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This thesis describes the social interaction between cultures. The objective of this thesis study is to identify factors that are present in interaction when parties are from different cultures as well as provide improvement possibilities for Inno-BarentsLab. The responders for this thesis research are Inno Barents Lab members. Nationalities are represented from Nordic, Asia, Russia and Southern hemisphere.

The thesis consists of introductory, theoretical, research result and conclusion parts. The introduction divides and discusses the concept of globalisation. Theoretical part explain the research methods used for gathering the information also cultural tools used in analysing of collected information. After theoretical part multiculturalism and Inno Barents Lab are described in this thesis. Research result part show the information gathered by qualitative research method, also author’s own experience as a student leader was used in the empirical part. Conclusion part merge the information displayed on the research result part.

The overall objective for the thesis was to provide information how to improve communication in multicultural working environment.
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1 INTRODUCTION

The effects of globalization are visible throughout the world today. The interests of business and society are overlapping in many aspects as well as the forces of human activities are increasing hence expansion beyond national borders. This equals into a process in which worldwide connections are increasing in almost every region. These connections are the reasons that lead to the worldwide unification, but not all of them. Increase in worldwide connections originate from development in technological, political, and economical regions. The boundaries within organisations are hugely influenced by globalization. Today’s Modern Multinational Corporations (hereinafter MNCs) and all of its departments, e.g. production, sales, marketing, and distribution, might be dispersed around the world in order to achieve location-specific advantages. (Thomas & Peterson 2015, 3, 4.)

The possibility of having more creative and better solutions when there is a very diverse team – multicultural workforce - that consists people with different culture, gender, age, and background. This creates a multicultural team, in other words, multicultural working environment in which solve problems or gain answers. This will result in a very innovative way and create a new, unpredicted and unusual results: the amount of old ideas is dramatically reduced. The group behaviour in a team, such as multicultural team, is not only individuals working in their own ways. In cases, in which people are working together in order to perform a task. The cultural differences among the members of the group becomes more apparent. (Thomas & Peterson 2015, 162.)

The word multicultural in business world often is associated with nationality, ethnic group, and maybe religion. These are essential parts, but not the only ones. (Lahti 2014, 18.)

When comparing groups with different cultural backgrounds, there is variety especially in their communication and behaviour among group. This is visible also elsewhere than only in cultures. It is seen that even small groups of people tend to develop unique and shared ways of communication and behaviour. Culture is at the heart of effective human interaction, therefore being essential ne-
cessity. These unique, shared ways communication and behaviour are assisting group spirit in everyday life. In example, tight work group e.g. people that have worked long-hours together, instead of being acquaintances, these communication patterns and behaviours becomes more complex. For any work group realisation of common rules and understanding is essential. In work groups the culture is detailed and it will take time to develop. Culture is formed from beliefs, needs, and cognitive processes, which then create a paradigm. Culture is ubiquitous it is visible in variety of groups, e.g. in the work place, religious, ethnic groups, and fine art. In the recent years National culture and its business culture have been on a merge of change due to rapid pace caused by ever expanding globalization. Researchers have found that fast changes are occurring when group of people faces new challenges. For the big part of world's population globalization has not caused any problems. The people who are in the middle of global interaction belong primarily to own national social group. There are differences in culture, but some cultures are similar. In cases like these the values of society are same and the differences occur mostly in beliefs. E.g. the Scandinavian countries where cross border cooperation has been a long-time norm. The differences between cultures are more visible than similarities. Still differences should be raised and discussed that a team in multicultural working environment can develop a new solution before these differences start to affect teamwork. One of the most common reason why there is no discussion on differences is team members' and leaders' judgement. (Mäkilouko 2003, 32 -36, 93.)

Multicultural working environment has great challenges as well as great results. One cannot work in multicultural working environment without ability of teamwork. Communication and its diversity is emphasized in almost all of the spheres in multicultural working environment. Still most of the lessons it holds can be studied only when being part of one.


1 RESEARCH METHODS

1.1 Qualitative Research Method

In the research of this thesis was used Qualitative research method. There are many ways of using qualitative research method. For this reason, the following explain the way it was used in the research.

The qualitative research method as a concept is easier to comprehend by the seven Ps. Those seven Ps are divided into Purpose, Paradigm, Process, Practice, Politics and Interpretation, Presentation, and the Promise. (Markula & Silk 2011, 10.)

The seven Ps are divided into three stages and following them one could ensure the right use of qualitative research method. The first stage is named the design of the research process. It includes Purpose, Paradigm, and Process. It is a form questions one should ask oneself upon the start of qualitative research. In order to be sure that qualitative research method is used properly. The purpose part is focused finding answers from the researcher to the questions of what the reason for the use of qualitative research, what is the aim for the use, is there ethical aspect taken in consideration, and furthermore to resolve the meaningful methods from qualitative research sphere. After these parts are found the next is Paradigm. The paradigm part is used in order to find the specific indicators that are used in the research project. Then the Process part determines the outlook of qualitative research for the researcher. It is said that every project has to have introduction, literature review, method selection, analysis or discussion and conclusion. (Markula & Silk 2011, 10.) After successfully filling these parts a researcher can be sure of the right use of qualitative research method.

This part involves the collection of empirical material, and how to interpret it. These two are hard to divide, therefore the next two Ps Practices and Politics of Interpretation are combined together by using common methodological practic-es, as well as different ways how to interpret the collected empirical material. (Markula & Silk 2011, 10.)
The practice and politics of interpretation parts are for the researcher for finding the different interview methods available. The part also is focused on the efficient use of interviews, and finally the right way of analysing the collected data. (Markula & Silk 2011, 10.) Furthermore, this part includes narrative analysis. The part of narrative analysis explains to the researcher the proper way of using it. The practice of analysing the collected empirical material from narratives. (Markula & Silk 2011, 10.)

The part of field methods is for finding the different types of it, efficient use of them, and the way of properly collect and analyse the collected empirical material from the field. (Markula & Silk 2011, 10.)

Lastly the Ps, presentation and promise parts, are the written and disperse part of qualitative research. The parts are for evaluating the qualitative research and determine the indicators of quality for the researcher. (Markula & Silk 2011, 10.)

The part of presentation is for the researcher in order to record the results of qualitative research. The different ways for the presentation of results to diverse audiences. The part of promise help the researcher see a proper qualitative research as well as take in consideration the planning, comprehension and execution of a research. The part tells the right quality indicators for the research. The part includes for the researcher a way for interpretation, evaluation, and contemplation of a qualitative research. And the right criteria. (Markula & Silk 2011, 10.)

