

Community-building, the Essence of Good Organizational Management: A Call to Replace “Leadership” with “Community-ship” in this Present Digital Age

Daniel A. Heller

ABSTRACT

Drucker and other early thinkers of management had a strong focus on what might be called today community building within organizations. In Drucker’s depiction of the knowledge worker, we can find hints at how community-building should be pursued in the present digital age where generative AI seems poised to disrupt white-collar work much like blue-collar work has long been disrupted by automation. Community-ship may be regarded as true leadership, as opposed to self-centered leadership, and that may allow it to transcend the divide between blue-collar and white-collar employees and create solidarity in this time of disruption. The Japanese understanding of leadership is inherently relational and contextual, just like community-ship. The time is right to revisit what has been done by leading Japanese companies to allow blue-collar workers to contribute to value creation and benefit from that contribution.

Keywords

Peter F. Drucker, management-by-objectives, knowledge worker, generative AI (artificial intelligence), front-line personnel, white-collar employees, solidarity, trust building

1. INTRODUCTION

The present paper takes a historical look back into the origins of modern organizational management to explore how early thinkers and practitioners (C. I. Barnard, A. P. Sloan, P. T. Drucker, and H. A. Simon) viewed the principal job of managers within companies. We find that these forefathers of the field had a strong focus on building connections and mutual understanding between people in organizations. Today we might call it building community within companies.

In particular, the paper examines the approach to management shown in the early writings of Drucker. He helped drive the evolution of an understanding of organizations that relied on the machine metaphor and its mechanical elements such as command and control, to one that emphasizes community and the highly human elements of organizations, such as discussion and dialogue.¹ Drucker’s Management-By-

Objectives (MBO) method for setting organizational goals and diffusing them throughout an organization is a clear example of this shift that he led. MBO's distinguishing factor from traditional goal setting is how MBO is done through deep and extended conversations between people. In a machine metaphor, community building makes little sense. People are supposed just to do their jobs and become cogs in the machine. The rest is supposed to be easy, but that is rarely, if ever, the case. With increased realization of the need to take into account the most uniquely human characteristics of people in organizations, we can see a growing awareness of the need for managers to knit people into a community.

Over a fifteen-year period from the late 1950s to the mid-1970s, as early computer-based automation began to show great potential and then grew rapidly, Drucker introduced and developed the concept of the *knowledge worker*. In Drucker's depiction of the knowledge worker, we can find hints at how community-building should be pursued in the present digital age where generative AI (artificial intelligence) seems poised to disrupt white-collar work much like blue-collar work has long been disrupted by automation. This overlap in turn suggests our present situation is crying out for blue-collar and white-collar solidarity. Bringing together these two classes of employees that are generally viewed as existing in widely separate communities requires a new kind of leadership. H. Mintzberg has proposed a new term, community-ship, as a way to move beyond traditional understandings of leadership. Instead of focusing on the (white-collar) leader, which a word like leadership obviously does, community-ship focuses on the community that is being led. In this regard, community-ship may be regarded as true leadership, as opposed to self-centered leadership, and that may allow it to transcend the blue-collar and white-collar divide and create solidarity between these two classes of employees. Community-ship would also appear to be a good fit with the portrayal of Japanese leadership in Hattori and Heller (2018), which reminds us that it is Japan where blue-collar and white-collar employees have long co-existed in large numbers in the same unions (Ojha, 2000).

Communities that are made up of people doing distinctly different jobs requiring different skills sets have not tended to be the focus of most management literature on communities. Instead, the literature has deeply investigated communities of similarly skilled people, which have been labeled *Communities of Practice* (Wenger, 1998). The challenge facing companies in the mid-2020s is expanding the managerial understanding of community to go beyond the limits of shared skills to extend to shared goals, vision, and mission. This expanded understanding is needed both in practice and in academia.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 outlines the basics of organizational management as described by Barnard and Sloan, two successful practitioners who authored books that greatly influenced the development of modern management thinking. Section 3 explores community building in the Drucker approach to organizational management revealed in two of his early writings, *Concept of the Corporation*, written in 1946 and *The Practice of Management*, written in 1954. Then, as part of an exploration of community building in the digital age, Section 4 turns to three of Drucker's books written in the late 1950s to mid-1970s on the knowledge worker. Finally, the paper concludes with Section 5, which proposes community-ship as the type of leadership that is needed in the present age.

¹ In his first book on management, *Concept of the Corporation*, Drucker used the term "social organization" in a way that fits with what we would call an organizational community today.

2. The Basics of Organizational Management

At the most basic level, how should an organization be run? On the eve of WWII, Chester I. Barnard gave what remains the clearest answer yet in his 1938 book, *The Functions of the Executive*. Building on his experience as a manager at American Telephone and Telegram Company (AT&T), including serving as president of the New Jersey Bell Telephone Company, Barnard's book laid the foundations for modern organizational theory.

As of 1968, Barnard's book had entered its 18th printing in the U.S. and was selling four times as many copies as when it first came out. In the introduction to the 30th Anniversary Edition, a leading management scholar, Kenneth R. Andrews, wrote that the book, "remains today, as it has been since its publication, the most thought-provoking book on organization and management ever written by a practicing executive."² In the years since, one might argue that Sloan's *My Years with General Motors* eclipsed Barnard's book as the most thought provoking management book written by a practicing executive. Yet even so, Barnard would likely come in as a close second.

What has made Barnard's work so compelling? The author of the present work would argue it is the parsimony of Barnard's hypotheses about how to manage an organization, which he defines as a cooperative system.³ Barnard proposed that only three things are needed for an organization to come into existence. These three conditions for establishing an organization are people having: (1) a common purpose, (2) the ability to communicate with each other, and (3) the desire to contribute action toward achieving cooperatively their common purpose.⁴ Barnard further proposed that only two things are needed for an organization to continue to exist once it has been created. Those two conditions are: organizational effectiveness and efficiency. If one can establish and maintain just these five conditions, that will be enough for an organization, at a minimum, to survive. Depending on what alternatives are available, simply satisfying these five conditions may very well be enough for an organization to thrive.

Organizational effectiveness can be thought of as customer satisfaction (CS). Organizational efficiency can be thought of as employee satisfaction (ES). So, achieving CS and ES, while establishing and maintaining the first three conditions described above, is "all" the executive of an organization needs

² Andrews (1968), p. xxi.

³ Barnard formally defined an organization as a "system of consciously coordinated activities or forces of two or more persons" (Barnard, 1968, p. 73).

