

Influential Article Review - Theoretical Grounds for The Study Of Psychology in the Context of Organizations

Leticia Palmer

Joseph Maldonado

Charlie Hines

This paper examines psychology. We present insights from a highly influential paper. Here are the highlights from this paper: This article provides an introduction to evolutionary psychology and its relevance to organizational design theory and practice. Evolutionary psychology assumes that human nature reflect adaptations to an ancestral environment that was intensely social, but differed profoundly from modern organizations in scale and complexity. Further, organizational structures and cultures co-evolved with human nature to deal with the different environmental challenges early humans faced. In this article, I present a concise review of the theoretical foundations of evolutionary psychology and convey how evolutionary psychology hypotheses about organizational design, culture, and leadership in organizations can be developed and tested. I also provide some directions for future research in this area and discuss implications for designing organizations that are perhaps better aligned with human nature than current structures. For our overseas readers, we then present the insights from this paper in Spanish, French, Portuguese, and German.

SUMMARY

- Mismatches in organizations. Modern organizations are in many ways different from the small-scale societies in which humans evolved, especially regarding their scale and complexity .
- Appeal of non-hierarchical organizations. One manifestation of mismatch is that there is a popular dislike for hierarchical structures in work organizations. Non-hierarchical organizations, as embodied in open production communities, like Linux or Wikipedia, and boss-less organizations such as W.L.Gore, Semco, or Valve Software enjoy a great deal of popularity despite their relative numbers and size .
- Leadership. Following a leader is an adaptive solution to ancestral coordination challenges . Extrapolating from current hunter-gatherers, leadership in the EEA was informal, charismatic, and domain-specific. For example, people followed a more aggressive leader during wartime and a younger leader during change. Such heuristics still affect humans today.
- Decision-making biases. A different mismatch pertains to decision-making biases in organizations. In an ancestral environment with plenty of dangers, humans evolved psychological mechanisms to make fast decisions. A decision rule such as «follow the individual that appears confident» was usually backed up by information about a person's competence as everyone knew each other well.

- Cultural evolution. Gene-culture coevolution models may shed light on the emergence of different organizational designs and cultures. Co-evolutionary models hypothesize that different social structures arise from the same evolved individual psychological mechanisms responding to different environmental cues.
- Multilevel selection in markets. Multilevel selection theory makes predictions about trade-offs and consequences of within-firm versus between-firm competition. Competition among firms has been suggested to reflect the ruthless logic of the Darwinian selection. A free market is a struggle for survival where successful firms survive and unsuccessful ones die out. This fits with the views of Adam Smith's invisible hand that economic actors are primarily self-interested.
- Reciprocity and kin selection. Humans cooperate with each other based on either kinship or reciprocity. Nowadays, many people work in organizations with genetic strangers, so reciprocity is an important force. A suite of social emotions guide people in prioritizing their goals and actions in such cooperative arrangements. One example is in teamwork. People experience anger when working in an organization that fails to reciprocate their cooperative actions.
- Sexual selection in the work place. A final example of applying evolutionary insights to the work place is offered by sexual selection theory. Unlike in small-scale societies where division of labor among the sexes was common—the men were generally hunters and the women gatherers —many organizations now have a gender-diverse work force.

HIGHLY INFLUENTIAL ARTICLE

We used the following article as a basis of our evaluation:

Van Vugt, M. (2017). Evolutionary psychology: theoretical foundations for the study of organizations. *Journal of Organization Design*, 6(1), 1–16.

This is the link to the publisher's website:

<https://jorgdesign.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/s41469-017-0019-9>

INTRODUCTION

W.L. Gore and associates is an international manufacturing company with over 10,000 employees worldwide and an annual revenue of 3.2 billion dollars, which is best known for the development of waterproof, breathable fabrics. Less well known is their unique organizational structure and philosophy. When successful units reach the size of about 150–200 employees, the unit splits in two equal parts, occupying adjacent buildings. There are no managers or workers at Gore company, every employee is an associate. In choosing a new CEO, the company invites nominations from the associates and the candidate that attracts the most followers gets the job. All important company decisions are democratic, consensual, and peer-reviewed. Gore and associates' features are frequently on the list of "most desirable companies to work for", and overall job satisfaction is high, and job turnover, low.

Gore's organizational structure may seem unusual to modern standards, but it reflects the social structure of ancestral humans who lived as hunter-gatherers in small-scale, egalitarian societies (Von Rueden and Van Vugt, 2015). In fact, humans spent approximately 99% of their history as a species, living in small, semi-nomadic bands with no formal leaders, no permanent hierarchies, and little or no wealth or power differences between members. Evolutionary psychologists argue that (a) such structures reflect adaptations to particular environmental challenges that early humans faced and (b) human nature has been shaped by the challenges of living in these small-scale societies (Buss, 2015). Both these elements have implications for organizational design, culture, and decision-making.

