Title	The case method and the science of human relations
Sub Title	
Author	十時, 嚴周(Totoki, Toshichika)
Publisher	慶應義塾大学法学研究会
Publication year	1960
Jtitle	法學研究 : 法律・ 政治・ 社会 (Journal of law, politics, and sociology). Vol.33, No.8 (1960. 8) ,p.(21)- (1)
JaLC DOI	
Abstract	
Notes	論説
Genre	Journal Article
URL	https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AN00224504-19600815-0082

THE CASE METHOD AND THE SCIENCE
OF HUMAN RELATIONS*

An Outline for a Course in Human Relations
in Business Administration

Toshichika Totoki

I. Introduction: Aim and limits of the paper

This paper will discuss an outline of a course in "Human Relations in Business Administration." Since the purpose of this paper is to contemplate a new course appropriate for teaching the human relations approach in Japan, I aim to do this in a way that will permit discussion of the relationship of the social scientist to the practitioner.

This subject, "Human Relations in Industry," discussed and attacked in both academic and non-academic publications, has become a rather loose phrase. At times it seems to mean all of the social sciences outside the realm of economics. At times it seems to confine the focus of study to manual laborers in manufacturing plants. For the purposes of this paper, I shall define the area as the study of the

social relations of people at work. The major problem, therefore, will be limited to the cultural, social, and psychological aspects of the organization of work, and the nature of the work experience, in the Japanese industrial situation. In other words, the object of study is people at work taking account of their inter-relationships in the typical patterns of Japanese culture.

What must be noted here is that teaching efforts shall be divided into and combined with two points—the organization and the individual. Although they are an indivisible entity, special emphasis shall be placed on the cultural, social, and psychological aspects of the organization, understanding of which is necessary for the appropriate practice of the human relations approach in any country. Without this emphasis, I believe, the so-called human relations approach is in danger of being done superficially, due to the lack of systematic knowledge of the behavioral sciences. In this sense, the relation of the social sciences to the practical shall be dealt with in detail.

Although it may be difficult to attain the ultimate aim, this more specific and limited goal must be considered as a step along the road to progress, for not only a growth in knowledge but also a growth in ability to understand concrete human behavior in the organization will be the aims of teaching.

In Japan's present situation, the new course in human relations which shall be proposed has a different meaning than the same subject in the American setting, in the sense that if we may regard the latter as placing more emphasis on realizing skill than the former, our new course may also be regarded as being more theoretically oriented than the latter.

The purpose of this paper is to organize the results of my stay in the United States, in such a way that they can be of good use in our teaching activities at home. Naturally, it is evident that the human factors in human relations are largely defined in terms of culture, by which social interactions, social norms, and even criteria of value judgements are derived. Therefore, the problems which I have to face should be deliberated carefully in order to clarify their culture-bound

characteristics. The first endeavor, then, will be to scrutinize the relationship between the American approach to human relations and the American setting; that is, what conditions exist that are necessary for the effective performance of that approach. The second endeavor will be to contemplate the modification of that approach, if necessary, for "transplanting" it into another cultural setting. The third point of endeavor, in my mind, is to take account of the cultural distinctions between America and Japan.

There can be little doubt that these problems are too difficult to deal with adequately in eleven short months, and more academic endeavor is required. But some arguments on this subject shall be introduced in this paper, in the hope that documenting such a theoretical problem may give support to a new course on human relations in Japan.

Within these limits and with these aims in mind, I shall present here the proposed new course, after a brief description of the Japanese setting in which I am expected to act. The reasons for proposing a new course will be discussed with some further considerations about the culture-bound nature of a social theory on human relations.

II. The new course of human relations proposed

It would be correct to say that any pedagogical tools, such as the case method used by the Harvard Business School, have never been used systematically by any universities in Japan. The traditional and strictly adhered to method of teaching in Japanese universities has been the lecture system, paradigm of which had been sought out in European universities, particularly in the German system of higher education of about eighty years ago. Before that time almost all higher education was carried out under the guardianship of feudal lords, and was very much influenced by classical Chinese culture, the so-called "*Shushi-Gaku*", which was famous for its despotic character. Therefore, it is not unlikely that the newly organized university system of the Meiji Era still held onto its basically despotic and phenomenally

authoritarian nature in its teaching methods. It would also appear that technological knowledge of Western cultures was eagerly and impatiently sought, due to the impetus given by the opening of the country to foreign intercourse. In short, the traditional customs of Japanese universities were mingled with ancient ways of thought on education and with the necessities of the new era.