⁴ Barnard (1968) states that these three conditions (common purpose, communication, and willingness to serve) are necessary and sufficient for an organization to come into being. The order of these three conditions is presented in Barnard's book as communication, willingness to serve, and common purpose. However, I have chosen to put common purpose first and willingness to serve third, which follows the order given in lectures by Nobuo Takahashi, professor emeritus, at the University of Tokyo that I attended when I was a graduate student. The reason I agree that it makes more sense to put common purpose first is that generally purpose is what motivates people to come together in the first place. Perhaps it was different in the U.S. in the 1930s. In present day East Asia, it may often make sense to leave it in Barnard's original order. For example, in China, willingness to serve due to a personal relationship and communication between people often comes before common purpose. Personal relationships are often the basis upon which people then go on to form a business relationship around some shared purpose. The opposite, on the other hand, simply does not happen. A business relationship will not develop into a personal relationship. It is precisely for this reason that so many businesspeople who are not Chinese may feel like they get betrayed in China. The non-Chinese side thinks a business relationship has developed into a personal relationship, but the Chinese side does not think so at all: "Don't take it personal. It's just business!"

to do. However, staying focused on just these five things is hard. It requires an executive and his or her top-management team to dedicate relentless efforts to creating space in the organization where people understand their common purpose and actually do connect to it and to each other. When such bonds exist, a sense of belonging (Baumeister and Leary, 1995; Lovell et al., 2021) will more easily emerge. People in the organization will seek to understand each other and become better able to work together to accomplish the organization's purpose. *This connecting and mutual understanding is what is meant by the community building that is the focus of this paper.*

The trickiest and most misunderstood of Barnard's five points is the last one. To most people, organizational efficiency does not sound anything like employee satisfaction (ES). In typical conversation, organizational efficiency even sounds like the exact opposite of ES. People associate efficiency with restructuring, which means layoffs. The remaining employees are pushed to do ever more work. This present understanding shows just how far we have strayed from the first principles of organizational management.

Barnard made his intention very clear when he wrote about efficiency as employee satisfaction. He wrote, "efficiency relates to the satisfaction of individual motives" (Barnard, 1968, p. 56). His reasoning is sound. The following quote explains Barnard's emphasis on the need to satisfy each individual within an organization for there to be any organizational efficiency. We would be wise to listen to him and move away from an obsession with optimization of the whole system at the neglect of the people who make up the system.

"If the individual finds his motives being satisfied by what he does, he continues his cooperative effort; otherwise, he does not. If he does not, this subtraction from the cooperative system may be fatal to it. If five men are required and the fifth man finds no satisfaction in cooperating, his contribution would be inefficient. He would withhold or withdraw his services, so that the cooperation would be destroyed. If he considers it to be efficient, it is continued. Thus, the efficiency of a cooperative system is its capacity to maintain itself by the individual satisfactions it affords." (Barnard, 1968, p. 57)

An individual will obtain satisfaction through intrinsic motivators, such as how interesting and meaningful the work is. Similarly, being recognized as the one doing the work well is an intrinsic motivator, as is feeling a sense of achievement and personal growth from doing the work. A feeling of pride and joy at having made a meaningful contribution to the common good may constitute the highest form of personal satisfaction. It is our internal feelings that produce satisfaction.

What about salary and benefits? Is not the amount someone gets paid a key driver of satisfaction in employees? Up until a certain minimum level, where a person's basic physiological needs for food and shelter and psychological needs for safety can be satisfied by money, salary does provide a floor or a foundation upon which a person's satisfaction is built. However, in the field of management, the consensus is that above this base level more salary will not produce satisfaction.⁵ The reason salary does not produce satisfaction is that it is not a motivator. External factors, such as

⁵ Herein lies the reason for the relentless pressure of marketing to make us want more and better food and to build an ever-bigger nest egg. If someone can be fooled into feeling his or her basic physiological and psychological

salary and benefits, simply do not motivate. It is not that salary has nothing to do with human feelings that are somehow related to what we view as satisfaction. Research has shown that these external factors clearly do influence dissatisfaction. The important point that must be grasped is that dissatisfaction is not the opposite of satisfaction.⁶ A higher salary may reduce or even eliminate an employee's dissatisfaction, but that is quite different from increasing satisfaction. It may seem like a raise in salary would increase satisfaction, but what is actually happening is an increase in salary makes a person feel recognized. This recognition triggers a feeling that personal growth has happened. In other words, motivation comes from a feeling of self-worth and achievement, not from the higher salary.

A higher salary is not the only way to show recognition. It's not even the best way. Praise is effective, especially when combined with giving an opportunity that will lead to even more personal growth. Nobuo Takahashi, a professor emeritus at the University of Tokyo, has written extensively about the way in which Japanese companies reward their best employees with the best work opportunities, which means giving the next big challenge.⁷ It needs to be a challenge that is big but not too big. Human resource managers help line managers match people to the right challenges. Giving recognition and triggering a feeling of personal growth in non-monetary ways is critical in an organization, because resources in an organization will invariably be limited. The distribution of these resources will greatly affect the efficiency of an organization, because people seek a sense of fairness in organizations.⁸ Keeping the remuneration of top managers (especially c-suite executives) from going too high frees up money to distribute to the lower levels of an organization, thereby allowing more people (the goal must be for all people) to make a living wage.

Barnard intentionally chose to use a definition of organizational efficiency that is directly linked to individual satisfaction. He did so because what he regarded to be more practical definitions of efficiency (such as output ÷ input, resource utilization, or productivity) had "little meaning for many organizations, especially not-for-profit, such as religious institutions" (Barnard, 1968, p. 92). Rather than use these more common and seeming more useful definitions, Barnard created a definition that can be applied to all types

needs have not yet been met, even though they may be making, say, a six-figure salary in U.S. dollars, then that person will feel like he or she is motivated by money. He or she will seek to obtain ever more money. This creates an opening for the bastardization of management that is called "managerialism," which can be described as a slavish devotion to one-dimensional managerial techniques in the sole pursuit of gains for managers even at the expense of other stakeholders (Klikauer, 2015).

⁶ The groundbreaking research of Frederick Herzberg and colleagues showed that satisfaction and dissatisfaction are separate things (Herzberg et al., 1959). The two words make it seem like they point to the two ends of a continuum, but this is not true in the human psyche. We are motivated by factors that come from inside of us, such as a sense of achievement and the feeling that we are appreciated. The degree to which we feel satisfied comes from the presence or absence of these intrinsic factors. On the other hand, we are demotivated by factors that come from the outside, such as salary and benefits. Whether or not these extrinsic factors are present will influence how dissatisfied we feel. Thus, it is possible for a person to feel both highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied at the same time. One of the jobs of a manager is to try to increase the intrinsic factors that motivate to create satisfaction and decrease these extrinsic factors that demotivate to alleviate dissatisfaction.

⁷ For more on this approach to Japanese human resource management where the next big challenge is given as a reward to the best employees, see, for example, the Japanese language publication, Takahashi (2010).

⁸ For more on people's desire for fairness or equity in organizations and a glimpse at how challenging it can be to do this, see, for example, Bobocel and Gosse (2015).

of organizations. His new definition fit well with his primary concern, namely, “efficiency of effort in the fundamental sense... (that is) efficiency relative to the securing of necessary personal contributions to the cooperative system” (Barnard, 1968, p. 92). So, the “efficiency of organization is its capacity to offer effective inducements in sufficient quantity to maintain the equilibrium of the system. It is the efficiency in this sense and not the efficiency of material productiveness which maintains the vitality of organizations” (Barnard, 1968, p. 92).

Barnard foreshadowed the thinking of H. Simon, which described in more detail in Section 3 of this paper. In short, Simon said management must be most concerned with what happens on the front-line. The actions and thought processes of front-line personnel are paramount to the smooth functioning of an organization, which is expressed in modern management by research on organizational capabilities and routines.⁹ In Japan, as well as in lean management, this same thinking is expressed in the focus on what is called the *gemba*, the place where things actually happen.

