertinent issues ". . . are too complex, mysterious, or threatening to deal with more directly" (p. 266). In addition, they state, "Metaphors can also be used to make the strange familiar and the familiar strange or to place the self and others on a social continuum" (Bolman & Deal, 1991, p. 266). According to Bolman and Deal, then, metaphors can alter an individual's perception of either a new or existing situation. They seem to imply that metaphors can also alter perceptions of interpersonal relationships and establish or, perhaps, prevent psychological equality. (For an in-depth analysis of this topic, see Mitroff, 1983.)



Sackmann ("The Role of Metaphors in Organization Transformation," (1989)) agrees with Bolman and Deal as she outlines how a "carefully chosen" metaphor can bring about successful changes in organizational culture. She presents three ways in which metaphor can act as a tool for change. First, metaphors can "refocus the familiar" (Sackmann, 1989, p. 464), a function similar to what Bolman and Deal termed making "the familiar strange" (1991, p. 266). Sackmann sees this "disorientation" as the first step in any transformation process. Second, images created by metaphorical language "make future actions more tangible" (Sackmann, 1989, p. 464). Sackmann explains this as the ability to "render vague and abstract ideas concrete" (1989, p. 465). Third, Sackmann states that metaphors "connote meanings on a cognitive, emotional, and behavioral level in a holistic way" (p. 464).

Sackmann makes her strongest case for this third function. She believes that metaphors derive their greatest strength from their ability to convey "entire systems or domains of meanings rather than individual, isolated concepts" (Sackmann, 1989, p. 466). In other words, metaphors act as a form of shorthand, conveying immense chunks of meaning in very little time and space. Sackmann suggests that metaphor functions in this manner mainly through the human ability to equate the "experience of an entire situation" with the use of just a single metaphor (p. 466). Further, she feels that the metaphor not only conveys the meanings and emotions of the situation but also directs, indeed compels, a specific future course of action (Sackmann, 1989). Based on these assumptions, Sackmann seeks to prove that "if metaphors are carefully selected, they can influence employees' thinking, feelings, and their construction of reality in ways that facilitate

organizational transformation" (p. 468) making metaphor a very useful organizational tool.

Sackmann makes one other important contribution to the literature by exposing the power and danger inherent in the use of metaphor. Backed by the findings of other researchers, she warns, "caution is . . . necessary regarding the use of metaphors," explaining metaphor's ability to convey different meanings for different individuals and to function as justification for many kinds of behavior--especially during periods of change and upheaval (Sackmann, 1989, p. 483). Metaphors can promote both constructive and destructive behaviors at such times, making the choice and use of the correct metaphor for change vitally important to any organization.

Researchers have recognized the problems and dangers inherent in the creation and use of both personal and organizational metaphors (cf. Garsombke, 1988; Glucksberg & Keysar, 1990; Gozzi, 1990a, 1990b). In his landmark article "Why Metaphors Are Necessary and Not Just Nice," Ortony (1975) states, "A metaphor used successfully can give insight and comprehension; used unsuccessfully it can generate confusion and despair" (p. 52). Krefting and Frost (1985) point to some of the more practical problems involved in implementing or changing the metaphors controlling an organization's culture. They see problems rooted in the fact that ". . . more than one individual is involved, problems are rarely obvious, and desired solutions are not readily apparent" (Krefting & Frost, 1985, p. 160).

#### The American approach to organizational culture.

Problems compound when the organization's members' ethnic and cultural backgrounds enter into the

equation--as they always must. Differences in how anyone views his or her world must be observed and understood in order to determine the metaphors existing within any given organization and for the application of the proper metaphor if the need for organizational change arises. As Hall and Hall (1987) state, utilizing their own mechanistic metaphor: "Culture can be likened to an enormous, subtle, extraordinarily complex computer. It programs the actions and responses of every person, and these programs must be mastered by anyone wishing to make the system work" (p. 4).

The "programming" for this vast computer remains linked to the backgrounds and histories of those who would program the machine. The United States values its roots as a wild, frontier nation, built by the hard labor of idealistic immigrants. These immigrants, while products of other cultural backgrounds, brought a common element to the young country: the drive to fight for what they desired. They fought to get to North America, fought to stay, and fought to succeed. Even with vast amounts of natural resources, Americans still needed individuality and innovation to conquer the land (Garraty, 1983). This constant struggle by an individual or group of individuals to survive and succeed surfaces today as a unique American organizational military metaphor. Among other things, this metaphor describes the successful American business person as "hero" or "maverick." The hero is a dynamic, powerful, *solitary* figure who goes into the "fray" boldly and with only one objective: to win--and at any cost. Social historian Klapp (1962) wrote, "The sensate emphasis of American culture . . . probably favors a hero of force" (p. 149). He continued, "[T]he tough guy is more successful in American life than

. . . the Christian ethos . . . would lead one to expect" (p. 149). The traditional "tough guy" in American business wants to keep or increase his or her power at the expense of everyone else, even those in the same organization. This self-centered and, almost defiantly, selfish, metaphor possesses the potential to damage or even destroy careers and lives.

Garsombke (1988) underscores this message in her article "Organizational Culture Dons the Mantle of Militarism." After reviewing both the positive and negative aspects of the prevalent and ever-increasing military metaphors in American organizations, Garsombke concludes that the tendency toward the most extreme characteristics of militarism bodes ill for America, leading to an extremely organization-centered philosophy where the "end justifies the means" (p. 53). Further, the most extreme militarism can create ". . . the phenomenon of organizational decision makers operating as if they were somehow above the law (Garsombke, 1988, p. 53). Again, this underscores the power and importance of metaphor in controlling organizational behavior--as well as some harmful effects of utilizing the wrong metaphor or carrying any metaphor to its extreme.

Ginter and Rucks take a position opposite to Garsombke's in "War Games and Business Strategy Formulation" (1983). They argue that the use of the military metaphor by organizations must be considered not only appropriate but natural and necessary since business and the military share "strategic and operational similarities" (p. 15) including "combat" between "opposing forces," and "operating procedures" to govern "combat support" (p. 16). Ginter and Rucks even advocate borrowing still more from the military,

such as "wargaming" and a greater reliance on "strategic" management (p. 16).

Ginter and Rucks have also developed an excellent model illustrating the parallels between business management and military management. In explaining this figure, entitled "The Military-Business Analogy," they note many similarities:

Firms compete using a variety of available resources (personnel, financial capital and equipment), are governed by unique operational procedures, function in societal and task environments and are affected by such factors as company mission, strategic plans, composition of resources, support units, timing, posture, and logistics. (Ginter & Rucks, 1983, p. 18)

According to Ginter and Rucks, since so many parallels exist, business becomes warfare, and military-style analysis not only makes business more effective but becomes essential in determining outcomes. While they make a compelling case for the use of a business-as-war metaphor, Garsombke advocates stepping back to examine what she considers as the many damaging effects of militarism on society, most notably the tendency to approach every conflict as a win-lose situation (Garsombke, 1988).

This position supports Hocker and Wilmot's (1991) reasons for distrusting the military metaphor for conflict. Although acknowledging that the "military image is the central metaphor of conflict" (p. 25), they note, when anyone envisions conflict as war (the inevitable outcome of the use of the military metaphor in organizations), certain sets of behavior arise naturally out of this view; indeed, these behaviors must follow. The behaviors include: the desire for vengeance, a repetition of hostilities, the desire for

still more power, and the "killing or reducing [of] the effectiveness of the opponent" (Hocker & Wilmot, 1991, p. 26). Again, this "win-lose" philosophy proves of little lasting benefit to either side of the conflict.

The military metaphor's "win-lose" aspect appears in several of the other prevalent metaphors in American organizational culture, including the "business-as-a-competition" (game) metaphor and the "business-as-a-jungle" metaphor. Both examples seem to equate winning with survival. Somewhat ominously, they also seem to equate losing with death.

In the competition metaphor, "gaming" takes place under controlled conditions with "rules of play" and, hopefully, a "level playing field." The object, to beat the opponent, must come through "fair play," and, supposedly, victory goes to the "best" (i.e. brightest, quickest, fastest, most competitive) person, "team," or organization. In other words, a friendly rivalry develops, and opponents move peacefully from one contest to another. Management as a game attracts those who wish to see the world as a simple, orderly place (cf. Burst & Schlesinger, The management game, 1987). As Gozzi (1990b) explained, "Behind the game metaphor there is an idealized vision of society in which all players start from the same line, the same rules apply to all, and the score is 0 to 0 at the beginning of the game" (p. 293). The game metaphor, state Hocker and Wilmot (1991), "is limiting when people won't 'play fair'" (p. 30).

In the jungle metaphor, few environmental aspects appear friendly; every movement increases the danger. Adversaries remain amorphous; nothing is as it seems. To mix the metaphors, "rules" for jungle "warfare" do not exist; the combatants remain free to act as they choose and any kind of action--however barbarous--can

be justified in the name of survival. (For examples of the business-as-jungle metaphor, see Ringer, Winning through intimidation, 1974.)