Undoubtedly this situation could not be akin to the American setting, in which the case method has given rise to an entirely unique pedagogical concept. Moreover, using the case method which is quite distinct from the traditional lecture system would probably evoke a great deal of criticism from the conservative Japanese university staffs. Under these circumstances, I shall propose the following outline of course development which is conducted by a combination of the case method and the lecture system, which I shall call the " lecture-case method."

The new outline I intend to propose is the schematic definition of a series of steps in the development of a course which deals with human problems at work, for the first year student of the Graduate School of Business Administration.

In Part I, the basic issues of the behavioral sciences shall be presented, subjects of which are divided into two groups—the first, " Introduction to the Science of Human Behavior "—the second, " Basic Concepts of Behavioral Science in Relation to Business Administration."

The aim of this section of the course is to give students a fundamental idea and a precise definition of the behavioral sciences, whereby business subjects can best be understood. Although the subjects of this section shall be taught mainly by the lecture system, case materials pertinent to these subjects could be used as many times as possible, if the means are available. Moreover, the seminar-discussion type of class shall be used frequently. It is obvious that tolerable amounts of reading necessary for these subjects may be assigned to the students. At any rate, adequate emphasis will be placed on this introductory part, (I shall describe the reasons for this in the next

chapter).

Fifteen class sessions out of sixty shall be allocated to this section, assuming that we can have two class sessions per week, thirty weeks in an academic year, and eighty minutes in each class session, though this assumption has not been authorized as of yet.

In Part II, topic areas and concepts which are indispensable to analyzing human relations in relation to business administration shall be presented, grouped under the following general headings—" The Small Working Group," " Productivity and Leadership," and " Organizational Changes."

In the first group, the conceptual schemes with which organizational behavior can best be analyzed should be discussed. This is a basic tool of small group study, developed in the fields of anthropology, sociology and social psychology. In other words, interdisciplinary studies of the small group which have been evolved during the last few decades form the foundation of proposed conceptual schemes.

In the second group, the important administrative problems shall be analyzed, working from the former frame of reference, from which the specific conceptual frame-work is derived. In this sense, the topic has become a most important one from the managerial view-point for the maintenance of high productivity and effective leadership.

In the third group, the acute business problems, that is, organizational changes and readjustments of human relationships, shall be discussed. The changing process of social phenomena has been energetically investigated by anthropologists, sociologists, and psychologists, and also has been regarded as the most awkward subject to study in the present state of scientific knowledge. These phenomena are usually classified into two categories, long-term change and short-term change, or macrocosmic versus microcosmic change. Between these two categories, there seems to be less accurate contemplation of theoretical systematizations.

Since much of what has already been discussed at the American situation is concerned with microcosmic change, the long-term change shall be emphasized more emphatically in the new course, because the

macrocosmic view-point is essential for the business administrator in mapping out the future. Generally speaking, narrow-minded practitioners of human relations are apt to manipulate human beings according to their own selfish interests. The ideal practitioner in human relations, to my mind, should consider the whole social structure, and the future direction of structural changes in the society. In other words, the people, who are engaging in human relations jobs should have a broader view-point of the changing new world than the people who are engaging in the technical, manipulative jobs in business. At any rate, in this third group, not only short-term change, but also long-term change shall be considered, in such a way that students may understand the limits and the responsibilities of the human relations approach in business administration.

Forty class sessions out of the sixty shall be allocated to Part II, and twenty class sessions out of this forty shall be devoted to case discussions. About half of the class sessions shall be occupied with case discussions relating to lectures also given on the subject; that is, one lecture and one case discussion related to the lecture shall constitute the two class sessions each week during the twenty-week time allottment given to this section.

It follows that the type of cases to be used in this section is the next problem which we should carefully consider. As we have very few cases collected by Japanese colleagues in the Japanese business situation, it is our obligation to collect and to write our own cases in order to fulfill our objectives. It is appropriate to point out that case writing is a very difficult job for the person without experience, and that we must begin to cultivate men of talent as case writers in Japanese university.

