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THE THREE LEVELS OF CULTURE

The purpose of this chapter is to show that culture can be analyzed at several different levels, with the term level meaning the degree to which the cultural phenomenon is visible to the observer. Some of the confusion surrounding the definition of what culture really is results from not differentiating the levels at which it manifests itself. These levels range from the very tangible overt manifestations that you can see and feel to the deeply embedded, unconscious, basic assumptions that I am defining as the essence of culture. In between these layers are various espoused beliefs, values, norms, and rules of behavior that members of the culture use as a way of depicting the culture to themselves and others.

Many other culture researchers prefer the term basic values to describe the deepest levels. I prefer basic assumptions because these tend to be taken for granted by group members and are treated as nonnegotiable. Values are open to discussion, and people can agree to disagree about them. Basic assumptions are so taken for granted that someone who does not hold them is viewed as a “foreigner” or as “crazy” and is automatically dismissed.

The three major levels of cultural analysis are shown in Exhibit 2.1.

Artifacts

At the surface is the level of artifacts, which includes all the phenomena that you would see, hear, and feel when you encounter a new group with an unfamiliar culture. Artifacts include the visible products of the group, such as the architecture of its physical environment; its language; its technology and products; its artistic creations; its style, as embodied in clothing, manners of address, and emotional displays; its myths and stories told about the organization; its published lists of values; and its observable rituals and ceremonies.
## Exhibit 2.1. The Three Levels of Culture.

1. **Artifacts**
   - Visible and feelable structures and processes
   - Observed behavior
     - Difficult to decipher

2. **Espoused Beliefs and Values**
   - Ideals, goals, values, aspirations
   - Ideologies
   - Rationalizations
     - May or may not be congruent with behavior and other artifacts

3. **Basic Underlying Assumptions**
   - Unconscious, taken-for-granted beliefs and values
     - Determine behavior, perception, thought, and feeling

Among these artifacts is the “climate” of the group. Some culture analysts see climate as the equivalent to culture, but it is better thought of as the product of some of the underlying assumptions and is, therefore, a manifestation of the culture. Observed behavior is also an artifact as are the organizational processes by which such behavior is made routine. Structural elements such as charters, formal descriptions of how the organization works, and organization charts also fall into the artifact level.

The most important point to be made about this level of the culture is that it is both easy to observe and very difficult to decipher. The Egyptians and the Mayans both built highly visible pyramids, but the meaning of pyramids in each culture was very different—tombs in one, temples as well as tombs in the other. In other words, observers can describe what they see and feel but cannot reconstruct from that alone what those things mean in the given group. Some culture analysts argue that among the artifacts, you find important symbols that reflect deep assumptions of the culture, but symbols are ambiguous, and you can only test a person’s insight into what something may mean if the person has also experienced the culture at the deeper level of assumptions (Gagliardi, 1990, 1999).

It is especially difficult to understand the espoused beliefs and values and the basic underlying assumptions of his or her own behavior. If you are the observer, you are not going to feel comfortable about doing the research, after all, if your own behavior is the behavior the group is playing around with. But if you are the observer inside the organization, you will have the opportunity to ask “what capacity” if you are interested in describing or naming what means bureaucratic.
It is especially dangerous to try to infer the deeper assumptions from artifacts alone because a person’s interpretations will inevitably be projections of his or her own feelings and reactions. For example, when you see a very informal, loose organization, you may interpret that as “inefficient” if your own background is based on the assumption that informality means playing around and not working. Or, alternatively, if you see a very formal organization, you may interpret that to be a sign of “lack of innovative capacity” if your own experience is based on the assumption that formality means bureaucracy and standardization.

If the observer lives in the group long enough, the meanings of artifacts gradually become clear. If, however, you want to achieve this level of understanding more quickly, you must talk to insiders to analyze the espoused values, norms, and rules that provide the day-to-day operating principles by which the members of the group guide their behavior. This kind of inquiry takes you to the next level of cultural analysis.

Espoused Beliefs and Values

All group learning ultimately reflects someone’s original beliefs and values, his or her sense of what ought to be, as distinct from what is. When a group is first created or when it faces a new task, issue, or problem, the first solution proposed to deal with it reflects some individual’s own assumptions about what is right or wrong, what will work or not work. Those individuals who prevail, who can influence the group to adopt a certain approach to the problem, will later be identified as leaders or founders, but the group does not yet have any shared knowledge as a group because it has not yet taken a common action in reference to whatever it is supposed to do. Whatever is proposed will only be perceived as what the leader wants. Until the group has taken some joint action and together observed the outcome of that action, there is not as yet a shared basis for determining whether what the leader wants will turn out to be valid.