Antithetical to the preceding metaphors and somewhat incongruous in our transient society, the notion of "organization-as-family" remains nonetheless a powerful American organizational metaphor. The family or "kinship" metaphor implies that those associated care about each other and share common bonds and responsibilities. Osborn (1975) refers to this metaphor as "another one of those Kenneth Burkeian figures of identification. It expresses [a] sense of union and relation with God . . ." (p. 8). Although difficult to cultivate, the familial metaphor potentially can have a profound impact on the organization. Adams (1983) discusses what he refers to as "images" or ". . . nonliteral, but 'true' symbolizations that are analyzable with respect to the corpus of schemes and tropes . . ." (p. 56). He reveals the power inherent in the familial or "relational" image in the following passage:

A relational image gathers its archetypal "force" from the sheer weight of time and traditions surrounding the cultural construct "family." The "family" is one of the oldest and most primary units of social cohesion and reaches back into the dawn of civilization. (Adams, 1983, p. 56)

Adams feels, when a person receives messages outlining his or her relative position to the speaker or "parent organization" in terms of kinship, he or she becomes enmeshed in "*a priori* behavioral expectations" (Adams, 1983, p. 57) handed down through time. In Western civilization, the family member's role carries considerable "ought weight" (p. 56) which persuades the listener to act in certain prescribed manners. As

Smith and Eisenberg (1987) point out, consciously or unconsciously, the listener will adapt to behaviors arising from a root-metaphor such as the familial and will base arguments and decisions upon this metaphor (p. 370).

Adams explores the many ramifications of the familial metaphor, noting, when a group of individuals become "imaginatively bonded-in-family," they will begin to act from a "collective orientation" which will force them to distinguish their group from any other group (p. 57). He warns, however, that while the "familial archetypes" encourage unity, they do not necessarily encourage harmony (p. 57). In their study of intra-family communication, Galvin and Brommel (1986) also explode the myth of family harmony. While pointing to the positive factors such as the creation of a shared identity (p. 42), the rapid transfer of information (p. 44), and the "apparently effortless teamwork" (p. 45) found in the family, Galvin and Brommel also believe conflict will occur as "an inevitable and valuable part of the process" (p. 166). In general, however, the organizational familial metaphor appears positive, creating bonds of trust and caring, cooperation, and a willingness to participate (cf. Peters & Austin, 1985).

Like the military metaphor, the familial image can create organizational problems when taken to the extreme and used to control a corporate culture. As in the case of Disneyland (Smith & Eisenberg, 1987), a powerful family metaphor can lead to incredibly high expectations on the part of employees. When management cannot extend expected benefits to new employees or must cut some benefits from older employees because of economic downturns or faulty investments, the employees



tend to feel "betrayed" by their "parent organization." Too much of an emphasis on kinship allows members of the organization to forget why they work, to forget that productivity and cost-effectiveness remain the very important bottom line to management and organizational survival. Disneyland employees fell into this psychological trap. Tensions caused by their feelings of betrayal resulted in a strike by the unhappy "children," an almost unprecedented occurrence at the "Magic Kingdom" (Smith & Eisenberg, 1987). As Smith and Eisenberg state:

The friendly, family atmosphere was so convincing that most employees and many managers came to believe it uncritically, seeming at times to forget that Disneyland was a for-profit business selling a highly calculated fantasy world. (p. 37)

#### The Japanese approach to organizational culture.

The works mentioned above concern the way in which Americans understand and operate American business. This study's other major object, understanding how the Japanese perceive their business environments, remains unaddressed to this point. Few scholars have attempted to explain what makes Japanese business unique in terms of Japanese national cultural metaphors. In this study, then, I must look beyond works of sociology, psychology, or management philosophy and into the realm of history and literature to discover the root metaphors and the pervasive cultural attitudes.

Several sociological and business works point the way to these basic and all-important metaphors. Benedict explains the bases of many cultural attitudes in her now-classic work on modern Japan, The chrysanthemum and the sword: Patterns of Japanese culture (1946/1965). A cultural characteristic which

underlies many of the most prevalent Japanese business metaphors must be the phenomenon noted by Benedict as "taking one's proper station" (p. 43). As Benedict states, "Japan's confidence in hierarchy is basic in her whole notion of man's relation to his fellow man and of man's relation to the State . . ." (p. 43). This hierarchy comes from conditioning which begins in the home and extends to include community, government, etc. in ever-widening circles (Benedict, 1965, 55-56). Nakane (1977) also notes this phenomenon: "ranking order, in effect, regulates Japanese life" (p. 31). This process extends to all facets of life for all ages: the proper method of address, seating arrangements at the family table, seating arrangements in a business meeting, the senior-junior ranking at school, among others (Nakane, 1977). In addition to a rigid hierarchy, Benedict also describes a culture obsessed with repayment of obligations or, as she puts it, "debtor to the ages and the world" (p. 98). Loyalty arises from this tendency to feel indebted--reinforcing the rigid rank system and placing great emphasis on the ties of kinship (see Benedict, 1965, Chapters 5 & 6).

Some of these metaphors have become a part of our pop-psychology perceptions of Japan and Japanese life including especially the "organization-as-extended-family" metaphor. As any business student knows, model Japanese organizations provide their workers with what have become known as the "divine treasures": lifetime employment, length-of-service wages and promotion, enterprise unionism, and company welfare benefits (Levine & Ohtsu, 1991, p. 103). Workers in organizations offering such benefits tend to view their employer as their "parent," one who takes care of them for a lifetime (Takeuchi, 1989). This "parent/child"

aspect of the familial metaphor remains one of the most pervasive and recognizable metaphors of Japanese organizational culture. Although, according to Levine and Ohtsu, only twenty-five percent of the work force benefits from these features (p. 105), these things appear natural within the Japanese cultural emphasis on family patterns and groupism (Aoki, 1984; Tung, 1984). In addition, they contribute to international opinion about Japanese labor practices, and, indeed, encourage the belief in the "business-as-family" metaphor.

Social scientists also recognize the familial relationship emphasis. Aoki and Dardess (1981) believe "[f]ew societies have been as conscious of the family as an ideal and a kinship unit as have the Japanese throughout their history" (p. 93). Kawasaki (1987) perceives negative implications in this devotion to family, especially the family metaphor as applied to any organization. He sees the Japanese people as constantly "repressing their own ego in their relations to the family or community" which leads to a group psychology (Kawasaki, 1987, p. 18-9). Going even further, he states, the Japanese worker applying the family metaphor to his or her organization could not say where home life ends and job begins. Yet, even he admits that this "anonymous and collective activity of the Japanese people" contributed greatly to Japan's economic success (Kawasaki, 1987, p. 40).

Tung (1984) articulates a view of family with its "responsibilities and obligations" as the most pervasive business metaphor in Japan:

In return for the employee's unquestioning dedication and loyalty to the company, the employer (as head of the corporate household) is obligated to assume responsibilities for all aspects of the worker's livelihood and well-being. Like children

in a family, the employees are protected and cared for by their parents, the employer. This phenomenon is called *amaeru*. (p. 35)

Takeuchi (1989) agrees, stating, "The employees are bound together as trusted comrades, not merely by the pursuit of financial interests" (p. 127). Ruch, in his book Corporate communications: A comparison of Japanese and American practices (1984), adds viewing the corporation as a family has "historic origins" in Japan which occur naturally out of the fact that the Japanese tend to spend all their time with the same people (pp. 25-27). He also points to the system of lifetime employment as well as the traditional Japanese emphasis on harmony as contributing factors to the "family" metaphor (Ruch, 1984).

Harmony influences another prominent Japanese organizational metaphor: business-as-religion. The Japanese or Asian way of viewing work as a religious activity may come under Western notions of "Oriental mysticism." We tend to think of the ritualistic samurai preparing for battle or the sword-maker carefully working sacred symbols into a gleaming blade, but "work-as-religion" remains a valid metaphor even in today's business environment. Kawasaki (1987) states, "Like so many other things in Japan, work is a ceremony . . ." (p. 41).

Shigeo addresses this issue in "Semiconductors and the Japanese Mind" (1989) discussing the "religious" feelings of the workers as they built "clean rooms" (rooms free of outside contaminants) for the purpose of manufacturing semiconductors; he reports the site manager felt "purified" in mind and body after the experience (Shigeo, 1989). Shigeo finds himself at a loss to explain this phenomenon but observes that some ". . . cultural elements, hitherto considered antipodal

to modern technology, are now enigmatically buttressing the manufacture of high-technology products" (p. 86).

De Mente (1987) also notes this phenomenon which juxtaposes ancient religion with modern technology. He reveals Japanese sociologists "often comment on the religious ardor with which the Japanese engage in business . . ." (p. 15). According to De Mente, Japanese businessmen abroad appear ". . . almost blindly dedicated to their cause and sacrificial to the point of martyrdom in their efforts to succeed" (p. 15).

Another salient metaphor for Japanese business appeared above from the American perspective. This metaphor, the "business-as-war" analogy, pervades both cultures with surprisingly diverse effects. While the American military metaphor tends to extol the virtues of the individual as "hero," the Japanese believe in the honor of the group (cf. Tung, 1984; Kawasaki, 1987). The Japanese, like the Americans, developed their metaphor out of a history of martial conflict (cf. Hall, 1971; Varley, 1972; Gibney, 1975). Their perspective on the analogy remains unique, however, because of the rather dramatic shift from feudalism to industrialism which occurred over a period of less than fifty years and which, according to Christopher (1983), left ". . . attitudes and behavior patterns characteristic of a feudal society" (p. 271).

In agreement, Ruch (1984) notes Japanese businessmen of the late twentieth century seem placidly to accept the fact that big business operates most effectively when organized along military lines, an assumption which Reischung (1973) sees as stemming from the active role of the samurai (Japan's historic warrior class) in the development of modern Japan. Reischung refers to this as "the traditional military

orientation of the ruling class" (p. 22) which makes the military metaphor a natural fit for Japanese business. Kawasaki (1987) concurs, pointing to the "efficient machinery of bureaucracy" and the "heavy nationalistic and militaristic indoctrination" which occurred after the Meiji Reformation of 1868 and prior to World War II which made the Japanese people comfortable with "feudalistic ideas" and "authoritarian rule" (pp. 181-83).

