Human Systems Engineering and Design (IHSED 2026), Vol. 237, 2026, 231–240
https://doi.org/10.54941/ahfe1008163

Reward Temporal Architecture: A Framework for Intentional Culture Shift Design in Large Organizations

So Nishina

STUDIO ZERO, Plaid Inc., Tokyo, Japan

ABSTRACT

The dominant model of organizational culture change asks leaders to alter what their people believe. This paper proposes a different target: the temporal architecture of what they are rewarded for. I introduce the Reward Temporal Architecture (RTA) model—a framework that reconceptualizes organizational culture as a portfolio of six reward dimensions (Purpose, Recognition, Growth Opportunities, Compensation, Psychological Safety, and Belonging) operating across fundamentally incommensurable time horizons. The critical insight is not the dimensions themselves—variants of this taxonomy exist in the literature—but their temporal incompatibility: organizations that design culture change as if all rewards operate on the same clock consistently missequence interventions, create reward voids that generate resistance, and exhaust their most potent levers before the slower-acting ones have had time to take hold. Drawing on a longitudinal qualitative case study of a major Japanese manufacturing conglomerate across four transformation episodes spanning twenty-five years, I derive four propositions: that Compensation functions as a one-time reform ticket rather than a cultural lever; that Purpose internalization follows radically different timelines depending on whether organizational defeat is present; that Recognition operates simultaneously on a short-term institutional layer and a twenty-year cultural layer that require different management logics; and that Belonging cannot be designed directly and will ambivalently serve both transformation and resistance depending on organizational conditions. The RTA model offers practitioners a time-layered design grammar and scholars a measurable, longitudinal research program for culture change.

Keywords: Culture shift design, Reward temporal architecture, Organizational culture change, Temporal dynamics, Human factors in organizations

INTRODUCTION

Consider a thought experiment. Two organizations face the same strategic challenge: their core business is declining, a major global integration is required, and management has articulated a clear and compelling purpose for the transformation. In the first organization, the purpose statement penetrates field-level behavior within months. In the second, five years of persistent communication produce only superficial compliance. The leadership quality is comparable. The purpose content is almost identical. What differs is one variable: in the first organization, employees had recently

Received March 13, 2026 Revised June 21, 2026 Accepted July 5, 2026 Available online September 25, 2026

watched their flagship product lose significant market share to a competitor during a self-inflicted supply crisis. In the second, no such event occurred.

This observation points toward a problem that culture change research has not yet solved. The question is not what to change in an organization's reward structure, but when different changes work, and why the same intervention produces radically different outcomes depending on temporal context. Existing frameworks for culture change (Kotter, 2012; Schein, 2010; Cameron and Quinn, 2011) are largely atemporal: they specify what leaders should do without theorizing the time horizons over which different interventions take effect. Culture change programs that fail often do so not because the diagnosis was wrong, but because fast-acting levers were expected to produce long-horizon effects on incompatible timescales.

This paper introduces the Reward Temporal Architecture (RTA) model to address this gap. The core argument is that organizational culture is not a single phenomenon with one rate of change. It is an architecture of nine temporal strata, each with its own natural horizon and design logic. The empirical foundation is a twenty-five-year longitudinal case study of a major Japanese manufacturing conglomerate — a company whose trajectory from state-owned domestic monopoly to globally integrated enterprise required repeated, high-stakes culture transformations across fundamentally different market conditions.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The Six Reward Dimensions

Culture Shift — as distinct from the broader and often unintentional concept of culture change — refers to the deliberate, sequenced redesign of an organization's reward portfolio such that the aggregate experiential output of organizational participation changes in a measurable and durable direction. Culture Shift Design (CSD) — the broader research program of which this paper is the foundational statement — operationalizes this by defining organizational culture as that aggregate experiential output of six reward types received through participation in organizational life. The dominant theoretical tradition tracing from Schein's (1985) three-level model locates culture in shared assumptions; CSD proposes instead that treating reward structure as the primary intervention target is both more tractable and more theoretically precise. Beliefs change when the reward environment that generated them changes, not the other way around.

