

- (4) The person who obeys authority does so, as it is usually stated, only in his capacity as a “member” of the corporate group and what he obeys is only “the law.”
- (5) In conformity with point (3), it is held that the members of the corporate group, in so far as they obey a person in authority, do not owe its obedience to him as an individual, but to the impersonal order.
- (6) In the rational type case, there is also complete absence of appropriation of his official position by the incumbent.
- (7) Administrative acts, decisions, and rules are formulated and accorded in writing, even in cases where oral discussion is the rule or is even mandatory.
- (8) Legal authority can be exercised in a wide variety of different forms.

Thus, Weber (1947) discussed that a bureaucratic organization is developed as a form of depersonalization. Bureaucracy is based on rules and procedures, hierarchy of office, and written records and files. Weber (1947, p. 332) emphasized that “the combination of written documents and a continuous organization of official functions constitutes the ‘office’, which is the central focus of all types of modern corporate action.” Bureaucracy is basically administered by specialist experts and professional managers. Employing experts and utilizing records combines knowledge and skills with business practices so that economical efficiency is accomplished.

### **Chester Barnard**

Chester Barnard is a well known management theorist and practitioner. He was a president of the New Jersey Bell Telephone company when he published his classical book about organization and management (Barnard, 1938).

On one hand, Weber (1947) focused on the structural and coercive aspects of organization; on the other hand, Barnard (1938, 1948) approached organization from both the viewpoint of its structure and dynamism and from paying attention to cooperative aspects of organization (Perrow, 1974). Barnard (1938) argued that hierarchical organization creates the specific organizations, such as executives and executive organizations. In complex organizations, executive organizations are separated from operational organizations because of the necessities of communication. Barnard (1938, p. 72) defined formal organization as “a system of consciously coordinated activities or forces of two or more persons,” and argued that formal organization is activated by informal organization at all levels of organization.

Barnard did not explicitly discuss the role of records in organization; however, he developed a theory of organizational knowledge. Barnard’s theory of organizational knowledge is regarded as an origin of knowledge management (Isomura, 2009; Niwamoto, 2006; Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1995).

Barnard (1936) emphasized that practitioners utilize both logical and non-logical mental processes; Barnard (1995) posed three different forms of knowledge: organic, personal, and formal knowledge. Knowledge is embedded in a physical body in the form of organic knowledge. Therefore, organic knowledge is also called skills. An individual accumulates knowledge that comes from local context; therefore, personal knowledge is basically context bound. Formal knowledge is expressed in language form and shared in society. Barnard (1950) insisted that practitioners utilize these different types of knowledge in reality, and that action and knowledge are inseparable from each other. Action creates organic knowledge; organic knowledge can be converted into personal knowledge by verbalization; and then, personal knowledge becomes formal knowledge if the former is shared with other people. Business people make judgments on the basis of these three types of knowledge. Thus, action creates knowledge and knowledge returns to action through decision making.

Barnard (1937) argued that reality has a stratified structure and is composed of verbalized, consciously perceived, and unconsciously sensed one. In addition, Barnard (1937) emphasized that business people face the unknown and unknowable. What is expressed in language is limited; and practitioners abstract only the least part of the whole reality, collect its fragments, analyze their relationship, and construct their understanding of the reality (Barnard, 1937; Niwamoto, 2006; Isomura, 2010).

Consequently, Barnard pointed out that what can be recorded is the least part of reality, and that it is dangerous if business people ignore the existence of what cannot be recorded. He argued that business people are required to connect what can be recorded with what cannot be. That is because Barnard emphasized the importance of logical and non-logical mental processes.

### **3. Discussion and Future Research**

In this paper, I review how five representative theorists and practitioners of organization and management argue the relationship between records and management. Most of them emphasize that managing on the basis of facts is useful to build a science of management. I summarize the main points of discussion and propose a plan of future research.

First, Taylor discussed that observing workers' jobs and measuring the time of each elementary movement contributes to creating the standardization of workers' jobs in production management. Second, Fayol argued that management methods are created by collecting and analyzing cases, and that these methods should be improved by checking the results. Therefore, fact-based management is indispensable for change

management. Third, Follett basically shared Fayol's views on the role of records, and suggested that collecting cases and comparing experiences should be utilized to educate people and enhance their abilities. Fourth, Weber argued that bureaucratic organization is designed to administer work by keeping records and setting rigid rules and procedures. Consequently, this type of organization would be systemized and would no longer depend on specific persons. Fifth, Barnard did not explicitly discuss the function of records; however, he emphasized that managers deal with both what can be kept and cannot be kept as records, and warned of the risk that dependence on records could mislead managers' decision making.

Overall, this paper concludes that the development of business administration and the organizational design are deeply related to keeping and utilizing records. Therefore, Pemberton's first and third answers are supported from the viewpoint of organization and management theory. However, it should be added that too much dependence on records is dangerous as practitioners face complicated and ever-changing reality. What can be kept as records is a fragment of reality; consequently, balancing what can and cannot be kept is important for managers when making a decision.