A. P. Sloan is famous for pioneering new ways of delegation in order to push decision making closer to the front-line of an organization.¹⁰ Under Sloan, organizational decisions at GM were made as much as possible at the lowest possible managerial levels in the organization. People closest to the front-line can see the most current information within its real-world context, and they were charged with making the appropriate operational decisions. They had clear organizational principles that guided them in deciding what was the right decision at that particular time and place.

What were the clear organizational principles that guided decision making by managers at GM? From Sloan’s two memoirs (Sloan, 1941, 1963), we can distill that there were three key organizational principles at GM under his leadership. We can summarize them as guiding people to pursue: (1) that which is good for society, (2) return on equity (ROE), and (3) productive efficiency. What Sloan viewed as the appropriate order of these three is debatable. The author of the present work holds that his lifework suggests the order written here. However, Sloan’s own feelings in his eighties as he looked back on his life may have been the reverse. The reasoning to surmise at Sloan’s preference for the reverse order in his later years is that Sloan ended his second memoirs, *My Years at General Motors*, with what could be called an ode to productive efficiency, or doing more with less. Also, he devoted much more space in *My Years* to matters related to ROE than to the good of society. However, writing twenty years earlier in his first memoirs, *Adventures of a White-Collar Man*, Sloan’s greatly emphasized the need for industry leaders and their companies to work for the good of society. Return on equity and efficiency were clearly lower priorities.

Sloan’s decentralized approach to decision-making was combined with centralization of management at upper levels of the organization to set strategic direction and promulgate GM’s organizing principles. Operational decisions were considered appropriate when they fit with the company’s overall strategic direction and were in line with the company’s organizational principles. Sloan organized General Motors into divisions that fit with the corporate strategy of a car for every purse.

⁹ The vast amount of research into organizational capabilities and the organizational routines that combine to create capabilities can be found in the Resource-Based View of the Firm. See, for example, Foss and Stieglitz (2012).

¹⁰ See Sloan (1963).

Divisional managers and their subordinates were expected to make decisions that matched with their division's allocated strategic positioning as determined by its brand. Here we can see an expression of community within each division with a strong guiding force being the division's brand. Divisional officers could even make "substantial changes in operating policies" as long as they were able to "sell" their ideas to central management and were "open to suggestions from the general officers" (Sloan, 1965, p. 433).

In this section, we have seen how three early thinkers and practitioners of modern management (Barnard, Simon, and Sloan) viewed people and creating connections between people as a central aim of organizational management. In the following section we will look at community-building in Drucker's early writings that demonstrate his approach to management.

3. Community building in Drucker's approach to management

Drucker's seminal work *Concept of the Corporation* was published in 1946. It did not use the term community building (i.e., connecting people and fostering mutual understanding to create a sense of belonging and a desire to contribute to achieving a shared purpose), but that is precisely what Drucker wrote was happening inside GM, as he described the organizational management of the company during WWII. Drucker's in-depth writing about a real-world organization can be seen as a great complement to Barnard's work, which was more theoretical in nature, even though Barnard wrote the book based on his real-world experience. *Concept of the Corporation* also complements Barnard's book by providing a detailed example of how, under Sloan's leadership, a huge organization was brought into existence as a community and then maintained as one. Going further, one can read Drucker's book as further complementing the work of Barnard because Drucker was not at all singularly focused on the role of the chief executive in an organization. Drucker's book highlights how people other than the chief executive play important roles in building community in a large organization.

Chapter Two of *Concept of the Corporation* is titled "The Corporation as Human Effort." Drucker writes, "the essence of the corporation is social, that is human, organization" (Drucker, 1946, p. 21). A corporation must be seen at its core as people working together to produce something. Drucker wrote, "even technical problems of modern industry are not technical in the sense of gadgeteering but are primarily problems of human organization for a technical end" (Drucker, 1946, p. 21). The focus of Drucker's book is on the people who populate an organization and on how these people can work together to produce something that is of value to society.

Drucker emphasized the role of a leader in an organization as an ethical person, who does his or her job "with a sense of duty" to put the welfare of the institution above personal gain and who realizes "the importance of his trust and a sense of mutual loyalty between him and his associates" (Drucker, 1946, p. 27). This mutual trust that forms between people at different hierarchical levels in an organization is the basis for decentralization, which Drucker positions as the central tenant of the way GM was organized.

Drucker called GM "an essay in federalism—on the whole, an exceedingly successful one. It attempts to combine the greatest corporate unity with the greatest divisional autonomy and responsibility; and like every true federation, it aims at realizing unity through local self-government and vice versa. This is the aim of General Motors' policy of decentralization" (Drucker, 1946, p. 46). Assuming there is diversity of thought among the leaders of an organization, a federalist approach is designed to permit a wide array of

methods and varying results, as people exercise their autonomy and are held responsible for the successes and failures that are produced.

Drucker was struck by the organizational diversity that came out of such a high degree of autonomy at GM. He emphasized,

“one intangible though very significant fact... (is) the atmosphere of a team of which the divisional manager is a member. There is no ‘General Motors atmosphere’ and very definitely no ‘General Motors’ type.’ In fact, I am greatly struck by the difference of atmosphere between divisions, and by the variety of personality and background between individual division managers. This variety is not only permitted, it is definitely encouraged by central management; for it is held that every man will do his best job when he does it his own way, and that each division will do its best job when it feels a pride in its tradition, manners and social climate. Hence central management refrains as much as possible from telling a division how to do its job; it only lays down what to do. Yet the divisional manager, though left alone as long as he does a good job, is conscious of his place on a team.”¹¹
(Drucker, 1946, pp. 56-57)

In his explanation of the functioning of GM, Drucker focused on the role of two objective metrics that allowed fair measurement of the achievements of both the policy makers in central management and the business line managers in each of the company’s divisions. The first of the two metrics was cost accounting to determine base pricing or general productive efficiency (that is, efficiency after removing the “noise” caused by temporary fluctuations, like those due to the business cycle). The second of the two metrics was market analysis to determine competitive standing vis-à-vis the products of rival manufacturers.

By these two metrics, as long as they are calculated fairly, a rigor is introduced into management that allows for higher performers, rather than just smooth talkers, to show that they can perform better. This creates a community of equal opportunity or the vaunted meritocracy that companies often seek. Calculated fairly means without fear or favor. If people are afraid to speak the truth they see and are prevented from challenging people who seem to be pushing personal agendas, the metrics for base pricing and competitive market standing become slippery numbers that can be made to say whatever a person wants them to say. The necessary backstop is to require people to justify the assumptions that were made. For example, in order to justify higher sales numbers and greater resulting profit, a manager may say that since this new car model is so great, it is going to jump to #1 in its class, even though the current model is only running a lackluster #3 in the market. The detailed basis for this jump in competitive standing must be presented and only if it is deemed reasonable after impartial vetting should it be considered as a plausible assertion.

¹¹ This passage from Drucker reminds me of a question I once got from a Korean consultant who asked why there was such diversity across Toyota’s factories, unlike the factories of Hyundai/Kia. Like GM under Sloan, Toyota has long adhered to clear organizing principles (respect for workers, just-in-time, build-in quality) within a federated system of plant management. The result has been a high level of variety across Toyota plants.