Since we do not have sufficient time to prepare our own cases for the purposes of this new program, many cases written by American colleagues shall be used in this course with a minimal change of case contents in order to minimize cultural barriers to understanding of case materials. Moreover, some Japanese novels and some autobiographical documents of Japanese businessmen shall be used as case

materials in part, if they are adequate for our purposes. However it should be noted that I am not exact yet as to which cases and documents are appropriate for teaching the analytical, conceptual scheme of human relations problems.

In Part III, five class sessions out of the sixty shall be devoted to experimental studies of group activities performed by the enrolled students, in order to improve their practical ability in measuring and evaluating human interactions. Sociometric techniques and the role playing method, socio-drama, and psycho-drama are included in these experimental studies.

Criteria of evaluation, no doubt, shall consist of three items: the student's participation and contributions during class sessions; the extent of his comprehension of the subjects, demonstrated in occasional reports which are assigned for students; and appropriateness of his ability to understand these subjects as demonstrated in a final report.

The schematic definition of a series of steps in the course development is as follow:

HUMAN RELATIONS

SCHEMATIC DEFINITION OF A SERIES OF STEPS IN THE COURSE DEVELOPMENT

PART I

15 class sessions out of 60

GROUP I

Introduction: Understanding Human Behavior in Social Organization
A. The point of view of behavioral science
  1. Concept: Rational-nonrational-irrational
               Logical-nonlogical-illogical
  2. Categories: Choice of goals
                  Goals-personality relationship
                  Goals-society relationship
  3. Summary   Plurality of goals in human behavior
B. Key concepts of behavioral science
  1. Culture
  2. Social organization

3. Personality

C. Relativism versus universalism in behavioral science

GROUP II

Human Behavior and Administrative Process

A. Dimensions of human behavior
   1. Cultural value system
   2. Social institution
   3. Individuals
B. Administrative process and theoretical models
   1. Organization-personality relationship
   2. Effectiveness-efficiency-satisfaction relationship
   3. Leader-follower relationship
   4. Morale and productivity
C. Clinical approach
   1. Historical development and its nature
   2. Research versus administration

PART II

40 class sessions out of 60

GROUP I

The Small Working Group

A. Dimensions of the working group
   1. Complexity of organizational systems
   2. Formal and informal organization
   3. Structural-functional systems
B. Elements of behavior in working groups
   1. Normative dimension: value, norms, role-expectation
   2. Personal dimension: personalities, need-disposition
   3. External frame of reference versus internal frame of reference
C. Group behavior patterns
   1. Status and group membership
   2. Group norms and work restriction
   3. Deviants and isolates
D. Individual behavior patterns
   1. Perceived reality: circle of assumption, perception, feelings
   2. Map-territory and map-making process
   3. Need hierarchy and individual needs
E. Inter-group behavior patterns
   1. Inter-group conflicts of values, and objectives
   2. Role conflict among organizational purposes

3. Coordination and loyalty

GROUP II

Productivity and Leadership
A. Dimensions of productivity
  1. Role-expectations and effectiveness
  2. Need-dispositions and efficiency
  3. Satisfaction: as a function of congruence of role-expectations with need-dispositions
  4. Belongingness and identification
B. Determinants of productivity
  1. Cultural values and group norms: multi-group memberships
  2. Personality and group membership: inter-personal settings
  3. External-internal rewards and satisfactions
C. Leadership patterns
  1. Institutional leadership patterns
  2. Personal leadership patterns
  3. Transactional leadership patterns
D. Function of leadership
  1. Authority and control
  2. Spontaneity and control
  3. Leadership and productivity

GROUP III

The Organizational Changes
A. Social changes and disorganization
  1. Role reallocation and reorganization of membership
  2. Time span of congruence of new role-expectation with need-disposition
  3. Leadership and changes
B. Group structure and change
  1. Allocative change of interaction frequency and changing process
  2. External-internal impacts of change
  3. Personality readjustment

PART III
5 class sessions out of 60

Experimental Studies of Group Activities
A. Sociometric measurement
B. Role playing
C. Interaction frequency chart

III. Reasons for the new proposal

It seems to me that the so-called social theories are somewhat confused with empirical generalizations; the former are notions about how things work, while the latter are descriptions of observed regularities. It may be useful, therefore, to clarify the point that theories in general have several levels:

     I. Axion
     II. Concept and variables
     III. Relation between concept and variables
     IV. Hypotheses
     V. Operational translation of hypotheses
     VI. Operational consequences

In a social science, theories are rather weak on the first and second levels, and usually begin by stating the third level, that is, the relation between concept and variables. For instance, Talcott Parson's theory[1] of the social system corresponds to this third level, in which framework he has attempted to contemplate systematically an internal consistency of complex relations between concept and variables.

