

# Possibility of Internationalization of Japanese Style of Management to Asia—Research Review

J.A.T.D. Nishantha

## Introduction

With the increasing internationalization of Japanese industry, possibilities for international adaptation and adoption of Japanese style of management (JSM), with or without modification, has become a central theme of management research in Japan as well as other countries. Research in this area would fall basically into comparative systems research. The JSM is understood as being characterized by features like the seniority system, lifetime employment, quality circles etc. The question raised in research is whether these elements of management could be practiced in Japanese enterprises operating in foreign countries. Researchers have attempted to determine which parts of JSM could be adopted in foreign countries. There was a rapid expansion in the internationalization of management practice from the latter half of the 1970s through the 1980s. Japanese enterprises were in serious international competition.

The application of JSM in different cultures was a challenge, even for excellent Japanese managers. On the one hand, cultural differences reduced the international adoption possibilities of their management systems. On the other hand, the JSM was praised and accepted in foreign countries as a model of excellent management culture for the improvement of management efficiency. However, the thought that the “Japanese style of management is culturally centered cite” always existed. In the internationalization of JSM, however, optimism prevailed.

Research on JSM raised and examined the following type of questions: in this style of management, which emerged and developed in Japan, easily transferable to countries with fundamentally different historical and cultural backgrounds? Furthermore how valid and relevant is JSM in foreign locations?

In this paper, the performance of the Japanese style of management will be examined, with special reference to Asia. This will be in the form of a review of relevant empirical research on the subject. This paper will review a cross section of the available literature on the extent of adoption of JSM in some foreign countries and on perceptions about its appropriateness and / or acceptability for those countries. In the course of this literature review, I will try to examine the strengths and limitations of these studies, to help us in finding how they can contribute to knowledge in this field of studies. The paper concludes by scrutinizing the main points raised and developed.

**Extent of Adoption in Selected Foreign Countries, and Perception of Appropriateness and Acceptability**

There is a considerable volume of research by management specialists, particularly in the Japanese language, about the possibility of adoption of JSM in the different work environments found in foreign countries. The work of Ichimura Shinichi (1988), one of the earliest in this genre, covers about 8 countries in Asia. Afterwards, a research group from Hiroshima University (1989) carried out a research in the ASEAN region on the same problem. This research was based on a questionnaire administered to business executives in Japanese firms found in the countries studied and was concerned with the awareness and consciousness of the interviewed executives about this subject. In 1992, Kishida Tamiki carried out a research comparing characteristics of the business administration styles of Japanese firms in some South East Asian countries, Thailand, Malaysia and Singapore. There is also research introducing different models for the adoption of JSM in foreign countries [(e.g. Shiroto Yasukage, (1991), Imada Takatoshi, Sonoda Shigeto (1995) and Suzuki Shigeru (1994 to 1998)). There are scholars who have contributed to the research on JSM from a comparative perspective in more than 2 countries like Korea, Malaysia, Thailand, Indonesia, Philippines, Singapore, China, India, Taiwan etc.

Table 1  
Rate of Adoption and the Extent of Acceptability of JSM in Asian Countries (1) %

JSM CHARACTERISTICS (2)	Adoption Rate					Degree of Appropriateness						
	No of answers excluding		Very High	High	Low	Very Low	No of answers excluding		Very High	High	Low	Very Low
	NA					NA	NA					
<b>Group principle</b>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	4	0	0	0	0	100
1.Root binding type of decision making	9	0	11.1	88.8	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
2.Letters of consultation	12	0	16.6	83.3	0	5	0	0	0	20	80	0
3.Flexible work schedules	9	0	0	66.6	33.3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
4.Morning exercises	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
5.Enterprise Union System	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>Equal treatment principle</b>	9	NA	0	2	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	100
1.Sharing of office room by all types of employees	10	20	10	50	20	1	0	0	0	100	0	0
2.Uniform system	3	0	33.3	66.6	0	1	0	0	0	100	0	0
3.Joint restaurant for white-blue collar workers	3	0	0	100	0	5	0	40	60	0	0	0
4.Rest room (toilets) common to white-blue collar workers	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>Holistic production control</b>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	4	0	25	75	0	0	0
1.System of 3S to 5S	8	25	75	0	0	1	0	100	0	0	0	0
2.Total Quality Control System	12	0	16.6	75	8.3	1	0	100	0	0	0	0
3.Small Group activities such as QC circles	12	0	16.6	75	8.3	5	0	60	40	0	0	0
4.Just in time production system	11	0	0	0	100	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
5.Multiply work	12	0	0	41.6	58.3	5	0	0	60	40	0	0
6.Subcontracting system	9	0	0	66.6	33.3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>Shared belongingness to enterprise</b>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
1.Emphasis in the management ideology	9	0	33.3	66.6	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
2.Enterprise internal promotion system	9	22.2	77.7	0	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
3.Company house or dormitories	9	0	88.8	11.1	0	4	0	0	0	0	100	0
4.Cultural and welfare activities	11	45.4	54.5	0	0	4	0	50	50	0	0	0
5.Sharing information	12	25	57.3	16.6	0	5	0	0	0	0	100	0
6.Proposal system	12	0	252	75	0	1	0	0	0	100	0	0
7.Labor-management cooperation activities	9	0	2.2	66.6	11.1	5	40	40	20	0	0	0
8.Equity holding by employees	2	0	0	0	100	4	0	0	0	0	100	0
9.Informal personal relations	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	4	0	0	0	0	0	100
<b>Work Retention Mechanisms</b>	2	0	0	50	50	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
1.Stable employment (lifetime employment)	10	0	50	50	0	5	0	0	0	100	0	0
2.Systematic recruitment of new university graduates	9	0	0	6	3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
3.Enterprise internal education (on the job training)	10	10	90	0	0	5	80	20	0	0	0	0
4.System of reshuffle of employees among sections	10	0	0	80	20	0	0	0	0	100	0	0
5.Salaries based on a system of gerontocracy	9	0	22.2	77.7	0	4	0	0	0	0	100	0
6.Promotion based on a system of gerontocracy	10	20	0	40	40	5	0	0	0	20	80	0
7.Payment of various allowances	12	8.3	58.3	16.6	0	1	0	0	0	100	0	0
8.Lump sum payments at retirement	10	10	30	40	20	5	0	0	0	40	60	0
9.Bonus system	12	66.6	25	8.3	0	1	0	0	0	100	0	0

Notes:

(1) This Table is prepared on the basis of data in Table A 1.1 (see Appendix to this Chapter). Refer to it for further details.  
 (2) The rate of adoption and the extent of acceptability of characteristics of JSM in foreign countries as determined by Japanese executives. The questionnaires were administered to Japanese executives.