The method from qualitative research sphere used in the thesis research is Narrative inquiry. In the following the reason for using the narrative inquiry method is explained.

Narrative inquiry in the field of sciences are coming more popular. With it the Narrative inquiry as a research method as well. There are held professional conferences with the topic of narrative work. The signs for narrative inquiry being a field in the making are strong, according Denzin and Lincoln. (Denzin & Lincoln 2005, 312.)

The qualitative research – especially narrative inquiry – gives a possibility interpret the material in many ways, which leads to an ever going demur against
creating one paradigm over the qualitative research. (Denzin & Lincoln 2005, 15.)

The narrative inquiry is qualitative research and although it usually addresses the questions among a small group – it is studying a bigger whole. To some professional researchers when asking the amount of persons narrated and credibility of research based on the amount, the questions becomes snappish for them. (Denzin & Lincoln 2005, 652.)

2.2 Empirical Research Method

The main source for researcher in Empirical Research method is experience. Experience joins together researchers’ topics and patches any gap between them. Recorded experiences, stories, are the communication meanings through which people comprehend, realise, and contemplates their live and interpret the social world around them. (Pickering 2008, 6.) Therefore, could be said that experience is at the centre of cultural studies. It is one of the main categories of analysis within the field. It is having been used as main material in many issues which has been pursued in cultural studies. Due to it been used as main material it has formed into a respected part of research practice. Still these values which empirical research holds are challenged; whether being a form of research data, or an analytical concept. Experience is perceived as a positive value. Its ambiguity is a result of multiple perspectives and senses. To that extent if it is used as a method and challenged as one as well, it would require many detailed discussions. (Pickering 2008, 17.)

One of the processes in the research is a dialogue, but anyone who conducts a research in cultural field should not assume in any circumstances that information could be interpret directly from experience or experience would reinforce what has been said. There are two aspects what to take in consideration when evaluating what a research subject has said – in this case my own experience.

The first aspect is that the information result has to be respected by researcher. The second is researcher has to find balance between what this information
might mean and how it is related the location of the research subject. (Pickering 2008, 19.)

2.3 Research Method

In order to analyse the culture research, it is important to have right tool and furthermore accurate way of interpreting data into information. This thesis research results are analysed by using two cultural tools.

The first one is Geert Hofstede Cultural Dimension Tool. The research behind the cultural dimension was enormous – it had based on a 10 years’ research. Since its international recognition it was accepted as a standard for understanding cultural differences. After his studies with IBM’s workers in 50 countries, Hofstede was able to identify 4 dimensions that differed between cultures. After cooperation with Drs Michael H. Bond and Michael Minkov, fifth and sixth dimensions were found. The dimensions are Power Distance, Individualism versus Collectivism, Masculinity versus Femininity, Uncertainty Avoidance Index, Pragmatic versus Normative, Indulgence versus Restraint. These dimensions are scaled from 0 to 100. Next these 6 dimensions are briefly explained (Manktelow et al. 2016.) Power Distance: This dimensions demonstrates how equality is seen in society. Individualism versus Collectivism: This dimensions demonstrates is group or individual work appreciated in society. Is it “I” instead “We”. Masculinity versus Femininity: Is the concept of success in society competition, achievement or quality of life, caring for others. Uncertainty Avoidance: Shows how future orientated the members are in society. Do they prepare for the future or react to it. Pragmatic versus Normative: Shows how society is valuing its past values and willing change them to prepare for the future. Indulgence: Shows how controlled are desires and impulses in society.

The second tool used in this study is the Lewis model that is based on three categories; Linear-active; Multi-active; Reactive. The model is made by British linguist Richard Lewis. Next all these categories are explained: Linear-Active: are determined as people orientated to organising, planning, pursue action chains and concentrating task at hand – one thing at a time. Multi-Active: People who are planning their meetings regarding the importance of the appointment. Multitasking and performing multiple tasks at the same time. Re-Active:
People who listen first and decides after. Usually waits for action to which react (Gus 2013).

The Lewis Model shows the divisions between countries. (Figure 1)

Figure 1. The Lewis Model

2.4 Research Questions

The following questionnaire was used to collect information regarding cultural differences from InnoBarentsLab (hereinafter IBL). The questionnaire was designed for IBL members to collect information on cultural differences, barriers, communication problems and other differences in cultural views. The questionnaire was send to students who were or are members of IBL. IBL was chosen as the information pool for this research due to the versatility of its members' cultural backgrounds. The questions are displayed first which after is the objective of the question.
(3) What would you improve in IBL?

- Clarify the way of leadership?
- More general meetings?
- Some other, what?

(Simply by describing an area is enough, for instance team-spirit.)

The question: what would you improve in IBL. The researcher wanted to see if there was one point that all the responders seemed problematic. The question offers two most common communication problems and open-word possibility in which the responder is able to describe the point of improvement.

(4) I could express anything I wanted.

The question: I could express anything I wanted. Show to the researcher how people from different cultural background see an IBL meeting. Does the ambiance foster team-work among different cultures or divide the cultures into their own groups. If there is strong sense of different cultures or sense of unity.

(5) The group members did not always have the same opinion about problems.

The question: the group members did not always agree about problems. The research objective was to resolve if there were singular opinion within IBL or possibility for more versatile solutions. Did the different cultural background offer new solutions. The way members dealt with different opinions were they seen as invalid or opportunity to approach the problem.

(6) I perceived some misunderstandings between the group members.

The question: I perceived some misunderstanding between the group members. The researcher wanted to see was there sign of cultural barriers in group work. Also how these possible cultural barriers were seen by the members.

(7) I did not succeed in accurately expressing what I wanted to say.
The question: I did not succeed in accurately expressing what I wanted to say. The researcher wanted to see if there are problems with communication, if yes, what kind of communication problems there are in IBL.

(8) Other students rarely behaved in a way or said things, which I did not expect.

The question: Other students rarely behaved in a way or said things, which I did not expect. The question’s objective was to show, if members had any problems with comprehension and how these ambiguous situations were seen by the members.

2.5 Limitation of Thesis

It was decided to limit the cultural context within InnoBarentsLab organisation.

With limitation to IBL the challenge in data collection decrease, it would be far more time-consuming to reach with questionnaire same amount of cultures that it was possible via IBL.

Accessible and relevant information pool due to multicultural teams normally being formed to include only two or three different cultures. There are exceptions depending the form of a team or nature of the task at hand. IBL combine four to six different cultures into one working environment. It is proven to provide results even with this variety of cultures which mean more relevant information.