This article serves as a primer on evolutionary psychology for scholars in organization design and culture). In the following sections, I provide a brief history of evolutionary psychology and why it is relevant to study organizations. I then discuss the key assumptions of evolutionary psychology and some

of its key theories and constructs as they are relevant to organizations. Building on this foundation, I will then illustrate how evolutionary psychology can be used as a heuristic framework for developing hypotheses and designing empirical research programs. I conclude by outlining some implications for organizational design and offer directions for future research. Organizational scholars have used evolutionary models before, for instance, to explain how firms adapt successfully to changing environments (Dekkers, 2005). Evolutionary psychology goes one step further by assuming that organizational structures are manifestations of a deeper psychology that was selected for by evolution as it enabled humans to respond adaptively to different environmental challenges. My approach in this primer is to shed light on how evolution via natural selection might have shaped the psychological foundations of organizational actors, thereby influencing aspects of organizational design and culture.

Organizations have been a part of human history for at least several millions of years. Like all primates, humans live in groups, although human groups tend to be larger and socially more complex. Our nearest relative, the common chimpanzee—with whom humans share a common ancestor some 5–7 million years ago—lives in groups of 30–50 individuals. Early humans tended to have group sizes that were substantially larger, around 50–150 individuals, but not nearly the size of modern complex societies (Foley, 1997). Although organizational structures do not fossilize, we know a lot about our ancestral past through studying current hunter-gatherer societies and through recent advances in knowledge from archeology, anthropology, behavioral genetics, neuroscience, evolutionary biology, and evolutionary psychology (Von Rueden and Van Vugt, 2015). Together, they paint a reliable picture of how human psychology and behavior evolved and in what kind of societies they evolved.

CONCLUSION

Evolutionary psychology has evolved as a separate field of inquiry from the study of organizations, yet this need no longer be. To the extent that organizational structures and cultures are manifestations of human nature, responding adaptively to different environmental challenges, evolutionary psychologists have a lot to offer. Evolutionary psychology not only generates many novel hypotheses about organizational design but it also offers a richness of methods such as comparative approaches, cross-cultural methods, and organizational neuroscience techniques. By understanding how our small-scale social psychology operates in modern organizations, we may be able to figure out how we can design organizations that are perhaps better aligned with our nature than the current structures in which modern humans live and work.

APPENDIX

TABLE 1

EXAMPLES OF THEORIES AND METHODS FROM EVOLUTIONARY PSYCHOLOGY CONTRIBUTING TO THE STUDY OF ORGANIZATIONS

Research question	Evolutionary theory	Evolved mechanism	Methodology
Do family businesses perform better in certain markets? How do organizations manage nepotistic biases?	Kin selection	People trust and cooperate with kin more than non-kin	1. Comparing family businesses with corporations 2. Simulations 3. Genetics
Do people dislike working in steep hierarchical structures?	Mismatch	People have a small-scale social psychology	1. Surveys in organizations 2. Psychological experiments 3. Anthropological records
Are organizations in new, competitive markets more egalitarian?	Multilevel selection	People invest more in group when competition between groups is strong	1. Models and simulations 2. Case studies 3. Archeological data
Do more entrepreneurial leaders create more entrepreneurial organizational cultures?	Cultural evolution	People copy the behavior of high-prestige models	1. Psychological studies 2. Neuroscience 3. Organizational surveys
Are there more sexual relationships and sexual conflicts and harassment in gender-diverse work places, based on particular sex ratios?	Sexual selection	People compete with the same sex rivals for the opposite sex	1. Psychological experiments 2. Comparative organizational studies

REFERENCES

- Barkow, J. H., Cosmides, L., & Tooby, J. (Eds.). (1992). *The adapted mind: evolutionary psychology and the generation of culture*. Oxford university Press.
- Boehm, C. (1999). *Hierarchy in the forest*. London: Harvard University Press
- Brosnan SF, Newton-Fisher NE, Van Vugt M (2009) A melding of minds: when primatology meets personality and social psychology. *Personal Soc Psychol Rev* 13:129–147
- Browne KR (2006) Sex, power, and dominance: the evolutionary psychology of sexual harassment. *Manag Decis Econ* 27:145–158
- Buss, D., (2015). *Evolutionary psychology: The new science of the mind*. Psychology Press.
- Colarelli, S. M., & Arvey, R. D. (Eds.). (2015). *The biological foundations of organizational behavior*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago
- Cosmides, L. and Tooby, J., (1997). *Evolutionary psychology: A primer*. Webpage: <http://www.cep.ucsb.edu/primer.html>.
- Dawkins R (2009) *The greatest show on earth: the evidence for evolution*. Free Press, New York
- Dekkers, R. (2005). (R) *Evolution: Organizations and the Dynamics of the Environment*. Springer Science & Business Media, New York
- Dunbar RM (2003) *The social brain: mind, language, and society in evolutionary perspective*. *Annu Rev Anthropol* 32:163–181
- Ebstein RP (2006) *The molecular genetic architecture of human personality: beyond self-report questionnaires*. *Mol Psychiatry* 11(5):427–445
- Ethiraj SK, Levinthal D (2004) *Bounded rationality and the search for organizational architecture: an evolutionary perspective on the design of organizations and their evolvability*. *Adm Sci Q* 49(3):404–437
- Foley RA (1997) *The adaptive legacy of human evolution: a search for the environment of evolutionary adaptedness*. *Evol Anthropol* 4:194–203
- Gavrilets, S., Auerbach, J., & Van Vugt, M. (2016). *Convergence to consensus in heterogeneous groups and the emergence of informal leadership*. *Sci Rep* 6:29704
- Griskevicius V, Cantu SM, Van Vugt M (2012) *The evolutionary bases for sustainable behavior: implications for marketing, policy, and social entrepreneurship*. *J Public Policy Mark* 31:115–128