In How to do business with the Japanese (1985), Zimmerman explores these aspects of militarism and ties them to the groupism habitual in Japanese culture. He delves into Japanese history (farther back than Reischung and Kawasaki) to the "Tokugawa Shogunate," discovering links between militarism and modern organizations. According to Zimmerman, the Tokugawa Shogunate, a series of military dictators, ruled Japan with absolute authority from the seventeenth through the nineteenth centuries, gaining control of much of Japan and developing a system of highly-trained and highly-disciplined managers to oversee the various districts. Zimmerman states, "Tokugawa Ieyasu [names in Japanese order], the architect of this social order, was an organizational genius, and is much admired by modern Japanese businessmen" (p. 6). Ruch (1984) supports this assertion, stating that the Japanese looked to the "eighteen-volume biography of Ieyasu Tokugawa, founder of Japan's last great military dynasty" for advice when rebuilding industry in their country after World War II (p. 32).

Zimmerman believes Japanese "groupism" is rooted in this same phenomenon. "Groupism," or the tendency to submerge the feelings and needs of the individual to those of the group (De Mente, 1988, p. 114), arose, according to Zimmerman, from the highly-structured

nature of their society. As seen above, regimentation and discipline existed as a way of life for centuries. Even the devastation of the second World War could not destroy these patterns of behavior. According to Zimmerman:

To rise in a society composed of groups and factions, you must attach yourself to a group. If you betray one group or faction without first making sure you have another group to fall back on, you will be left out in the cold and despised by all. (p. 9)

When discussing groupism, Tung's (1984) views dovetail with those expressed above; she states that hierarchy and discipline govern groupism (p. 45). She also addresses the central conflict in the Japanese military metaphor: "the dual emphasis on homogeneity and competitiveness, two principles that may appear contradictory" (Tung, 1984, p. 34). Based on evidence gathered through surveys and interviews, Tung concludes the Japanese emphasize policies which simultaneously take advantage of cultural homogeneity and foster group identity, in-house training programs that involve all new employees. In addition, however, they foster competition through promotions, although these promotions come at a slower rate than they would in Western organizations (Tung, 1984, p. 34).

Dollinger (1988) and Rehder (1990) disagree with Zimmerman and Tung on the roots of groupism. Both see groupism or "collectivism" as a direct result of the Confucian tradition which, in spite of its Chinese origins, the Japanese long ago made uniquely their own. According to Dollinger, collectivism implies lifetime relationships and loyalty to the group: "Self-promotion is more than egotism, it is disloyal and immoral" (p. 580).

In the preceding sections, we have explored the origins of several of the most prevalent metaphors in American and Japanese corporate society. Every metaphor presents a different set of behaviors for the organizational member to follow. These behaviors dictate everything from attitude to decision-making process, and the individual can adopt behaviors consciously or unconsciously. For the United States, we have examined the following metaphors: business-as-family, business-as-a-jungle, business-as-a-competition (game), and business-as-war. For Japan, we have discussed the business-as-family, business-as-a-religion, and business-as-war metaphors. Obviously, not all of these metaphors operate universally in the business environment, nor are these the only metaphors available for study. Each culture adapts the metaphor in its own unique way.

As seen in the above discussion, the application and ramifications of any organization's metaphor lie in national as well as corporate culture. Many (cf. Benedict, 1965; Nakane, 1977; De Mente, 1987, 1988; Rehder, 1990); etc.) believe the Japanese value themselves by the position which they hold within any organization including the family, the firm, and the government. American culture stresses the exact opposite: the organization, including sports clubs and other "teams," occupies a position secondary to the individual. This fundamental difference underlies the way in which the two metaphors focused upon in this study, business-as-war and business-as-family, apply in each culture.

#### Theoretical perspectives

Archetypal metaphors. Osborn (1967, 1975, 1976) defines "archetypes" as those metaphors which penetrate



deep into the human subconscious. These archetypes possess certain characteristics such as an immunity to time, a lack of cultural exclusiveness, attachment to prominent experiences, and symbolic richness (Osborn, 1975). From the artifacts and the field research, I discovered a number of archetypal metaphors at work within the corporate cultures of both countries: competition (including games or gambling), jungle, family, religion, organism, machine, quest, and war. In my pursuit of prominent figurative language in the Japanese and American corporate cultures, I discovered two metaphors which consistently possessed all of the attributes of an archetype and which appeared together or separately in some form in each of the artifacts examined: the business-as-war and the business-as-family metaphors.

Both metaphors possess Osborn's "immunity to time." Both extend back in human history to the very beginning of existence (cf. Hall, 1973, Chapter 3). In spite of the increasing transience of modern society, the family endures. In spite of the increasing cost of destruction, war continues to occur. Both cross international boundaries and operate in similar ways within such diverse business cultures as those of Japan and the United States (see below). Both familial and military metaphors describe a great number of "prominent," life-shattering experiences, such as birth and death. Lastly, both metaphors contain great "symbolic richness" in that both can depict experiences using seemingly endless powerful and vivid adjectives.

As mentioned above, these two metaphors appear to lack cultural exclusiveness. In other words, these metaphors translate freely between cultures--something which I did not believe to be the case prior to this study. Through my research, I discovered the metaphors

exist in both cultures, but the application or understanding of the metaphors remains culturally dependent. An examination of the artifacts underscores the differences and highlights the similarities in Japanese and American approaches to these archetypal metaphors.

Minimetaphors. According to Gozzi (1990b), "minimetaphors," or subsets of tenors and vehicles, arise from one powerful archetype or "master metaphor." Indeed, he defines the master metaphor as ". . . one that organizes a whole field of minimetaphors around it" (Gozzi, 1990b, p. 291). Gozzi's master metaphors can be equated with Osborn's archetypal metaphors. The minimetaphors associated with the master metaphors of war and family help delineate the differences between Japanese and American organizational culture.

Major triad. Hall and Trager (Hall, 1973) developed a system which they called the "major triad" in order to understand the different modes of behavior in any culture. The major triad includes "formal" behavior or behavior grounded in tradition; "informal" behavior, a kind of "out-of-awareness" which comes from imitation; and "technical" behavior of which the recipient remains fully conscious and acquires through the dictates of a teacher (Hall, 1973, pp. 66-67). Hall discovered that the major triad could also apply to the components of a communication message once the message was broken into these parts: the "sets" or words, the "isolates" or sounds, and the "patterns" or syntax (p. 105). This theory can be applied to cultural metaphors in order to determine their origins and transmission in organizational society.

## CHAPTER III

### Methodology

#### Artifacts

I chose the artifacts for my study from a variety of available sources, including books and movies. The choice of artifacts depended on certain criteria. First, works used in the study must have had wide distribution and availability during the second half of the twentieth century. Second, works must contain some lasting cultural value in the continuing influence of their message; secondary sources helped to determine this value. Third, accessibility of the works to the general populace of either Japan or the United States influenced my decision to include them in this study. The works did not necessarily exist in the cultures of both countries. Finally, and most importantly, the works chosen displayed consistent use of metaphorical language--whether or not a specific metaphor appeared in a fully-enunciated form.

The two movies examined dealt with themes of business, family, and warfare in Japanese society. The books came from the areas of literature, history, economics, business, and popular culture. I examined eight books with relevance to the roots of Japanese organizational cultural metaphor and twelve books related to American business culture. Several works (pamphlets, handbooks, etc.) related to specific

companies appear in the study as well (see Appendix A for an annotated bibliography of artifacts). These works provided examples of metaphors at work within the general, as well as the corporate, cultures of each society.

#### Field Research

For my field research, I visited the Georgetown (Kentucky) plant of Toyota Motor Manufacturing, U.S.A., Inc. As a non-participant observer, I toured the plant, paying close attention to the symbols of corporate culture and the attitudes of the employees. In addition, I interviewed key individuals in training and development and human resources. They provided me with additional written material in the form of the "Training Course Catalog" and the employee handbook which appear in the study below. This field research forms an integral part of the study since it allowed me to observe the dominant cultural metaphors at work within the business environment of a Japanese-run American-staffed manufacturing facility.

#### Procedures

The method used in this study combined characteristics of qualitative content analysis and rhetorical criticism with an examination of contextual elements. I searched the works mentioned above for instances of metaphorical language or for the use of language and reasoning resulting from metaphors. The language or metaphors extracted received consistent use throughout the work. I then looked for the most powerful and most fully articulated metaphors and tried to assess the impact they exerted on the overall work compared with the frequency of use. Using Osborn's "archetypes" theory (1975), I discovered the most

pervasive cultural metaphors in these works, and then, broke them down into "minimetaphors" (per Gozzi, 1990a). Finally, using Hall's "Major Triad" or three levels of culture (formal, informal, and technical modes of behavior) as well as his "sets and patterns" approach to the components of communication (1973), I probed the use of these metaphors from a cultural perspective.

On February 27, 1992, I toured the Georgetown Toyota facility, taking note of the symbols of organizational culture (as discussed in Bolman and Deal's Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership (1991)) that appeared in the lobby and offices, and on the plant floor. I then interviewed Joyce Whiting, a Training and Development specialist. Later that same day, I interviewed Edwin Gritton, the Assistant General Manager in the area of Human Resources. For the interviews, I asked a series of questions designed to uncover the perceptions of corporate culture at Toyota. I wished to determine which cultural metaphors exist at Toyota, how these metaphors developed, and how they transfer between "generations" of employees at the plant. I based my interviews on a set of diagnostic questions modified from Harrison's Diagnosing organizations: Methods, models, and processes (1987) as well as Interviewing: Principles and practices (Stewart & Cash, 1991). Many questions, including "Describe what Toyota means to you" and "How do you communicate ideas about Toyota to new employees?" involve the use of story-telling, metaphor, or other forms of symbolism (see Appendix B for a list of questions asked).