The country of origin of responders is not told in order to keep their identity anonymous. To keep the country of origin anonymous the country division was made between Asia, Nordic, Russia, and Southern hemisphere.
3 MULTICULTURALISM

The concept of multiculturalism is increasingly seen as something that societies as well its individuals have to face in everyday situations. The European migrant crisis in 2015 is a solid reminder of how there is no room for a homogenous society in today’s world. Instead, countries with their population need to learn how to operate and work with different cultures. They also need to integrate individuals from different cultures into their own. These are only a fraction of what really could be the difference between two totally different cultures, for instance, Nordic and Middle-East cultures. This thesis gives an advice how to act in situation, which involves working together with representors from different cultures. I have had the privilege of working with persons from cultures such as Middle-East, Latin-America, Asia, Balkan and Middle-Europe.

General interest is between benefit and knowledge as well as integration. Benefit in a sense of having useful information regarding working environment including different cultures. Knowledge on how were seen situations in which cultures worked together – which the downsides were as well as which the upsides are. Integration how an individual might see a working environment in a different culture.

Societal meaning in learning how colleagues with different cultural backgrounds are working together is meaningful countless ways. The statistics provided by Statistical centre of Finland. It shows the percentile share of immigrants not employed by the host country – in this case Finland. Immigrants from Iraq - between years 2003 – 2011 - only 14 percent have been employed, from Somalia 9 percent, on other hand, from Estonia 70 percent and from Sweden 50 percent. Where the cultural difference is significantly smaller among Northern countries than between Middle-East, Africa and Finland. This working pool could be used by the host country (Table 1).
Table 1. Age constant employment per cents in 2011 by birth nation and immigration year (Source: Statistics Finland 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irak</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viro</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruotsi</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomi</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1 Defining Culture

Culture and communication are joint “Culture is communication and communication is culture.” It is hard to separate or even divide these two apart. What makes people to act different ways in similar kind of situation. What is the reason that same message makes perfect sense to some and nonsense to others. Why same hand gesture is mark of acceptance to some and an insult to others. The answer to these and many more are put into one: people are a product of their surroundings, everything that happen around – in society, country, media, newspapers, advertisement, nowadays social media – evolves the way of thinking, seeing things. The common factor is communication. Everything is communicated to people from cradle to grave. (Samovar & Porter 2001, 31.) Even in interaction between two cultures the communication does not share the same concept even when there are conjunctive aspects between culture and communication. Most common differences in communication appears in controversial issues and the amount of contextual communication included in either oral or written communication. Also many ways of using language are in a key role, for instance, forms initiation of denial, question, politeness, and astonishment. To summarise in these cases languages do not translate. (Mäkilouko 2003, 30, 31.)

Culture serves people’s basic need as a member of our society – where to find one’s place and how to understand surroundings and know how to properly act in it. Culture makes people’s world less perplexing place and provides satisfaction for our three type of needs: Basic needs: food, shelter, and physical protection. Derived needs: organisation of work, distribution of food, defence, social
control. Integrative needs: psychological security, social harmony, purpose in life. (Samovar & Porter 2001, 32, 33.)

There are many ways through which culture is taught and here are a few examples: Proverbs reflect the basic beliefs of the culture. In Sweden “He who stirs another’s porridge often burns his own” advises people to mind their own business before embarking to another’s. (Samovar & Porter 2001, 36, 37.) Finnish proverb, roughly translated, “Early bird gets the worm”, reflects the Finnish way of believing waking up early in order to achieve day’s task, or “One who stretch to a spruce will tumble down on a juniper”, tells how one should not be too ambitious in his actions. Proverbs are at the core of every culture; often used by individuals as well as experts trying to learn a new culture.

Another part that holds a key role in enculturation and how culture is taught is folktales, legends, and myths. Learned in childhood they are affecting our perceptions as adults. Then there is Art through, which individuals are reflecting their emotions, feelings, and values from culture. Finally, there is Mass Media. (Samovar & Porter 2001, 38 – 40.) Samovar and Porter remind that beside previously mentioned “teachers” there is many other sources from which culture is learned by an individual, but here are listed some of the most visible ones.

For instance, your national flag – how you are feeling differently to it opposed to other country’s flag that is the essence of cultural membership. (Samovar & Porter 2001, 33.) In a nutshell, book suggest to think a moment the cultural beliefs one hold, which influences how one perceives with surrounding and acts.

3.2 Collected Empirical Data

The information pool used for the part of empirical data in this thesis is time span from 15th of September 2014 to 5th of November 2014. During that time, I took part in 5 projects in IBL. I have listed also different nationalities that took part in these projects. 15th of September 2014 Business Festival: grand-opening of Lapland UAS when Krista Kiuru (Educational minister of Finland, at the time) officially opened school. There was organised Business Festival where companies had stands in order to promote their organisations. I represented IBL at the event. Nationalities of the project members were European and Asian; 9th of October 2014 Recruitment Event: recruitment Event for Russian Speaking Job
seekers project in cooperation Rovaniemi Kehitys Oy was done to connect local companies and Russian speaking persons in Rovaniemi region. Nationalities of the project members were Russian and European; 3th of November 2014 Improvement of communication within IBL: the project took place at the end of my leadership term when noticeable communication problems occur among group members of IBL. Nationalities of the project members were South-America and European; 5th of November 2014 enhance the use of the intranet: the project took place at the end of my leadership term. After it was clear to see problems in communication flow within IBL. Especially with project updates in order resolve the project was executed. Nationalities of the project members were South-America and European; 5th of November 2014 Company visit to Oulu: the last project of my leadership term in IBL. A company meeting was set with Business Kitchen in Oulu. For future cooperation between IBL and Business Kitchen. Nationalities of the project members were South-America and European.
4 INNOBARENTSLAB

The next chapter explain in more detail the essence of IBL. IBL is in a key role of this thesis as it is multicultural working and learning environment. Without the existence of IBL this thesis could not have taken place.

IBL is more than student based organisation in it is included experience which cannot be gained anywhere else. By definition IBL is physical and virtual entity in which young people – in this case students – are combining entrepreneurship and innovation daily. With help existing or aspiring entrepreneurs, experts and teachers, also all stakeholders from business world or public institutions. (Krastina & Lammi 2014, 84.)

The students who participate in IBL are from around the globe. It creates an opportunity for a student to learn business-skills as well as other cultures. For the information pool for this thesis it was the best place to gather information regarding different cultures’ communication patterns. The origin of IBL is explained: IBL has been developed within the Young Innovative Entrepreneurship (hereinafter YIE) project. It started in fall 2012. The project started from a need of a support structure for innovative businesses and projects. YIE project launched an innovation lab networks in the Barents Region. For the innovation lab networks was given a working title InnoBarentsLab it was assumed creating support across borders in Barents Region. The support was aimed for innovative business development in the future. (Krastina & Lammi 2014, 84.)