Finally, a plan of future research is proposed. This paper proposes the research hypothesis that business administration and organization design are developed by keeping and utilizing records. The hypothesis was partly tested by examining cases of when scientific management was introduced and developed in Japan. The overview of its introduction and development process (Isomura, 2012) has already been reviewed. Therefore, the next step is to collect additional cases in Japan to reconfirm that combining scientific management and records management contributes to creating the standardization of work, improving management methods, and developing human resources. Moreover, I intend to examine how managers attempt to avoid the risk of having too much dependence on records and can find a way to incorporate what records cannot be kept into their practices.

### **Acknowledgments**

This paper was prepared as a research project financially supported by a Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (B), 22330164.

### **References**

- Barnard, C.I. (1936). Mind in everyday affairs. In C.I. Barnard, *The functions of the executive* (pp.301-322). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Barnard, C.I. (1937). Notes on some obscure aspects of human relations. In W. Wolf and

- H. Iino (Eds.), *Philosophy for managers: Selected papers of Chester I. Barnard* (pp.63-111). Tokyo: Bunshindo.
- Barnard, C.I. (1938). *The functions of the executive*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Barnard, C.I. (1948). *Organization and management: Selected papers*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Barnard, C.I. (1950). Skill, knowledge, and judgment. In W.B. Wolf and H. Iino (Eds.), *Philosophy for managers: Selected papers of Chester I. Barnard* (pp.129-137). Tokyo: Bunshindo.
- Barnard, C.I. (1995). The significance of decisive behavior in social action: Notes on the nature of decision. *Journal of Management History*, 1(4), 28-87.
- Breese, J.D. (1995). Henri Fayol's centre for administrative studies. *Journal of Management History*, 1(3), 37-62.
- Brichford, M. (1972). The relationship of records management activities to the field of business history. *The Business History Review*, 46(2), 220-232.
- Copley, F.B. (1923). Frederick W. Taylor: Father of scientific management. New York: Harper & Borthers.
- Duranti, L. (1989). The odyssey of records managers- Part II: from middle ages to modern times. *Records Management Quarterly*, 23(4), 3-11.
- Fayol, H. (1917). *Administration industrielle et generale*. Paris: Dunod.
- Fayol, H. (1918). *L'aveil de l'esprit public*. Paris: Dunod.
- Follett, M.P. (1925). How must business management develop in order to possess the essentials of a profession. In H.C. Metcalf and L. Urwick (Eds.), *Dynamic administration: The collected papers of Mary Parker Follett* (pp. 117-131). London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons.
- Follett, M.P. (1949). *Freedom and co-ordination: Lectures in business organization*. London: Management Publication Trust.
- Gerth, H.H. and Mills, C.W. (Eds.) (1946). *From Max Weber: Essays in sociology*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Graham, P. (Ed.) (1996). *Mary Parker Follett: Prophet of management*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Isomura, K. (2009). The gap between knowledge management and records management. *CGSA Forum* (Chuo Univerity), 7, 17-37.
- Isomura, K. (2010). Barnard on leadership development: Bridging action and thinking. *Journal of Management History*, 16(2), 216-232.
- Isomura, K. (2012). Review of the introduction and development process of scientific

- management in Japan. *CGSA Forum* (Chuo University), 10, 95-106.
- Metcalf, H.C. and Urwick, L. (Eds.). (1941). *Dynamic administration: The collected papers of Mary Parker Follett*. London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons.
- Niwamoto, Y. (2006). *Developing Barnard's theory of management*. Tokyo: Bunshindo (in Japanese).
- Nonaka, I. and Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge-creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- O'Connor, E.S. (2011). *Creating new knowledge in management: Appropriating the field's lost foundations*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Peaucelle, J.-L. (2003). *Henri Fayol: Inventeur des outils de gestion*. Paris: Economica.
- Pemberton, J.M. (1995). Who put the "management" in records management? *Records Management Quarterly*, 29(4), 68-73.
- Perrow, C. (1974). *Complex organizations: A critical essay*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Reid, D. (1995). Fayol: From experience to theory. *Journal of Management History*, 1(3), 21-36.
- Sasaki, T. (1984). *Henri Fayol: The man, his strategy and theory*. Tokyo: Bunshindo (in Japanese).
- Sheldon, O. (1923). *The philosophy of management*. London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons.
- Taylor, F.W. (1903). *Shop management*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Taylor, F.W. (1911). *The principles of scientific management*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Tonn, J. (2003). *Mary P. Follett: Creating democracy, transforming management*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organization*. New York: The Free Press.
- Wren, A.G. (1995). Henri Fayol: Learning from experience. *Journal of Management History*, 1(3), 5-12.
- Wren, A.G. (2005). *The history of management thought* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Wren, D.A. and Bedeian, A.G. (2009). *The evolution of management thought* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

## 記録管理と経営管理の失われた環を求めて

磯村 和人

### 要旨：

本稿の目的は、経営管理の研究分野における代表的な研究者、実務家が記録の役割をどのように論じ、彼らのアイデアを実践に応用しようとしてきたかをレビューすることにある。具体的には、テイラー、ファヨール、フォレット、ウェーバー、バーナードの考えを検討する。一方で、テイラー、ファヨール、フォレットは、生産管理や一般管理に焦点を当てている。他方で、ウェーバーとバーナードは、主として組織の性質と設計について論じている。結論として、経営管理と組織設計の発展はどのように、記録を作成し、分析し、活用するか、その方法と深く結びついていることを仮説として提示する。

### キーワード：

記録管理、経営管理、組織設計、科学、経験