## CHAPTER IV

### Analysis and Discussion

#### Analysis

Archetypal metaphors. Osborn's theory of archetypal metaphors or those metaphors possessing immunity to time, a lack of cultural exclusiveness, attachment to prominent experiences, and symbolic richness (Osborn, 1975) applies very well to my study's artifacts and field research. Examining these artifacts using Osborn's archetypal metaphor theory underscores the differences and highlights the similarities in Japanese and American approaches to the business-as-war and business-as-family metaphors as well as to organizational culture in general.

For instance, while still operating under the military metaphor, the Japanese worker would most likely abide by the dictum "selfish men destroy themselves" and follow the order "you move as a group, not as individuals" (Kurosawa, 1954), while the American would be busy "looking out for #1" and feel that his or her first "duty" involves the individual self (cf. Ringer, 1974; 1977). Again with the military metaphor at work, the Japanese corporation consistently views only a certain amount of individual or departmental in-fighting as healthy (J. Whiting, personal communication, February 27, 1992, but see also Kurosawa, 1960 and Ishinomori, 1988, for a different

viewpoint on individual competition). American companies tend to encourage each individual, department, line, or office to "shoot down" the others' ideas and plans (Cohen, 1973, pp. 24-25) and act as if they were an autonomous group (Iacocca, 1984, pp. 156, 160-63, 174-75). As these examples show, both cultures use the same basic metaphor but apply it in different ways.

The business-as-family metaphor, on the other hand, contains many of the same elements in both American and Japanese business cultures but expressed in different terms or to a much greater or lesser degree. Consider the following uses of the business-as-family metaphor. In Japan, Honda employees feel a strong sense of community, of family because "the company cared about them" (Shook, 1988, p. 27; pp. 99-100). In the United States, employees of the corporate giant IBM feel the company appreciates them, cares about the quality of their lives, and treats them like "human beings" because "IBM put[s] people first" (Mills, 1988, pp. 51, 57). At Toyota Motor Manufacturing, U.S.A., Inc., the management tenet "Human resources are our greatest asset" (J. Whiting, personal communication, February 27, 1992) expresses the same concern and awareness for the employees.

The difference between American and Japanese use of the business or organization as family metaphor comes in the degree of application: Japanese workers may see their fellow employees as ". . . brothers and sisters of a family helping each other to keep going as a group" (J. Roberts, 1974, p. 216), but American workers appear to recognize the "partnership" (Mills, 1988, p. 172) or "shared expectations" (Weyerhaeuser, 1988a, p. 5) between management and employee only. Apparently in most American corporations, if the company becomes a

family, then each employee feels like an only child. Another fine example of this stands out through comparison of the "Employee Handbooks" of Toyota and Weyerhaeuser Company (both from 1988). The Toyota handbook stresses teamwork, cooperation, and responsibility to fellow workers a total of 33 times (not including the number of times employees receive the title "team member"). The most explicit statement of the family metaphor follows:

Toyota Motor is a very large and powerful organization, much like a large family. It is made up of many different members, each playing an important role and each helping the other members of the Toyota family, and at the same time depending on each other. (Toyota, 1988a, pp. 12-13)

The Weyerhaeuser handbook for salaried employees referred to the "responsibility" of the company to the employee and the employee to the company only once at the beginning of the book:

The Weyerhaeuser way is . . . Being a fair employer--fair treatment of people in a work climate that strives to make the best of their talents. (Weyerhaeuser, 1988a, p. 2)

No mention of any relationship responsibilities between and among coworkers occurred.

As can be seen from this discussion, the same business-as-war and business-as-family archetypes pervade both cultures. The roots of the archetypes, however, stem from quite different sources. Viewing the organization as a family appears to have a long history in Japan from centuries of family-run "zaibatsu" (J. Roberts, 1974, p. 28) to the "parentalism"--such as counselling for absenteeism (J. Whiting and E. Gritton, personal communication,



February 27, 1992) and seat-belts on the tourmobiles-- displayed by Toyota today. A lot of this must be attributed to the homogeneity of the population and the intense sense of loyalty engendered by this similarity and closeness (cf. J. Roberts, 1974; Musashi, 1982). The homogeneity-based "groupism" remains strong-- especially when conditions place great pressure on the individual. For instance, loyalty to the group and to each other continued in spite of harsh conditions at Toyota during the tremendous push to manufacture in the 1970s: "The work here is so difficult that people try to support and encourage one another . . . . We feel it's not fair to drop out and go home alone" (Kawata, 1982, p. 157). The Japanese business-as-war metaphor with its emphasis on loyalty, dedication to perfection, self-sacrifice and "out-wait your enemy" philosophy seems to have emerged from the samurai tradition, but its emphasis on striving for the good of the group could have developed because of the historic isolation of the Japanese islands (Kurosawa, 1954; Musashi, 1982; Ohmae, 1983).

In contrast to the Japanese adaptations of the business-as-war and the business-as-family metaphors, American corporate culture apparently took a more individualist approach. Traditional business roles involve a loner who gets ahead because of individual "star" talent (Whyte, 1957; Cohen, 1973; W. Roberts, 1987). Indeed, some question arises about the existence of a fully-enunciated American business-as-family metaphor. As Mills (1988) points out, creation of a "family" of concerned employees can be likened to "modern alchemy" (p. 20) in that the results remain unpredictable. This individualism tends to encourage the American's "intrinsic desire to win" (W. Roberts, 1987, p. 19) and "lust for leadership"...

(W. Roberts, 1987, p. 21) and dispels the development of a business-as-family outlook. Lack of a single unified American tradition and the vast distances of the United States from a geographical standpoint also discourage the development of a true the business-as-family metaphor (Toffler, 1981).

Minimetaphors. Gozzi's (1990b) theory of master metaphors which generate associated minimetaphors helps reveal the pervasive cultural archetypes in American and Japanese organizations. These minimetaphors also help delineate differences between archetypes. Some of the most important minimetaphors of the Japanese version of business-as-war include:

1. External competitors as "the enemy."
2. Workers as an "adaptable labor force."
3. Education or instruction as "training camp."
4. Projected business plans as "fighting on multiple fronts."
5. Management as "staff officers."
6. Initial job training as "assimilation."

The American business-as-war archetype contains these (and other) minimetaphors:

1. Management as "captains" or "generals."
2. Workers as "interchangeable labor force."
3. All competitors as "the enemy."
4. Projected business plans as "single objective--winning."
5. Education or instruction as "boot camp."

(For a more complete listing, see Appendix C.)

The Japanese business-as-family metaphor includes the following minimetaphors:

1. Management as "parents."
2. Employees as "united members."
3. Workers as "loving and caring family members."
4. Coworkers as "brothers and sisters."

5. Goal as "safety and welfare of members."

6. Workers as "treasured children."

On the American side, these appear to be some of the minimetaphors associated with business-as-family:

1. Management as "autocratic parent."

2. Employees as "unreliable kids."

3. History of company as "corporate heritage."

4. Company as "protector."

5. Company goal as "keeping family together."

[For a more complete listing, see Appendix D.]

Major triad. An examination of the artifacts using Hall and Trager's (Hall, 1973) "major triad" of formal, informal, and technical behavioral modes yields some interesting information about the communication of cultural metaphors. The transmission of the major cultural metaphors appears to be differentiated on the basis of formal versus informal behavior. For the Japanese, more of the components of the metaphor appear under the guise of formal behavior rather than informal behavior: the group must stick together, uniforms ensure that no one stands out at any level, promotions occur at certain points in the professional's career, etc. For the American, more of the accepted behaviors appear to fall into the informal category: get what you can out of the company, usual lack of clearly-defined dress code, promotions based on outstanding achievements, etc. Interestingly, it seems as if the American firms have more clearly-delineated technical behavioral modes (including more explicit rules of behavior and policy), perhaps a result of the power of bureaucracy.

Hall (1973) notes these areas will tend to overlap; all three will appear to a certain extent in any given situation (p. 67). Consequently, each set requires analysis as it appears within its pattern before the

true nature of the behavior may be perceived. The effects of this in terms of the present study remain to be seen. The results appear inconclusive.

### Discussion

The Japanese and American business environments contain many metaphors including the jungle, machine, religion, and competition (game) metaphors, but the business-as-war and the business-as-family appear to be among the most prominent and enduring. These two metaphors retain significance because they generate special feelings in the hearts and minds of workers as well as management. When viewing something as a "battle" or "conquest," certain associated behaviors naturally occur. Employees tend to become more aggressive and less conciliatory. They will tend to work harder and, in some ways, in a more unified manner when they feel threatened--especially by outside forces. In addition, they will respond more readily to management's dictates. For instance, management can employ the business-as-war metaphor to demand extraordinary sacrifices on the part of their employees: wage increases do not occur because of the "hardships of war"; employees may work long hours of overtime because the company demands more and more time "in the trenches"; terminated workers may become simply more "casualties." This metaphor encourages deference to structure (bureaucracy and the military have a lot in common), discipline (the chain of command and martial law), and control (those of higher "rank" have a right to give orders).

The business-as-family metaphor can, in much the same manner, exert a powerful influence on the psyches of the employees. When the company president appears in the metaphorical role of "parent," employees tend to

become "children" who require care and nurturing. This would tend to discourage disagreement with a sympathetic "care-giver" and, perhaps, stifle new ideas and perspectives. It also encourages a "father knows best" attitude in which employees continually defer to the wise company president.

The business-as-war metaphor developed from the violent histories of both cultures and may have potentially damaging ramifications. The American tendency to view all internal and external competitors as the "enemy" probably arose because of the harsh and isolated conditions endured by early American settlers; England, an ocean away, could not provide much assistance, and the Native Americans did not want to donate their land to the cause of civilization. However necessary or natural in the past, this same tendency today causes fragmentation and needless conflict within organizations. The drive to defeat everyone in order to "get ahead" destroys relationships and comradeship.