For example, if sales begin to decline in a young business, a manager may say, “We must increase advertising” because of her belief that advertising always increases sales. The group, never having experienced this situation before, will hear that assertion as a statement of that manager’s beliefs and values: “She believes that when one is in trouble it is a good thing to
increase advertising.” What the leader initially proposes, therefore, cannot have any status other than a value to be questioned, debated, challenged, and tested.

If the manager convinces the group to act on her belief, the solution works, and the group has a shared perception of that success, then the perceived value that “advertising is good” gradually becomes transformed: first into a shared value or belief and ultimately into a shared assumption (if actions based on it continue to be successful). If this transformation process occurs, group members will tend to forget that originally they were not sure and that the proposed course of action was at an earlier time just a proposal to be debated and confronted.

Not all beliefs and values undergo such transformation. First of all, the solution based on a given value may not work reliably. Only those beliefs and values that can be empirically tested and that continue to work reliably in solving the group’s problems will become transformed into assumptions. Second, certain value domains—those dealing with the less controllable elements of the environment or with aesthetic or moral matters—may not be testable at all. In such cases, consensus through social validation is still possible, but it is not automatic. Third, the strategy/goals of the organization may fall into this category of espoused beliefs in that there may be no way of testing it except through consensus because the link between performance and strategy may be hard to prove.

Social validation means that certain beliefs and values are confirmed only by the shared social experience of a group. For example, any given culture cannot prove that its religion and moral system are superior to another culture’s religion and moral system, but if the members reinforce each others’ beliefs and values, they come to be taken for granted. Those who fail to accept such beliefs and values run the risk of “excommunication”—of being thrown out of the group. The test of whether they work or not is how comfortable and anxiety free members are when they abide by them.

In these realms, the group learns that certain beliefs and values, as initially promulgated by prophets, founders, and leaders, “work” in the sense of reducing uncertainty in critical areas of the group’s functioning. And, as they continue to provide meaning and comfort to group members, they also become transformed into nondiscussible assumptions even though they may not be correlated to actual performance. The espoused beliefs and moral/ethical rules are so well supported that they serve the normative functions of regulating behavior. So, the desired behaviors are locked in as part of organizational culture.

If the beliefs and values are not congruent with performance, we might expect the group to be resistant to the desired behaviors. Schon, 1978, says that people and the organizations record in that way. This is common to organization. Hewitt states that management and leadership are the tools to get ahead.

So in analyzing the leadership problems fully among those are a part of the management's guide performance of the organization, and they look to the future. Our organization may not be mutually concerned about the highest of both, but it is concerned about the highest of both. The group of large and substantial, the organization we understand, and we understand such in hand that’s the pattern, and we say stand more fully.
ethical rules remain conscious and are explicitly articulated because they serve the normative or moral function of guiding members of the group in how to deal with certain key situations, and in training new members how to behave. Such beliefs and values often become embodied in an ideology or organizational philosophy, which then serves as a guide to dealing with the uncertainty of intrinsically uncontrollable or difficult events.

If the beliefs and values that provide meaning and comfort to the group are not congruent with the beliefs and values that correlate with effective performance, we will observe in many organizations espoused values that reflect the desired behavior but are not reflected in observed behavior (Argyris and Schon, 1978, 1996). For example, a company’s ideology may say that it values people and that it has high quality standards for its products, but its actual record in that regard may contradict what it says. In U.S. organizations, it is common to espouse teamwork while actually rewarding individual competitiveness. Hewlett-Packard’s highly touted “The HP Way” espoused consensus management and teamwork, but in its computer division, engineers discovered that to get ahead they had to be competitive and political (Packard, 1995).

So in analyzing espoused beliefs and values, you must discriminate carefully among those that are congruent with the underlying assumptions that guide performance, those that are part of the ideology or philosophy of the organization, and those that are rationalizations or only aspirations for the future. Often espoused beliefs and values are so abstract that they can be mutually contradictory, as when a company claims to be equally concerned about stockholders, employees, and customers, or when it claims both highest quality and lowest cost. Espoused beliefs and values often leave large areas of behavior unexplained, leaving us with a feeling that we understand a piece of the culture but still do not have the culture as such in hand. To get at that deeper level of understanding, to decipher the pattern, and to predict future behavior correctly, we have to understand more fully the category of basic assumptions.