There is no single fixed concept of JSM. The characteristics of JSM have the tendency to vary depending on to the scholar concerned. Views of different authors differ with respect to the potential for adoption of JSM in foreign countries. Some argue that JSM could be adopted at the factory level, but not at the office level (Ishida Hideo, 1985, Nakagawa Takio, 1992). On the other hand, some scholars believe that, in reality, there is no potential for the adoption of JSM in foreign countries (Yoshihara Hideki, 1985).

My focus is limited to researches on two aspects of JSM in the Asian countries concerned: (1) rate or extent of adoption of certain elements of JSM and (2) the extent of acceptability / unacceptability of these characteristics in the countries concerned. Tables 1 to 7 summarize the findings of the relevant researches surveyed. Of these, Table 1 presents a summary of the findings of 12 studies on the rate of adoption, and those of 5 studies on the extent of acceptability of different elements of JSM. Of the 12 studies, 9 have been carried out by the same author (Suzuki) in 9 Asian countries. The balance three, carried out by 2 authors (Yamashita and Tokita) are on groups of countries- Asian N.I.Es, ASEAN and South East Asia. Of the five acceptability studies four were carried out by one single author for four different Asian countries and the other by another author for South East Asia asa group.

Based on these studies, I have developed Table 4 to indicate the rate of adoption and Table 3, to indicate the extent of acceptability of JSM both in a national context. The short references to all these researches are found at the top of Table A. 3 in the Appendix to this paper and detailed references, in the bibliography. I have analyzed the degree of adoption and acceptability, as the case may be, with four levels:

1. Very high
2. High
3. Low
4. Very low.

Table 2  
Rate of Adoption of JSM in Asian Countries %

Countries	Very High	High	Low	Very Low
Korea (Suzuki 1998 d)	19.2	42.3	30.7	7.6
Malaysia (Suzuki 1998 a)	11.1	25.9	51.8	11.1
Thailand (Suzuki 1996)	7.4	22.2	51.8	18.5
Indonesia (Suzuki 1998 e)	11.1	25.9	40.7	22.2
Philippines (Suzuki unpublished)	7.4	29.6	40.7	22.2
Singapore (Suzuki 1995 a)	3.8	23.1	42.3	30.7
China (Suzuki 1994 b)	3.8	26.9	42.3	26.9
India (Suzuki 1998 c)	18.5	14.8	44.4	22.2
Taiwan (Suzuki 1994 c)	20	40	32	82
Asian N.I.E.s (Tanaka 1998)	6.7	13.3	60	0
ASEAN (Tanaka 1998)	6.7	20	46.7	26.6
South East Asia (Tsuneda 1993)	0	58.8	41.2	0
Total	114.7	342.8	524.6	216.0

Notes; This Table is based on data in Table A.1 and Table 3. Refer to Table A.1, Table. 3 and the text for further details.

Table 2 indicates the percentage rate of adoption of JSM characteristics in Asian Countries. To get the percentages for each country, I first count the responses in regard to different JSM characteristics falling into each group in the classification above. The total number of responses falling in each category is then expressed as a percentage only of total answers excluding NA. As noted, assessment of position from very low to very high is based on the opinions of interviewed Japanese business executives. The range of answers falling into the four groups above is indicated in footnotes to Table A 1. Table 1 clearly shows that in most of the Asian countries the rate of adoption of identified JSM characteristics is not very high. Only 9 elements out of 31 are reported to have had higher than a 50% rate of adoption - see the total number of occasions where “very high” or “high” appear in Table 3. If countries where the percentages in the columns marked “very high” and “high” in Table 4 add up to 50% or more are considered those where JSM is extensively adopted, only Korea (61.5%), Taiwan (60%) and the group “South East Asian countries” (58.8%) fall into that category. It appears than in other countries and regions, the JSM is not widely practised in terms of the above criterion.

Table 3  
Rate of Acceptability of JSM in Asian Countries %

Countries	Very High	High	Low	Very Low
Thailand (Yamashita 1989)	11.1	16.7	16.7	55.6
Indonesia (Yamashita 1989)	11.1	0	33.3	55.5
Singapore (Yamashita 1989)	5.6	16.7	16.7	61.1
Malaysia (Yamashita 1989)	5.5	22.2	16.7	55.6
South East Asia (Tsuneda 1993)	0	16.7	83.3	0

Notes; This Table is based on data in Table A.1. Refer to Table A. 1 for further details.

The conclusions of the studies on the extent of acceptability also were not very positive. (See Table 1) Out of 26 elements, only 6 received more than 50% on “high” or “very high” scales from interviewees. These results, analyzed in a national context (see Table 3), show that the rate of acceptability of JSM in Asian countries is rather weak. In every country more than 60% of responses are on the “low” or “very low” scale with respect to the acceptability of JSM.