- Hagen, E. H. (2005). Controversial issues in evolutionary psychology. *Handb Evol Psychol* 145-173
- Henrich J, Gil-White F (2001) The evolution of prestige: freely conferred deference as a mechanism for enhancing the benefits of cultural transmission. *Evol Hum Behav* 22:165–196
- Henrich J, Heine SJ, Norenzayan A (2010) The weirdest people in the world? *Behav Brain Sci* 33:61–83
- Hooper PL, Kaplan HS, Boone JL (2010) A theory of leadership in human cooperative groups. *J Theor Biol* 265:633–646
- Johnson, D. D. P., Price, M. E., & Van Vugt, M. (2013). Darwin’s invisible hand: market competition, evolution and the firm. *J Econ Behav Organ* 90 pp. S128–140
- Josephs RA, Sellers JG, Newman ML, Metha P (2006) The mismatch effect: when testosterone and status are at odds. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 90:999–1013
- Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. Macmillan, New York
- Laland KN, Odling-Smee J, Feldman MW (2000) Niche construction, biological evolution and cultural change. *Behav Brain Sci* 23:131–175
- Laland, K. N., & Brown, G. R. (2011). *Sense and nonsense: Evolutionary perspectives on human behaviour*. Oxford University Press, Oxford
- Li YJ, Kenrick DT, Griskevicius V, Neuberg SL (2012) Economic decision biases and fundamental motivations: how mating and self-protection alter loss aversion. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 102(3):550
- Lieberman N, Klar Y (1996) Hypothesis testing in Wason's selection task: social exchange cheating detection or task understanding. *Cognition* 58(1):127–156
- Nicholson N (1997) Evolutionary psychology: toward a new view of human nature and organizational society. *Hum Relat* 50:1053–1078
- Nicholson N (1998) Seven deadly syndromes of management and organization: the view from evolutionary psychology. *Manag Decis Econ* 19:411–426
- Pierce BM, White R (1999) The evolution of social structure: why biology matters. *Acad Manag Rev* 24:843–853
- Pinker, S., (2015). The false allure of group selection. *The handbook of evolutionary psychology*. pp 867–880
- Powers ST, Lehman L (2013) The coevolution of social institutions, demography and large-scale human cooperation. *Ecol Lett* 16:1356–1364
- Puranam P, Alexy O, Reitzig M (2014) What’s “new” about new forms of organizing? *Acad Manag Rev* 39(2):162–180
- Puranam P, Håkansson DD (2015) Valve’s way. *J Organ Des* 4(2):2–4
- Richerson PJ, Boyd R (2005) *Not by genes alone: how culture transformed human evolution*. Chicago University Press, Chicago
- Saad, G. (2011). *Evolutionary Psychology in the Business Sciences*. Springer, New York
- Sear R, Lawson DW, Dickins TE (2007) Synthesis in the human evolutionary behavioural sciences. *J Evol Psychol* 5(1):3–28
- Shane, S. (2010). *Born Entrepreneurs, Born Leaders*. Oxford University Press, Oxford
- Sherman GD, Lerner JS, Josephs RA, Renshon J, Gross JJ (2016) The interaction of testosterone and cortisol is associated with attained status in male executives. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 110(6):921
- Spence M (1973) Job market signaling. *Q J Econ* 87(3):355–374
- Spisak BR, O’Brien MJ, Nicholson N, Van Vugt M (2015) Niche construction and the evolution of leadership. *Acad Manag Rev* 40:291–306
- Tinbergen N (1963) On aims and methods of ethology. *Ethology* 20(4):410–433
- Tooby J, Cosmides L (2015) Conceptual foundations of evolutionary psychology. In: Buss D (ed) *Handbook of evolutionary psychology*, pp 5–67
- Tyler T, Lind EA (1992) A relational model of authority in groups. *Adv Exp Soc Psychol* 25:115–191
- Van Vugt M, Ahuja A (2010) *Naturally selected: why some people lead, why others follow, and why it matters*. Profile, London
- Van Vugt M, Grabo AE (2015) The many faces of leadership: an evolutionary-psychology approach. *Curr Dir Psychol Sci* 24:6484–6489