The aim for IBL is to create an ecosystem that enhances entrepreneurial and innovative attributes in young people. The need for an innovation lab network such as IBL was noticed – specially to support the cross-border business cooperation of young entrepreneurs in the Barents Region. IBL is seen as an additional method in order to achieve that support. IBL reflects a mix of many already existing models and practices of business support. The most essential philosophy when referring to IBL is defined by Krastina and Lammi as learning by doing. (Krastina & Lammi 2014, 85.) This enable the students from other cultures freely contribute into on-going work, meaning the variety in working/learning methods between cultures are more visible.
The organizational structure and concept of IBL is based on previous studies on practices and visits of similar entities also in use has been thesis work performed by students and their reflected results. (Krastina & Lammi 2014, 85.)

The concept of IBL is explained by following: Inno in the name of InnoBarentsLab refers to the mind-set and the environment which IBL is trying to create in the minds of students. Not declaring themselves as innovators but acknowledging that innovation, innovativeness and creativity lays at the core of contemporary business life; Barents refers to the location in which IBL operates – the Barents Region; Lab refers to a place for the experimentation which is required by IBL’s philosophy – learning by doing.
5 CULTURAL FINDINGS

All the following Cultural findings are analysed by using of Geert Hofstede’s multidimensional culture tool and The Lewis model. The findings were collected from members of IBL by using the thesis questionnaire.

In charts each pillar/colour represent a responder: four pillars equals to four responders, four different coloured pillars equals to four responders.

The responders’ answers are highlighted in the following sub-chapters (5.1; 5.2; 5.3; 5.4) by “answers”, prior the answers are the analysis of them made by the author.

5.1 Asia

The group Asia has 4 responders with the age average of 23, 25. By clarifying the age distribution among group it was possible to show differences in answers depending the age (Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responders’ evaluations of IBL core processes. The answers give a clear image of individual opinion on IBL which helped to determine possible variations
among responders as well as if there is some part in the processes that were seemed troublesome (Table 3).

Table 3. the group’s results on IBL’s core processes

To the third question Group Asia, which consist of female responders, gave a homogenous answer. The common pattern in answers is related to collectivism. The responders clearly state that there are areas for improvement. Communication being one of them, still Group Asia avoid confrontation in a fear of losing one’s face and this can be seen by the suggested alternative communication channels: Rigid rules and guidelines to follow in order to avoid ambiguous situations; provision of clear plans is included in rules and guidelines; held a general meeting only when necessary, therefore create more hierarchical structure which is typical for Group Asian’s cultural background. Also team-spirit is improved by the clear communication channels. Distinction between male and female responders could not been made due to lack of male responders, geographically responders are from both north and south part of home country of Group Asia. Therefore, according to the answers that is not a divisive factor in them.

“Strengthen leadership, create stricter discipline for each department/team and more efficient way to make decisions. Not necessary, only add more general meeting once needed. Otherwise, team-meeting is enough. Team engagement. Attendance commitment.”
“More co-operated and arranged and provide clear plans”

“I want to improve in connecting team member. It can be called improving team – spirit. “

Responders’ assessment of the process of IBL meeting. The answers reflect the perspective of an individual as well as the consistency of group Asia on IBL meeting. The researcher will have an indication of any problems in meetings either on group or individual level (Table 4).

Table 4. group Asia’s evaluation on IBL meeting and mean values of answers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How would you scale IBL meetings by these standards?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Values: Clear: 3.5 Confusing: 2.25 Informal: 3.75 Efficient: 3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fourth question and given answers reflect how the responders of Group Asia feel that an open-dialogue is established. In this case, an open-dialogue being vertical line communication between a tutor teacher – leader – subordinate. The differences between genders cannot be made. Responders are from both north and south part of home country of Group Asia.

“IBL’s environment is great for people who want to express themselves. They are free to create, to experiment and along with the guidance from seniors, they have the chance to make any idea become possible. “

“Yes, I agree. “

“I felt free to express any opinions and ideas to tutor teacher and team
members.”

The fifth question and the answers indicate that in case of a problem it is solved through a meeting where consensus is tried to reach. Also observation of ambiguous situation when too many projects were in progress parallel. The time being in IBL has already shown that different approaches to problems are a norm between different cultures, therefore not seeing the new approach as something to be overruled, on the contrary, something to taken in consideration when solving the problem.

“Try to listen from all sides and figure out the best solution together, explain/compromise/persuade the reset to follow. “

“That’s what happen in every group, everywhere in the world. This kind of disagreement is considered normal. “

“Sometimes. “

“It is normal trouble in an organization. The important thing is that group members are willing to sit down and discuss about it. In IBL, we can discuss about problems and find out the solution together. However, because there are too many projects are run at the same time so not everybody deeply understands about the problems. “

The sixth question’s answers indicate strongly to the fact that IBL has taught the responders how to approach a problem in a working environment as well as the responders possessing more broad perspective what comes to members with different cultural background.

“I will try to gather all members and have a talk in order to explain myself and hear more from them. “

“Because we were an international group. Everybody have his own personal background, own culture, own way of thinking. Again, this is happening in a normal way, unavoidable. “

“Yes. “

“It happens in every groups that has more than 2 people. When I’m in IBL, I live with it and try not to make it involve in the work. “
The seventh question and answers reflect to the fact that communication barriers are identified but not seen as something that could potentially affect the outcome of team-work.

“Practice English more =))
Be patient and kind to explain further to the others. “

“Sometimes I could not make it to transfer all of my ideas and opinions to people. But in the end, we managed to succeed in all the projects because everyone understands we are moving towards the same goal. “

“Sometimes. “

The eight question and answers correlate to Multidimensional tool low score on Uncertainty Avoidance. The responders want to solve unexpected occurrence with patience and meeting in order to reach consensus. Also understanding of the core of problem – no ambiguity – give an opportunity to reach consensus in a new way. One differing answer were given but it relates to resolving the ambiguous situation – knowing the different working methods of team members.

“Try to understand why they did such things and explain so together with them I can reach a mutual understanding and behaviour. Give them some time to adapt to the new way of behave. “

“If there was none interaction relating problems to member communicate with other members. “

“It depends on people. I think in general they’re nice and behave well. I like my team when I organized the Northern Star seminar. “

“I think it’s hard to me to work in IBL because of the change in team member. It’s unstable so it takes time to know how to work together. “

5.2 Nordic
The group Nordic has 3 responders with the age average of 21, 33. By clarifying the age distribution among group it was possible to show differences in answers depending the age (Table 5).