**Basic Underlying Assumptions**

When a solution to a problem works repeatedly, it comes to be taken for granted. What was once a hypothesis, supported only by a hunch or a value, gradually comes to be treated as a reality. We come to believe that nature
really works this way. Basic assumptions, in this sense, are different from what some anthropologists called “dominant value orientations” in that such dominant orientations reflect the preferred solution among several basic alternatives, but all the alternatives are still visible in the culture, and any given member of the culture could, from time to time, behave according to variant as well as dominant orientations (Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, 1961).

Basic assumptions, in the sense defined here, have become so taken for granted that you find little variation within a social unit. This degree of consensus results from repeated success in implementing certain beliefs and values, as previously described. In fact, if a basic assumption comes to be strongly held in a group, members will find behavior based on any other premise inconceivable. For example, in a group whose basic assumption is that the individual’s rights supersede those of the group, members find it inconceivable to commit suicide or in some other way sacrifice themselves to the group even if they had dishonored the group. In a capitalist country, it is inconceivable that anyone might design a business organization to operate consistently at a financial loss or that it does not matter whether or not a product works. In an occupation such as engineering, it is inconceivable to deliberately design something that is unsafe; it is a taken-for-granted assumption that things should be safe. Basic assumptions, in this sense, are similar to what Argyris and Schon identified as “theories-in-use”—the implicit assumptions that actually guide behavior, that tell group members how to perceive, think about, and feel about things (Argyris and Schon, 1974, 1996).

Basic assumptions, like theories-in-use, tend to be nonconfrontable and nondebatable, and hence are extremely difficult to change. To learn something new in this realm requires us to resurrect, reexamine, and possibly change some of the more stable portions of our cognitive structure—a process that Argyris and others have called “double-loop learning,” or “frame breaking” (Argyris, Putnam, and Smith, 1985; Bartunek, 1984). Such learning is intrinsically difficult because the reexamination of basic assumptions temporarily destabilizes our cognitive and interpersonal world, releasing large quantities of basic anxiety.

Rather than tolerating such anxiety levels, we tend to want to perceive the events around us as congruent with our assumptions, even if that means distorting, denying, projecting, or in other ways falsifying to ourselves what may be going on around us. It is in this psychological process that culture has its ultimate impact on us. It tells us what to pay attention to what is going on around us. After we describe what a “thought world” is for ourselves and others who share our values and are vulnerable in similar ways, we will not understand or misinterpret the world.

The human tendency to think, or questioning the world’s fairness. In this sense, a culture of a group, as psychological. We continue to function as members with our self-esteem (Harre, 1981) are, how to believe in ourselves. Recognizing that such culture is so an.

To illustrate the following case of a student in education, that she was being offered an opportunity, how to observe the behavior of others. We observe people to interpret their lives as a problem.” We press, “the work at home.”
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are different from
assumptions” in that
among several basic
assumptions of a culture, and any
type of culture according to
(Neologit, 1961).
people can become so taken for
granted. This degree of
assumed beliefs and
assumptions comes to be
inconceivable to
members find it
insufferable to
sacrifice themselves
in a capitalist country, it
organization to operations, whether or not a
member, under the grants assumption,
the case, are similar to
implicit assumptions
about how to perceive, (Hatch and Schultz, 2004).
are confrontable and
be confronted. To learn some-
structure—a process
“shirking,” or “frame
Such learning
basic assumptions
world, releasing
want to perceive
if that means
ourselves what
ness that culture
has its ultimate power. Culture as a set of basic assumptions defines for
us what to pay attention to, what things mean, how to react emotionally
to what is going on, and what actions to take in various kinds of situations. After we have developed an integrated set of such assumptions—a
“thought world” or “mental map”—we will be maximally comfortable with
others who share the same set of assumptions and very uncomfortable and
vulnerable in situations where different assumptions operate because either
we will not understand what is going on, or, worse, we will misperceive and
misinterpret the actions of others (Douglas, 1986; Bushe, 2009).
The human mind needs cognitive stability. Therefore, any challenge
or questioning of a basic assumption will release anxiety and defensive-
ness. In this sense, the shared basic assumptions that make up the
culture of a group can be thought of both at the individual and group level
as psychological cognitive defense mechanisms that permit the group to
continue to function. At the same time, culture at this level provides its
members with a basic sense of identity and defines the values that provide
self-esteem (Hatch and Schultz, 2004). Cultures tell their members who they
are, how to behave toward each other, and how to feel good about them-
se. Recognizing these critical functions makes us aware why “changing”
culture is so anxiety provoking.