The clearest example of a community building measure that Drucker found in wartime GM was the employee suggestion system. Such a mechanism was particularly necessary due to the war, where many people with no industrial experience were rapidly and successfully brought into GM's plants (Drucker, 1946). The only way to build community rapidly was for managers to take a risk, make themselves vulnerable and trust these new, largely unskilled workers. "We take him (the new worker) into our confidence" is how a personnel manager explained it (Drucker, 1946, p. 18).

Management gave personal agency to workers to decide what worked best for each of them on an individual basis, while sharing with the workers what needed to be done and why. This approach allowed for innovative ways to run a mass production plant. For example, skilled jobs would be broken down into a series of unskilled operations that could all be performed by a single worker at his or her own pace, rather than having each one done by a different person at the constant pace of an assembly line. Quality and productivity were enhanced and so was worker satisfaction. Managers realized the importance of connecting with workers and helping them to have a real relationship with their work, which in turn allowed workers to take pride in their work.

The suggestion system that was instituted at GM during WWII shows that it is possible to build participatory community quickly, even in large factories. In 1944, there were 400,000 workers at GM who made 115,000 suggestions, of which 28,000 were implemented (Drucker, 1946, p. 190). That this was done during a time of a national crisis, for what most people viewed as a just war, played an important role as people were predisposed to unite in patriotism. Fighting against Nazi Germany to keep Europe free and save the Jews from slaughter was a strong motivator. While seldom rising to an existential crisis as in wartime, in peacetime too, companies and their employees are continually buffeted by external shocks and internal challenges, whether or not the challenges are actually recognized or whether or not the challenges are still largely latent and not yet fully manifested.

These pressures create, or should create, or can be managed deftly to create crisis conditions that motivate people and bring people together. Although these crises fortunately will rarely, if ever, rise to the level of a hot war, that does not change the reality of modern capitalism, which does not permit anything close to complacency as long as monopoly power has been kept in check by good government policy. Capable managers are able to instill the right amount of crisis thinking in themselves and in their employees.¹²

Drucker's contribution was soon followed by another landmark work in the field of management that had a similar emphasis on front-line employees. As already mentioned above, in 1947, Herbert A. Simon published *Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making Processes in Administrative Organizations*. On page 2 of this book, Simon wrote: "In the study of organization, the operative employee must be at the focus of attention..." (Simon, 1997, p. 2). By *operative employee*, Simon means the front-line workers, salespersons, or material handlers. Everything that truly matters to the customer is done by these people. They are the ones who determine the quality, cost, and delivery of a product or service. So, a customer cares most of all about what front-line personnel do or fail to do. Front-line

¹² For an interesting study on the role managers play in managing the anxiety level of their employees, see Yokozawa et al. (2021).

personnel are also the ones who get hurt or worse when there are unsafe working conditions. A bad manager is one who forgets that his or her primary responsibility is to make sure the front-line runs well. Doing so is step one in taking care of the customer.

A good manager spends time on the front-line to study what is really happening. Yet, apart from supervisors who may sometimes substitute for front-line workers, managers are not part of the front-line. Nevertheless, managers are the ones who are ultimately responsible for workflow and work culture in an organization, including but not limited to the front-line. People in an organization together create the work environment, but leaders set the tone and enforce discipline when needed to maintain cultural norms. Managers and front-line personnel have different skills and do different work, but they have common cause in seeking a healthy workplace. In this way, we can think of managers and front-line personnel as inhabiting the same community.

Management literature has studied communities in workplaces, but the focus has tended to be on people with similar skills who do similar work. People who share practices and who are in some form of a relationship with each other and who interact in particular contexts have been called *Communities of Practice* (Lave and Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998; Hoadley, 2012). Such people co-construct knowledge and learning, where tacit knowledge becomes largely explicit through social relationships situated within certain cultural norms, customs, and practices.

Andriessen (2005) calls communities that share a social group and are part of the same team, *strategic communities*. An example of such a community is a small team of experts who are called in as trouble shooters to solve problems. What about communities that bridge expertise? There is a need to broaden managerial understanding of community, so that it is not limited only to those members who share skills. Why cannot members who share workplace goals, vision, and mission also be in community even if they do not share skills and expertise? As we will see in the next section, white-collar employees and front-line personnel, when viewed as increasing having a shared identity, with both being knowledge workers, may be able to create just such a community.

Before the publication of Drucker's *The Practice of Management* in 1954, organizations had primarily been viewed through a machine metaphor.¹³ The machine metaphor turns people into cogs, with the predictable result being alienation and demotivation. Even if it does not reach the extent shown in the parody of the assembly line scenes in Charlie Chaplin's famous movie, *Modern Times*, nobody wants to have his or her unique human side stripped away in order to just become one more interchangeable part. Yet, this is the essence of the machine metaphor for understanding how organizations work.

Despite the existence of many alternatives, the machine metaphor continues to be used widely today. It is even built into terms like empowerment, which implies that managers need to flip on a worker's "power switch" to get a worker to engage positively with work. Top managers tend to like the machine metaphor because it makes them the ones operating the machine. The top manager gets to push the buttons that

¹³ For more on the view of organizations through the machine metaphor (as well as seven other metaphors), see Morgan (1986). The eight prominent metaphors described by Morgan are organizations as: machines, organisms, brains, cultures, political systems, psychic prisons, flux and transformation (i.e., in a perpetual state of permanence and change), and instruments of domination.

make the whole thing work. The machine metaphor suggests top managers can express their will broadly and predictably. The machine will do what it is told. When things do not go as they should, it is because there are broken parts in the machine. Replace the parts and it will work correctly. Top management's beautiful ideas will come to life. It's a metaphor that is wildly off-base in most organizations.

The bureaucracies in modern organizations may suggest the machine metaphor, especially in the largest companies that have massive bureaucracies. It is a matter of math. Assuming that one manager can manage up to six direct reports (a number that is quite reasonable for an organizational setting where a manager interacts closely with those reporting to him or her), an organization of 10,000 employees will have at least five managerial levels above the front-line employees (e.g., manager, general manager, vice president, c-suite, and president).

It is quite normal for people to get lost in the web of bureaucracy that is created in huge hierarchies. Aware of the need to continually tackle this challenge within large organizations, Drucker (1954) proposed a method of management that would keep people closely connected even though they are inside of a large organization. He called it Management-By-Objectives (MBO), and it has been embraced by countless large organizations that want to keep their employees from feeling like cogs in a machine.

In MBO, organizational objectives or goals are set at each organizational level; that is, by each manager at each level with consideration given to achieving the organization's purpose within the reality faced by that manager and the constraints of the goals set at the level immediately above. A goal is accepted, rejected, or modified as requested by managers who sit at a hierarchical level above the manager who sets the goal. Above the organizational hierarchy sits the Board of Directors that makes sure a company's leadership team is setting goals that fit with the company's vision, mission, and values. In its ideal state, goals set at the top can be pushed through the organization like water flowing down a flight of stairs. At each organizational level, there will be time for that manager to set goals that align with the higher levels, while also fitting with the real-world situation at that organization level.

However, the distinguishing feature of Drucker's MBO is that goals are not assumed simply to flow down an organizational hierarchy like a waterfall. Instead, discussion is built into the process, so that the goals of the upper levels can be understood. A manager can only set his or her goals when he or she has a deep understanding of the goals of the hierarchical level above, including how the goals fit with the company's vision, mission, and values. We can interpret MBO's ongoing dialogue between people at different hierarchical levels as an effort in community building.