Table 5. the members’ ages

![Column chart showing the ages of Nordic group members]

The responders’ evaluations of IBL core processes. The answers give a clear image of individual opinion on IBL which helped to determine possible variations among responders as well as if there is some part in the processes that were seemed troublesome (Table 6).
To the third question Group Nordic, responders consist of women, geographically located middle and northern part of Finland. Group Nordic suggest improvements in communication, time-scheduling, and recruitment of new members. The answers reflect the need of avoiding ambiguous situation in which group tasks are not divided clearly. Note of having lack of members is due to in order to avoid ambiguity every person has to have their own specific tasks, which create the dilemma of insufficient personnel, and because there are not enough members all the tasks are not signed therefore an ambiguous situation is born.

“More structure in implementation, planning step-by-step (what, when, who, where & how). “

“Recruitment of persons on other campuses as well – increased know-how & networking. “

“More emphasis on attending general meetings – for gathering ideas & communicating with others, attending general meetings is probably the best way to stay motivated. “

“More efficient marketing for our project. And to have more time to organize events so that marketing can also be done well enough for all projects of IBL. “
“Recruiting more active members to IBL.”

“More efficient flow of information more clear structure.”

Responders’ assessment of the process of IBL meeting. The answers reflect the perspective of an individual as well as the consistency of group Nordic on IBL meeting. The researcher will have an indication of any problems in meetings either on group or individual level (Table 7).

Table 7. Nordic’s evaluation on IBL meeting and mean values of answers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Clear</th>
<th>Confusing</th>
<th>Informal</th>
<th>Efficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean values</td>
<td>3,6</td>
<td>2,6</td>
<td>3,6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fourth question’s answers show how Group Nordic is used to the multicultural environment and its way of idea-creating in which multiple ideas are formed during a meeting. Not a typical cultural behaviour for Group Nordic.

“Yes, I was afraid at the start to voice out my objections and ideas but I grew used to speaking out.”

“Yes I agree, I feel like in IBL I can freely express my thoughts and ideas.”

“I could express anything I wanted sometimes there is too many people talking at the same time and the noise is too much.”

The fifth question and Group Nordic’s answers tell how consensus is reach in case of problems. Team-work is seemed to be open and resourceful. Also comprehension of differences between cultures is noticed.
“True but we were able to discuss openly about the best solution. “

“This is true as well, because we have members coming from different countries so there is more than one way to create solutions for problems. But in the end, we have always managed to find a solution that is good for everyone. “

“Group members didn’t always the same opinion on the problems, but the cooperation has been well. “

The sixth question with Nordic Group’s answer show sign of misunderstandings which are a norm. Even more interesting is to see how misunderstandings are due to communication barrier between members. Cultural differences are definitely acknowledged by Group Nordic.

“Small misunderstandings due to poor level of speech execution, on my side at least. “

“I do not completely agree with this, because according to my experience, everything has gone smoothly. But I would not be surprised if there were some since we have people from so many cultures working together. “

“I noticed sometimes there are misunderstandings due to different dialects. “

The seventh question show Group Nordic answers relating to the fact that within IBL there is common ground, where different culture tries to reach understanding, and communication between different cultures is possible.

“I do not agree completely because usually I have managed to say everything I first intended to. Within this multicultural group it is easy to express own thoughts because I feel like the members of IBL are all really open-minded."

“I feel like I have been able to express my feelings as I wanted.”

The eight question and answers given show how Group Nordic with low Uncertainty score: IBL has created conventional working tradition that the team members follow, the unexpected situations happen, when leader confronts its team members (not usual leadership method in Nordic), and if some team members do not follow the common working pattern.
“I do not know exactly what to think of this, I guess I did not have that big expectations on how people will behave. Sometimes teacher was certainly pushing us to do our best bit more aggressively than I expected.”

“Sometimes during group work, some members did their work as they liked ignoring rest of the team.”

5.3 Russia

The group Russia has 4 responders with the age average of 20, 00. By clarifying the age distribution among group it was possible to show differences in answers depending the age (Table 8).

Table 8. the members’ ages
The responders’ evaluations of IBL core processes. The answers give a clear image of individual opinion on IBL which helped to determine possible variations among responders as well as if there is some part in the processes that were seemed troublesome (Table 9).

Table 9. group’s results on IBL’s core processes

The third question with Group Russia, consist both man and women responders, indicate clear sign of Collectivism. Answers are perspective of a group instead oneself. From the answers given some of responders reflects to Power Distance, where characteristic and strong leaders are favoured. Group Russia feel there is a need for more communication within IBL.

“Organizing of more general meeting to have more efficient work.”

“Leader’s approach on the meeting; it shouldn’t be held in a form of asking what have been done and what needs to done.”

“Punctuality”

“Need stricter, motivated and sociable leader!”
Responders’ assessment of the process of IBL meeting. The answers reflect the perspective of an individual as well as the consistency of group Russia on IBL meeting. The researcher will have an indication of any problems in meetings either on group or individual level (Table 10).

Table 10. group Russia’s evaluation on IBL meeting and mean values of answers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How would you scale IBL meetings by these standards</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confusing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean value: Clear 3,75 Confusing 2,5 Informal 4,25 Efficient 3,25

The fourth question and Group Russia’s answers reflect easiness to contribute in conversations. That is due to Russia’s communication pattern including eloquence, persuasion, expressive body language, and talkativeness.

“It’s not a problem to express everything what is on your mind, all of the members always ready to listen the ideas.”

“IBL is an open stage for personal expressions and idea sharing, but, at the same time, it must be followed by respectful attitude to IBL members and good manners. I feel myself free in there.”

The fifth question show how Group Russia is acknowledging cultural differences and using its versatile approach in advantage. Collectivism play a key role again in answers as well, for instance consensus is reach in order to solve the problems. Difference in answer is seen but general opinion is that different ideas are not a problem instead a tool to solve same problem with a different way.
“But it’s common thing. Everyone has his own meaning to the problem, that’s why the idea can be developed in a different approach.”

“The Group members usually sitting in silence so you know about opinion of only few persons.”

“Of course, people are multicultural in IBL. And that is a big Plus, so that international community provides different solutions on a current problem. It is not that bad as it might seem.”

The sixth question reflect Group Russia’s collectivistic tendencies also how the collectivistic tendencies are not confused by confrontation among peers.

“Sometimes.”

“Yes.”

“It happen. Depends, usually if somebody is having a strong character and does not want to meet the consensus.”