Table 4  
Rate of Acceptability and Unacceptability of Characteristics of JSM (28 features)

Rate of Acceptability of Characteristics of JSM	TOTAL	TOTAL	Rate of Unacceptability of Characteristics of JSM
1.Emphasise on the management ideology	38.0	32.3	1.Reshuffle of employees among sections
2.Enterprise internal education	29.7	25.4	2.Multiple work
3.Sharing of information	27.0	25.0	3.Equal treatment principal.
4.Enterprise internal promotion system	22.0	20.9	4.Salaries based on a system of gerontocracy
5.Root binding type decision making	20.9	18.2	5.Promotion based on a system of gerontocracy
6.Bonus System	20.8	16.7	6.Emphasis on the management ideology
7.5S	19.6	16.2	7.JIT production system
8.Stable employment	19.0	14.9	8.Root binding type decision-making
9.Flexible work schedules	14.2	14.0	9.Flexible work schedules
10.Labor-management cooperation	11.1	13.3	10.QC circles
11.TQC	10.9	12.2	11.Letter of consultation
12.Salaries based on a system of gerontocracy	9.8	9.2	12.Stable employment
13.Cultural and Welfare activities	8.3	9.1	13.Sharing of office room by all types of employees
14.Quality checking inside production process	8.0	8.9	14.5S
15.Promotion based on a system of gerontocracy	6.3	8.0	15.Proposal system
16.Equal treatment principal.	6.0	6.8	16.Sharing of information
17.Company house or dormitories	5.4	6.4	17.TQC
18.Letter of consultation	5.4	4.9	18.Labor-management cooperation
19.QC circles	4.4	4.7	19.Systematic recruitment of new graduates
20.Flexible work schedules	4.3	3.1	20.Quality checking inside production process
21.Multiple work	3.0	1.7	21.Enterprise internal education
22.Proposal system	2.4	1.7	22.Subcontracting system
23.Reshuffle of employees among sections	2.3	1.4	23.Cultural and Welfare activities
24.JIT production system	2.3	1.3	24.Bonus System
25.Sharing of office room by all types of employees	2.0	1.3	25.Company house or dormitories
26.Systematic recruitment of new graduates	1.3	1.2	26.Payment of various allowances
27.Lump sum payments at retirement	1.3	1.1	27.Internal promotion system
28.Subcontracting system	1.2	0.9	28.Lump sum payments at retirement

Notes:

This Table is based on data in Table A.2 to A.5. Refer to Tables A.2 to A.5 for further details. Suzuki had given 3 points for the 1<sup>st</sup> choice (most highly accepted), 2 points for the 2<sup>nd</sup> most highly acceptable and 1 point for the 3<sup>rd</sup> most acceptable characteristics of JSM. Refer to the text of section III. Evaluation of Perceptions about JSM for more details

Table 4 summarizes average results for 9 countries in Asia, about the degree of acceptability / unacceptability of JSM. These studies were also conducted by Suzuki (further details are indicated in Tables A 2 to A 5). In this study, every interviewee was asked to indicate 3 items, each as most acceptable and most unacceptable. The author has assigned a score of 3 points respectively for the most acceptable and the most unacceptable characteristic, 2 points for the 2<sup>nd</sup> most acceptable and unacceptable, and 1 point for the 3<sup>rd</sup> most acceptable and unacceptable characteristic of JSM. Table 4 presents a summary of Suzuki's research results. On the left side of the table, characteristics of JSM are listed from most acceptable to least acceptable and on the right hand side, from the most unacceptable to least unacceptable.

There is significant contradiction in the results. Conceptually, one would expect the listing of characteristics from most acceptable to least acceptable to roughly correspond in the reverse order to the listing of characteristics from most unacceptable to least unacceptable. The very nature of this research, it appears, could not have produced this ideal result. The listing in Table 4 does not meet this condition even in a general sense. Some of the items appearing very low on the left hand scale appear also very low on the right hand scale.

An analysis of a large number of responses from a widely varying group of business executives can obviously produce such results. Furthermore the listing of characteristics acceptability/ unacceptability accordingly in Table 4 is based on the relevant total score in Table A.2 and Table A.4. How these total scores are computed is explained in footnotes to the two Appendix Tables cited above. The total columns of these Appendix Tables and the Table 4 attempt to present some average picture of relevant conditions that prevailed in several countries at different periods of time. The degree to which this kind of analysis could be useful, for analytical purposes or even for management decision making purposes is doubtful.

The studies quoted also examine as to why the interviewed business executives consider various JSM practices as acceptable / unacceptable in countries surveyed. The study results in this connection are summarized in the Tables 1 and 3. Here again, the methodology has been merely to report perceptions of surveyed business executives. In two Appendix Tables 1 and 3, I have presented, respectively, the most widely cited 5 reasons for the acceptability / unacceptability of the five most acceptable / most unacceptable JSM characteristics. In each Table there are therefore 25 reasons indicated some reasons appearing more than once in each Table. Most commonly cited reasons are indicated below:

- (1) For acceptability of JSM.
  - It motivates employees.
  - It creates a sense of participation and commitment among local employees.
  - It strengthens the sense of shared belongingness among employees.
- (2) For unacceptability of JSM.
  - The custom of subdivision of work is not acceptable.
  - It is difficult to secure talented staff and job-hopping is very widely practiced.
  - Strong resistance from local executives.
  - The status gap between different employee categories.
  - Consciousness of belonging to the enterprise is low.

In the research of Tsuneda, pertaining to South East Asia, the JSM characteristics like

QC, Kaizen (reform activities), 5S and enterprise internal education are positively considered both by Japanese representatives and local managers. Sharing of office room by different types of employees, wearing of a uniform, equity holding by employees, QC circles and proposal system are acceptable to Japanese representatives but the local managers do not appear to like them. The single labor union practice, salaries and promotions based on seniority and lump sum payments at retirement are not acceptable. The elements positively viewed by both the Japanese representatives and local managers are those related to the production side. These also appear capable of successful implementation with the participation of workers at higher levels. On the other hand, the elements which the Japanese prefer but are rejected by Asian managers, are those that appear like customs, having very little to do with production-related and technical factors. The elements positively accepted by Asian managers and not by Japanese representatives are elements that are based on a strong group consciousness. (Tsuneda Minoru, 1993).

