

functions well under a stable and growing economy; it does not function well under a turbulent and low-growth economy. In regard to a change of Japanese management, responses vary among different elements of Japanese management. While decision-making, characterized by group, and the Japanese production system, symbolized by Total Quality Management (TQM), have not changed much, employment system, overseas office management, and corporate management system have become more market-oriented. Lastly, on the gender-based role differentiation and participation of women in economic activities, it was found that gender-based role differentiation had weakened over the past four decades due to the change in social and legal conditions. With this book, the readers will obtain a vast knowledge of and insight into the evolution of Japanese industrial development, management style, and career development as well as an agenda facing Japanese management today. The book is well researched with informative tables. Hence, the book is useful as an essential information source and tool for thought for those who would like to study the historical development and future course of Japanese economy, industry, and management.

MITSURU MIZUNO
Nihon University

***Managing Korean Business: Organization, Culture, Human Resources and Change.* Edited by Chris Rowley, Tae-Won Sohn, and Johnseok Bae. London: Frank Cass, 2002. Pp. 212.**

Before 1997, Korea's business model has been considered by many to be a mechanism of the Korean economic miracle. The Asian financial crisis in 1997 destroyed such an image, and since then, positive and negative views on the Korean model have come out. This book avoids such extreme views and develops more sophisticated

views on the Korean model. According to the book, the cause of the crisis in Korea is attributable to both external and internal factors. The book asserts that the recent problems faced by Korean businesses may not be due to the Asian business model, but a general crisis of models that include Fordism, Keynesianism, and Welfare statism. Its approach is fresh and has profound implication upon the studies of Asian business organizations. *Managing Korean Business* provides an evolutionary view on the Korean model and analyses the capabilities of this model at firm level rather than at national level. Its analysis is quite different from past simplistic business literature that tends to be plagued by universalism and searching for the best "practice". The evolutionary approach of this book allows readers to better understand the substantial change of Korean business environment since the 1997 Asian crisis.

The contributors to the book provide quite diverse foci and perspectives to the topic. Shim and Steers (Chapter 2) analyse the past accomplishments and liabilities of entrepreneurial Korean firms. Instead of crony capitalism, they argue that the principal cause of the crisis was a failure of the management to adjust to the rapidly changing business environment. According to them, there is an urgent need for a "managerial revolution" to streamline and modernize approaches to both organization and management because the entrepreneurship of Korean owner-management, which once worked as a source of competitive advantage, has turned into a liability as it has become bureaucratic and non-responsive in nature. Oh and Park (Chapter 3) analyse the success and failure of the two biggest Korean conglomerates — Samsung and Hyundai. They argue that the *chaebol* (Korean business conglomerate) structure is stable but it would be difficult for *chaebols* to change. They highlight the fact that the *chaebol* structure defies existing theoretical frameworks (for example, Anglo-American-type orthodox) and better theoretical perspectives should be developed. Cho and Yoon (Chapter 4) analyse the origins, functions, and influences of dynamic collectivism embedded in

Korean corporate culture, which is formed by three driving forces: cultural legacy, social climate, and corporate leadership. They argue that these three factors, once considered capabilities for Korean firms, have now become liabilities. Park (Chapter 5) evaluates the effectiveness of campaigning approaches to cultural change and the reasons for their success and failure. He argued that Korean firms' organizational "culture change campaigns" since the mid-1980s were not successful due to lack of professional competencies and short-sighted views. Park also points out that culture change efforts have not brought the desirable outcome. Kwun and Cho (Chapter 6) provide a case study of Korea Telecom and find important implication to Korean firms. They point out that commitment of the top management and empowered change agents are important factors for the success of change. According to them, the change in organizational structure that was strongly supported by top management was successful, while the momentum for the change without such support was a failure. This case suggests that for organizational change to be successful, the sources of change need to be shifted from "external" to "internal" as its process develops. Pucik and Lim (Chapter 7) summarize the evolution and transformation of human resources in Korean management during the early 1990s. They analyse Samsung's internal data and found that the direction of change is from quantity-oriented, seniority-based, and harmony-oriented towards more quality-based, performance/competence-based, and a flexible system. Taylor, Cho, and Hyun (Chapter 8) examine the management of Korean firms in China. They find that considerable responsibilities were delegated to Chinese managers and suggest that a long-term approach was required for Korean firms to be successful in China. Also, mutual trust between the two nationalities will need to be established.

Although these articles are somewhat complementary, they are quite diverse in terms of perspective. There are three major subjects: entrepreneurship and employees, structure and culture, and domestic and overseas issues. Many important issues are discussed and problems in

Korea's past management are diagnosed. Unlike previous literature that tends to be obsessed by universalism, these articles focus on the change and transformation of the Korean management.

The Korean economy, once a role model for latecomers in economic development, has reached a turning point. Since the Asian financial crisis, the numerous capabilities of Korean firms that had contributed significantly to Korea's past economic miracle have become liabilities. Korean firms have to undertake a managerial revolution in order to survive in a rapidly changing global environment. *Managing Korean Business* diagnoses problems of past Korean management and suggests a new direction. The book urges Korean companies to implement effective change of management which would require painful but fruitful unlearning and relearning process. This book is a useful guide for Korean business circle that has to overcome liabilities and reform its systems. It also provides academics with new perspectives and insights in approaching Korean management, stimulating further research in this field.

YONG-JOO LEE

Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

***A Zone of Asian Monetary Stability.* By Tetsuji Murase.** Canberra: Asia Pacific Press, Australian National University, 2002, Pp. 304.

The publication of this study should have been extremely timely. Appearing just a few months after the launch of the Euro, the book was poised to cast light on how Asia could learn from Europe's formation of a monetary union and outline the steps toward the actualization of an Asian monetary unit. Instead, the book has been caught in the undertow by current events and China's entry into the World Trade Organization (WTO), both of which have combined to turn attention from fiscal and monetary issues to trade issues.

If one can envision an Asian economic area — as several Asian leaders have done in the past —