clearly signaled the importance of continuing to work even as one satisfied bodily needs. The extensive facilities in Google suggest that the employee should not feel any need to leave the premises and should always be comfortable at work.

Polychronic time, in contrast, requires spatial arrangements that make it easy for simultaneous events to occur, where privacy is achieved by being near someone and whispering rather than by retreating behind closed doors. Thus, large rooms are built more like amphitheaters to permit a senior person to hold court, or sets of offices or cubicles are built around a central core that permits easy access to everyone. We might also expect more visually open environments such as the office bullpens that permit supervisors to survey an entire department so that they can easily see who might need help or who is not working.

When buildings and offices are designed in terms of certain intended work patterns, both distance and time are usually considered in the physical layout (Allen, 1977; Steele, 1973, 1981, 1986). These design issues become very complex, however, because information and communication technology is increasingly able to shrink time and space in ways that may not have been considered. For example, a group of people in private offices can communicate by telephone, email, fax, and videophone, and can even become a virtual team or meeting by using conference calls enhanced by various kinds of video software (Grenier & Metes, 1992; Johansen et al., 1991).

Human Essence and Basic Motivation

Every culture has shared assumptions about what it means to be human, what our basic instincts are, and what kinds of behavior are considered inhuman and therefore grounds for ejection from the group. Being human is both a physical property and a cultural construction, as we have seen throughout history. Slavery was often justified by defining slaves as "not human." In ethnic and religious conflicts the "other" is often defined as not human. Within the category of those defined as human, we have further variation. In their comparative study, Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) noted that in some societies humans are seen as basically evil, in others

as basically good, and in still others as mixed or neutral, capable of being either good or bad.

Closely related are assumptions about how perfectible human nature is. Is our goodness or badness intrinsic so we must simply accept what we are, or can we, through hard work, generosity, or faith, overcome our badness and earn our salvation or nirvana? Where a given macro culture ends up in terms of these categories is often related to the religion that dominates that cultural unit, but, as we shall see, this issue is very much at the heart of leadership.

What assumptions do leaders make about the fundamental motivation of workers? In the United States we have seen a transition across several sets of such assumptions:

1. Workers as rational-economic actors
2. Workers as social animals with primarily social needs
3. Workers as problem solvers and self-actualizers, whose primary needs are to be challenged and to use their talents
4. Workers as complex and malleable (Schein, 1980)

Early theories of employee motivation in the United States were almost completely dominated by the assumption that the only incentives available to managers were monetary ones because it was assumed that the only essential motivation of employees was economic self-interest. The Hawthorne studies (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939; Homans, 1950) launched a new series of "social" assumptions, postulating that employees are motivated by the need to relate well to their peer and membership groups and that such motivation often overrides economic self-interest. The main evidence for these assumptions came from studies of restriction of output, which showed clearly that workers would reduce their take-home pay rather than break the norm of "a fair day's work for a fair day's pay." Furthermore, workers will put pressure on high producers ("rate busters") to work less hard and make less money to preserve the basic norm of a fair day's work.

Subsequent studies of work, particularly on the effects of the assembly line, introduced another set of assumptions: employees are self-actualizers

who need challenge and interesting work to provide self-confirmation and valid outlets for the full use of their talents (Argyris, 1964). Motivation theorists, such as Maslow (1954), proposed that there is a hierarchy of human needs and an individual will not experience and work on the "higher" needs until lower ones are satisfied. If the individual is in a survival mode, economic motives will dominate; if survival needs are met, social needs come to the fore; if social needs are met, self-actualization needs become salient.

It is at this point not clear whether in any given organization it will be the deeper national assumptions or the managerial occupational assumptions that will dominate a particular reward system. In the Western capitalist system, money and the assumption that people are primarily motivated by it still appears to predominate in the managerial culture. But my recent conversations with Danica Purg, who runs a very forward-looking Management School in Bled, Slovenia, suggest that the countries that were dominated for decades by communism take full employment very seriously and make it very hard to "fire" someone; this makes life difficult for the young entrepreneurial type who has been bred on "no job security" and "no organizational loyalty expected."

Assumptions about Appropriate Human Activity

How do humans relate to their environment? Several basically different orientations have been identified in cross-cultural studies, and these have direct implications for variations we can see in organizations.

The "Doing" Orientation. At one extreme, we can identify a "doing" orientation, which correlates closely with (1) the assumption that nature can be controlled and manipulated, (2) a pragmatic orientation toward the nature of reality, and (3) a belief in human perfectibility (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961). In other words, it is taken for granted that the proper thing for humans to do is to take charge and actively control their environment and their fate.

Doing is the predominant orientation in the United States and is certainly a key assumption of U.S. managers, reflected in the World War II slogan "We can do it," immortalized in the Rosie the Riveter posters and in the stock American phrases "getting things done" and "let's do something

about it." The notion that "the impossible just takes a little longer" is central to U.S. business ideology. Organizations driven by this assumption seek to grow and to dominate the markets they are in.