Under a strict implementation of MBO, a manager is required to write down once or twice a year a description of his or her understanding of the goals of his or her manager and how his or her own work goals fit with the goals of the next level up in the organizational hierarchy. The written document provides the basis for ongoing thorough discussion to align work. It also brings out any contradictory demands that a manager may be receiving. Importantly, MBO pushes a manager to listen to the people he or she is managing.

Drucker writes that the greatest benefit of MBO is it allows a manager to control his or her own performance. This ability to exercise control over oneself, by which is meant the ability to direct one's own work, is motivating. The reverse, being told what to do, is demotivating. Controlling performance means setting goals that can be reliably measured. This means allowing a manager timely access to the

relevant information needed to measure performance. Doing so is what keeps a manager feeling like he or she is in control of himself or herself, rather than feeling controlled by another person. This in turn opens the door to ownership of one's work and the desire to improve.

4. Community Building in the Digital Age

In Drucker's later works, we can see even clearer hints at the need for community-building in the age of the *knowledge worker*. More recently, this need for community building in organizations has been amplified by the seminal work of Heckscher and Adler (2006), which featured chapters that emphasized the need for trust building within and across companies in the age of collaborative communities (e.g., MacDuffie and Helper, 2006; see also Adler et al., 2011). Where knowledge is increasingly dispersed and rapidly changing, hierarchical control becomes unmanageable and simply cannot keep up.

In the mid-2020s, we have now entered the age of artificial intelligence. Our present world is one where the idea of a *knowledge worker*, a term first coined¹⁴ in Drucker (1959) and developed in Drucker (1969) and Drucker (1973), is being given new and expanded life. Knowledge workers deal primarily with information and engage in knowledge creation. Drucker was a pioneer in introducing this idea into organizations just as computers began to occupy important places in businesses and management. The term knowledge worker is generally thought of as applying to the white-collar jobs of people who work at a computer or other digital device. However, such a perception has not captured reality for a long time already. As early as the 1970s more and more factory workers in the developed world began to use a keypad to do more and more of their work, and thus can easily be seen as a type of knowledge worker.

We can see how truly wide the distribution of knowledge workers in a typical organization is if we are willing to reconsider our understanding of information. Bits and bytes in a computer are digital information. Letters and numbers on a page are analog information. What about that piece of plastic or metal in front of you? Yes, that cup you are drinking out of also represents a bundle of information.¹⁵

The cup's shape, the way it feels when you touch it, the color, its durability, and its recyclability, are all forms of design information, and the list goes on and on. There are countless nuggets of information contained within that cup. Before the cup existed as a physical object, it likely existed as a digital blueprint. Assuming the manufacturing process was done correctly, what happened when the cup was made? The digital information on the blueprint was transferred to a series of different mediums, such as metal or plastic, paint or other coloring medium, and ink if there is writing on the cup. As information is transferred from one medium to another, people are working together to get the knowledge embodied in a product that makes it to an end user.

Services can be thought of in the same way. Listening to someone give a speech or make a presentation can be seen as information in someone's head (and on speaking notes) that were transferred to an ephemeral medium, sound waves in the air. When looked at this way, the key differences between manufactured products and services are: (a) whether there is a tangible medium or not, and (b) if production and consumption are done sequentially which is manufacturing or if production and

¹⁴ Nickols (2017) lays out the progression of Drucker's thinking on the term "knowledge workers."

¹⁵ For further discussion of the informational view of products and services, see Heller and Fujimoto (2018).

consumption happen simultaneously which is a service.

Since essentially all employees in the digital age can be viewed as some form of a knowledge worker, there is a need to build community that includes all people. This is increasingly being recognized in many different industries as the line between blue-collar employees and white-collar employees becomes more and more artificial. It is being called on the one hand the servitization of manufacturing and on the other hand the delivery of what were previously viewed as professional services as if they are being made in a factory (e.g., modern hospital management). This blurred line increases the need for all employees, whether white-collar or blue-collar, to stand together in solidarity.

We can see this need to stand up for one another in the way generative AI is automating away white-collar tasks, just as automation has been doing to blue-collar tasks since the dawn of the industrial revolution, but especially with the advent of computer-based automation, including robots, that began to take off in the early 1970s. Yet, just as machines have not actually severely limited the number of blue-collar jobs, AI is more of a bogeyman than a real threat. Both automation and AI are often used by management as a bludgeon to tell workers to stop asking for higher wages: "If you ask for more money, we'll just replace you with automation/AI." It is the same sad story that has long been overused by managers who want to keep any gains from going to non-managerial employees.

It has been two hundred years since machines started replacing so much manual work and more than fifty years since computer-based automation began to become widespread. Yet, there are still plenty of good blue-collar jobs left. In reality, machines do not seem to have replaced blue-collar work so much as transformed it. The heavy lifting, the repetition, the precision, all of these can be done by machines with no strain at all. Whereas, the adjusting, the decision making, and the problem solving to eliminate root causes, these are still best done by humans. Machines and humans working together is what blue-collar work looks like today. The same interplay is unfolding for white-collar work thanks to advances in AI.

We can expect there to be increased opportunities for solidarity between blue- and white-collar employees now that they are facing a similar challenge. The community that needs to be built inside of companies transcends traditional boundaries, and there is an opportunity to strengthen community as blue- and white-collar distinctions are lessened. To see how that may play out we can look to the Japanese companies, which are generally averse to letting MBAs take control of an organization and where there tends to be more mixing between the blue- and white-collar workers, such as in Japanese *enterprise unions* that have long been a pillar of Japanese management (Abegglen, 1985). You do not need a master's degree of any type to become a senior manager in a Japanese company. In fact, a bachelor's degree is not even required to enter the management ranks. Further exploration of this difference in Japan compared with the U.S.'s degree obsession is needed to see how it plays out in organizations where respect for others is not based on whether they have a degree or not.

5. Community-ship as true leadership

In the 1980s, Henry Mintzberg coined the term *emergent strategy* (Mintzberg and Waters, 1985). It was an idea that completely changed the view of strategy within companies. Prior to Mintzberg's fieldwork (he shadowed chief executives to see what they were really doing each day), it was wrongly assumed that top executives in companies spent most of their time deeply contemplating strategic plans. The assumption

was that corporate planners analyzed the market and the organization. The results of this analysis informed top executives who then decided on the strategy, which was then formulated into a plan. The organization then executed the plan. It is a simple model of strategy that unfortunately many still adhere to, even though it has been shown again and again to be simply wrong.

Mintzberg's reframing of strategy does not deny the role of planning and top managers in setting strategy. What it does is put them in their proper place. They are important, but by no means are they the only ones who are doing the thinking. In fact, what managers do is only make a company's deliberate strategy. The actual strategy a company will follow is determined by the thoughts, judgements, and actions of each and every person who executes that deliberate strategy. The decisions made by all employees will either contribute to making the strategy better or making it worse. Whether the strategy is helped or hurt will depend on the judgement of the people who execute the strategy within the real-world context they face each and every day.