Purpose links daily work to a socially meaningful rationale that provides decision-making justification. Recognition encompasses the frequency and fairness with which challenge and achievement are publicly acknowledged; its dual-layer temporal structure is a central empirical finding of this paper. Growth Opportunities are the material conditions for competence development. Compensation is unique for its immediacy — the only reward dimension that takes effect at the moment of implementation. Psychological Safety reduces the perceived cost of speaking up; its definitional content shifts dramatically over decade-scale organizational evolution. Belonging — the sense of community membership and collective identity — is the single non-designable reward: the one dimension that accrues rather than can be built.

The Reward Temporal Architecture

The central theoretical contribution is the mapping of these six dimensions onto nine temporal strata (Table 1). Three structural observations deserve emphasis. First, Recognition and Growth Opportunities each split across two strata: what an intervention does immediately (ignite motivation) differs categorically from what it produces after years of accumulation (cultural norms, organizational capability). Second, Belonging occupies its own category — accumulated asset — because it does not respond to intervention on any horizon; it is the sedimentary deposit of everything else the organization has done. Third, the strata are not independent: Compensation creates the stability that Purpose needs to diffuse, and depleting it prematurely removes the primary short-horizon lever.

Table 1: The reward temporal architecture: nine temporal strata across six reward dimensions.

Dimension	RTA Layer	Horizon	Mechanism and Design Implication
Compensation	Immediate	Hours–days	The only dimension capable of neutralizing resistance in real time. Functions as a one-time reform ticket — organizations that exhaust it on non-transformational issues lose their primary short-horizon lever.
Purpose (crisis)	Short-term	Days–weeks	Organizational defeat eliminates interpretive ambiguity: purpose becomes empirical conclusion rather than managerial preference. See Defeat-Accelerated Purpose (Paper 2).
Recognition (institutional)	Short-term	Months–~2 yrs	Formal system redesign produces observable behavioral change. Cultural embedding on the normative layer operates on a qualitatively different, decade-scale timeline.
Growth Opp. (expectation)	Short-term	Immediate–months	Role offers ignite motivation near-instantly. The organizational capability these investments produce matures over 20+ years — the same action has two reward effects on different clocks.
Purpose (stability)	Medium-long	~5 years	Under non-crisis conditions, purpose penetrates field-level sensemaking through accumulated usage. Management persistence is necessary but insufficient; social negotiation must run its course.

(Continued)

Table 1: Continued.

Dimension	RTA Layer	Horizon	Mechanism and Design Implication
Psychological Safety (definitional)	Long-term	10+ years	Redefining safety from compliance to active inclusion requires co-evolution with societal change. Policy change and cultural embedding operate on incommensurable timescales.
Recognition (cultural)	Ultra-long	~20 years	The normative layer — where praise becomes a spontaneous field-level act — accumulates over two decades of consistent institutional practice. The institutional and cultural layers are not the same reward.
Growth Opp. (capability)	Ultra-long	20+ years	Organizational capability from talent investment becomes a structural asset only after the invested cohort has accumulated sufficient seniority to influence decisions.
Belonging	Accumulated asset	Non-designable	Belongs to no intervention; it sediments from decades of consistent organizational character. Functions ambivalently: as cohesive resilience and as inertial resistance to platform-level change.

Note. Horizons are empirically derived and represent approximate central tendencies. DAP = Defeat-Accelerated Purpose.

Key Derived Constructs

Three constructs recur in the empirical analysis. Defeat-Accelerated Purpose (DAP) refers to the mechanism by which organizational failure compresses the Purpose diffusion timeline from five years to near-immediate alignment. Financial Slack as Reform Ticket captures the regularity that all major transformation episodes were initiated from positions of financial strength — transformation requires surplus to make change bearable for those it disadvantages. Task Stickiness describes the degree to which employees cannot abandon current tasks without abandoning their competence base; high task stickiness constrains the culture design space before any reward intervention is considered.

METHODOLOGY

The empirical work follows an extended case method (Burawoy, 1998), using a single organization studied longitudinally over twenty-five years. RTA theory requires temporal granularity — I need to know not only that certain interventions produced certain outcomes but when, and through what processes. The focal organization is a major Japanese manufacturing conglomerate whose trajectory from state-owned domestic monopoly to global enterprise required repeated culture transformations under genuinely different conditions. This variation within a single organization allows the

RTA model to be tested against different combinations of market condition, financial state, and competitive threat while holding organizational history constant.