The Japanese tendency to view only external competitors as the enemy and to suppress most internal conflicts came from isolation as well. In their case, it began as the isolation of a very small island. With less land to spare, the Japanese cultivated harmony with their closest kin and allies while simultaneously warring with the enemy. Proximity and psychological compatibility led to the current and very prevalent groupism. In its modern form and in the extreme, the Japanese business-as-war metaphor can lead to "group think," and, consequently, to poor decisions.

The findings of this study concur with those of Garsombke (1988): the extreme forms of business-as-war can lead to a narrow perspective and can prevent compromise. Often those using such metaphors confuse

aggression with progress and refuse to yield to better ideas. Taken to the extreme, the military metaphor can also lead to paranoia and erratic choices. Additionally, the business-as-war metaphor predisposes the manager to exhibit fundamentalist "Theory X" (MacGregor, 1957/1986) behavior thereby degrading and dehumanizing the worker.

The business-as-family metaphor developed out of the homogeneity and groupism prevalent in Japanese society. It seems to develop with greater difficulty in American society perhaps because of a lack of traditional respect for elders and for the family. In both cultures, it may be declining (cf. Toffler, 1980, pp. 216-219). The business-as-family metaphor appeared as one of the most pervasive metaphors in the Japanese artifacts studied. Loyalty to one's group, respect for the company and its representatives, responsible behavior to coworkers, and self-sacrifice all arise from this metaphor. Managers in the United States cannot tap the same rich vein to establish parental and familial obligations. Instead, loose ties develop through such vague references as "the company treats me like family" or "the company cares." Although less-developed, the metaphor does appear in American business culture. In the 1950s, Whyte spoke disparagingly of the "organization man" who made a "relationship . . . for keeps" with his or her company as a part of an emerging negative trend (p. 75). He also lamented the "incubus of team work" and the submersion of the individual to the group (Whyte, 1957, p. 445). By the 1970s, however, Jackson (1989) reveals that "the family feeling of loyalty" to the company died when people began to change jobs with greater and greater frequency (p. 20). Certain observers have pointed to a similar trend in Japanese society as the

the "jobs-for-life" concept battles with the desire for greater wealth and freedom (cf. Holden, 1989).

Each society has interpreted the metaphors in a slightly different way making them culturally unique but not culturally exclusive. Both cultures use the same concept of "war" (to disable or destroy an opponent), and "family" (a caring group of related individuals) in the broadest sense. The minimetaphors that arise from these archetypes, however, disclose the true similarities and differences in the way each society applies the metaphors. In Japanese society, for instance, the price of doing business may be limited to the "acceptable costs of battle" (Ohmae, 1983, p. 38); whereas, in the United States, tradition dictates that no upper limit exists, that one "defeat the competition at any cost" (Cohen, 1973, p. 8). This generates the probability that the Japanese firm might draw back in certain business ventures after assessing whether the cost exceeds its limits, but the American firm might jeopardize the jobs and security of its workers by refusing to draw back for any reason. Likewise, the minimetaphors surrounding the business-as-family archetype in some instances present almost antithetical points of view: if the Japanese treat their workers like "treasured children" and the Americans treat theirs like "unreliable kids," then the respective management's attitudes must differ tremendously. This, in turn affects the policies and decisions made.

As mentioned above, similarities also exist between the cultural minimetaphors. Both Japan and the United States tend to view training or education of young business people as "boot camp" or "training camp." Likewise, they both view instructions as "orders" and new employees as "new recruits." The similarities

between the two conceptions of the business-as-family appear in the area of goals. Once a company begins to operate from a business-as-family perspective, it usually sees one of the primary goals of the organization as "the safety and welfare of the team members" (Toyota handbook, 1988, p. 9) or "the high quality of life of the employees" (Mills, 1988, pp. 40-41).

Differences in the use of the metaphors may occur because of the different ways in which the metaphors are transmitted. The results appear inconclusive. Application of Hall and Trager's (Hall, 1973) "Major Triad" to the metaphors discovered in the artifacts seems to indicate that the Japanese transmit their conceptions of the business-as-war and the business-as-family metaphors more often through "formal" channels of behavior. In the case of business-as-family, the metaphor exists in institutional form based on centuries of family-run zaibatsu. These companies continue as the huge firms or "keiretsu" of today (Ferguson, 1990, p. 58); they also continue the practices of hiring graduates from certain universities upon graduation, promoting employees based on length of service, and providing job security for an entire worklife. In this way, they systematically train and promote large numbers of workers dedicated to the company.

In the United States, apart from the major schools of business and the traditions at work in the largest firms, no formalized transmission of business ideals exists. Executives move from company to company and take with them only their loyalty to themselves. Throughout American corporations, informal channels of communication transmit most of the ideology concerning business behavior. Surprisingly considering the



Japanese propensity for detail and precision, organizational behavioral norms appear to be transmitted via informal rather than technical modes. American companies with historic bureaucratic origins transmit more of their behavioral norms through technical channels (written communication and training seminars, etc.).

The particular communication channels needed probably arise out of the differences between Japanese society and American society in terms of cultural contexting. Many scholars (cf. Hall, 1973; 1976; Borisoff & Victor, 1989) consider that homogeneous societies communicate very little through words and gestures because of their similar, shared cultural experiences; researchers term such societies "high-context." Because of its extreme homogeneity, Japan appears to possess a "high-context" culture. In contrast, culturally diverse societies must communicate much more in order for their meanings to be understood; the United States falls into this "low-context" category.

Many of the minimetaphors associated with business-as-war may have become "dead" metaphors with limited influence. "Dead" metaphors, or metaphors whose current uses have very little to do with the original meaning (Davidson, 1979, p. 32), may be observed frequently when discussing the minimetaphors surrounding business-as-war and business-as-family. Probably related to our rapidly changing society, these metaphors endure but their earlier meanings become obscure. For instance, when the phrase "barriers to obtaining a goal" occurs in business conversation, the mind's "eye" does not instantly produce a scene in which "goals" (however they would look) attempt to scale a wall. Similarly, when someone refers to a

multinational corporation (or MNC) as a "house," the image of a single building with one blood-related family operating an enterprise does not appear. These metaphors play only a small part in actively producing the military metaphor's feelings of aggression or the family metaphor's warmth, but they do contribute to the overall archetypal receptiveness.

The MNC I visited appeared to bring certain elements of an indigenous Japanese metaphor to its American facility. The extant metaphors in Toyota's Georgetown (Kentucky) manufacturing facility appeared to be a typically-Japanese internal business-as-family metaphor with a strong parental organization and a muted external business-as-war metaphor. The Toyota handbook and the personal interviews revealed that influences of the parent organization abound in the American plant. One particularly interesting observation reoccurred during several interviews: Toyota may have chosen its rural Southern location because of that area's historic emphasis on family and loyalty (E. M. Seeman, personal communication, October 31, 1991; J. Whiting, personal communication, February 27, 1992).

The above discussion reveals that, while the business-as-family and the business-as-war metaphors operate differently in each culture, they remain compatible. As American companies continue to adopt and adapt many successful Japanese business concepts such as the quality circle (see Ouchi, 1981) and the Japanese explore more concepts traditionally associated with American business such as merit promotions (cf. De Mente, 1987, 1988; Holden, 1989), the differences between Japanese and American business concepts continue to lessen. During my visit to Toyota's Georgetown facility, I observed how these two cultures . . .

with their different metaphorical perspectives could work productively together. As J. Whiting of Toyota pointed out, the two cultures can be blended together only superficially; the most productive solution appears to be adopting the best of both cultures (J. Whiting, personal communication, February 27, 1992). The growing success of MNCs seems to assure that a trend toward this eclectic approach will continue.

## CHAPTER V

### Conclusions

#### Limitations

Limitations apply to this study in several areas. In the first place, the artifacts and the field research pertain to some of the largest American and Japanese corporations. The metaphors in use might differ in kind and degree depending on the size of the institution. Also, they could vary depending upon the products manufactured or the type of management involved.

In the second place, although the artifacts chosen represent a wide sampling of those available, some potentially informative works do not appear in this study. The actual documents in use in Japanese firms rarely appear in translation in the United States. Since many scholars who could translate Japanese works of economics and business management prefer, instead, to write original works, the availability of English materials concerning Japanese corporate culture remains a major hindrance to a study of this kind.

Finally, the real significance of organizational metaphors has only just been recognized. The study of corporate culture began only recently as well. Further research in the areas of sociology and psychology must occur before many of the theories and implications proposed in this study can be thoroughly tested.

Recommendations for future study

While many metaphors appear to operate frequently in American organizational culture today, the military metaphor merits more immediate and intensive study. First, like the jungle metaphor and, to a certain extent, the competition metaphor, the military metaphor functions as a manifestation of America's unfortunate fascination with war and violence (cf. Carpenter, 1990). With the military metaphor, however, the governing body *sanctions* the violence--supposedly for a limited period (Frاند, 1988). The frequent use of the military metaphor in both cultures manifests, perhaps, modern society's same fascination with violence and destruction.

Second, the military metaphor pervades every facet of organizational life, at all levels of the organization. This means that everyone from the office clerk or the worker on the plant floor to the chief executive "officer" feels the demands and operates under the influence of this mind-set. At times the military metaphor can provoke cruel or violent behavior, and, always, it isolates coworkers who fear that they might become one of the "walking wounded" or the "casualty" of some ambitious new plan of attack. Unlike the relative cultural purity of the Japanese, American society actually consists of a vast array of cultures--rather than the traditional hope of a "melting pot." This means that we have no homogeneity factor to fall back on when dealing with the divisive business-as-war metaphor. Someone, presumably at a high level in the corporation, must act to stop this propensity to view business as a vast battlefield of lone warriors or such innovative programs as "team concept" and "participative management" will not survive to aid our faltering productivity.