The results of the studies so far surveyed differ not only in accordance with the country where the study concerned was conducted, but also according to the scholars who undertook the studies concerned. The following comments cover some studies not analyzed in the foregoing Tables as well. Fairness in the Japanese enterprise towards employees is evaluated high in almost every case. But there are country-wise differences. Malaysian white-collar workers feel dissatisfaction towards the seniority system, the authority relations and the vagueness in the decision making process (Kawabe Nobuo, 1991). The group principle is not liked much in the Philippines and Singapore, though in Indonesia it is considered favorable as far as labor management relations are concerned (Ichimura Shinichi, 1988). While the employment stabilization system in the Philippines and Singapore have produced good results in terms of improving labor management relations, in Indonesia, it is found not to have produced any positive results. Though seniority-based promotion is taken as satisfactory by workers in Malaysia and Taiwan, it is not liked much in Thailand, Indonesia and China (Imada & Sonoda, 1995). In the latter three countries, treatment of individual personality of employees with respect and honor is considered important. Also the style of making a lot of warnings, not followed by actual penalization (Ichibatsu Hyakkai), as in Japan, appears not to hold good in other Asian countries (Uchida Ken, 1994).

The extent of adoption of various characteristics of JSM appear to vary according to whether the foreign country concerned is a Western or an Eastern country. Characteristics like sharing office by all types of employees and cultural and welfare activities of enterprises are adopted in countries of either region. But, characteristics like the bonus system, the uniform system, payment of various allowances and recreational trips are adopted only in a few cases in Western countries, although in most of the Eastern countries these are widely adopted. The features like equity holdings by employees and JIT system are found very rarely in either group of countries (Tanaka Takuo, 1993).

On the question as to whether JSM has universality and cross-country transferability, Yoshihara (1989), has argued that the characteristics of JSM like employment stability, seniority-based promotion, equality principle and participation in decision making are universally applicable. Ishida Hideo (1985) also holds a similar opinion. Yoshimura has argued that due to three reasons, JSM produces high productivity with high worker morale in

countries like Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand and Taiwan: (i) the increased opportunities for workers to participate in decision-making, (ii) direct leadership role of executives and technicians among workers and (iii) the rationality of JSM that matches the various kinds of needs. He believes that JSM produces these results and they contribute to company development. He strongly believes in the universality of JSM (Yoshimura, 1992).

The above summarizes the findings of researches undertaken so far about how JSM works in selected Asian countries. There are a few studies dealing with JSM in some Western countries as well. Even though the history of Japanese enterprises abroad is not long, a considerable volume of research has been undertaken by various management specialists on this subject.

All this research has clearly been extremely time consuming and detailed. While adding significantly to the empirical side of the JSM research, one should however note that some of this research often merely present a record of what business executives think. It is quite possible that their personal likes and dislikes to various elements of JSM have affected their perceptions about "rate of adoption", "extent of acceptability" and "extent of unacceptability". The primary reason for Japanese enterprises to establish in Asian countries often is related to the presence of cheap labor in these countries. It is quite obvious that there are only a very few executives or white color workers in a company, as compared to numbers of non-executive employees, specially the blue-collar workers. None of the Japanese scholars referred to above have paid any attention to how the non-executives think. Most of them have indeed ignored the local executives as well in their studies. The reason for the neglect of non-executive category of workers in these researches may be a misunderstood consciousness that blue-collar workers do not have their own views towards work or there is no such need to examine their views. Also the linguistic problems, i.e. the language barrier which prevents Japanese scholars from communicating with them, also could have been a reason. This no doubt was a real problem but it would be wrong to consider that the views of the executives represent the viewpoint of all employees in a particular country or even a particular enterprise. It would be also wrong to assume that executives are unaware of the real feelings of employees working under their supervision. How different types of employees feel about JSM in different countries can be very different. There could be certain characteristics of JSM, which executives are not willing to accept or adopt but could be welcomed by non-executives, and vice versa.

Another point to be noted is that the meaning given to a particular characteristic of JSM by one business executive may be different from the meaning given to it by another business executive. More importantly, the respondents are likely to have been thinking about what a particular characteristic means superficially, without any thinking going into the underlying circumstances in Japan which have given rise to that particular characteristic of JSM in the management practices within Japanese enterprises.

Another point worth noting is that in all this research, there is a tendency to measure "rate of adoption", "extent of acceptability" or "extent of unacceptability" in terms of points or in percentage terms using two dimensional answers of "yes" or "no". There would be a mixture of JSM characteristics as hybrid styles of JSM with local styles added to certain JSM characteristics. The question that such hybrid systems can be developed in other

countries has not been addressed. In this field there is a lot more that can be done and has to be done.

### Conclusions

In the foregoing pages in this paper, I have discussed the internationalization of JSM and its rate of adoption in foreign countries.

There is a considerable volume of research about diffusion of JSM in practical situations found in different countries. These studies came out with different conclusions depending on the country, in which they were carried out and sometimes also depending on the scholar. These studies, appear to have been done with great effort but their very methodologies appear to introduce various limitations into study results. Most of these researches report the viewpoints of executives either Japanese or local. In this sense, even though a great deal of research regarding adoption, acceptability and unacceptability of JSM had been carried out, there is still room for further research in this field.