Three informants were selected through purposive theoretical sampling. Informant A brings twenty-plus years of HR leadership perspective. Informant B contributes front-line product planning experience, including direct involvement in the supply crisis that constitutes a key DAP episode. Informant C offers the analytically rare vantage point of someone who observed the domestic organization from the international subsidiary in Geneva. Interviews were semi-structured, sixty to ninety minutes each, conducted across two rounds with a six-month interval. Analysis proceeded through open coding of four transformation episodes (Issues I–IV), assigning scores of 1 to 4 across the six reward dimensions, followed by cross-episode analysis to identify recurring mechanisms and theoretical anomalies.

Scoring validity was established through two procedures. Scores were assigned only when accounts from two or more informants independently converged; divergences were retained as analytically significant — generational asymmetries in Issue II and vantage-point differences in Issue III emerged as findings through this process. Each score was anchored to a concrete organizational referent: a documented policy change, structural event, or observed behavioral shift. Round 2 accounts were compared against Round 1 to assess interpretive stability across time.

CASE FINDINGS

Issue I: Building a Global Identity on an Untested Framework (1999–)

When the focal organization established its international subsidiary through two major acquisitions in 1999, management deployed a four-element strategic framework — representing the satisfaction of Society, Shareholders, Customers, and Employees — as a common evaluative language. The early reception was not what management had hoped for: the framework was widely perceived as a relabeling of existing principles. Management's response was to continue using it as the sole reference for every major decision, for years. The framework became common language not through persuasion but through operational persistence. This took approximately five years — the RTA's medium-term Purpose diffusion baseline, against which later temporal compressions can be measured.

Simultaneously, a small number of employees were sent on overseas assignments; Informant C's cohort later formed the practical infrastructure for global integration that would otherwise have been impossible. The long-horizon Growth Opportunity return was being seeded in 1999 — investment whose organizational payoff in the 2010s is exactly what retrospective evaluation would have missed and what the RTA model predicts.

Table 2: Issue I: reward portfolio configuration — 1999– — "dawn of global identity".

Dimension	Score	Analytical Rationale
Purpose	4/4	Persistent usage over five years converted initial skepticism into genuine shared language — a textbook illustration of the RTA medium-term diffusion timeline.
Recognition	2/4	Systems remained culturally variable across acquired entities; standardized cross-cultural recognition was developmental rather than functional.
Growth Opp.	3/4	Overseas assignments functioned as motivational pull. The organizational capability return was not yet measurable — the long-horizon clock had just started.
Compensation	3/4	Industry-leading compensation provided financial stability that allowed slower-acting dimensions room to develop without defection pressure.
Psych. Safety	3/4	Residual security from the public corporation era coexisted with new integration uncertainty — unstable but sufficient for the integration to proceed.
Belonging	4/4	Shared pride in becoming a Japanese global enterprise generated high cohesion. External criticism of the acquisition strategy strengthened internal solidarity.

Context: M&A integration required constructing a viable global identity for a recently domestic institution. The four-element framework was deployed as common evaluative language.

Issue II: The Reward Void and the Reform Ticket (2003–2005)

The workforce reduction of 2003–2005 produced the case's clearest Triple Deprivation signature: Recognition, Psychological Safety, and Belonging collapsed simultaneously as merit-based evaluation replaced seniority, lifetime employment ended, and organizational trust eroded. The organization did not collapse. Two mechanisms stabilized it. First, a generous severance package converted departure from organizational betrayal into commercially rational transition — Informant B notes the generosity changed the interpretive frame entirely. Compensation was deployed precisely as the RTA model predicts: as a one-time reform ticket. Second, management had established prior to the reduction a clear expansionist narrative, providing the 'external vector' the RTA model identifies as necessary for Purpose to survive a Safety collapse. Employees who can see where the organization is going can tolerate where it currently is.

Table 3: Issue II: reward portfolio configuration — 2003–2005 — "structural reform under triple deprivation".