Thus, as deliberate strategy is executed, it is constantly being infused with emergent strategy. The combination of deliberate strategy and emergent strategy produces a company's realized strategy. How much of a company's realized strategy will be deliberate, and how much of it will be emergent? At the two-year mark, a typical executive (if he or she is being honest, which sadly is a trait that executives are not known for) might say the realized strategy is no more than 5% of the initial deliberate strategy. That low number is partially because the deliberate strategy itself will have changed over time as more information came in and deliberate adjustments to the plan were made. But what is likely to be more responsible for the disappearance of much of the initial deliberate strategy is the smart thinking, wise judgement, and good footwork of the many executors of the strategy. They were the ones who introduced the emergent strategy that makes up the bulk of what is actually done, the realized strategy.

We must not think that a low number like 5% means the initial deliberate strategy was only marginally important. Much to the contrary, it set the direction of the strategy right at the beginning when everyone was unsure of which direction to go. Without a good start, even the best emergent strategy is unlikely to be enough. So, the weight of the initial deliberate strategy may be much more than 1/20th, but even so, the weight is not going to be 19/20th either. It will fall somewhere in between these two numbers, but it is probably unlikely to be more than half. The relative weight of deliberate strategy and emergent strategy in a realized strategy is going to be different in each case and context. The point is both are needed. Both are important.

We acknowledge that both are important when the remuneration of a CEO is kept within a reasonable multiple of the remuneration of the average employee in a company. In the 1970s, Drucker wrote that a reasonable multiple is 25:1 or at most 30:1.¹⁶ If the average remuneration of an employee in an organization is 75,000 USD, then according to this ratio the CEO should make around 2.25 million USD. In the 1970s, Fortune 500 companies in the U.S. began to exceed this reasonable multiple. That was why Drucker wrote that companies should hold this line, because they were beginning not to. What happened was the opposite. CEO pay skyrocketed in the 1980s and 1990s and remains at alarmingly high levels in the 2020s. How high? The weight of average CEO pay in the largest companies in the U.S. has become

¹⁶ Drucker, P. "Is Executive Pay Excessive?" *Wall Street Journal*, May 23, 1977.

250-300 times more than the average worker.¹⁷ We have become numb to the folly of multiples that are ten times what Drucker deemed reasonable. Such silliness has caused us to become fixated on superheroes who supposedly lead our greatest companies.

Mintzberg has proposed we take our focus off the leader. What is a leader but someone who exists for the sake of the community he or she leads? Ultimately, the community clearly matters more than the leader. By definition, there is no leader without followers. However, our use of the term leadership obscures this important fact. The word leadership without a doubt pushes us to focus on leaders. Their huge salaries (or more accurately the huge gap between their salaries and the salaries of the average employee) make us think top managers must be great leaders, when actually such a huge salary gap ought to tell us that a person who is willing to receive so many times more remuneration than others is clearly not a good leader at all. Those receiving outlandish pay that is ten times more than what is reasonable have forfeited their right to a called a leader.

By choosing to become super rich while not raising the average salaries of the rest of the people in their organizations, these so-called leaders are saying they are not part of the community they are charged with leading. Good luck leading when you are an alien to those you are trying to lead. Such self-proclaimed leaders do not need any more of our attention. MBA programs may want big donations from heroic leaders and would love to highlight research that says how great these people are if only there was some.¹⁸ We do not have to buy what they are selling. A focus on leadership pushes us away from paying attention to what should be the focus of our attention, the collaborative community inside of an organization¹⁹ and the impact this community has on the society or societies in which it exists.

Our work communities get neglected by our obsession with our so-called leaders' careers, fame, and ever higher salaries. Leaders themselves may not even notice that they are destroying community or selfishly sacrificing other people for their own personal gain, since they too are focused on the leader not the community. Such a leader thinks all is well as long as he or she is doing well. A true leader is different; he or she cares more about the community and the people in it than himself or herself. Good leadership involves sacrifice by the leader, not sacrificing the community. What are we to do with a world that has gone so astray?

Mintzberg (2009, 2013) proposed the term *community-ship* as a new way of talking about leadership. The term pushes us to focus on the community not on the leader. The evaluation of a leader *as a leader* should be based on whether the community is thriving, not on whether the leader is succeeding individually. In community-ship style leading, the questions that are asked when evaluating the leader are:

¹⁷ According to the Economic Policy Institute, the wage gap between CEOs and average employees was 281 in 2024. (<https://www.epi.org/blog/ceo-pay-increased-in-2024-and-is-now-281-times-that-of-the-typical-worker-new-epi-landing-page-has-all-the-details/>)

¹⁸ See Miller and Xu (2016, 2017) for research showing the comparatively poor results of MBA led corporations. Relatedly, a comprehensive review of heroic leadership can be found in Allison et al. (2017). Readers are directed in particular to Chapter 17 by Dik et al. (2017).

¹⁹ Adler et al. (2011) describe a "collaborative community" as one where top managers not only acknowledge but even celebrate the central role played by front-line personnel in an organization in creating a culture of teamwork and trust.

Are people growing? Do people care about each other? Does management look beyond the bottom line and take an interest in all parts of their community both those inside the company, as well as those outside the company who are closely connected to it? Is the company seeking to contribute positively to the larger societal context in which a company exists? Are the people charged with leading a community acting responsibly for the sake of the community and not just looking out for themselves?

Hattori and Heller (2018) argue that it is precisely these types of questions that are the primary concern of research on leaders in Japan. These questions also starkly contrast with the primary concern of most leadership research found in the English language literature, namely the traits and characteristics of a good leader. The Japanese understanding of leadership is inherently relational and contextual, just like community-ship. We can see the community-ship nature of leadership in Japan on the shop floor of a typical factory. The person who is literally called “leader” on the shop floor is the person in charge of a small group of workers. In Toyota, it would be the team leader, who may head a group of 6-8 workers, or the group leader, who heads a group of 3-4 team leaders. In both cases, it is a rather intimate setting. The leader is not someone far away, but someone you know well, someone with whom you share community.

Delanty (2010) argues that community is an ideal that is worthy of our pursuit. His book suggests that community building is in desperate need of our fervent pursuit. He explains that we need to pursue healthy communities, because with modernity we have largely lost them. Delanty says we get a sense of security and belonging when we are in a community. Sharing with others naturally flows from such feelings. When a leader is immersed in a community, he or she will be less inclined to hoard the fruits of an organization’s success for himself or herself.

To live in community means you care about the people with whom you share time and place. Of course, you do not have to like everybody in the community or agree with them. Who could possibly like everyone around them? Yet, even if people dislike each other or disagree with each other, they generally will figure out how to get along if they see themselves in a community together. Even if it takes a long time to get to such a state, people are willing to keep at it when they see each other as neighbors.

A healthy community will value differences even though it may be primarily perceived by what its people have in common. The reason differences are appreciated is because differences are a natural part of life and our differences are what makes life together more interesting. Internal differences are also what gives an organization the requisite variety to be able to handle variety in the external environment.²⁰ The only differences a community will find it difficult to accept are those attitudes and behaviors that are viewed as directly destructive to a community’s continued existence. Yet, it is exactly here that tensions arise. An older generation may see the attitude or behavior of a younger generation as norm busting and destructive to community. Yet, the younger generation may see the same attitude or behavior as exactly what is needed to keep the community alive. Who is right? Time will tell.