### Bibliography

- Abegglen James C, 1973, *Management and Worker: The Japanese Solution*, Sophia University, (translated; Urabe Katsumi, 1974, *Nihonno Keiei kara Naniwo Manabuka: Shinpan Nihon no Keiei*, Daiamondo Sha, Tokyo)
- Abegglen James C, 1984, *The Strategy of Japanese Business*, Ballinger Company (translated; Tajiri Akio, 1989, *Nihonnno Kigyuu Shakai*, Kouyou Shobou, Tokyo.)
- Abo Tetsuo, 1995, *The origins of Japanese industrial Power: strategy, institutions and the development of organisational capability / edited by Etsuo Abe and Robert Fitzgerald*, F. Cass, England.
- Bhaskar Chatterjee, 1990, *Japanese Management*, Sterling Publishers, New Delhi.
- Chen Min, 1995, *Asian management systems: Chinese, Japanese and Korean styles of business*, Routledge, London.
- Chou Myon, 1994, *Zaichuu Nikkei Kigyuu no Kigyuu Bunka ni kansuru Ichi Kousatsu-Zaichuu Nikkei Kigyouno Tairitsu Mondaiwo Tooshite, Keieigaku Kenkyuu Ronshuu*, Vol.1, p183-211, Meiji University, Tokyo.
- Fujino Tetsuya, 1998, *Globalization no Shinten to Renketsu Keiei, Tounan Ajia kara Sekai heno Shiten*, Bunshindou, Tokyo.
- Harris Philip R, Moran Robert T, *Managing Culture Differences*, Gulf publishing Company, 1979. (Translation, Kokusai Shouka University Kokusai Kouryu Kenkyu jo, 1983, *Ibunka Keiei Gaku*, Perikan Sha, Tokyo.
- Hasegawa Hiroyuki, 1998, *Higashiajiano Keiei Shisutemu Hikaku*, Shin Hyouron, Tokyo.
- Hatakeyama Hideki, 2000, *Kindai Nihonno Kyodai Kougyou Keiei*, Taga Shuppan, Tokyo.
- Hayashi Shuuji, 1986, *Keiei to Bunka*, Chuou Kouronsha, Tokyo.
- Hayashi Kichirou, 1990, *Case Study-Global Kigyuu no Kaigai Genchika Senryaku: KokuSaika no Saisentande Nanikga Okotteirunoka*, PHP Kenkyu Jo, Kyoto.
- Hayashi Masaki, 1995, *Nihonteki Keieigakuteki Kenkyuu, Shougaku Ronsou*, Vol 36, No.3-4, Chuou Daigaku Shougaku Kenkyuukai, Tokyo.

- ・ Hayashi Shuji, 1988, *Culture and management in Japan*, translated by Frank Baldwin, University of Tokyo Press, Tokyo.
- ・ Hazama Hiroshi, 1974, *Nihonteki Keiei- Shuudanshugino Kousai*, Nihon Keizai Shinbunsha, Tokyo.
- ・ Ichimura Shinichi, 1982, *Nihon Kigyō in Ajia*, Touyou Keizai Shinpousha, Japan. Suzuki Shigeru, 1994 a, Chuugoku ni okeru Nikkeikigyō 7 sha no Jirei Kenkyū, *Oosaka Keidai Ronshu*, Vol. 45, No 1, Osaka.
- ・ Imada Takatoshi & Sonoda Shigeto, 1995, *Ajia karano Shisen: Nkkee Kigyō ni Hataraku 1 mannin kara mita Nihon*, Toukyou Daigaku Shupan kai, Tokyo.
- ・ Imada Takatoshi, 1994, Chugoku ni okeru Nihonjin kan to Nkkeeigyō Hyōka: Tounan Ajia 3ka koku Chousa no Hikakude, *Keiei Koudou Kagaku*, Vol. 27, No3, Tokyo.
- ・ Suzuki Shigeru, 1994 b, Chuugoku ni okeru Nikkeikigyō no Keiei, *Osaka Keidai Ronshu*, Vol. 45, No 3, Osaka.
- ・ Suzuki Shigeru, 1994 c, Taiwan ni okeru Nikkeikigyō no Keiei, *Osaka Keidai Ronshu*, Vol. 45, No 4, Osaka.
- ・ Suzuki Shigeru, 1995 a, Shingaporu ni okeru Nikkei Kigyō 8sha no Jirei Kenkyū, *Oosaka Keidai Ronshuu*, Vol.46, No 1, May, Osaka Keizai University, Osaka.
- ・ Suzuki Shigeru, 1995 b, Mareshiyani okeru Nikkei okeru Nikkeikigyō 7 sha no Jirei Kenkyū, *Oosaka Keidai Ronshuu*, Vol.46, No 4, Osaka Keizai University, November, Osaka.
- ・ Suzuki Shigeru, 1997, Shingaporuni okeru Nikkeikigyō no Keiei, Roumukanri, *Osaka Keidai Ronshuu*, Vol.48, No 3, September, Osaka Keizai University, Osaka.
- ・ Suzuki Shigeru, 1998 a, Mareshiyani okeru Nikkeikigyō no Keiei, *Osaka Keidai Ronshuu*, Vol.48, No 5, January, Osaka Keizai University, Osaka, Japan.
- ・ Suzuki Shigeru, 1998 b, Taiwan Touitsu Kigyō no Keiei, Kokusaika Senryaku to Chuugoku Genchika Houji no Keiei, *Osaka Keidai Ronshu*, Vol. 48, No 6, March, Osaka Keizai University, Osaka.
- ・ Suzuki Shigeru, 1998 c, Indo ni Okeru Nikkei Kigyō no Keiei, *Osaka Keidai Ronshuu*, Vol.49, No 1, May, Osaka Keizai University, Osaka.
- ・ Suzuki Shigeru, 1998 d, Kankoku ni okeru Nikkei Kigyō no Keiei, *Osaka Keidai Ronshu*, Vol. 49, No 2, July, Osaka Keizai University, Osaka.
- ・ Suzuki Shigeru, 2000, *Ajia ni okeru Nikkeikigyō no Keiei: anke-to genchi chosani motoduite*, Aimu Keiri Kyōkai, Tokyo.
- ・ Suzuki Tatsuji, 1996, *Kigyō Ronri/ Bunka to Keiei Seishu*, Bunchin Dou, Tokyo.
- ・ Tadashi Hanami, 1983, *Kaigai Kigyō no Roushi Kankei*, Nihon Keizai Shinbunsha, Tokyo.

Table A.1: Rate of Adoption and Extent of Appropriateness of JSM in Japanese Enterprises in Asian countries (1).