However, many social theories are concerned with the fourth and fifth levels from which some measurement techniques are constructed in order to verify hypotheses proposed. Many of them also emphasize only the empirical and social consequences, particularly, taking into account the practical usefulness of the studies.

In short, the criteria of usefulness of theories depend upon the following items: internal consistency, verifiability, plausibility, empirical consequence, and social consequence. Accordingly, theories and empirical generalizations are apt to be confused in the present state of knowledge, and sometimes these confusions result in misconceptions of the social sciences in such a way that one specific empirical generalization is applied to another related event, and an over-generaliza-

---

(1) Parsons, Talcott *The Social System*, Tavistock Publications Ltd. London, 1952

tion is committed.

It would appear that these over-generalizations are preponderant in the theories of human relations due to the unsystematic conceptualizations of human behavior, particularly due to the lack of a cross-cultural view-point of the appropriateness of theories. In other words, it is quite plausible that theories appropriate to Western culture, are at times inappropriate to other cultures. We have much evidence which demonstrates the culture-bound nature of so-called social theories, which cultural anthropologists have scrutinized during the last few decades through studying and comparing many different cultures.

That is the reason why I stated before that my main purpose was to scrutinize the applicability of the human relations approach preponderant in America to the Japanese business situation. In this sense, the new course development which was described in the former chapter is dependent upon the considerations of those academic problems, details of which shall be explained in this chapter. For this purpose, the explanation shall follow these three steps: (a), the human relations approach and cultural contexts, (b), the case method versus research methodology, and (c), the interdisciplinary approach to human relations on the job.

(A) The human relations approach and cultural contexts :

Although the Harvard Business School might well be crowned with the victory in the area of human relations as a pioneer, originator, promoter, and performer, the emergence of scholarly and managerial interest in human relations in the working place was undoubtedly related to the social requirements of the Mid-thirties, which was about the time when the American industrial situation was undergoing a complete transformation. Therefore it may be very instructive for our purposes to put the efforts of the human relations movement in historical perspective, and to discuss the relation between the social scientist and the practitioner.

According to Reinhard Bendix's paper, " Managers, Workers, and Ideas in the United States," the human relations movement in this

country is said to closely correspond with the Mid-thirties and forties' managerial ideology which emerged after the Great Depression. He says, " The contrast between earlier and later images of the manager is easily stated in abstract terms. In the 1940's the habits of business were said to include industry, arrangement, calculation, prudence, punctuality, and perseverance. A century later a group of prominent managers listed personal appearance, intelligence, willingness to assume responsibility, self-control, broadmindedness and decisiveness as the first six of a dozen executive traits. Vague as these ideal qualities are, they had clearly changed from the image of a man whose success consists in getting things done to one whose success depended upon effective action in a complex, industrial organization."[2] These changes, without doubt, were also related to the environment and organization of American industry which came to need a number of administrative employees. This increasing bureaucratization has affected management qualitatively as well as quantitatively. The bureaucratic careers may be said to demand a new language of teamwork and loyalty well fitted with the requirements of the new era.

In short, the earlier picture of industrial society, Bendix says, had contained a division between the successful few and the unsuccessful many which had left no place for the large number of those who belonged to neither group. As the proportion of independent businessmen declined while that of dependent employees increased, it became necessary to accommodate the prevailing images and beliefs to the realities of bureaucratic organizations rather than to the realities of a competitive market.[3] It may well be that Bendix's explanations are pertinent to the origin of the human relations movement, especially considered from the view-point of the changing process of American managerial ideology.

This movement also could be interpreted in broader concepts, that

(2) Bendix, R. " Managers, Workers, and Ideas in the United States," in Arensberg, C. M. et al. (eds.) *Research in Industrial Human Relations,* (Harper Brothers, New York, 1957) p. 10.

(3) *Ibid.,* p. 13.

is, individualism and the egalitarian tradition in the sense of Western culture. For instance, the special American concern for maintaining good relations with employees undoubtedly reflects the necessity for making employment as attractive as possible to people who have been acculturated in the traditional egalitarian doctrine, and who are in a position to pick and choose among places of work due to the persistent shortage of labor from Colonial days on.