Delanty explains that something called communitarianism contrasts sharply with community. Just like managerialism is a bastardization of management (Klikauer, 2015), communitarianism has the trappings of community but is something completely different at its core. Communitarianism has a much narrower tolerance of differences than we find in a healthy community. Communitarianism emphasizes unity at the

²⁰ See the Law of Requisite Variety for more on this point (Ashby, 1965; Beer, 1984).

expense of diversity. It pushes people to fit a mold or else.

Having lived in Japan for more than 25 years, the author of the present work has often seen communities slip into communitarianism. Yet, contrary to popular belief, I have seen many instances where the nail that sticks out is not hammered down, but rather it is celebrated. The latter occurs when people do not perceive the difference as a threat to the community. Even when a community may be threatened, some forms of aberrant behavior in Japan are tolerated simply because trying to hammer down that nail would only make things worse.

We can understand the distinction between community and communitarianism by thinking of a typical neighborhood. A person generally does not get to choose his or her neighbors. People learn to live together, sometimes complaining about the people next door and sometimes we see neighbors going at each other as they set mutual boundaries. It can be really hard to work out where that boundary line is, but people are generally able to come to an understanding. There basically is no other choice. No one has the right to change how a neighbor lives, unless it crosses that fine line where community is truly threatened. Most of the time we figure out how to live with each other and over time may even be surprised to find that we have made new friends.

Neighborhoods are challenged when people who have very different cultural backgrounds move in. Unfamiliar customs and values can be seen as a threat to community. According to Delanty, one approach to accepting such differences is multiculturalism, which assumes a dominant culture and argues for tolerance of minority cultures. Delanty explains multiculturalism as a concept that emerged in the West from a desire to manage culture, as plurality and division increased with greater immigration. It allowed for greater participation in society by newcomers and a fuller exercising of citizenship rights.

Another way of managing a growing number of differences, even differences that are viewed by some as destructive to community, is to embrace it. An embrace is a long hug. It takes time for a variety of voices, especially voices that are very different, to be expressed and heard. Over time understanding grows and trust gets built as long as there is good faith on both sides. Time allows us to evaluate each other to see if we are making good faith efforts or just pretending to listen.²¹

The idea of community as it is understood in the West began with the Greek understanding of community. The Greek word used for community is *koinoia*. Delanty explains that the idea of *koinoia* overlapped with the idea of a city (the polis), which was also a word used to indicate the state and society. For Aristotle, community was viewed as a rather urban way of living that was unlike tribal and rural ways of associating with others. Communal forms are born within a city through daily interactions between people, some of which are likely to lead to friendships and other forms of close association.

Thus, we see that this idea of community that began with the Greeks puts community as the beating heart of a society. Take away community and society will disintegrate. For Aristotle community and society were similar concepts, since both had roots in friendship and direct relationships. Strong communities are understood to lessen the need for governmental control. In writings of the 19th Century,

²¹ For more on embracing different voices and the long time doing so will inevitably take, I suggest Michael Kimmel's December 19, 2021 article "What Does It Mean to Save a Neighborhood?" in the *New York Times*, which references Gill (2019).

community came to represent the aim of a utopian society that would not need the state at all. This fit with the view that the state was largely a monster, a Leviathan (Thomas Hobbes' term), that was at best a necessary evil.

Delanty explains that there even arose the myth of "total community" a term coined by Robert Nisbet in 1953 to indicate the conditions where the state and society become fused together into one thing. Nisbet described this myth as having been the fuel for the first half of the 20th Century's wave of totalitarian ideologies, whether they were based on fascism, nationalism, or fundamentalism. Totalitarianism seeks to co-opt community, so that it can dominate the interactions between people to bring society increasingly in line with state control. Community-building when it has been coopted like this can be a highly dangerous movement, as Helmut Plessner presciently foresaw what could happen in Germany in his 1924 book, *The Limits of Community*.

From Delanty's book we can see that community is a particularly tricky word because it can refer to both exclusivity, as in this is "our community (not yours)," and inclusivity, as in the existence of our shared humanity, "a community of all people." The exclusive understanding of the word community has its roots in the Greek city, a local and immediate place where daily interactions happen. The inclusive view of the word community has its roots in the Roman and Christian traditions, which seek to transcend the here and now through shared principles and, in the case of Christianity, a shared belief in God as the creator of all people.

The writings of the late Pope John Paul II (Karol Wojtyła) speak eloquently to the need for community to embrace the differences that will always be there when human beings come together. Caryl (2014, p. 74) quotes Wojtyła's writing in Polish from 1969, "There is an irreducible specificity and uniqueness to each individual—yet no human being can exist in isolation. Individuality is defined by social interaction." In these words, we can find the yearning for community that welcomes the differences that are inherently in us as human beings.

A person who aspires to exercise true leadership as community-ship must navigate along this uneven terrain where the exclusivity and inclusivity of community are both allowed to blossom. Exclusivity binds people together and enhances teamwork to achieve an organization's shared purpose. Inclusivity opens the door to fresh ideas and new ways of doing things. Harnessing these two opposing forces is the leader-as-community-builder's primary job.

Japanese companies allowed just such leaders to flourish in post-WWII Japan and in doing so redefined community in a manufacturing company to fully include blue-collar employees. This is the essence of the contribution of the Toyota Production System and other similar management methods that emerged in post-WWII Japan. As humanity faces what appear to be major transformation of work in the age of generative AI, it would behoove us to look again at community management, the essence of good management, and revisit what has been done by leading Japanese companies to allow front-line (blue-collar) workers to contribute to value creation and benefit from that contribution.²²

²² For an example of how a leading Japanese company, Toyota, connects front-line workers with value creation, see Heller (2026).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I consider it a great honor to publish this paper in a special issue of *Yokohama Business Review* to celebrate the life and legacy of Hiroshi Morita. I miss him dearly. I remember Hiroshi from my very first days at YNU in April 2005. He looked sharp in a nice suit and was always quick with a kind word. I would later see how skilled he was at building community. A committee meeting that could easily be rather boring was seldom that way when Hiroshi led it. The work was the same, but the atmosphere was different. He knew how to make the mood lighter, but he never made light of the work that had to be done. I worked closely with Hiroshi for half a year in 2010-2011 and then again from 2015 until December 2024 when he suddenly and much too early passed on to his reward.

I saw first-hand in 2021 how dedicated he was to teaching. During the height of the COVID-19 pandemic when nobody could make the trip to Japan, Hiroshi led the creation of a virtual field trip (VFT) into Edo Japan (mid-1800s). The VFT took place once a week for three months. It became the glue that held us together as faculty at YNU and seven other universities as we worked closely with student participants to co-produce the Collaborative Mindset Module for the International Management Program for Managers (IMPM). Thirty IMPM participants from fifteen countries around the world would log on to Zoom and instantly be transported 200 years into the past. Hiroshi would literally jump into ancient woodblock prints made by Utagawa Hiroshige of the Fifty-Three Stations of the Tokaido Road and guide us on short but unforgettable journeys of art, culture, and business.