“Sometimes it happens. People just get confused about specific moments in IBL projects and that is usual thing. Most important skill here is a patience – that plays very big role in case to work with multicultural environment.”

The seventh question and the answers show that are some problems with communication patterns, and accuracy what comes to comprehensive expressions. Russians are poor listeners and more story-tellers which might could be the reason for Group Russia’s answers.

“No.”

“No.”

“Nope, depends how you express that. Not IBL’s fault.”

The eight question and the collected answers reflect understanding toward work in multicultural working environment. The responders are demonstrating comprehension on multicultural issues as communication.

“Yes.”

“If there was none interaction relating problems to member communicate with other members.”
“True, that’s life, taking into consideration that you work in an intercultural environment, so, no surprises.”

“At least, it would be nice to get a clear statement related on problem. I do not consider this as a big problem. But it doesn’t mean that you should not work on your language and pronunciation at all.”

5.4 Non-Asian Southern Hemisphere

The group Non-Asian Southern Hemisphere has 2 responders with the age average of 25, 50. By clarifying the age distribution among group it was possible to show differences in answers depending the age (Table 11).

Table 11. the members’ ages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Non-Asian Southern Hemisphere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average age: 25.5
The responders’ evaluations of IBL core processes. The answers give a clear image of individual opinion on IBL which helped to determine possible variations among responders as well as if there is some part in the processes that were seemed troublesome (Table 12).

Table 12. the group’s results on IBL’s core processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How would you scale IBL by these standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean values: Cooperation 4 Progress 3.5 Informal 4 Clear structure 4 Working environment 4

The third question and Non-Asian Southern Hemisphere, group responders are men, answers show how IBL is not well-enough connected with local businesses. Collectivism is seen as how answers are aimed to improve IBL for future.

“IBL needs to become a more serious organization and start taking bigger projects. Not just decorating venues and organizing restaurant days. That is good as a starting place but after 4 years of work, they cannot be the main job to do. Leaders need to create ties with companies and institutions in order to increase the number of opportunities through collaboration.”

“Arrange more meetings with outsider organisations/companies in order to acquire more knowledge for future business.”
Responders’ assessment of the process of IBL meeting. The answers reflect the perspective of an individual as well as the consistency of group Non-Asian Southern Hemisphere on IBL meeting. The researcher will have an indication of any problems in meetings either on group or individual level (Table 13).

Table 13. group Non-Asian Southern Hemisphere’s evaluation on IBL meeting and mean values of answers

The fourth question indicate how Non-Asian Southern Hemisphere had no difficulties sharing opinions whilst working at IBL

“Opinions are heard and there is no problem in expressing them.”
“Open environment in which it is easy to tell own opinions.”

The fifth question and Group Non-Asian Southern Hemisphere tell that disagreements were common in IBL

“Disagreements were quite common and sometimes it was hard to find a solution, probably due to the differences between people’s points of view.”
“I perceived often different opinions among the members.”

The sixth question and answer indicate how Non-Asian Southern Hemisphere belong in Masculine society where it is normal behaviour to resolve conflicts by
confrontation, which means “a lot of misunderstandings among the members” is considered as a norm.

“There were often misunderstandings, mostly because of the lack of language skills.”

“A lot of misunderstandings among the members.”

The seventh question Non-Asian Southern Hemisphere feels there is a lack of comprehension in that dialogue; the norm is debate until other party agrees on the opinion given.

“I normally did, even though I did not usually say much. Most of the time it just felt unnecessary.”

“With some members there is problems with comprehension.”

The eight question and Group Non-Asian Southern Hemisphere’s answers indicate an environment, where with high score of Uncertainty Avoidance can be motivated by the sense of security.

“Normally they behaved quite expectedly.”

“Yes.”
6 LEADERSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE

The leadership questionnaire was designed for giving the leadership point-of-view on IBL meetings, and core processes. With this the researcher is able to indicate communication problems more efficiently when both members’ and leaders' side are taken in consideration.

The leadership questionnaire part’s layout is following: Firstly, is shown analysis of a question asked from a leader, secondly, is the leader’s answer, in this questionnaire took part 2 leaders, finally, is the analysis of given answers.

The questions asked from leaders can be found on Appendices.

The first question shows to the researcher, if leaders saw clear problems in communication flow among the IBL team members. And if, the members felt it necessary to have clarification after meetings.

Leader 1: “Considering this all IBL members, whom are participating in a project, could express their opinions freely. Every opinion is taken in consideration. If oneself – a member - is outside of a project or group, that person could reach the leader after a meeting. This didn’t happen too often – still sometimes. I believe it is a sign of open-mindedness and collaboration”

Leader 2: “In general during meetings everyone were able to express their opinions without the fear of being misunderstood. Sometimes there were debates between different cultures – these debates happened from job responsibilities distribution between different departments. When assigning new members into teams, current leaders were reluctant to take these new members into their teams. Despite, I would say these incidents played a minor role. Sometimes members came to me ask an advice after some meetings, but not because they felt it necessary due to communication problems.”

The believed signs by the leader are due to in-group development within IBL. The strong sense of unity is also sign of co-culture; IBL members are seeing
themselves as an in-group in which opinions are heard and considered until conclusion can be reached, instead of ambiguous situation. Also strong believe in the leadership has been found – an example group members reach the leader after a meeting to reach completion.

The second question resolves how usually different opinions were handled by the IBL member among themselves. And what kind of problems were the most common.

Leader 1: “The problem is the situation which is touching all the members. In that case the problems consider every member. In order to solve them: all the opinions need to be heard; based on these opinions the right solution for solving the problem could be established.”

Leader 2: “Misunderstandings are unavoidable in every group, and especially in multicultural working environment. In a nutshell, it is how these situations are handled more than how they occurred. In my perspective, the problems were due to the different dialects, and language level, which is a tricky question in begin with – the level of understanding is good with every member, therefore it becomes a matter of: are members willing to understand what the other member is trying to say. Motivation I would say.

Dialogue is praised by IBL standards and ambiguous situation are avoided. In some of the cultures this kind of meeting procedure is against national culture norms. But again it is proving that members from different cultures are adjusting by the new norms established by their new environment – the IBL.

The third question resolves how communication and cultural misunderstandings are seen in IBL. How these problems occur, and what is typical reaction for the group when having these problems.

Leader 1: “I do not remember any cases where members have said that they cannot work together, because of misunderstandings. Most of these misunderstandings were handled as soon as they did occur.”

Leader 2: “They are unavoidable. The reason why these are and were, is not a simple question to answer. There are many explanations why;
more like guidelines because “culture” is just one factor inside you and like any other part in you it is a subject of change. Still these problems are not a crucial part of IBL.”