- Van Vugt M, Hogan R, Kaiser R (2008) Leadership, followership, and evolution: some lessons from the past. *Am Psychol* 63:182–196
- Van Vugt M, Ronay R (2014) The evolutionary psychology of leadership: theory, review, and roadmap. *Organ Psychol Rev* 4:74–95
- Van Vugt, M., & Kameda, T (2012). Evolution and groups. In J. Levine (Ed.). *Handbook of Group Processes*. Psychology Press, Hove
- van Vugt, M., & Tybur, J. M. (2015). The evolutionary foundations of status hierarchy. *Handb Evol Psychol* (2):788–809
- Von Rueden, C., & Van Vugt, M. (2015). Leadership in small-scale societies: Some implications for theory, research, and practice. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 26(6), pp 978–990
- Wilson DS, Ostrom E, Cox ME (2013) Generalizing the core design principles for the efficacy of groups. *J Econ Behav Organ* 90:S21–S32
- Wilson DS, Van Vugt M, O’Gorman R (2008) Multilevel selection theory and major evolutionary transitions: implications for psychological science. *Curr Dir Psychol Sci* 17:6–9
- Wilson, D. S., & Wilson, E. O. (2007). Rethinking the theoretical foundation of sociobiology. *The Quarterly review of biology*, 82(4), 327–348.
- Zhang Z, Zyphur MJ, Narayanan J, Arvey RD, Chaturvedi S, Avolio BJ et al (2009) The genetic basis of entrepreneurship: effects of gender and personality. *Organ Behav Hum Decis Process* 110(2):93–107

TRANSLATED VERSION: SPANISH

Below is a rough translation of the insights presented above. This was done to give a general understanding of the ideas presented in the paper. Please excuse any grammatical mistakes and do not hold the original authors responsible for these mistakes.

VERSION TRADUCIDA: ESPAÑOL

A continuación se muestra una traducción aproximada de las ideas presentadas anteriormente. Esto se hizo para dar una comprensión general de las ideas presentadas en el documento. Por favor, disculpe cualquier error gramatical y no responsabilite a los autores originales de estos errores.

INTRODUCCIÓN

W.L. Gore and associates es una empresa de fabricación internacional con más de 10.000 empleados en todo el mundo y un ingreso anual de 3.200 millones de dólares, que es más conocido por el desarrollo de tejidos impermeables y transpirables. Menos conocido es su estructura organizativa única y su filosofía. Cuando las unidades exitosas alcanzan el tamaño de unos 150-200 empleados, la unidad se divide en dos partes iguales, ocupando edificios adyacentes. No hay gerentes ni trabajadores en la compañía Gore, cada empleado es un asociado. Al elegir un nuevo CEO, la empresa invita a las nominaciones de los asociados y el candidato que atrae a más seguidores consigue el trabajo. Todas las decisiones importantes de la empresa son democráticas, consensuadas y revisadas por pares. Gore y las características de los asociados están frecuentemente en la lista de "empresas más deseables para trabajar", y la satisfacción general del trabajo es alta, y la rotación del trabajo, baja.

La estructura organizativa de Gore puede parecer inusual para los estándares modernos, pero refleja la estructura social de los seres humanos ancestrales que vivían como cazadores-recolectores en sociedades igualitarias a pequeña escala (Von Rueden y Van Vugt, 2015). De hecho, los humanos pasaron aproximadamente el 99% de su historia como especie, viviendo en pequeñas bandas semi-nómadas sin líderes formales, sin jerarquías permanentes, y poca o ninguna diferencia de riqueza o poder entre los miembros. Los psicólogos evolutivos sostienen que (a) tales estructuras reflejan adaptaciones a desafíos ambientales particulares a los que se enfrentaron los primeros seres humanos y b) la naturaleza humana ha

sido moldeada por los desafíos de vivir en estas sociedades a pequeña escala (Buss, 2015). Ambos elementos tienen implicaciones para el diseño organizacional, la cultura y la toma de decisiones.

Este artículo sirve como un primer sobre la psicología evolutiva para los estudiosos en el diseño de la organización y la cultura). En las siguientes secciones, proporciono una breve historia de la psicología evolutiva y por qué es relevante para estudiar organizaciones. Luego analizo los supuestos clave de la psicología evolutiva y algunas de sus teorías y construcciones clave, ya que son relevantes para las organizaciones. Basándome en esta base, ilustraré cómo la psicología evolutiva puede ser utilizada como un marco heurístico para desarrollar hipótesis y diseñar programas de investigación empírica. Concluyo delineando algunas implicaciones para el diseño organizacional y ofrezco orientaciones para futuras investigaciones. Los académicos de la organización han utilizado modelos evolutivos antes, por ejemplo, para explicar cómo las empresas se adaptan con éxito a los entornos cambiantes (Dekkers, 2005). La psicología evolutiva va un paso más allá al asumir que las estructuras organizativas son manifestaciones de una psicología más profunda que fue seleccionada por la evolución, ya que permitió a los seres humanos responder adaptativamente a diferentes desafíos ambientales. Mi enfoque en esta imprimación es arrojar luz sobre cómo la evolución a través de la selección natural podría haber dado forma a los fundamentos psicológicos de los actores organizacionales, influyendo así en aspectos del diseño organizacional y la cultura.