JSM CHARACTERISTICS (2)	KOREA (1998d)		MALAYSIA (1989)		THAILAND (1996)		INDONESIA (1998a)		PHILIPPINES (1998e)		SINGAPORE (1998a)		CHINA (1994b)		INDIA (1998c)		TAIWAN (1994c)		ASEAN (1998)		S.E.ASIA (1993)		THAILAND (1989)		INDONESIA (1989)		SINGAPORE (1989)		MALAYSIA (1989)		S.E.ASIA (Tokita) (1993)								
	R.A.	E.A.	R.A.	E.A.	R.A.	E.A.	R.A.	E.A.	R.A.	E.A.	R.A.	E.A.	R.A.	E.A.	R.A.	E.A.	R.A.	E.A.	R.A.	E.A.	R.A.	E.A.	R.A.	E.A.	R.A.	E.A.	R.A.	E.A.	R.A.	E.A.									
Group principle	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA								
1.Root binding type decision-making	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low							
2.Letters of consultation	Very Low	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA						
3.Flexible work schedules	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA					
4.Morning exercises	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA				
5.Enterprise Union System	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA			
Equal treatment principle	Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low				
1.Sharing of office room by all types of employees	Very Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low			
2.Uniform system	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		
3.Joint restaurant for white-blue collar workers	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
4.Rest room (toilets) common to white-blue collar workers	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Holistic production control	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
1.System of 3S to 5S	High	Very High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High		
2.Total Quality Control System	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
3.Small Group activities such as QC circles	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
4.Just in time production system	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	
5.Multiply work	Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	
6.Subcontracting system	Low	Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	
Shared belongingness to enterprise	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
1.Emphasis in the management ideology	Low	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	
2.Enterprise internal promotion system	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High
3.Company house or dormitories	Very High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High
4.Cultural and welfare activities	High	Very High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High
5.Sharing information	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
6.Proposal system	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
7.Labor-management cooperation activities	High	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
8.Equity holding by employees	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
9.Informal personal relations	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Work Retention Mechanisms	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
1.Stable employment (lifetime employment)	Low	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	
2.Systematic recruitment of new university graduates	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
3.Enterprise internal education (on the job training)	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High
4.System of reshuffle of employees among sections	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
5.Salaries based on a system of gerontocracy	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High
6.Promotion based on a system of gerontocracy	Very High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High
7.Payment of various allowances	Very High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High
8.Lump sum payments at retirement	Very High	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
9.Bonus system	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High	
The average Adoption rate (6)	52	40	55	47	43	44	45	40	46	40	40	45	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	
No of companies Adopted (7)	98	92	37	81	51	52	18	55	14	55	18	52	18	55	14	55	14	55	14	55	14	55	14	55	14	55	14	55	14	55	14	55	14	55	14	55	14	55	14

Notes

(1) EA= Extent of appropriateness to the country, according to perceptions of the business executives interviewed. The

Table A 2 Degree of Acceptability (1) of Characteristics of JSM (28 features) Points

	TOTAL	TAIWAN (1994 C)	SINGAPORE (1995 A)	KOREA (1998 D)	MALAYSIA (1998 A)	THAILAND (1996)	INDONESIA (1998 E)	PHILIPPINES NOT PUBLISHED	CHINA (1994 B)	INDIA (1998 C)
1.Emphasize on the management ideology	38.0	141	46	14	27	6	8	3	91	6
2.Enterprise internal education	29.7	54	48	16	59	6	19	8	46	11
3.Sharing of information	27.0	56	47	6	45	19	13	6	45	6
4.Enterprise internal promotion system	22.0	16	59	9	52	15	28	10	8	6
5.Root binding type decision-making	20.9	33	34	13	28	23	26	3	25	3
6.Bonus System	20.8	8	82	9	35	28	15	4	44	2
7.5S	19.6	NA	22	8	50	28	19	5	NA	5
8.Stable employment	19.0	57	6	9	20	12	32	16	13	6
9.Flexible work schedules	14.2	4	27	12	31	18	22	10	2	2
10.Labor-management cooperation	11.1	20	9	16	18	10	9	5	5	8
11.TQC	10.9	57	1	-	11	1	2	-	12	2
12.Salaries based on a system of gerontocracy	9.8	11	23	14	17	14	2	6	-	1
13.Cultural and Welfare activities	8.3	10	18	5	10	11	12	6	3	-
14.QC checking inside production process	8.0	NA	19	6	14	8	8	1	NA	-
15.Promotion based on a system of gerontocracy	6.3	2	10	33	6	3	3	-	-	-
16.Equal treatment principal.	6.0	20	7	9	4	5	2	-	4	3
17.Company house or dormitories	5.4	2	2	2	10	12	6	-	12	3
18.Letter of consultation	5.4	15	8	12	2	-	4	-	8	-
19.QC circles	4.4	12	9	1	7	3	3	1	4	-
20.Flexible work schedules	4.3	5	7	-	4	11	1	5	6	-
21.Multiple work	3.0	9	2	-	1	3	6	-	4	2
22.Proposal system	2.4	10	6	-	1	-	-	-	5	-
23.Reshuffle of employees among sections	2.3	9	-	1	4	2	1	3	1	-
24.JIT production system	2.3	12	2	3	-	-	2	-	6	1
25.Sharing of office room by all types of employees	2.0	-	4	-	10	4	1	1	-	-
26.Systematic recruitment of new graduates	1.3	-	-	2	3	-	-	-	4	3
27.Lump sum payments at retirement	1.3	-	-	-	-	4	3	3	2	-
28.Subcontracting system	1.2	3	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	1
The average Adoption rate	45.9	52	40	55	47	43	44	45	40	48
No of companies Adopted	498	98	92	37	81	51	52	18	55	14

Notes

(1) The most acceptable 3 characteristics of JSM in the foreign countries as determined by Japanese executives. The questionnaires were administered to Japanese executives. Suzuki had given 3 points for the most acceptable, 2 points for the 2<sup>nd</sup> most acceptable and 1 point for the 3<sup>rd</sup> most acceptable characteristics of JSM.