Dimension	Score	Analytical Rationale
Purpose	3/4	The expansionist global narrative provided the forward vector that allowed employees to interpret sacrifice as transition rather than abandonment.
Recognition	1/4	Merit evaluation prioritized differentiation over acknowledgment. Process-level recognition effectively ceased — the first casualty of the reform.

(Continued)

Table 3: Continued.

Dimension	Score	Analytical Rationale
Growth Opp.	3/4	Senior departures opened advancement paths for younger employees, who experienced restructuring as organizational renewal. This generational asymmetry is analytically significant.
Compensation	3/4	High levels maintained; the generous severance package functioned as the reform ticket — making departure commercially rational rather than organizationally punitive.
Psych. Safety	1/4	Lifetime employment assumptions structurally terminated. Anxiety was endured rather than resolved, sustained by the forward narrative and financial security that remained.
Belonging	1/4	Dual shock of layoffs and system change produced sharp erosion of organizational trust — the first measurable decline of a belonging asset built over decades.

Context: Production site consolidation and the largest workforce reduction in organizational history coincided with a shift from seniority-based to performance-based evaluation.

Issue III: The Cost of Stable Rewards (2013–)

Issue III is the case's most counterintuitive episode: a largely intact reward portfolio — Purpose at 3, Compensation stable, Belonging recovering — coincided with inadequate response to a platform-level competitive disruption. The RTA model identifies the pathology as Belonging-Induced Exploration Blindness: the organization had built an unusually strong Belonging asset grounded in domestic market leadership and product craftsmanship, and Informant A describes field-level management optimizing for incremental share gains while the entire product platform was replaced beneath them. Acknowledging disruption meant acknowledging the obsolescence of the identity that Belonging was anchored to. The subsequent supply crisis resolved this interpretive resistance in the way only competitive defeat can, and constituted the conditions that made Issue IV possible.

Table 4: Issue III: reward portfolio configuration — 2013– — "silent crisis: stagnation beneath stable rewards".

Dimension	Score	Analytical Rationale
Purpose	3/4	Brand repositioning maintained domestic market pride, but late-mover position in next-generation devices raised unresolved questions that financial performance allowed management to defer.
Recognition	2/4	Systems rewarded operational continuity over exploration. Absence of recognition for new-domain challenge created a de facto signal that employees read accurately.
Growth Opp.	2/4	Market maturation reduced dynamic experience; efficiency optimization displaced expansionary investment, producing stagnation for challenge-motivated employees.

(Continued)

Table 4: Continued.

Dimension	Score	Analytical Rationale
Compensation	3/4	Robust performance sustained high compensation — but financial comfort was substituting for the Purpose and Growth rewards degrading beneath it.
Psych. Safety	2/4	Awareness of market contraction created background anxiety that structural stability masked but did not resolve, producing organizational paralysis.
Belonging	3/4	Historical brand attachment sustained cohesion — simultaneously the organization's greatest resilience resource and the primary mechanism of its platform-change blindness.

Context: Platform disruption emerged as the organization faced an ambidexterity challenge — sustaining legacy business while investing in new categories — and initially prioritized stability.

Issue IV: Defeat as Design Tool (2020–)

The 2022 integration of domestic and international operations — a voluntary surrender of domestic sovereignty politically impossible in any prior period — became tractable because competitive defeat had already done the interpretive work years of management communication had failed to do. When failure is undeniable and structurally attributed, the argument for integration requires no further elaboration.

The leader who executed the integration had a background in corporate planning and food business, not core product operations — an executive whose identity was not embedded in the legacy structures faced none of the cognitive and social cost that would have made execution prohibitive for a core-business insider. I term this property Transformational Peripherality. The HR reform of this period — redefining Psychological Safety from separation of private life from work to whole-person inclusion — illustrates the dimension's long-horizon nature: the institutional change has been made; field-level experience is still catching up.

Table 5: Issue IV: reward portfolio configuration — 2020– — "autonomous drive: purpose and individual growth converge".