Las organizaciones han sido parte de la historia humana durante al menos varios millones de años. Como todos los primates, los seres humanos viven en grupos, aunque los grupos humanos tienden a ser más grandes y socialmente más complejos. Nuestro pariente más cercano, el chimpancé común —con quien los humanos comparten un ancestro común hace unos 5-7 millones de años— vive en grupos de 30-50 individuos. Los primeros seres humanos tendían a tener tamaños de grupo que eran sustancialmente más grandes, alrededor de 50-150 individuos, pero no casi el tamaño de las sociedades complejas modernas (Foley, 1997). Aunque las estructuras organizativas no se fosilizan, sabemos mucho sobre nuestro pasado ancestral a través del estudio de las sociedades actuales de cazadores-recolectores y a través de avances recientes en conocimientos de arqueología, antropología, genética conductual, neurociencia, biología evolutiva y psicología evolutiva (Von Rueden y Van Vugt, 2015). Juntos, pintan un panorama confiable de cómo evolucionó la psicología y el comportamiento humanos y en qué tipo de sociedades evolucionaron.

CONCLUSIÓN

La psicología evolutiva ha evolucionado como un campo de investigación separado del estudio de las organizaciones, sin embargo, esta necesidad ya no es. En la medida en que las estructuras y culturas organizativas son manifestaciones de la naturaleza humana, respondiendo adaptativamente a diferentes desafíos ambientales, los psicólogos evolutivos tienen mucho que ofrecer. La psicología evolutiva no sólo genera muchas hipótesis novedosas sobre el diseño organizacional, sino que también ofrece una riqueza de métodos como enfoques comparativos, métodos interculturales y técnicas de neurociencia organizacional. Al entender cómo funciona nuestra psicología social a pequeña escala en las organizaciones modernas, podemos ser capaces de averiguar cómo podemos diseñar organizaciones que tal vez estén mejor alineadas con nuestra naturaleza que las estructuras actuales en las que los seres humanos modernos viven y trabajan.

TRANSLATED VERSION: FRENCH

Below is a rough translation of the insights presented above. This was done to give a general understanding of the ideas presented in the paper. Please excuse any grammatical mistakes and do not hold the original authors responsible for these mistakes.

VERSION TRADUITE: FRANÇAIS

Voici une traduction approximative des idées présentées ci-dessus. Cela a été fait pour donner une compréhension générale des idées présentées dans le document. Veuillez excuser toutes les erreurs grammaticales et ne pas tenir les auteurs originaux responsables de ces erreurs.

INTRODUCTION

W.L. Gore and associates est une entreprise de fabrication internationale avec plus de 10.000 employés dans le monde entier et un chiffre d'affaires annuel de 3,2 milliards de dollars, qui est surtout connu pour le développement de l'eau imperméable, tissus respirables. Leur structure organisationnelle et leur philosophie sont moins connues. Lorsque les unités qui réussissent atteignent la taille d'environ 150 à 200 employés, l'unité se divise en deux parties égales, occupant des bâtiments adjacents. Il n'y a pas de gestionnaires ou de travailleurs à l'entreprise Gore, chaque employé est un associé. En choisissant un nouveau PDG, l'entreprise invite les candidatures des associés et le candidat qui attire le plus d'adeptes obtient le poste. Toutes les décisions importantes de l'entreprise sont démocratiques, consensuelles et évaluées par les pairs. Les caractéristiques de Gore et des associés figurent fréquemment sur la liste des « entreprises les plus désirables pour lesquelles travailler », et la satisfaction globale au travail est élevée, et le roulement de l'emploi est faible.

La structure organisationnelle de Gore peut sembler inhabituelle aux normes modernes, mais elle reflète la structure sociale des humains ancestraux qui ont vécu comme chasseurs-cueilleurs dans de petites sociétés égalitaires (Von Rueden et Van Vugt, 2015). En fait, les humains ont passé environ 99 % de leur histoire en tant qu'espèce, vivant dans de petites bandes semi-nomades sans dirigeants officiels, sans hiérarchies permanentes, et peu ou pas de différences de richesse ou de pouvoir entre les membres. Les psychologues évolutionnistes soutiennent que a) ces structures reflètent des adaptations à des défis environnementaux particuliers auxquels les premiers humains ont été confrontés et b) la nature humaine a été façonnée par les défis de la vie dans ces petites sociétés (Buss, 2015). Ces deux éléments ont des répercussions sur la conception organisationnelle, la culture et la prise de décisions.

Cet article sert d'introduction sur la psychologie évolutive pour les chercheurs dans la conception d'organisation et la culture). Dans les sections suivantes, je donne une brève histoire de la psychologie évolutionniste et pourquoi il est pertinent d'étudier les organisations. Je discute ensuite des hypothèses clés de la psychologie évolutionniste et de certaines de ses principales théories et constructions telles qu'elles sont pertinentes pour les organisations. S'appuyant sur cette base, je vais ensuite illustrer comment la psychologie évolutionniste peut être utilisée comme un cadre heuristique pour développer des hypothèses et concevoir des programmes de recherche empirique. Je conclus en exposant certaines implications pour la conception organisationnelle et en proposant des orientations pour la recherche future. Les spécialistes de l'organisation ont déjà utilisé des modèles évolutifs pour expliquer comment les entreprises s'adaptent avec succès à l'évolution des environnements (Dekkers, 2005). La psychologie évolutionniste va plus loin en supposant que les structures organisationnelles sont les manifestations d'une psychologie plus profonde qui a été choisie par l'évolution car elle a permis aux humains de répondre de façon adaptative aux différents défis environnementaux. Mon approche dans cette amorce est de faire la lumière sur la façon dont l'évolution par la sélection naturelle pourrait avoir façonné les fondements psychologiques des acteurs organisationnels, influençant ainsi les aspects de la conception organisationnelle et de la culture.