Finally, the reasons for corporate warfare must be considered. Most authorities sanction warfare on the basis of defending what the combatants hold dear: "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" (or words to that effect) but also defense of loved ones or the home. Corporate generals realize that fighting for "market share" might not possess the same incentive as fighting to preserve jobs and life-styles. Employees will fight harder for something personal, so the organization must emphasize the costs of failure and the gains of success to the individual; "battle" then commences on every level, and the cycle perpetuates itself. This implies not only an "us versus them" mentality but also the creation of the idea of "noble" warfare--something not found in either the jungle or the game metaphors. All these things imply a greater potential threat for harmful repercussions from the business-as-war metaphor and, therefore, a greater need for future study.

The American version of the business-as-family metaphor merits future study also because of its potential as a tool of control and manipulation. When the managers of a firm operate from a familial perspective, they often hide their true motives behind a mask of concern and caring. If the employees feel that they remain indebted to the corporation for their quality of life, their job satisfaction and their career fulfillment, then manipulation will surely follow. Protective companies try to stop their employees from smoking, try to encourage dieting, and offer psychological counselling for emotional problems and drug abuse. When does the concerned employer become the omnipotent and omniscient parent? Where does the responsibility of the employer end? The extent of the loyalty and the obligation felt by

employees in firms developing a "family" culture thus takes on new and rather ominous importance.

An additional area for future research comes from Osborn's survey of the metaphors in major speeches (1975). As a result of this survey, Osborn ranked the "mean potency" of a number of metaphors. He attributes a 7.21 (out of 10) potency ranking to the family metaphor and a 6.79 (again, out of 10) potency ranking to the war metaphor (pp. 6, 8). How does this relate to the potency and usage of these metaphors in the business culture? Preliminary research from this study indicates a higher ranking for the war metaphor in both the Japanese and American corporate cultures and, perhaps, a lower ranking for the family metaphor in American corporate culture. Researchers should undertake more quantitative studies in this area.

Important findings might result from a study of the reasons why Japanese manufacturers locate plants in particular areas of the United States. The common reasons (lack of a strong union force, cheap labor, cheap land) probably do not reveal the entire story. The compatibility of archetypal metaphors perhaps plays a role in choice of location. Indeed, this could affect the success of a transplant organization in any country. More research seems warranted.

#### Implications for intercultural communication

The results of this study indicate that the military metaphor remains a pervasive--and potentially harmful--cultural metaphor for conflict as well as life in the United States. This metaphor, with its emphasis on the individual's battles for survival and supremacy comes into direct opposition with Japanese cultural ideals and the military metaphor which governs their conflict and transactions with the West. The Japanese

emphasis on tradition, uniformity, and the group seem in direct competition with the need for individuality and entrepreneurship in the United States. American corporations continue their attempts to implement "team concept" and "participative management," but what works in Japan (even with its American roots from Deming and Stilwell) might remain incompatible with American traditions and cultural patterns. Only with recognition of such opposing cultural patterns can potentially explosive areas of international relations be reconciled.

The business-as-family metaphor appears to create harmony in the Japanese work environment. If the American corporations could tap into a similar familial feeling within their corporate cultures, more harmony and responsibility could arise. Unfortunately, it appears that the average American remains generally unreceptive to things Japanese. Both cultures operate from attitudes of xenophobia which refuse to die; therefore, the need for more contact between cultures and more receptibility to new ideas persists. By studying the archetypal metaphors at work within both cultures, the differences between the two diminish.

Perhaps both societies would benefit from the creation of a new metaphor, one which does not have its heart in military images. Both inherently war-loving nations, the United States and Japan disagree easily and violently because of their insistence that politics and business can be equated with war. Also, because of their different perceptions of the ways in which business and war relate, conflicts must occur. Perhaps the world would benefit if they stopped viewing each other as the enemy and battled hunger, disease, and ignorance instead.



Appendices

## APPENDIX A

## Annotated Bibliography of Artifacts

Japanese Cultural Metaphors

As a part of my research on Japanese cultural metaphors, I examined works by two of the most prominent and award-winning Japanese authors of the twentieth century:

Abe, K. (1991). The woman in the dunes (E. Dale, Trans.). New York: Vintage.

Abe exposes the intense loyalty that underlies the Japanese psyche in his study of the results of a school teacher's unfortunate vacation on the coast. The young man finds himself trapped along with a female resident in a pit in the dunes. Their job for life includes almost-constant digging of sand in order to prevent the destruction of the community. Although it begins as entrapment, the young man learns to respect a life of sacrifice and purpose. Finally given the chance to escape, he instead stays out of loyalty and dedication to a life now full of meaning.

Kawabata, Y. (1988). Palm-of-the-hand stories (L. Dunlop & J. M. Holman, Trans.). San Francisco: North Point Press.

Kawabata's collection of extremely-short short stories deals with relationships--especially those which bind families together. The following were of particular interest:

--"Love Suicides," in which an abandoned wife and child remain devoted to the absent father and follow his wishes to the letter--and to the death;

- "Toward Winter," in which a samurai fights fate, wins, and builds a temple to commemorate the event;
- "Samurai Descendant," in which pride of ancestry both sustains and destroys a family;
- "Water," in which ancient and modern ways meet and flow together; and
- "Riding Clothes," in which a woman discovers the secrets of her life in the city where her father died.

Also, I investigated these books on Japanese economics and business:

Ishinomori, S. (1988). Japan, inc.: An introduction to Japanese economics (the comic book) (B. Scheiner, Trans.). Berkeley, CA: U. of CA Press.

Ishinomori examines, in comic book form, the workings of the Japanese economy and its view of the West. He does not hesitate to explore the issues of internal conflict and competition.

Kamata, S. (1982). Japan in the passing lane: An insider's account of life in a Japanese auto factory (T. Akimoto, Trans.). New York: Pantheon.

During the frenzied production of economical cars because of the oil crises of the 1970s, Toyota hired many seasonal laborers, including the author. The working conditions drained and even defeated many of these temporary employees.

Musashi, M. (1982). The book of five rings: The real art of Japanese management (B. J. Brown, Y. Kashiwagi, W. H. Barrett, & E. Sasagawa, Trans.). New York: Bantam.

Musashi codified the rules and ways of the samurai in the late 1500s and early 1600s. These rules

included being diligent in work, perfectionist in detail, and discreet in business dealings. According to the translators, this work forms the basis for the modern Japanese business ethic.

Ohmae, K. (1983). The mind of the strategist: Business planning for competitive advantage. New York: Penguin.

Ohmae explores economic planning and business strategy from the point-of-view of the aggressive militaristic manager.

Roberts, J. G. (1974). Mitsui: Three centuries of Japanese business. New York: Weatherhill.

Mitsui ranks as one of the oldest of the family-owned and -operated "zaibatsu." The work follows the history of Japan and Japanese business through the story of this giant corporation.

Shook, R. L. (1988). Honda: An American success story (revolutionizing the art of management). New York: Prentice Hall.

Shook's work underscores the importance of family and quality in Honda's American manufacturing plants. He points out that Japanese principles and ethics apply equally as well in the United States.

I also reviewed two classic Japanese movies:

Motoki, S. (Executive Producer), & Kurosawa, A. (Director). (1954). The seven samurai [film]. New York: Sony Video.

Kurosawa's classic "Eastern Western" tells the story of a brave group of warriors who protect a farming village from roving bandits.

Tomoyuki, T. & Kurosawa, A. (Producers), & Kurosawa, A. (Director). (1960). The bad sleep well [film]. New York: Sony Video.

This movie tells a rather sordid tale of corruption, kick-backs, and murder involving the highest levels of management in a large Japanese firm.

#### American Cultural Metaphors

The artifacts used for my investigation of American cultural metaphors include:

Cohen, P. (1973). The gospel according to the Harvard Business School. New York: Doubleday.

This could be called the diary of a future "Captain of Industry." In decidedly and deliberately military terms, Cohen details his days at Harvard Business School, the "officer candidate school" for business leaders.

Garson, B. (1977). All the livelong day: The meaning and demeaning of routine work. New York: Penguin.

From personal experiences, Garson discovered that most people developed strategies or "games" to fight back against the demeaning monotony of the assembly line and other repetitious work. The fascinating interviews and background stories illuminate the courage and tenacity of those under "Theory X" rule.

Iacocca, L. (1986). Iacocca: An autobiography. New York: Bantam.

Iacocca tells his story from his early years to his struggles at Ford and his success at Chrysler. His colorful language and thinly-veiled "Japan-bashing" made the book popular with many Americans.

Miller, L. M. (1989). Barbarians to bureaucrats: Corporate life cycle strategies (lessons from the rise and fall of civilizations). New York: Clarkson N. Potter.

The title says it all. Miller explores the evolution of business organizations in terms of history and civilization.

Mills, D. Q. (1988). The IBM lesson: The profitable art of full employment. New York: Times Books (Random House).

This work delicately probes the rationale behind IBM's policy of full employment and its respect for its employees. Only in the last section does Mills suggest that this lesson may not work for every company and that it may not work forever for IBM.

Ringer, R. J. (1977) Looking out for #1. New York: Fawcett.

and

Ringer, R. J. (1974) Winning Through Intimidation. New York: Fawcett.

Ringer's two now-classic works detail the "vicious jungle" and the horrors of battle endured by the courageous "tortoise," as he learns the inside story of real estate at "Screw U."

Roberts, W. (1987). Leadership secrets of Attila the Hun. New York: Warner.