Dimension	Score	Analytical Rationale
Purpose	4/4	Defeat reactivated purpose with near-immediate field-level alignment — a textbook DAP event. The group purpose redefinition transformed defeat from demoralizing to mobilizing.
Recognition	2/4	Structured one-on-one communication represents genuine institutional improvement. The cultural layer — where praise becomes spontaneous and normed — remains in early accumulation.
Growth Opp.	3/4	Internal mobility and self-directed goal-setting repositioned growth as individual rather than institutional. The organizational capability return will not mature for another decade or more.

(Continued)

Table 5: Continued.

Dimension	Score	Analytical Rationale
Compensation	2/4	Strengthened performance differentiation introduced individual variation in acceptance that the organization is still navigating.
Psych. Safety	2/4	The definitional shift has been institutionally enacted. Cultural embedding — the moment it becomes spontaneous field-level norm — remains a long-horizon project.
Belonging	3/4	Belonging is shifting from organizational dependency toward purpose resonance. This transition is active, unresolved, and analytically significant: one foundation is being redirected toward another.

Context: Competitive defeat created conditions for radical governance restructuring. A new group purpose and individualized HR system were introduced to promote autonomy and challenge-oriented culture.

CROSS-CASE ANALYSIS: FOUR PROPOSITIONS

Proposition 1 — Temporal Sequencing Determines Outcome More Than Intervention Content: All four episodes used broadly similar reward levers. What distinguished durable from partial transformations was sequencing logic: Compensation first (short-term stability), then Purpose activation, then long-horizon Growth investment. Episodes driven by urgency rather than temporal logic produced short-term compliance without long-term embedding.

Proposition 2 — The Reform Ticket Has a Denominator: Every major transformation episode was initiated from a position of robust financial health. Organizations that allow financial surplus to erode also erode their primary short-horizon transformation lever. Compensation requires pre-accumulated surplus to function as a reform ticket — this is a structural precondition, not a tactical choice.

Proposition 3 — Belonging Is a Lagged Variable, Not an Outcome Variable: Belonging cannot be produced by any intervention; it can only be eroded faster than it is rebuilt. When Safety and Recognition collapsed in Issue II, belonging eroded measurably — functioning as a lagged output of all other dimensions. It should be tracked as a health indicator, not managed as a direct target.

Proposition 4 — Task Stickiness Sets the Outer Bound of Culture Design Space: The focal organization's core product category has unusually low task stickiness — core operational work can be deprioritized without employees losing their competence base. This gave management unusual latitude in redefining purpose and identity. Organizations in high task-stickiness domains face a prior design challenge: before redesigning culture, they must identify what would make current mandatory tasks dispensable.

CONCLUSION

Organizations do not fail at culture change because they lack commitment, resources, or clear purpose. They fail because they treat culture as a single phenomenon with a single rate of change — and then express surprise when their fastest-acting interventions don't produce the slowest-acting outcomes. The RTA model offers a different diagnostic lens: not what is the culture, but what is the temporal architecture of the reward portfolio, and is the intervention sequence coherent with that architecture?

The empirical findings suggest four structural regularities: Compensation purchases time but doesn't build culture; Purpose can be slow or fast depending on whether defeat is present; Recognition operates simultaneously on a two-year institutional clock and a twenty-year cultural clock; Belonging can only be tended, not planted. Their integration into a single temporal framework — one that specifies design sequencing logic rather than just intervention content — is what distinguishes the RTA model from existing culture change frameworks. Paper 3 develops the Minimum Viability Reward Structure; Paper 4 addresses the non-designability of Belonging. Culture change is too consequential, and too consistently failed, to theorize only once.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author gratefully acknowledges the cooperation of the interview informants at the focal organization.

REFERENCES

Burawoy, M. (1998). The extended case method. Sociological Theory, 16(1), 4–33.
Cameron, K. S. and Quinn, R. E. (2011). Diagnosing and Changing Organizational Culture. 3rd edn. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Deci, E. L. and Ryan, R. M. (2000). The 'what' and 'why' of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. Psychological Inquiry, 11(4), 227–268.
Kotter, J. P. (2012). Leading Change. Boston: Harvard Business Review Press.
Schein, E. H. (1985). Organizational Culture and Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Schein, E. H. (2010). Organizational Culture and Leadership. 4th edn. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Weick, K. E. (1995). Sensemaking in Organizations. Thousand Oaks: Sage.