Les organisations font partie de l'histoire de l'humanité depuis au moins plusieurs millions d'années. Comme tous les primates, les humains vivent en groupes, bien que les groupes humains aient tendance à être plus grands et socialement plus complexes. Notre parent le plus proche, le chimpanzé commun, avec lequel les humains partagent un ancêtre commun il y a environ 5 à 7 millions d'années – vit en groupes de 30 à 50 individus. Les premiers humains avaient tendance à avoir des groupes beaucoup plus grands, environ 50 à 150 individus, mais pas presque la taille des sociétés complexes modernes (Foley, 1997). Bien que les structures organisationnelles ne se fossilisent pas, nous en savons beaucoup sur notre passé ancestral en étudiant les sociétés actuelles de chasseurs-cueilleurs et grâce aux progrès récents des connaissances de l'archéologie, de l'anthropologie, de la génétique comportementale, des neurosciences, de la biologie

évolutive et de la psychologie évolutive (Von Rueden et Van Vugt, 2015). Ensemble, ils brossent un tableau fiable de l'évolution de la psychologie et du comportement humains et de l'évolution des sociétés.

CONCLUSION

La psychologie évolutionniste a évolué comme un domaine d'enquête distinct de l'étude des organisations, mais cela ne doit plus être. Dans la mesure où les structures organisationnelles et les cultures sont des manifestations de la nature humaine, répondant de manière adaptative aux différents défis environnementaux, les psychologues évolutionnistes ont beaucoup à offrir. La psychologie évolutive génère non seulement de nombreuses hypothèses nouvelles sur la conception organisationnelle, mais elle offre également une richesse de méthodes telles que les approches comparatives, les méthodes interculturelles et les techniques de neurosciences organisationnelles. En comprenant comment notre psychologie sociale à petite échelle fonctionne dans les organisations modernes, nous pouvons être en mesure de comprendre comment nous pouvons concevoir des organisations qui sont peut-être mieux alignés avec notre nature que les structures actuelles dans lesquelles les humains modernes vivent et travaillent.

TRANSLATED VERSION: GERMAN

Below is a rough translation of the insights presented above. This was done to give a general understanding of the ideas presented in the paper. Please excuse any grammatical mistakes and do not hold the original authors responsible for these mistakes.

ÜBERSETZTE VERSION: DEUTSCH

Hier ist eine ungefähre Übersetzung der oben vorgestellten Ideen. Dies wurde getan, um ein allgemeines Verständnis der in dem Dokument vorgestellten Ideen zu vermitteln. Bitte entschuldigen Sie alle grammatikalischen Fehler und machen Sie die ursprünglichen Autoren nicht für diese Fehler verantwortlich.

EINLEITUNG

W.L. Gore und Associates ist ein internationales Produktionsunternehmen mit über 10.000 Mitarbeitern weltweit und einem Jahresumsatz von 3,2 Milliarden Dollar, der vor allem für die Entwicklung wasserdichter, atmungsaktiver Stoffe bekannt ist. Weniger bekannt ist ihre einzigartige Organisationsstruktur und Philosophie. Wenn erfolgreiche Einheiten die Größe von etwa 150 bis 200 Mitarbeitern erreichen, teilt sich die Einheit in zwei gleiche Teile auf und besetzt angrenzende Gebäude. Es gibt keine Manager oder Mitarbeiter bei Gore Company, jeder Mitarbeiter ist ein Mitarbeiter. Bei der Wahl eines neuen CEO lädt das Unternehmen Nominierungen von den Mitarbeitern ein und der Kandidat, der die meisten Follower anzieht, bekommt den Job. Alle wichtigen Unternehmensentscheidungen sind demokratisch, einvernehmlich und von Experten begutachtet. Gore und Mitarbeiter sind häufig auf der Liste der "wünschenswertesten Unternehmen zu arbeiten", und insgesamt Arbeitszufriedenheit ist hoch, und Job-Umsatz, niedrig.