Table A 3 The Top Five Reasons for Acceptability of the Five Most Acceptable Characteristics of JSM

Order	CHARACTERISTICS	REASONS FOR APPROPRIATENESS
1	Emphasis on management ideology (1)	(i) Strengthen the consciousness of belongingness to the company. (ii) Help to understand and enforce the company's policy and targets. (iii) Further unity and solidarity. (iv) Emphasize the importance of social responsibility and contribution. (v) Necessitate as the standard for work.
2	Enterprise internal education	(i) Foster talent within the company (ii) Strengthen the sense of belongingness in the company. (iii) Increase motivation. (iv) Promote employees to settle in the company. (v) Mean of technique transfer.
3	Sharing of information (2)	(i) Form the common recognition and the feeling as one body by the sharing and enforcement of management policy and targets. (ii) Overthrow possession of intelligence. (iii) Open and improve motivation. (iv) Improve communication and become adaptable. (v) Participate in deciding the intention (policy)
4	Enterprise internal promotion system	(i) Secure and retain excellent talent and lower the unemployment rate. (ii) Increase motivation through promotion. (iii) Develop employees' ability. (iv) Communicate and promote understanding to circumstances in the company. (v) Avoid risk by recruitment in the middle.
5	Root binding type decision-making (3)	(i) Agree as one in the company. (ii) Increase understanding and assent to the management policy. (iii) Dissolve and share differences of recognition between the Japanese and the local employees. (iv) Give a sense of participation and responsibility to the local employees. (v) Avoid opposition among groups and foster team work.

Notes (1) Suzuki mentions, this element has some reasons to be unacceptable. Those reasons are indicated below; (i) The difficulty of understanding the Japanese way of management, (ii) It is difficult to make an incorporation relation between workers where individualism is strong, (iii) The employees are only interested in salary and other payments, (iv) There is repulsion to the press from one side, (v) This mental side, or factors this element has, is too strong. (2) Suzuki mentions this element has some reasons why it is unacceptable. These reasons are indicated below; (i) Does not match to the top down type of dissection making, (ii) There is a tendency of information monopolization which is based on the individualism between employees, (iii) There are few remarks from workers (do not talk much about work). (3) Suzuki mentions this element has some reasons why it is unacceptable. These reasons are indicated below; (i) Does not match to the top down type of dissection making, (ii) This element has elements of heterogeneous, non-logic and non-rationality, (iii) It takes time, and the individual responsibility isn't definite, (iv) The Japanese representative must make the last decision. (v) The local employees are unfamiliar and not good at root binding.

Table A 4 Degree of Unacceptability of characteristics of JSM (28 features) Points

	TOTAL	TAIWAN (1994 c)	SINGAPORE (1995 a)	KOREA (1998 d)	MALAYSIA (1998 a)	THAILAND (1996)	INDONESIA (1998 e)	PHILIPPINES Not published	CHINA (1994 B)	INDIA (1998 c)
1. Reshuffle of employees among sections	32.3	94	56	22	39	28	17	5	24	6
2. Multiple work	25.4	55	35	24	50	17	25	2	20	1
3. Equal treatment principal	25.0	18	41	15	41	18	47	11	13	21
4. Salaries based on a system of gerontocracy	20.9	26	56	3	37	30	11	11	11	3
5. Promotion based on a system of gerontocracy	18.2	22	59	3	33	18	14	5	9	4
6. Emphasis on the management ideology	16.7	28	21	18	31	13	15	4	20	-
7. JIT production system	16.2	35	12	18	11	9	11	10	27	13
8. Root binding type decision-making	14.9	25	28	5	27	17	17	21	10	3
9. Flexible work schedules	14.0	16	20	10	36	12	5	8	5	4
10. QC circles	13.3	54	14	4	11	1	6	-	28	2
11. Letter of consultation	12.2	8	27	2	30	18	11	5	9	-
12. Stable employment	9.2	32	9	11	17	8	2	-	4	-
13. Sharing of office room by all types of employees	9.1	7	23	10	13	11	4	6	7	1
14. 5S	8.9	NA	30	9	7	4	4	5	NA	3
15. Proposal system	8.0	21	4	2	9	7	14	3	9	3
16. Sharing of information	6.8	13	3	14	3	3	7	-	16	2
17. TQC	6.4	23	5	1	7	3	4	-	15	-
18. Labor-management cooperation	4.9	9	8	4	8	4	-	2	5	4
19. Systematic recruitment of new graduates	4.7	6	22	2	6	6	-	-	-	-
20. QC checking inside production process	3.1	NA	6	3	2	4	4	2	NA	1
21. Enterprise internal education	1.7	5	5	-	2	-	-	-	3	-
22. Subcontracting system	1.7	2	3	-	2	2	3	-	3	-
23. Cultural and Welfare activities	1.4	2	5	-	5	-	-	-	1	-
24. Bonus System	1.3	6	-	3	-	-	-	-	3	-
25. Company house or dormitories	1.3	4	4	-	-	-	-	-	4	-
26. Payment of various allowances	1.2	1	1	-	9	-	-	-	-	-
27. Internal promotion system	1.1	4	-	2	-	1	-	3	-	-
28. Lump sum payments at retirement	0.9	3	3	-	1	-	-	-	1	-

Notes 1. The most unacceptable 3 characteristics of JSM in the foreign countries as determined by Japanese executives. The questionnaires were administered to Japanese executives. Suzuki had given 3 points for the most unacceptable characteristics; 2 points for the 2<sup>nd</sup> most unacceptable characteristics and 1 point for the 3<sup>rd</sup> most unacceptable characteristics of JSM. Sources: The full titles of these papers are given in the bibliography.

Table A 5 The Top Five Reasons for Unacceptability of the Five Most Unacceptable Characteristics of JSM (1)

ORDER	CHARACTERISTICS	REASONS FOR APPROPRIATENESS
1	Reshuffle of employees among sections (2)	(i) The local employees have aspirations for a professional career. (ii) To be considered for demotion (to a lower position) (iii) Employment is according to the kind of occupation. (iv) The work and skills are individual responsibilities. (v) To be connected with subdivision of the work. (vi) To be connected with talented individuals changing and leaving job of the.
2	Multiple work (3)	(i) The local employees have aspirations for a professional career. (ii) To be considered labor reinforcement. (iii) To be connected with subdivision of the work and limitation of the work range. (iv) Single ability work is universal. (v) The employment form according to the type of job. (vi) Employees avoid doing extra tasks. (vii) employees hate It.
3	Equal treatment principle (4)	(i) A class consciousness exists because of the influence of colonial times in Europe and America. (ii) The gap in educational background is wide. (iii) Hard to secure talent labor. (iv) To be connected with occurrences of executive resistance, changing jobs and friction. (v) The status gap works as a motivation period. (vi) A social standing system and racial problem exist in society.
4	Salary based on gerontocracy (5)	(i) The ability principle, the merit system the school career principal. (ii) Hard to secure and retain talent labor. (iii) No concept of seniority system. (iv) The wage raise is done by negotiation with individuals (v) The local employees have aspiration for the professional job carrier. (vi) The pay raise rate is low.
5	Promotion based on gerontocracy (6)	(i) The ability principle, the merit system, and the school career principle. (ii) Hard to secure and retain excellent talent. (iii) No concept of seniority system. (iv) The local employees have aspirations for a professional career. (v) A sense of belongingness for the company is low.