To illustrate how unconscious assumptions can distort data, consider
the following example. If we assume, on the basis of past experience or
education, that other people will take advantage of us whenever they have
an opportunity, we expect to be taken advantage of, and we then interpret
the behavior of others in a way that coincides with those expectations.
We observe people sitting in a seemingly idle posture at their desk and
interpret their behavior as “loafing” rather than “thinking out an important
problem.” We perceive absence from work as “shirking” rather than “doing
work at home.”

If this is not only a personal assumption but also one that is shared
and thus part of the culture of an organization, we will discuss with others what
to do about our “lazy” workforce and institute tight controls to ensure that
people are at their desks and busy. If employees suggest that they do some
of their work at home, we will be uncomfortable and probably deny the
request because we will figure that at home they would loaf (Bailey, 1992;
In contrast, if we assume that everyone is highly motivated and competent, we will act in accordance with that assumption by encouraging people to work at their own pace and in their own way. If we see someone sitting quietly at their desk, we will assume that they are thinking or planning. If someone is discovered to be unproductive in such an organization, we will assume that there is a mismatch between the person and the job assignment, not that the person is lazy or incompetent. If employees want to work at home, we will perceive that as evidence of their wanting to be productive.

In both cases, there is the potential for distortion, in that the cynical manager will not perceive how highly motivated some of the subordinates really are, and the idealistic manager will not perceive that there are subordinates who are lazy and are taking advantage of the situation. As McGregor noted many decades ago, such assumptions about “human nature” become the basis of management and control systems that perpetuate themselves because if people are treated consistently in terms of certain basic assumptions, they come eventually to behave according to those assumptions to make their world stable and predictable (1960).

Unconscious assumptions sometimes lead to ridiculously tragic situations, as illustrated by a common problem experienced by U.S. supervisors in some Asian countries. A manager who comes from a U.S. pragmatic tradition assumes and takes it for granted that solving a problem always has the highest priority. When that manager encounters a subordinate who comes from a cultural tradition in which good relationships and protecting the superior’s “face” are assumed to have top priority, the following scenario has often resulted.

The manager proposes a solution to a given problem. The subordinate knows that the solution will not work, but his unconscious assumption requires that he remain silent because to tell the boss that the proposed solution is wrong is a threat to the boss’s face. It would not even occur to the subordinate to do anything other than remain silent or, if the boss were to inquire what the subordinate thought, to even reassure the boss to go ahead and take the action.

The action is taken, the results are negative, and the boss, somewhat surprised and puzzled, asks the subordinate what he would have done or would he have done something different. This question puts the subordinate into an impossible situation. The boss is a face-saving person. He cannot afford to admit that he made a mistake. Therefore, he pretends he is the face that is not being saved. He then disorders the relationship by asking the subordinate, who cannot help him because he cannot perceive that he is giving bad advice, to advise him how he would have handled the situation.

If an employee who is being asked to advise their boss can say, “I think you should do X,” the boss will take that advice as a reflection of the subordinate’s face-saving activity. The boss, who is still looking for answers, then asks the subordinate to do X. It is only a matter of time before the subordinate’s face is saved, and the boss’s face is punished. If the employee were to say, “I think you shouldn’t do X,” the boss would then ask, “Why don’t you do that? I need your advice.” The subordinate does not say that X is not helpful, but that the problem should not be approached in the way that the boss has. It would only take a few minutes to figure that out and get started again. Instead, after a long discussion, the employee should say, “If you want my advice, you probably should approach this differently. Maybe we should...” The employee then leaves the boss to solve the problem by himself or with someone else.

If an employee were to say, “I think you should do X,” the boss would say, “I agree. I think we should do X.” The employee, who knows the boss’s face is not being saved, would say, “I agree. I think we should do X.” The boss then asks, “How do we do that?” The subordinate would say, “We can’t do that.” The boss, who is now very upset, asks, “Why not?” The subordinate would say, “Because it’s not possible.” The boss, who is still not paying attention, asks, “Why not?” The subordinate would say, “Because it’s not possible.” The process then repeats itself until the boss either agrees or disagrees and the subordinate’s and the boss’s faces are saved.
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an impossible double bind because the answer itself is a threat to the boss's face. He cannot possibly explain his behavior without committing the very sin he was trying to avoid in the first place—namely, embarrassing the boss. He may even lie at this point and argue that what the boss did was right and only "bad luck" or uncontrollable circumstances prevented it from succeeding.