Gores Organisationsstruktur mag für moderne Standards ungewöhnlich erscheinen, aber sie spiegelt die soziale Struktur der Ureinwohner wider, die als Jäger und Sammler in kleinen, egalitären Gesellschaften lebten (Von Rueden und Van Vugt, 2015). Tatsächlich verbrachten die Menschen ungefähr 99 % ihrer Geschichte als Spezies und lebten in kleinen, halbnomadischen Banden ohne formale Führer, ohne permanente Hierarchien und wenig oder gar keinen Reichtum oder Machtunterschiede zwischen den Mitgliedern. Evolutionspsychologen argumentieren, dass (a) solche Strukturen Anpassungen an bestimmte umweltpolitische Herausforderungen widerspiegeln, denen der frühe Mensch gegenüberstand, und (b) die menschliche Natur wurde durch die Herausforderungen des Lebens in diesen kleinen Gesellschaften

geprägt (Buss, 2015). Beide Elemente haben Auswirkungen auf Organisationsdesign, Kultur und Entscheidungsfindung.

Dieser Artikel dient als Grundierung der Evolutionspsychologie für Wissenschaftler in Organisationsdesign und Kultur). In den folgenden Abschnitten gebe ich eine kurze Geschichte der Evolutionspsychologie und warum es relevant ist, Organisationen zu studieren. Ich bespreche dann die wichtigsten Annahmen der Evolutionspsychologie und einige ihrer wichtigsten Theorien und Konstrukte, da sie für Organisationen relevant sind. Aufbauend auf dieser Grundlage werde ich dann veranschaulichen, wie die Evolutionspsychologie als heuristischer Rahmen für die Entwicklung von Hypothesen und die Gestaltung empirischer Forschungsprogramme genutzt werden kann. Abschließend möchte ich einige Implikationen für die Organisationsgestaltung skizzieren und Richtungen für die zukünftige Forschung anbieten. Organisationswissenschaftler haben beispielsweise bereits evolutionäre Modelle verwendet, um zu erklären, wie sich Unternehmen erfolgreich an sich verändernde Umgebungen anpassen (Dekkers, 2005). Die Evolutionspsychologie geht noch einen Schritt weiter, indem sie davon ausgeht, dass Organisationsstrukturen Manifestationen einer tieferen Psychologie sind, die von der Evolution ausgewählt wurde, da sie es dem Menschen ermöglichte, anpassungsfähig auf verschiedene Umweltherausforderungen zu reagieren. Mein Ansatz in dieser Grundierung ist es, aufzuklären, wie Evolution durch natürliche Selektion die psychologischen Grundlagen von Organisationsakteuren geformt und damit Aspekte der Organisationsgestaltung und Kultur beeinflusst haben könnte.

Organisationen sind seit mindestens mehreren Millionen Jahren Teil der Menschheitsgeschichte. Wie alle Primaten leben Menschen in Gruppen, obwohl menschliche Gruppen tendenziell größer und sozial komplexer sind. Unser nächster Verwandter, der gewöhnliche Schimpanse – mit dem der Mensch vor etwa 5–7 Millionen Jahren einen gemeinsamen Vorfahren hat – lebt in Gruppen von 30 bis 50 Individuen. Frühe Menschen neigten dazu, Gruppengrößen zu haben, die wesentlich größer waren, etwa 50–150 Individuen, aber nicht annähernd die Größe moderner komplexer Gesellschaften (Foley, 1997). Obwohl Organisationsstrukturen nicht versteinern, wissen wir viel über unsere angestammte Vergangenheit durch das Studium aktueller Jäger-Sammler-Gesellschaften und durch die jüngsten Fortschritte in Derologie, Anthropologie, Verhaltensgenetik, Neurowissenschaften, Evolutionsbiologie und Evolutionspsychologie (Von Rueden und Van Vugt, 2015). Gemeinsam zeichnen sie ein zuverlässiges Bild davon, wie sich menschliche Psychologie und Verhalten entwickelt haben und in welchen Gesellschaften sie sich entwickelt haben.

SCHLUSSFOLGERUNG

Die Evolutionspsychologie hat sich als separates Untersuchungsfeld aus dem Studium von Organisationen entwickelt, aber das muss nicht mehr sein. In dem Maße, in dem Organisationsstrukturen und Kulturen Manifestationen der menschlichen Natur sind und anpassungsfähig auf unterschiedliche Umweltherausforderungen reagieren, haben Evolutionspsychologen viel zu bieten. Die Evolutionspsychologie erzeugt nicht nur viele neue Hypothesen über Organisationsdesign, sondern bietet auch einen Reichtum an Methoden wie vergleichende Ansätze, interkulturelle Methoden und organisatorische neurowissenschaftliche Techniken. Indem wir verstehen, wie unsere kleine Sozialpsychologie in modernen Organisationen funktioniert, können wir vielleicht herausfinden, wie wir Organisationen entwerfen können, die vielleicht besser auf unsere Natur ausgerichtet sind als die gegenwärtigen Strukturen, in denen moderne Menschen leben und arbeiten.

TRANSLATED VERSION: PORTUGUESE

Below is a rough translation of the insights presented above. This was done to give a general understanding of the ideas presented in the paper. Please excuse any grammatical mistakes and do not hold the original authors responsible for these mistakes.

VERSÃO TRADUZIDA: PORTUGUÊS

Aqui está uma tradução aproximada das ideias acima apresentadas. Isto foi feito para dar uma compreensão geral das ideias apresentadas no documento. Por favor, desculpe todos os erros gramaticais e não responsabilize os autores originais responsáveis por estes erros.