Notes

- (1) Extent of unacceptability to the country, as determined by business executives. The questionnaires were administered to business executives, both local and Japanese.
- (2) Suzuki mentions this element has some reasons why it is acceptable. These reasons are indicated below; (i) Helps to prevent from rebate and the exclusion of bad molecule, (ii) Helps to tackle Problems occur in human relations, (iii) Works as a means of layoff, (iv) Makes flexible correspondence possible.
- (3) Suzuki mentions this element has some reasons why it is acceptable. These reasons are indicated below (i) Helps tackle the high job-hopping percentage and the absent percentage, (ii) Helps dealing with small batch production, (iii) personnel reduction (iv) Training skilled labor (v) Suzuki mentions this element has some reasons to be acceptable. Those reasons are indicated below, (iv) The cost reduction, (vii) becoming the products high addition of value.
- (4) Suzuki mentions this element has some reasons to be acceptable. These reasons are indicated below (i) The upper and lower intention communication is easy. (ii) It sets a motive to the worker layer.(iii) The emphasis of the posture of human being respect (iv) The forming of making labor and management an incorporation
- (5) Suzuki mentions this element have some reasons to be acceptable. These reasons are indicated below (i) The improvement of the fixation percentage (ii) It is effective with the inflation. (iii) The evaluation of the loyalty (iv) The respect of the experience person(v) It fits in with the value view of Confucianism (Korea).
- (6) Suzuki mentions, this element have some reasons to be acceptable. Those reasons are indicated below(i) The fixation percentage improvement(ii) The existence of the trend to esteem an elder people (iii) The upper and lower consciousness of seniority is strong. (iv) It is easy to understand and the consent-ability is high. (v) It fits in with the value view of Confucianism (Korea).

Table A 6 Group Wise View of Adoption, Appropriateness and Unacceptability of JSM (%)

TOTAL		TOTAL AV.	TAIWAN (1994 C)	SINGAPORE (1995 A)	KOREA (1998 D)	MALAYSIA (1998 A)	THAILAND (1996)	INDONESIA (1998 E)	PHILIPPINES NOTPUBLISHED	CHINA (1994 B)	INDIA (1998 C)
A Rate Of Adoption	Group principle	39.4	42.4	38.3	45.3	38.9	43.6	32.7	31.9	38.2	35.7
	Work retention mechanisms	48.9	52.7	41.4	63.7	49.4	48.8	50.2	47.5	42.4	51.6
	Shared belongingness to enterprise	53.1	62.6	46.5	62.2	53.9	47.6	46.6	52.1	50.0	58.9
	Holistic production control	35.1	38.8	31.7	42.1	42.2	28.3	34.9	39.7	20.0	37.8
B Extent Of Appropriateness	Group principle	8.2	13.3	13.2	6.3	11.0	9.5	8.0	2.3	9.8	0.8
	Work retention mechanisms	11.6	16.1	21.8	10.7	19.4	9.7	10.8	5.6	8.0	2.8
	Shared belongingness to enterprise	15.0	34.4	24.3	7.6	20.9	9.8	9.1	3.8	21.6	4.0
	Holistic production control	4.3	18.6	9.9	2.9	11.9	6.1	5.7	1.0	4.2	1.6
C Extent Of Inappropriateness	Group principle	12.6	14.0	24.5	6.8	26.5	14.5	9.3	7.8	7.8	2.0
	Work retention mechanisms	10.0	21.7	23.4	4.9	16.0	10.0	4.9	2.3	6.1	1.4
	Shared belongingness to enterprise	8.2	12.4	10.8	6.9	12.1	5.8	10.4	2.9	8.5	3.8
	Holistic production control	12.6	33.8	15.0	8.4	12.9	5.7	8.1	2.7	18.6	2.9
B - C	Group principle	-4.4	-0.7	-11.3	-0.5	-15.5	-5.0	-1.3	-5.5	+2.0	-1.2
	Work retention mechanisms	+1.6	-5.6	-1.6	+5.8	+3.4	-0.3	+5.9	+3.3	+1.9	+1.4
	Shared belongingness to enterprise	+6.8	+22.0	+13.5	+0.7	+8.8	+4.0	-1.3	+0.9	+13.1	+0.2
	Holistic production control	-8.3	-15.2	-5.5	-5.5	-1.0	+0.4	-2.4	-1.7	-14.4	-1.3

Notes The elements of each Group is as following. Here the JSM characteristics are divided only into 4 groups, because there is not much attention paid to the Equal treatment principle in the studies exist.

Group principle (4elements)	Root binding, letter of consultation, sharing of office room by all type of employees, flexible work scheduled	Shared belongingness to enterprise (8 elements)	Emphasis in the management ideology, enterprise internal promotion, equal treatment, company house or dormitories, cultural and welfare activities, sharing information, proposal system, labor-management cooperation activities.
Work retention mechanisms (9 elements)	Stable employment, systematic recruitment of new university graduates, Enterprise internal education, reshuffle of employees, promotion based on gerentroy, salaries based on gerentroy, payment of various allowance, bonus system, lump sum payments at retirement,	Holistic production control (7 elements)	5s, TQC, QC circle, JIT system, multiple work, sub contracting system