No signs of cultural clash are detected by the leader. Members are able to comprehend different cultural backgrounds, or if not these personal traits are left outside the IBL cooperation.

The fourth question helps to see how usually the communication is between the team and a leader in a multicultural working environment. Also what kind of problems they were and how often. Also if leaders had any means to resolve these communication problems.

Leader 1: “During the different projects and meetings. There were situations where they – members – did not understand each other in a detailed way. In this case I tried interpret the task in a way that a common comprehension was achieved. In meetings I tried keep an open environment during conversations. I was ready to repeat the message until everyone did understand it. This did not happen too often – to be more specific only sometimes.”

Leader 2: “During meetings I had no problems to communicate with the team, or, at least, which I am aware of. The best indicator for me is that all the assigned projects were finished as scheduled. I personally like to plan ahead my meetings, in order to assure good flow of communication. During general meetings avoid dialogue between leaders and members, of course the questions and such are asked after the project updates and new project presentations are finished. In order to make sure there are none misunderstandings. I do not know, if this was a really efficient way of handling meetings, or more my way of demising language challenges. Good or bad way it is not my job estimate. I let the results speak on their behalf.”

Communication problems are universal they exist in all the aspects of human interaction and cannot be caused by multicultural working environment; or only
because of it. In case there were problems the leader handled these problems; again contradicts with some cultural norms hold by some members’ culture, but as members didn’t leave or avoided this new method of approaching social situation – culture defines scripts a method taught by society how to handle social situations – the co-culture subsides the existing norms.

The fifth question shows how the usual communication is in IBL. Also, if the leader needed to aid communication flow. And how often these occurred?

Leader 1: “Regular – but not too often – mostly it is about the attitudes within IBL. How interested the members were in things happening in IBL. I feel between divisions inside IBL. The Non-Asian Southern Hemisphere were a group that had most of the problems with communication.”

Leader 2: “I had none situation where the members did not understand each other. Although they do happen, but not in a scale of causing problems to a teamwork.”

The fact that the Non-Asian Southern Hemisphere had difficulties – according the leader – is sign that multi-active cultures felt the meetings were too conversational and decision were not reached quick enough. A dialogue prolonged before a decision should be rapid, short, and efficient in these cultures. Reactive cultures feel, in many cases, the decision is made too hastily, if the dialogue before is too short. But again as this reactive culture in IBL are from Asia – where are strict hierarchical society structure – the opinion of leader matter more than cultural norms; and as Uncertainty Avoidance is low, meaning, if old rules are seemed obsolete they are abandoned.

The sixth question helps to see leader’s subjective perspective on multiculturalism.

Leader 1: “There are lot of aspects in cultures – such as religion, language, emotional. Some of these issues plays a huge role, especially, in communication. Still communication is not a problem in IBL – everyone is taken in consideration the different levels in English. The biggest problem is emotional, more specifically, stress management. If an individual is not able to cope the stress it will become a problem later on.”
Leader 2: “Multiculturalism is a necessity of tomorrow. Without it our globe is not able to develop itself. Different ways of thinking putting into one - are a valuable asset that provides countless opportunities. IBL is cultural melting-pot in which a rare opportunity can be experienced in a young age. An eye opening opportunity for everyone. Still how it is seen in IBL? It is seen as a common goal for every member to be able understand cultures and persons no matter where they come from.”

Does the leader see definite signs of creation of co-culture among IBL.

Leader 1: “During my time as a leader. I have seen many cultures becoming one entity. An individual creates a passion and strong cooperation while working in IBL. You become a member of a family, which believes in same values. The previous members help the new members in this process of integration.”

Leader 2: “Definitely in every definition there are. That is why, it is not a spooky monster to be afraid of – meaning cultural differences – but save place where to experience them – different cultures – without being afraid of standing out of the crowd. When comparing to an experience of visiting or moving to another country. With it everyone is the same but different, the beauty behind IBL.”
7 DELIBERATION

The deliberation part concentrate analysing the answers given by the members of IBL through Geert Hofstede’s multidimensional tool as well as Lewis’s T-Chart model. The objective of this deliberation is to compare if there are any similarities between the answers given and multidimensional tool and T-Chart model.

7.1 Asia

Group Asia is collectivistic society, which means they valuate work group where everyone takes responsibility and contributes in the well-being of the working environment. From given answers it is clear to see the collectivistic behaviour.

Asia is Reactive country. Meaning they create efficiency with politeness towards each other within working environment. IBL has typical features from an Asian working environment.

Group Asia is Feminine society. Problems are solved with meetings and consensus is always reached. Well-being is appreciated and status is not important. Conflicts are handled by negotiation and compromise. From given answers this dimension is according multidimensional tool.

Group Asia is Reactive country that means in the working environment misunderstandings are resolved by a leader who is knowledgeable, patience. From answers given it is clear to see Asia has cultural tendency for this while working in IBL.

Group Asia has low score on Uncertainty Avoidance. Meaning they are adoptable for new ways of solving problems and are not afraid to break traditions if they are seemed obsolete. From answers given it is clear to see how Asia’s answers reflects to the multidimensional tool. Asia wants solve unexpected occurrence with patience and meeting in order to reach consensus.
7.2 Nordic

Group Nordic is an Individualist society, meaning individuals are expected to take care of themselves and only closest relatives. From the answers given it is clear to see, how Nordics feel being a part of IBL, therefore being open and more cooperative in order to achieve the best results. Not so much going through action steps with the team, but making decisions in an individualistic manner.

Group Nordic is Re-Active country as well as Asia is. First it might be overwhelming in a situation where many opinions are heard at the same time. Still from the answers given it can be seen Nordics got used to it and feel the ambiance of IBL also for their liking.

Group Nordic is Feminine society. They resolve differences through consensus and team-work is huge part of working. From the answers given it can be seen: there were problems, but all of the problems were resolved, or they did not impact crucially the cooperation.

Nordic belonging in the Reactive part. They have witnessed some misunderstanding within IBL, but still offering a reason why that would be. In the end, Nordic country seems acknowledge cultural differences and be able to contribute into the team work beside them.

Nordic has a high score in Uncertainty Avoidance meaning, they have need for reform, old believes which to follow in order to anticipate future happenings. New ideas or behaviour is in tolerated at first. Security is highly appreciated in decisions making; and it also motivates individuals.

7.3 Russia

Group Russia is Collectivistic society. It is common think for a group instead oneself. Relationships with work group and friends are highly valuated by Russians. It is important information as well as negotiation channel. It is important for collectivistic behaviour to have social gatherings in order to maintain the group-spirit.
Group Russia is Multi-Active. The communication pattern has eloquence, persuasion, expressive body language, talkativeness. For Russians it is easy to swoop in conversation and contribute in it too. From the answers given Russians feel IBL offers a place for conversations.