From the point of view of the subordinate, the boss's behavior is incomprehensible because to ask the subordinate what he would have done shows lack of self-pride, possibly causing the subordinate to lose respect for that boss. To the boss, the subordinate's behavior is equally incomprehensible. He cannot develop any sensible explanation of his subordinate's behavior that is not cynically colored by the assumption that the subordinate at some level just does not care about effective performance and therefore must be gotten rid of. It never occurs to the boss that another assumption—such as "you never embarrass a superior"—is operating, and that, to the subordinate, that assumption is even more powerful than "you get the job done."

If assumptions such as these operate only in an individual and represent her idiosyncratic experience, they can be corrected more easily because the person will detect that she is alone in holding a given assumption. The power of culture comes about through the fact that the assumptions are shared and, therefore, mutually reinforced. In these instances, probably only a third party or some cross-cultural experiences could help to find common ground whereby both parties could bring their implicit assumptions to the surface. And even after they have surfaced, such assumptions would still operate, forcing the boss and the subordinate to invent a whole new communication mechanism that would permit each to remain congruent with his or her culture—for example, agreeing that, before any decision is made and before the boss has stuck his neck out, the subordinate will be asked for suggestions and for factual data that would not be face threatening. Note that the solution has to keep each cultural assumption intact. We cannot, in these instances, simply declare one or the other cultural assumption "wrong." We have to find a third assumption to allow them both to retain their integrity.

I have dwelt on this long example to illustrate the potency of implicit, unconscious assumptions and to show that such assumptions often deal with fundamental aspects of life—the nature of time and space; human
nature and human activities; the nature of truth and how we discover it; the correct way for the individual and the group to relate to each other; the relative importance of work, family, and self-development; the proper role of men and women; and the nature of the family.

These kinds of assumptions form the core of macrocultures and will be discussed in detail in Part II, The Dimensions of Culture. We do not develop new assumptions about each of these areas in every group or organization we join. Members of any new group will bring their own cultural learning from prior groups, from their education, and from their socialization into occupational communities, but as the new group develops its own shared history, it will develop modified or new assumptions in critical areas of its experience. It is those new assumptions that then make up the culture of that particular group.

**Summary and Conclusions**

Any group’s culture can be studied at three levels—the level of its artifacts, the level of its espoused beliefs and values, and the level of its basic underlying assumptions. If you do not decipher the pattern of basic assumptions that may be operating, you will not know how to interpret the artifacts correctly or how much credence to give to the espoused values. In other words, the essence of a culture lies in the pattern of basic underlying assumptions, and after you understand those, you can easily understand the other more surface levels and deal appropriately with them.

Though the essence of a group’s culture is its pattern of shared, basic taken-for-granted assumptions, the culture will manifest itself at the level of observable artifacts and shared espoused values, norms, and rules of behavior. In analyzing cultures, it is important to recognize that artifacts are easy to observe but difficult to decipher and that espoused beliefs and values may only reflect rationalizations or aspirations. To understand a group’s culture, you must attempt to get at its shared basic assumptions and understand the learning process by which such basic assumptions evolve.

Leadership is originally the source of the beliefs and values that get a group moving in dealing with its internal and external problems. If what leaders propose works and continues to work, what once were only the leader’s assumptions gradually come to be shared assumptions. When a set
of shared basic assumptions is formed by this process, it defines the character and identity of the group and can function as a cognitive defense mechanism both for the individual members and for the group as a whole. In other words, individuals and groups seek stability and meaning. Once achieved, it is easier to distort new data by denial, projection, rationalization, or various other defense mechanisms than to change the basic assumption. As we will see, culture change, in the sense of changing basic assumptions, is difficult, time-consuming, and highly anxiety-provoking—a point that is especially relevant for the leader who sets out to change the culture of an organization.

The most central issue for leaders is to understand the deeper levels of a culture, to assess the functionality of the assumptions made at that level, and to deal with the anxiety that is unleashed when those assumptions are challenged.