In this same vein, James C. Worthy pointed out in his paper "Management's Approach to Human Relations," that the lack of a high degree of social stratification in this country, the relative ease with which people have been able to move from one social class to another, and above all the strong egalitarian elements in American culture have tended to deprive members of the managerial group of a full sense of assurance of their right to authority in relation to their subordinates.[4] Americans are likely to be troubled, he states, by vague feelings of uneasiness when placed in positions where they must behave in a superior manner toward other Americans who by all the standards of American tradition are their equals and whose position of inferiority in the business enterprise in no way detracts from their essential equality as citizens and men.[5]

It is not unlikely that this uneasiness helps to explain the peculiar sensitivity of the American employer to what his employees think of him. In other words, a deep-seated egalitarianism among native Americans has offered the cultural background of the human relations movement in the United States, and because of it, many scholarly works have been attracted by this topic. It might be said that the specific American settings in specific periods evoked the specific human relations movement and induced the specific human relations research.

However, much of the human relations research in America has shown little sensitivity to the environment. Generally speaking, some of the generalizations in the literature on human relations in industry

(4) Worthy, J. C. "Management's Approach to Human Relations," in Arensberg et al., op. cit., pp. 17–18.

(5) Ibid., p. 18.

have been related with two main tendencies : (1) a tendency toward psychologizing of social events, that is, the explanation of a social process in terms of the individual characteristics of the persons involved, and (2), a tendency to study the small group in a vacuum ignoring both organizational and cultural environment.[6] Therefore, empirically searched generalizations in the human relations field have retained a completely culture-bound character. In spite of these facts, the so-called pseudo-scientific human relations research findings were circulated even in different cultural settings, as if to imply that all human beings are equal in principle and behave in the same way. It is quite obvious that the workers' cultural backgrounds will shape their work conduct.

If a sensitivity to the environment and the cultural perspective is taken into account, the reformation of some of the present propositions about human relations in the workplace should also be considered. The analytically relevant variables to this reformation are obviously cultural and social. Take the matter of leadership. The most practical generalizations in the literature on leadership tell us that the democratic way of leadership along with membership participation in managerial decisions will probably improve organizational effectiveness. This generalization is quite all right in some cultural settings, if the culture has supplied the members of the work group with an egalitarian ideology, if the labor and product market situation has not coerced the members into all-out effort, if the skills of participation are existent, and the cost is not too high, if the decision does not necessitate secrecy, and if major threats from the outside do not necessitate speed, etc.

Thus, there is the necessity of being theoretical for the scientist, who has to concern himself with basic variables in human behavior. On the other hand, the practitioner has to consider a given organization at a given place and time, its unique culture, traditions, and personalities. The social scientist and practitioner, after all, use the

---

(6) Wilensky, H. L. "Human Relations in the Workplace : an Appraisal of Some Recent Research," in Arensberg et al., op. cit., p. 46.

same thought process, and both of them have to make guesses about how things are related.

This being so, it would be appropriate for the new course proposed earlier to deliberate cultural social variables, (and for fifteen class sessions in the beginning section to be devoted to the subject). Since there is all the difference in the world between America and Japan, there should be an urgent demand to take such problems into consideration, without reference to which we cannot understand the meaning and objectives of the human relations approach in Japanese settings, particularly when and if we want to import this administrative tool into our country.

One area of understanding the relationship between research and practice in the field of human relations in which I made progress during my stay in the United States was the realization that the case method as a means of training in administrative skills had been part of the basic background of the origin of the human relations approach in America. In the beginning, I think, the case method used at the Harvard Business School was one of the influential means of the development of this human relations movement, so that the nature of the two were inseparably intertwined. Therefore, it may be appropriate to point out some characteristic features of the case method in relation to the human relations research and training.

(B)   The case method versus research methodology

There can be little doubt that business education in general should provide students with both scientific knowledge and practical skills of application, both of which are like two wheels of the same cart. In relation to the skills and practice of business administration, the case method could be used as a most pertinent pedagogical tool whereby business subjects can best be taught. Particularly, it would be an effective way of teaching business administration in the American setting, an effectiveness which I could directly observe in the United States.