INTRODUÇÃO

A W.L. Gore e associados é uma empresa de fabrico internacional com mais de 10.000 colaboradores em todo o mundo e uma receita anual de 3,2 mil milhões de dólares, que é mais conhecida pelo desenvolvimento de tecidos impermeáveis e respiráveis. Menos conhecida é a sua estrutura organizacional única e filosofia. Quando as unidades bem sucedidas atingem o tamanho de cerca de 150-200 funcionários, a unidade divide-se em duas partes iguais, ocupando edifícios adjacentes. Não há gerentes ou trabalhadores na empresa Gore, todos os empregados são associados. Ao escolher um novo CEO, a empresa convida as nomeações dos associados e o candidato que atrai mais seguidores consegue o trabalho. Todas as decisões importantes da empresa são democráticas, consensuais e revistas pelos pares. As características de Gore e associados estão frequentemente na lista das "empresas mais desejáveis para trabalhar", e a satisfação geral do emprego é elevada, e o volume de negócios, baixo.

A estrutura organizacional de Gore pode parecer invulgar aos padrões modernos, mas reflete a estrutura social dos humanos ancestrais que viveram como caçadores-coletores em sociedades igualitárias em pequena escala (Von Rueden e Van Vugt, 2015). De facto, os humanos passaram aproximadamente 99% da sua história como espécie, vivendo em pequenas bandas semi-nómadas sem líderes formais, sem hierarquias permanentes, e pouca ou nenhuma riqueza ou diferenças de poder entre membros. Os psicólogos evolucionários argumentam que (a) tais estruturas refletem adaptações a desafios ambientais particulares que os primeiros humanos enfrentaram e (b) a natureza humana tem sido moldada pelos desafios de viver nestas sociedades de pequena escala (Buss, 2015). Ambos os elementos têm implicações para o design organizacional, cultura e tomada de decisão.

Este artigo serve de primordial sobre psicologia evolutiva para estudiosos em design e cultura de organização). Nas secções seguintes, forneço uma breve história de psicologia evolutiva e por que é relevante estudar organizações. Em seguida, discuto os pressupostos-chave da psicologia evolutiva e algumas das suas principais teorias e construções, uma vez que são relevantes para as organizações. Com base nesta fundação, vou então ilustrar como a psicologia evolutiva pode ser usada como um quadro heurístico para desenvolver hipóteses e desenhar programas de investigação empírica. Termino delineando algumas implicações para o design organizacional e oferecendo direções para futuras investigações. Os estudiosos organizacionais já usaram modelos evolutivos antes, por exemplo, para explicar como as empresas se adaptam com sucesso a ambientes em mudança (Dekkers, 2005). A psicologia evolutiva vai um passo mais além assumindo que as estruturas organizacionais são manifestações de uma psicologia mais profunda que foi selecionada pela evolução, pois permitiu que os humanos respondessem adaptativamente a diferentes desafios ambientais. A minha abordagem neste primer é esclarecer como a evolução através da seleção natural pode ter moldado os fundamentos psicológicos dos atores organizacionais, influenciando assim aspetos do design organizacional e da cultura.

As organizações fazem parte da história humana há pelo menos vários milhões de anos. Como todos os primatas, os humanos vivem em grupos, embora os grupos humanos tendam a ser maiores e socialmente mais complexos. O nosso parente mais próximo, o chimpanzé comum, com quem os humanos partilham um antepassado comum há cerca de 5 a 7 milhões de anos atrás, vive em grupos de 30 a 50 indivíduos. Os primeiros humanos tendem a ter tamanhos de grupo substancialmente maiores, cerca de 50-150 indivíduos, mas não quase o tamanho de sociedades complexas modernas (Foley, 1997). Embora as estruturas organizacionais não fossilizem, sabemos muito sobre o nosso passado ancestral através do estudo das sociedades de caçadores-coletores atuais e através de recentes avanços no conhecimento da arqueologia, antropologia, genética comportamental, neurociência, biologia evolutiva e psicologia evolutiva (Von Rueden e Van Vugt, 2015). Juntos, pintam uma imagem fiável de como a psicologia humana e o comportamento evoluíram e em que tipo de sociedades evoluíram.

CONCLUSÃO

A psicologia evolutiva evoluiu como um campo de investigação separado do estudo das organizações, mas isso já não precisa ser. Na medida em que as estruturas e culturas organizacionais são manifestações da natureza humana, respondendo de forma adaptada a diferentes desafios ambientais, os psicólogos evolutivos têm muito a oferecer. A psicologia evolutiva não só gera muitas hipóteses novas sobre o design organizacional, como também oferece uma riqueza de métodos como abordagens comparativas, métodos transculturais e técnicas organizacionais de neurociência. Compreendendo como a nossa psicologia social de pequena escala funciona em organizações modernas, podemos ser capazes de descobrir como podemos projetar organizações que talvez estejam mais alinhadas com a nossa natureza do que as estruturas atuais em que os humanos modernos vivem e trabalham.