Hiroshi played a central role in the IMPM Module at YNU in 2019, 2021, 2023, and 2024. In May of 2025, we at YNU ran the IMPM module for the fifth time, but it was the first time we had to do it without Hiroshi warmly welcoming participants and embodying the Japanese hospitality that he taught in the sessions he led. Yet, all of us on the YNU team could feel Hiroshi's spirit carrying us through the module, which we dedicated to him. The world will never be the same without Hiroshi's smile, energy, and warmth, but it is much better for him having lived a good life. I will hold my memories with Hiroshi close to my heart and endeavor to do my utmost to carry on his legacy of helping to build community that is filled with joy and a love of living.

REFERENCES

- Abegglen, J. C. (1985). *Kaisha, the Japanese Corporation*, New York: Basic Books.
- Adler, P., Heckscher, C. and Prusak, L. (2011). "Building a Collaborative Enterprise," *Harvard Business Review*, July-August Issue, pp. 95-101.
- Allison, S. T., Goethals, G. R., and Kramer, R. M. (2017). *Handbook of Heroism and Heroic Leadership*, Oxfordshire, U.K.: Routledge.
- Andrews, K. R. (1968). "Introduction to the Anniversary Edition," in C. I. Barnard, *Functions of the Executive*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Andriessen, J. H. E. (2005). "Archetypes of knowledge communities," in P. van den Besselaar, G. De Michelis, J. Preece, and C. Simone (eds.), *Communities and technologies*, Milan: Springer, pp. 191-213.
- Ashby, W. R. (1965). *Introduction to Cybernetics*. London: Chapman & Hall.
- Barnard, C. I. (1968). *Functions of the Executive* (30th Anniversary Edition), Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Baumeister, R. F. and Leary, M. R. (1995). "The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation," *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 117(3), pp. 497-529.
- Beer, S. (1984). "The Viable System Model: Its Provenance, Development, Methodology and Pathology," *The Journal*

- of the Operational Research Society*, Vol. 35 (1), pp. 7-25.
- Bobocel, D. R. and Gosse, L. (2015). "Procedural Justice: A Historical Review and Critical Analysis," in R. S. Cropanzano and M. L. Ambrose (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Justice in the Workplace*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 51-88.
- Caryl, C. (2014). *Strange Rebels: 1979 and the Birth of the 21st Century*, New York: Basic Books
- Delanty, G. (2010). *Community* (2nd Edition), Oxfordshire, U.K.: Routledge.
- Dik, B. J., Shimizu, A. B., and O'Connor, W. F. (2016). "Career Development and a Sense of Calling," in S. T. Allison, G. R. Goethals, and R. M. Kramer (eds.), *Handbook of Heroism and Heroic Leadership*, Oxfordshire, U.K.: Routledge, pp. 316-338.
- Drucker, P. F. (1946). *Concept of the Corporation*. New York: John Day.
- Drucker, P. F. (1954). *The Practice of Management*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Drucker, P. F. (1959). *Landmarks of Tomorrow*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Drucker, P. F. (1969). *The Age of Discontinuity*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Drucker, P. F. (1973). *Management*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Foss, N. J. and Stieglitz, N. (2012). "20 Modern resource-based theory (ies)" in M. Dietrich and J. Krafft (eds.), *Handbook on the Economics and Theory of the Firm*, Cheltenham, U.K.: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 256-274.
- Gill, E. (2019). *The Crisis of Expertise*, New York: Springer.
- Hattori, Y. and Heller, D. A. (2018). "Japan: You're the Leader? The Long-Term Relationship Approach to Japanese Leadership," in S. Western and É.-J. Garcia (eds.) *Global Leadership Perspectives: Insights and Analysis*, London: Sage Publications, pp. 105-112.
- Heckscher, C. and Adler, P. (eds.) (2006). *The Firm as a Collaborative Community: Reconstructing Trust in the Knowledge Economy*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Heller, D. A. (2026). "Manufacturing Engineering at Toyota: Change, Continuity, and Performance Implications," *Journal of Global Management*, forthcoming.
- Heller, D. A. and Fujimoto, T. (2018). "Monozukuri Management: Driver of Sustained Competitiveness in the Japanese Auto Industry," in T. Nakano (ed.), *The Japanese Firm System in Evolution: New Directions, Breaks, and Emerging Practices*, London: Routledge, pp. 107-126.
- Herzberg, F. I., Mausner, B., and Snyderman, B. (1959). *The motivation to work* (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley.
- Hoadley, C. (2012). "What is a community of practice and how can we support it?" in S. Land and D. Jonassen (eds.), *Theoretical foundations of learning environments*, Oxfordshire, U.K.: Taylor and Francis, pp. 286-299.
- Klikauer, T. (2015). "What is managerialism?" *Critical Sociology*, Vol. 41(7-8), pp. 1103-1119.
- Lave, J., and Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lovell, A., Beckstrand G., and Sturt, D. (2020). *Rethink: 2022 Global culture report*. Salt Lake City, UT: O. C. Tanner Institute.
- MacDuffie, J. P. and Helper, S. (2006). "Collaboration in Supply Chains: With and Without Trust," in C. Heckscher and P. Adler (eds.), *The Firm as a Collaborative Community: Reconstructing Trust in the Knowledge Economy*, New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 417-466.
- Miller, D. and Xu, X. (2016). "A fleeting glory: Self-serving behavior among celebrated MBA CEOs," *Journal of Management Inquiry*, Vol. 25(3), pp. 286-300.
- Miller, D. and Xu, X. (2017). "MBA CEOs, Short-Term Management and Performance," *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 154, pp. 285-300.
- Mintzberg, H. (2009). "Rebuilding Companies as Communities," *Harvard Business Review*, July-August Issue, pp. 140-143.
- Mintzberg, H. and Waters, J.A. (1985). "Of strategies, deliberate and emergent," *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 6(3), pp. 257-272.
- Morgan, G. (1986). *Images of Organization*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Nickols, F. (2017). "Knowledge Worker, Drucker Dictums," Publicly available manuscript, pp. 1-3. https://www.nickols.us/Druckers_Dictums.pdf
- Ojha, A. K. (2000). "Can Japanese Management Practices be Successfully Transferred to other Countries?" in C. M. Lau, K. K. S. Law, D. K. Tse, and C. S. Wong (eds.), *Asian Management Matters: Regional Relevance and Global Impact*, River Edge, N.J.: Imperial College Press, pp. 403-416.

- Simon, H. A. (1997). *Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making Processes in Administrative Organizations* (4th Edition), New York: The Free Press.
- Sloan, A. P., in collaboration with Boyden Sparkes (1941) *Adventures of a White-Collar Man*, New York: Doubleday, Doran, & Company.
- Sloan, A. P. (1963). *My Years with General Motors*, New York: Doubleday & Company.
- Sloan A. P. (1965). *My Years with General Motors* (paperback edition), New York: Macfadden Books.
- Takahashi, N. (2010). *Kyomo no seikashugi: Nihon gata nenko jyoetsu fukkatsu no susume* [The Illusion of Pay-for-Performance: A call to revive the Japanese seniority system], Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo (in Japanese).
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*, Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Yokozawa, K., Nguyen, H. A., and Tran, T. B. H. (2021). "Role of personal anxiety in individual kaizen behaviour and performance: evidence from Japan," *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, Vol. 41(6), pp. 942-961.

[Daniel A. Heller, Professor by Special Appointment, Institute for Multidisciplinary Sciences, Yokohama National University and Faculty of Global Management, Chuo University]

[2025年11月12日受理]