The "Being" Orientation. At the other extreme is a "being "orientation, which correlates closely with the assumption that nature is powerful and humanity is subservient to it. This orientation implies a kind of fatalism: because we cannot influence nature, we must become accepting and enjoy what we have. We must focus more on the here and now, on individual enjoyment, and on acceptance of whatever comes. Many religions operate on this assumption. Organizations operating according to this orientation look for a niche in their environment that allows them to survive, and they try to adapt to external realities rather than create markets or dominate some portion of the environment.

The "Being-in-Becoming" Orientation. A third orientation, which lies between the two extremes of doing and being, is "being-in-becoming," referring to the idea that the individual must achieve harmony with nature by fully developing his or her own capacities, thereby achieving a perfect union with the environment. The focus is on development rather than a static condition. Through detachment, meditation, and control of those things that can be controlled (e.g., feelings and bodily functions), the individual achieves full self-development and self-actualization. The focus is on what the person is and can become rather than what specific thing the person can accomplish. In short, "the being-in-becoming orientation emphasizes that kind of activity which has as its goal the development of all aspects of the self as an integrated whole" (Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, 1961, p. 17).

The definition of what constitutes growth and whether or not it should be encouraged varies widely. In Essochem Europe a talented country manager was refused a promotion to be European manager because he was "too emotional," which reflected the parent company's assumptions about management being of necessity unemotional. In contrast, DEC was extreme in the degree to which it allowed and encouraged all forms of self-development, which was later reflected in the degree to which "alumni" of DEC, now working on their own or in other organizations, used the phrase "I grew up in DEC."

In Ciba-Geigy, it was clear that each person had to fit in and become part of the organizational fabric and that socialization into the existing mode was therefore how development was defined. To succeed to senior executive levels, a manager had to have had a successful overseas assignment and had to develop cross-cultural skills mandated by the company.

Countries and the organizations within them differ in how much they consider the growth and development of their people to be an important management function, even as academics advocate that human development and successful organizational performance should both be possible (Chapman & Sisodia, 2015; Keegan & Lahey, 2016).

Assumptions about the Nature of Human Relationships

At the core of every culture are assumptions about the proper way for individuals to relate to each other to make the group safe, comfortable, and productive. When such assumptions are not widely shared, we speak of anarchy and anomie. This set of assumptions creates norms and behavioral rules that deal primarily with the two central issues of (1) what the relationship should be between higher and lower status people (and by implication between the individual and the group), and (2) what the relationship should be between peers and fellow team members.

These rules are taught early in life and come to be labeled as "proper behavior," etiquette, tact, good manners, and situationally appropriate behavior—that is, know your place in the structure and know what is appropriate. These rules change and reflect current social issues as is best exemplified by the importance of knowing what it is "politically correct" to say. What is proper and "situationally appropriate" varies with the degree of "intimacy" of the relationship, which in most cultures can be divided into four "levels" (Schein, 2016).

Levels of Relationship. The boundaries between these levels vary by country, religion, and ethnicity, but every macro culture has some version of these broad levels, as laid out in Exhibit 6.4. Understanding the rules of situational propriety becomes critical when macro cultures interact. For example, in a Brazilian subsidiary of a multinational chemical company a new CEO from the German branch opened his first meeting with a very

formal agenda that included time allocations for each item and very precise instructions. He proudly presented the agenda to open the meeting and was greeted with laughter and joking, leading to his total humiliation and severely damaging his relationship with the local executives. Neither he nor the Brazilians who were used to very informal management understood that neither his nor their behavior was situationally appropriate.

Exhibit 6.4   Four Levels of Relationship in Society

Level -1. Exploitation, No Relationship or a Negative Relationship

Examples: Prisoners, POWs, slaves, sometimes members of extremely different cultures or those we consider underdeveloped, sometimes very old or very emotionally ill people, the victims or "marks" for criminals or con men

Comment: We recognize, of course, that inside these groups intense relationships form and that if we choose to build a relationship with someone in this category we are able to do so. But we don't owe them anything and don't have an expected level of trust or openness with them.

Level 1. Acknowledgement, Civility, Transactional Role Relations

Examples: Strangers on the street, seatmates on trains and planes, service people whose help we need, which includes professional helpers of all sorts whose behavior is governed by the defined role definitions in the culture

Comment: The parties do not "know" each other but treat each other as fellow humans whom we trust to a certain degree not to harm us and with whom we have polite levels of openness in conversation. Professional helpers fall into this category because their role definition requires them to maintain a "professional distance."

Level 2. Recognition as a Unique Person; Working Relationships

Examples: Casual friendships, people whom we know "as people," members of working teams, people whom we have come to know through common work or educational experiences, clients or subordinates who have developed personal but not intimate relationships with their helpers or bosses

Comment: This kind of relationship implies a deeper level of trust and openness in terms of (1) making and honoring commitments and promises to each other; (2) agreeing to not undermine each other or harm what we have agreed to do; and (3) agreeing not to lie to each other or withhold information relevant to our task.

Level 3. Strong Emotions—Close Friendships, Love and Intimacy

Examples: Relationships where stronger positive emotions are involved

Comment: This kind of relationship is usually viewed as undesirable in work or helping situations. Trust here goes one step beyond Level 2 in that the participants not only agree not to harm each other but assume that they will actively support each other when possible or when needed and be more open.