However, when and if we try to contemplate " transplanting " this

method to our country, some careful consideration should be given. For instance, although open discussion has been thought to be the most desirable and favorable way of solving problems in America, an implicit agreement without open discussions has also been thought to be a desirable and favorable way of reaching conclusions in other countries. Therefore, democratic decision-making at some time may be regarded as an unwelcome scheme. Another important factor related to this problem is a way of thinking. For example, the brightest students in our country are apt to be rather reluctant to speak in group discussions, but are apt to think carefully and deeply by themselves. An incontrovertible truth, they believe, should be disclosed to them only through long self contemplations based upon rigorous academic training. This is a cultural and traditional way of thinking among Japanese intellectuals. Moreover, the " rough and ready " method or " do everything with dispatch " method have been considered immoral, even in the busy daily business situation. More curious to say, group discussions usually mean " a great cry but little wool."

In this situation, a radically introduced case method may evoke considerable confusion and discontinuity of educational circumstances, if we don't realize the correlative effectiveness of the case method with cultural and social backgrounds. For example, the assumptions related to the efficiency of group discussions have parallels with the theory of the so-called Group Dynamics, the basic assumption of which is a positive ego-involvement to the group frame of reference being created by individual participation. This assumption, however, has become empirically out of fashion today, partly due to the cross-cultural studies of the same project. Under some circumstances, participation in group discussions have raised negative ego-involvement of individual participants. Therefore, those factors of a given culture which could correspond to a group situation which is encouraging individual ego-involvement have been systematically pursued. Particularly these theories have been developing in the field of the behavioral sciences.

In this new course, therefore, the case method would have two

aims : (1), to promote creative group thinking, and (2), to train students to obtain the skills of administrative practice in the field of human relations. In other words, gradual training in democratic and effective decision-making and problem-solving development shall be achieved by introducing the case method in moderation, that is, a moderate amount of case discussion sessions with adequate case materials for the Japanese business situation shall be used. These educational developments, I believe, may contribute to the modernization of our business administration and to the promotion of the productivity of our industries.

In the field of the behavioral sciences, there has been emphasized the research methodology from which empirical generalizations and stimulating theoretical models have been drawn. It seems to me that the case method and the research method are confused with each other so that some theoretical and methodological problems incident to the case method are obscured in part.

According to the case method, case materials are abstract maps of a given situation, in the limits of which students have to analyze the problems incident to these case materials, and have to develop their analytical thinking and skills of problem-solving and decision-making. In other words, students have to concentrate their attention on the artificially demarcated areas of real business situations described in a given case, without consideration of other important factors not described in the material. Therefore, if and when necessary data for appropriate solution of a business situation is not presented in the case material, students have to make an insufficient decision and a poor analysis. Moreover, if these teaching processes continue for a long time, students necessarily will find their own analytical abilities for a business career destroyed. They might grow accustomed to responding to poorly and insufficiently perceived realities due to insufficient growth of their own fact-finding ability, or they might misunderstand the scientific nature of the human relations approach.

It is obvious, however, that the case method is based upon the case

writing method, in which some theoretical orientations are assumed. In other words, case materials are selected from and written from the writer's perceived reality of a given business situation based upon the implicit criteria. What criteria the case writer should have are the purely theoretical problems of his own special field, that is, conceptual schemes by which the given problems are analyzed have been elaborated by theoretical works in each of the special fields. Therefore, it is quite evident that the case method cannot exist without methodological contemplation, and that the case writer must always pay attention to these methodological aspects of case writing.

In spite of all considerations, I am still anxious about this matter, that is, about whether or not it is adequate to discuss given materials in the classes for the purpose of training students who intend to devote their lives to the business world. In my opinion these students, if they enter the real business world, must face a fact-finding-step before they face a problem-solving and a decision-making step, that is, they shall not be able to have already arranged materials as they did in classroom discussions. At any rate, they must collect the necessary data for their decision by themselves. Even if they happen to get already collected data, they may have to speculate on the adequacy of that data by themselves.

Eventually fact-finding techniques and methodological elaborations of research tools are necessary for both the case writers and the case readers. The most important point, it seems to me, is to comprehend an appropriate conceptual scheme, by which whole steps of the human relations approach are conducted.

Since the case method is basically one of the clinical approaches, the intensive and rather long-range study of specific groups or events, we must pay attention to the relationship between theory and practice, problems of which have parallels with medicine and law. Therefore, it may well be that the clinical method in general is reconsidered under the recent view-point of interdisciplinary approaches.