Roberts tries to make Attila an acceptable management model. In the process, he points out many aggressive ways to manage people through "loyalty" and "discipline" and "destroy" the competition.

Toffler, A. (1970, 1981). Future shock. New York: Bantam.

This landmark work details the effects of change--originally begun by the upheaval of the Industrial Revolution--on modern society. The book also tells how antiquated bureaucracies learn to cope with the rapid change experienced during this century.

Waterman, R. H., Jr. (1987). The renewal factor: How the best get and keep the competitive edge. New York: Bantam.

Waterman explores the more positive factors of modern American business in a manner similar to his popular book (co-written with Tom Peters), In search of excellence (1982).

Weyerhaeuser Company. (1989). Where the future grows: A history of Weyerhaeuser Company. Tacoma, WA: author.

Weyerhaeuser published this history of the company in advance of the ninetieth anniversary of its founding (1990). It details the struggles of the Weyerhaeuser family to conquer the "empire" of the Northwest.

Whyte, W. H., Jr. (1957). The organization man. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Whyte's classic work on the oppressive domination of bureaucracy remains a lively, effective narrative. Three generations of business students have studied this work.

Written materials obtained during my field research include:

- Toyota. (1988). Toyota Motor Manufacturing, U.S.A., Inc. team member handbook. Georgetown, KY: Author.
- Toyota. (1992). Toyota Motor Manufacturing, U.S.A., Inc. training course catalog: 1992. Georgetown, KY: Author.
- Weyerhaeuser Company. (1988). Weyerhaeuser annual report. Tacoma, WA: Author.
- Weyerhaeuser Company. (1988). Weyerhaeuser handbook for salaried employees. Tacoma, WA: Author.



## APPENDIX B

Questions asked during interviews at Toyota Motor Manufacturing, U.S.A., Inc.\*

1. Describe what "Toyota" means to you.
2. How was this feeling or idea communicated to you? or How did you come to feel to this way?
3. How do you (or the management through you) communicate ideas about Toyota to new employees?
4. How are new employees helped to fit in with the existing teams?
5. How are problems between employees handled?
6. Is competitiveness between departments or teams discouraged or encouraged?
7. How does Toyota U.S.A. differ from Toyota's Japanese operations?
8. Describe the ideal Toyota employee.
9. In a word or phrase, describe the culture or environment at this plant.
10. How do American workers fit into a primarily Japanese organization?
11. How are workers chosen for employment?

\*Note: This listing does not include all follow-up questions.

## Appendix C

List of minimetaphors discovered pertaining to the Japanese and American concepts of business-as-war

## Japan:

Tenor	Vehicle
1. company goals	"strategic missions"
2. external competitors	"the enemy"
3. workers or employees	"adaptable labor force"
4. price of doing business	"acceptable costs of battle"
5. education or instruction	"training camp"
6. projected business plans	"fighting on multiple fronts"
7. management	"staff officers"
8. marketplace	"changeable battleground"
9. supervisors or superiors	"absolute authority"
10. instructions	"orders"
11. company personnel	"advance guards for the Japanese economic giant"
12. new employees	"new recruits"

## United States:

1. management	"captains" or "generals"
2. workers or employees	"interchangeable labor force"
3. all competitors	"the enemy"
4. advancement	"moving up through the ranks"
5. new employees	"new recruits"
6. projected business plans	"single objective--winning"
7. knowledge	"ammunition"
8. company	"empire"

9. start of new project "launching"
10. attainment of goals "capturing objectives"
11. senior officials "veterans of many campaigns"
12. executive's life and career  
"battle"
13. individual workers "lone soldiers"
14. goals "targets"
15. rules of behavior "tactics"
16. business personnel who engineer takeovers  
"corporate raiders"
17. main corporate office  
"headquarters"
18. associates "professional cadre"
19. searching for employment  
"job campaign"
20. desired remuneration "salary target"

## Appendix D

List of minimetaphors discovered pertaining to the Japanese and American concepts of business-as-family

## Japan:

Tenor	Vehicle
1. coworkers	"brothers and sisters"
2. management	"parents"
3. education	"responsibility of company from cradle to grave"
4. caring for employees	"wonderful tradition"
5. company	"citizen of local community"
6. employees	"united members"
7. workers	"loving and caring family members"
8. goal	"safety and welfare of members"
9. job	"secure home"
10. workers	"treasured children"
11. company	"house"
12. head of company	"father"
13. president	"patriarch"
14. management	"paternal authority"

## United States:

1. internal business conduct	"in house"
2. related firm	"sister company"
3. employer	"caring entity"
4. company gathering	"family picnic"
5. history	"corporate heritage"
6. employees	"unreliable kids"
7. goal	"keeping family together"
8. management	"dictatorial parents"

- |                                    |  |
|------------------------------------|--|
| 9. managers                        | "custodians"                                     |
| 10. company                        | "protector of employees"                         |
| 11. company concerns               | "quality of all aspects of<br>life of employees" |
| 12. main office                    | "home office"                                    |
| 13. central office to subsidiaries | "parent company"                                 |
| 14. company responsibility         | "protect its employees"                          |
| 15. company goal                   | "let employees grow"                             |

## References

- Adams, J. (1983). The familial image in rhetoric. Communication Quarterly, 31, 56-61.
- Aoki, M. (Ed.). (1984). The economic analysis of the Japanese firm. New York: Elsevier Science Publishing.
- Aoki, M., & Dardress, M. B. (Eds.). (1981). As the Japanese see it: Past and present. Honolulu, HA: U. Press of Hawaii.
- Benedict, R. (1965). The chrysanthemum and the sword: Patterns of Japanese culture. Rutland, VT: Tuttle. (Original work published 1946)
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1991). Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Borisoff, D., & Victor, D. A. (1989). Conflict management: A communication skills approach. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Brand, J. D. (1989, April). The Tennessee Valley Authority and the public power controversy: The power of metaphor in public debate. Paper presented at the meeting of the Southern States Communication Association, Louisville, KY.
- Burke, K. (1989). On symbols and society. Chicago: U. of Chicago Press.
- Burst, A., & Schlesinger, L. A. (1987). The management game. New York: Viking.
- Carbaugh, D. (1985). Cultural communication and organizing. In W. B. Gudykunst, L. P. Stewart, S. Ting-Toomey (Eds.). Communication, culture and organizational processes (3047). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

- Carpenter, R. H. (1990). America's tragic metaphor: our twentieth-century combatants as frontiersmen. The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 76, 1-22.
- Christopher, R. C. (1983). The Japanese mind: The goliath explained. New York: Linden Press (Simon & Schuster).
- Davidson, D. (1979). What metaphors mean. In S. Sacks (Ed.), On metaphor (pp. 29-45). Chicago: U. of Chicago Press.
- De Mente, B. (1987). How to do business With the Japanese: A complete guide to Japanese customs and business practices. Lincolnwood, IL: NTC Business Books.
- De Mente, B. (1988). Japanese etiquette and ethics in business. Lincolnwood, IL: NTC Publishing Group.
- Dollinger, M. J. (1988). Confucian ethics and Japanese management practices. Journal of Business Ethics, 7, 575-584.
- Duncan, H. D. (1968). Symbols in society. New York: Oxford U. Press.
- Ferguson, C. H. (1990, July-August). Computers and the coming of the U. S. keiretsu. Harvard Business Review, pp. 55-70.
- Frاند, E. (1988, January). Thoughts on war and peace. Research and Development, p. 19.
- Galvin, K. M., & Brommel, B. J. (1986). Family communication: Cohesion and change (2nd ed.). Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company.
- Garraty, J. A. The American nation: A history of the United States to 1887, Vol. 1 (5th ed.). New York: Harper and Row.
- Garsombke, D. J. (1988). Organizational culture dons the mantle of militarism. Organizational Dynamics 17.1 (1988): 46-56.

- Gibney, F. (1975). Japan: The fragile super power.  
New York: W. W. Norton.
- Ginter, P. M., & Rucks, A. C. (1983, September-October).  
Wargames and business strategy formulation.  
Managerial Planning, pp. 15-19, 24.
- Glucksberg, S., & Keysar, B. (1990). Understanding  
metaphorical comparisons: Beyond similarity.  
Psychological Review, 97, 3-18.
- Gozzi, R., Jr. (1990a). Is life a game? Notes on a  
master metaphor. Et Cetera, 47, pp. 291-293.
- Gozzi, R., Jr. (1990b). Metaphors that undermine human  
identity. Et Cetera, 46, pp. 49-53.
- Hall, E. T. (1976). Beyond culture. New York: Anchor  
(Doubleday).
- Hall, E. T. (1973). The silent language. Garden City,  
New York: Anchor (Doubleday).
- Hall, E. T., & Hall, M. R. (1987). Hidden differences:  
Doing business with the Japanese. Garden City, NY:  
Anchor Press/Doubleday.
- Hall, J. W. (1971). Japan: From prehistory to modern  
times. New York: Dell (Bantam).
- Harrison, M. I. (1987). Diagnosing organizations:  
Methods, models, and processes. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Hocker, J. L. & Wilmot, W. W. (1991). Interpersonal  
conflict (3rd ed.). Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown.
- Holden, T. (1989, January 9). Big bucks vs. a job for  
life: Why top talent is defecting. Business Week,  
p. 58.
- Holman, C. H. (1980). A handbook to literature (4th  
ed.). Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill, 1980.
- Kawasaki, I. (1987). Japan unmasked. Rutland, VT:  
Tuttle.
- Kipling, R. (1912). Collected verse of Rudyard Kipling.  
Garden City, NY: Doubleday, Page, and Co. (Original  
work published 1889)



- Klapp, O. E. (1962). Heroes, villains, and fools: The changing American character. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Krefting, L. A., & Frost, P. J. (1985). Untangling webs, surfing waves, and wildcattling: A multiple-metaphor perspective on managing organizational culture. In P. J. Frost, L. F. Moore, M. R. Louis, C. C. Lundberg, & J. Martin (Eds.), Organizational culture (pp. 155-168). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). Metaphors we live by. Chicago: U. of Chicago Press.
- Levine, S. B., & Ohtsu, M. (1991). Transplanting Japanese labor relations. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 513, 102-116.
- Louis, M. R. (1985). An investigator's guide to workplace culture. In P. J. Frost, L. F. Moore, M. R. Louis, C. C. Lundberg, & J. Martin (Eds.), Organizational culture (pp. 73-92). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Maas, D. O. Images that unify: The role of analogues. Et Cetera, 47, (164-171).
- Mansfield, R., & Zeffane, R. (1983). Organizational structures and natural contingencies. Aldershot, Hamps., England: Gower.
- MacGregor, D. M. (1986). The human side of enterprise. In M. T. Matteson & J. M. Ivancevich (Eds.), Management classics (pp. 315-324). Plano, TX: Business Publications. (Original work published 1957)
- Martin, J. (1985). Can organizational culture be managed? In P. J. Frost, L. F. Moore, M. R. Louis, C. C. Lundberg, & J. Martin (Eds.), Organizational culture (pp. 95-98). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

- Miller, J. J. & Kilpatrick, J. A. (1987). Issues for managers: An international perspective. Homewood, IL: Irwin.
- Mitroff, I. I. (1983). Stakeholders of the organizational mind. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Naisbitt, J., & Aburdene, P. (1985). Re-inventing the corporation: Transforming your job and your company for the new information society. New York: Warner.
- Nakane, C. (1977). Japanese society. New York: Penguin.
- Nelson, J. (1989, April). Metaphor as a method of invention. Paper presented at the meeting of the Southern States Communication Association, Louisville, KY.
- Ortony, A. (1975). Why metaphors are necessary and not just nice. Educational Theory, 25, 45-53.
- Osborn, M. (1967). Archetypal metaphor in rhetoric: The light-dark family. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 25, 239-252.
- Osborn, M. (1975). The archetypal metaphor in rhetoric: A progress report upon research. Paper presented at the meeting of the Southern States Communication Association, Richmond, VA.
- Osborn, M. (1976). A new rhetorical theory for metaphor. Paper presented at the meeting of the Eastern Speech Communication Association, Philadelphia, PA.
- Ouchi, W. G. (1982). Theory z: How American business can meet the Japanese challenge. New York: Avon.
- Peters, T., & Austin, N. (1985). A passion for excellence: The leadership difference. New York: Warner/Random House.
- Rebischung, J. (1973). Japan: The facts of modern business and social life. San Francisco: James May.

- Rehder, R. R. (1990, January-February). Japanese transplants: After the honeymoon. Business Horizons, pp. 87-98.
- Ritter, K. W., & Andrews J. R. (1978). The American ideology: Reflections of the Revolution in American rhetoric. Urbana, IL: Speech Communication Association.
- Ruch, W. V. (1984). Corporate communications: A comparison of Japanese and American practices. Westport, CT: Quorum.
- Sackman, S. (1989). The role of metaphors in organization transformation. Human Relations, 42, 463-485.
- Samovar, L. A., & Porter, R. E. (Eds.) (1976). Intercultural communication: A reader. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Schmitz, A. O. (1978). Metaphor and knowing. Humanities In the South, 48, 7-9.
- Shigeo, O. (1989). Semiconductors and the Japanese mind. Japan Quarterly, 36, 86-91.
- Siltanen, S. A. (1991, April). Metaphor: The necessary mother of theory invention and development. Paper presented at the meeting of the Southern States Communication Association, Tampa, FL.
- Singer, M. R. (1987). Intercultural communication: A perceptual approach. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Smircich, L. (1985). Is the concept of culture a paradigm for understanding organizations and ourselves? In P. J. Frost, L. F. Moore, M. R. Louis, C. C. Lundberg, & J. Martin (Eds.), Organizational culture (pp. 55-72). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Smith, R. C., & Eisenberg, E. M. (1987). Conflict at Disneyland: A root-metaphor analysis. Communication Monographs, 54, 367-380.

- Stewart, C. J., & Cash, W. B., Jr. (1991).  
Interviewing: Principles and practices (6th ed.).  
Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown.
- Sypher, B. D., Applegate, J. L., & Sypher, H. E.  
(1985). Culture and communication in organizational  
contexts. In W. B. Gudykunst, L. P. Stewart, &  
S. Ting-Toomey (Eds.), Communication, culture, and  
organizational processes (pp. 13-29). Beverly Hills,  
CA: Sage.
- Takeuchi, H. (1989). Japanese business is humane. In  
D. L. Bender & B. Leone (Eds.), Japan: Opposing  
viewpoints (pp. 124-128). San Diego: Greenhaven.
- Toffler, A. (1980). The third wave. New York: William  
Morrow and Co.
- Tsoukas, H. (1991). The missing link: A  
transformational view of metaphors in organizational  
science. Academy of Management Review, 16, 566-585.
- Tung, R. L. (1984). Key to Japan's economic strength:  
Human power. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Co.
- Varley, H. P. (1972). Samurai. New York: Dell.
- Zimmerman, M. (1985). How to do business with the  
Japanese. New York: Random House.

## Bibliography

The following listing contains works consulted but not cited in the text.

## Books

- Asante, M. K., Newmark, E., & Blake, C. A. (1979). Handbook of intercultural communication. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Bender, D. L., & Leone, B. (Eds.). Japan: Opposing viewpoints. San Diego: Greenhaven Press.
- Brandt, V. S. R. (1986). Skiing cross-culturally. In T. S. Lebra & W. P. Lebra (Eds.), Japanese culture and behavior: Selected readings (pp. 188-194). Honolulu: U. of Hawaii Press.
- Clark, R. (1979). The Japanese company. New Haven: Yale U. Press.
- Fürstenberg, F. (1974). Why the Japanese have been so successful in business (G. Copeman, Trans.). New York: Hippocrene Books.
- Hamabata, M. M. (1990). Crested kimono: Power and love in the Japanese business family. Ithaca: Cornell U. Press.
- Heenan, D. A., & Perlmutter, H. V. (1979). Multinational organization development. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Hsu, F. L. K. (1975). Iemoto: The heart of Japan. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Ishihara, S. (1989). The Japan that can say no: Why Japan will be first among equals (F. Baldwin, Trans.). New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Ishikawa, A. (1985). Strategic budgeting: A comparison between U. S. and Japanese companies. New York: Praeger.

- Janowitz, M., & Little, R. W. (1974). Sociology and the military establishment (3rd ed.). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Kitahara, M. (1989) Children of the sun: The Japanese and the outside world. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Magaziner, I., & Patinkin, M. (1989). The silent war: Inside the global business battles shaping America's future. New York: Random House.
- Maruyama, M. (1969). Thought and behavior in modern Japanese politics (I. Morris, Ed.). New York: Oxford U. Press.
- Mesthene, E. G. (1970). Technological change: Its impact on man and society. New York: Mentor.
- Minami, H. (1971). Psychology of the Japanese people (A. R. Ikoma, Trans.). Toronto: U. of Toronto Press.
- Prosser, M. H. (1978). The cultural dialogue: An introduction to intercultural communication. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Smith, M., McLoughlin, J., Large, P., & Chapman, R. (1985). Asia's new industrial world. New York: Methuen and Co.
- Smith, M. J. (1988). Contemporary communication research methods. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Wolcott, H. F. (1990). Writing up qualitative research. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Yanaga, C. (1968). Big business in Japanese politics. New Haven: Yale U. Press.
- Yoshikawa, M. (1978). Some Japanese and American cultural characteristics. In M. H. Prosser (Ed.), The cultural dialogue: An introduction to intercultural communication (pp. 220-230). Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

## Articles

- Altman, M. (1990). How not to do things with metaphors we live by. College English, 52, 495-505.
- Bobrow, D. B. (1989). Japan in the world: Opinion from defeat to success. Journal of Conflict Resolution, 33, 571-604.
- Brophy, B. (1988, July 18). Out of sight--but not mind. U. S. News & World Report, pp. 33-34.
- Campbell, N.C.G., & Roberts, N. J. (1986). Lanchester market structures: A Japanese approach to the analysis of business competition. Strategic Management Journal, 7, 189-200.
- Fallows, J. (1986, December). The Japanese are different from you and me. The Atlantic Monthly, pp. 35-41.
- Keen, P. G. W. (1990, January). Sorry, wrong number: When it comes to cross-cultural communications, why can't American companies connect? Business Month, pp. 62-67.
- Kidder, R. L., & Hostetler, J. A. (1990). Managing ideologies: Harmony as ideology in Amish and Japanese societies. Law and Society Review, 24, pp. 895-922.
- McEnery, J., & DesHarnais, G. (1990). Culture shock. Training and Development Journal, 44(4), 43-47.
- Ohmae, K. (1989, January-February). Companyism and do more better. Harvard Business Review, pp. 125-132.
- Pascale, R. T. (1978). Communication and decision making across cultures: Japanese and American comparisons. Administrative Science Quarterly, 23, 91-110.
- Pascale, R. T. (1978, March-April). Zen and the art of management. Harvard Business Review, pp. 153-162.
- Rapoport, A. (1988). War without hatred. Etc.: A Review of General Semantics, 45(3), pp. 211-217.

Wriston, W. B. (1990, January-February). The state of American management. Harvard Business Review, pp. 78-83.

Miscellaneous

Frye, J. K. (1976, March). The functions of metaphor in presidential inaugural addresses. Paper presented at the meeting of the Eastern Communication Association.