(C) Interdisciplinary approach to Human Relations at Work

Throughout the preceding discussion we have pointed out the limitations inherent in the results of the isolated use of the case method and the urgent need for systematic knowledge of behavioral sciences on a broader scale than can be achieved by any one case method. Without such broader knowledge the application of behavioral science to problems of human relations will necessarily be limited to the settings and problems in which a partial skill has been achieved, and to the number of instances in which its results can be safely generalized. From this point of view, the development of theoretical knowledge has a very practical function. Moreover, some clinical research has contributed to the development of theoretical knowledge in such a way that the observed phenomena of clinical studies can be related to concepts which are derived independently from a classification of occurrences and which are backed by hypotheses. Thus, it may be concluded that though it is the function of theory to explain observations in such a way as to make prediction possible, the clinical studies will also be of the greatest practical value if they can contribute to the accumulation of more generally applicable theoretical knowledge.

Although the immediate applicability of clinical studies to the solution of practical problems is largely a basic concern of business administration, it is not easy to do this without a fundamental acquaintance with recent interdisciplinary studies. Because the interdisciplinary approaches have achieved a higher degree of applicability to the practical solutions, they are more comprehensive than the usual single disciplinary approaches. Particularly in the field of human relations, anthropological, sociological, and psychological approaches are necessarily required, due to the complexity of human behavior, and these disciplines cannot be separated from one another for the purposes of practical use.

For many years now, interdisciplinary studies have been formulated in the behavioral sciences and have contributed to the solution of many social problems. However, in the human relations field, not only is there a lack of incentive to orient studies to this approach, but in addition there may even be an inability to make such efforts. Even

if there now exist such efforts, they are still insufficient for our real intentions. In short, it may be concluded that we need a more vigorously interdisciplinary-minded approach in the human relations field so that more applicable theoretical approaches will be possible.

Thus far, we have discussed the reasons for this new course in human relations, refering to the cultural context, research methodology, and the interdisciplinary approach. This new course might be misunderstood as being too theoretical and hence impractical. However, I would like to say that the practicability depends exclusively upon the given situation to which the new course is applied. The new course shall be modified according to the students' reactions against it, after its inception.

As education should be entirely dynamic in nature, courses and pedagogical methods should be wholly concerned with the interactions between the teacher and the taught. This new course, therefore, must assume a dynamic nature also.

IV. Conclusion

This report has had two purposes. First, I have attempted to outline a new course appropriate for teaching Human Relations at Work in a Japanese university. Second, I have put forth efforts to clarify the underlying reasons for this new course in a way that will permit discussion of the relation of the social scientist to the practitioner in the Japanese cultural context. The results of these efforts have drawn attention to the importance of cultural differences, of the patterns of social interaction, and of the process of modernization, and emphasize the need for further understanding of the significance of this course for effective development of business administration in Japanese society.

A complete, radical change of business administration may not be feasible in a country like Japan, where overpopulation and shortage of natural resources are preponderant problems. Though the subject

of human relations at work, which was apparently imporoed from the United States after World War II, has been attracting management's attention, it is doubtful whether or not they have been able to understand the social functions of the human relations movement in the American way of business administration, and whether or not they have been able to eliminate the manipulative aspects of the traditional administrative practices inherent in the so-called oriental despotism and patriarchalism. Unless these suspicions can be disproved, it cannot be denied that most of the Japanese managerial groups, implicitly or explicitly, have looked upon the so-called human relations method as a new manipulative measure against the modernization movements of Japanese workers. At the same time, however, it cannot also be denied that other administrators, who have utilized human relations as a body of, scientific knowledge and humanistic skills of business administration, have done a good job in this new area.

At any rate, in the present Japanese industrial scene, the human relations movement is apt to be misunderstood as an intention to reincarnate the traditional semi-feudalistic human relationships which have been recently changed, due to the nation-wide democratization policies after the war. Consequently, the new course should dispel these misunderstandings even at the expense of emphasizing the historical consequence and theoretical nature of human relations both in the United States and Japan. If a single conclusion were to be drawn from the preceeding discussion, it would be that not only the principles of business administration, but also the principles of business education are not absolute; they are relative to the culture of the society.

However, it is urgently necessary to elucidate the necessity of understanding human beings at work and the social consequences of developing the human relations approach at work for the benefit of the Japanese administrators as well as for those people who intend to devote their whole lives to the field of administration. It is our privilege and also our professional obligation to engage in a crusade against the social despotism which still exists to some extent in the field of business administration.