Group Russia is Feminine country, which might be surprising when taken in consideration Russia’s high score in Power Distance. Collectivistic behaviour is favoured as well as consensus in order to solve problems. The answers show: Russians are acknowledging cultural differences and using its versatile approach in advantage. In other words, working together well in team work situations in IBL.

Group Russia feels there are some problems with communication patterns, and accuracy what comes to comprehensive expressions. As Multi-Active country: Russians are poor listeners and more storytellers, which might be the case for Russian’s answers.

Russia being very Uncertainty avoidance country – prefer having things planned before they happen. These answers show how IBL has affected on Russian’s cultural tendencies, meaning co-culture subsides the dominant one while working with IBL members.

7.4 Non-Asian Southern Hemisphere

Group Non-Asian Southern Hemisphere group is Collectivistic society, which means loyalty for the group is highly valued; culture itself foster strong relationships – everyone takes others well-being in consideration. From answers given it is visible how the well-being of future members is in it. The direct link between culture and the answer can be determined.

Group Non-Asian Southern Hemisphere is Multi-Active countries. They are emotional group, extroverts who believe in words – not so much of planners instead action weight more. Using body language as way of communication. From answers given it is clear to see IBL offers for multi-active - like group Middle-East – opportunity freely express their opinions and thoughts.

Multi-active countries, such as the group Non-Asian Northern Hemisphere, are talkative; meaning dialogues are frequently interrupted, and what one might
seem as a dispute is normal way of conducting for them. Conversations are vivid with body language used often. Silence is rarely experienced by multi-actives. From answer given it can be see that IBL has a talkative working environment, which is seem normal to the group Non-Asian Northern Hemisphere.

The group members of Non-Asian Southern Hemisphere are from Masculine societies, therefore valuing competition, achievement, and success as indicators of successful life.

The group Non-Asian Southern Hemisphere feels within IBL there is some miscommunication, which can be due to talkative nature of multi-active cultures. Or high dependency of confrontation, if one party of dialogue evades the confrontation.

The group Non-Asian Southern Hemisphere has high score on the dimension of Uncertainty Avoidance, which means there is a need maintain rules, even though they would not be followed, in order to give a sense of security. From the answer given the group Non-Asian Southern Hemisphere feels IBL is an environment, where one – with high score of Uncertainty Avoidance – can be motivated by the sense of security.
8 CONCLUSIONS

This research was executed in order to identify the factors in communication when an individual is at multicultural working environment. In this thesis took part 13 members from IBL (according Facebook in IBL Core team there are 44 members making the answer percent 30 %) when including 2 leaders who took part altogether it is 15 members making the overall answer percent 34%.

In this research took part nationalities from Nordic countries, Russia, Asia, Non-Asian Southern Hemisphere. This wide range of nationalities in thesis questionnaire secure that the results represent multicultural perspective within IBL.

Both of the questionnaires used in the research phase of this thesis are successful. Both of them were able to provide insight into the working environment of IBL.

In this conclusion part, firstly, the author determines the factors in communication, secondly, brings points of improvement to the IBL administration; this is done by analysing the chart mean values.

All the nationalities want either more direct, straightforward leader or more efficient transparent chain of communication. Providing transparent chain of communication is included in leadership responsibilities. When thinking the characteristics of an international manager, in many cases, connection between cultures plays important part.

Based on the leadership questionnaire the leaders do not see the communication as problematic with in IBL. Even though it does exist and both of them were unanimous that the problem is the motivation of members than e.g. poor language skills, comprehension or negative attitude towards other cultures.

More knowledge is required or guidelines for a student to follow. All cultures have their own social script that each culture member follow in an ambiguous situation.

IBL could compile and provide cultural reading material for its members in order to courage them on the topic as well as organise get-together evenings where
besides working together members have time to know personality behind the culture. By this IBL could create a co-culture and decrease the impact of national culture and social scripts in communication as well as increase the motivation among members. With combination of these two methods decrease in cultural misunderstanding can be expected. IBL’s method in keeping the projects more task-orientated is efficient. The meetings are seen as a positive experience where all nationalities are able to express their opinions. Rare phenomenon in a multicultural working environment as, in case of IBL, it consists from all categories multi-active, linear-active, re-active; it has to be remembered that each of these categories have different way to approach social interaction. Disagreement are not seen as a personal issue more of cultural trait that create broad perspective to deal cultural differences in future. And all the responders confirm that consensus is reach, if not at the moment then later; and solution for a disagreement is found through the consensus.

Based on the thesis research most of the challenges occur while social interaction. There are reasons for that social interaction is in a key role throughout culture – it is a way teach cultural values from generation to another. It is essence in forming one’s script. It is a challenge that can be won with in-group spirit, co-culture mentality that replace national culture; it creates unity within IBL and helps the cooperation between its members.

The IBL process and progress were seen as satisfactory by its members. The average grade on scale from 1 to 5 for cooperation was 3,76; progress 3,38; informal 3,69; clear structure in the meetings 3,53; working environment 4,07. In general IBL has created a safe environment in which a student can learn what the differences are between two cultures – without the fear of being misunderstood. Beneficial investment in the future, not only for improving language, social, working, practical, corporation skills before enter to working markets, but cultural knowledge – meaning corporate culture – is a necessity of tomorrow and a lesson that otherwise is learned in social studies.

IBL meetings were scaled by IBL members on scale from 1 to 5 as follows: clear 3,69; confusing 2,38; informal 3,9; efficient 3,15. The collected average grades align with the IBL process and progress results. The meetings are seen clear, informal, and most importantly not confusing for the members.
The average grade when taken all the scores from both statistics is 3.65. The parts falling under this average grade are: efficient (3.15), progress (3.38), clear structure in the meetings (3.53).

The improvement points are all regarding meeting. And the personality traits, more straightforward, direct leader are aligned with the improvement points. Therefore, the traits of more sociable, culture aware, and a good communicator for a leader of IBL is recommendation.

The opportunities are definitely more than the challenges therefore IBL is a great educator of students of globalisation. But even there the theoretical study has to be combined with practical study. This said opportunities are endless. And, in the end, defined so by the members of IBL.
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APPENDICES

Appendix. 1 Questionnaire to the IBL members

Appendix. 2 Leadership Questionnaire
Appendix. 11 (2) Questionnaire to the IBL members

This questionnaire is totally anonymous. Your name or identity will not show anywhere in this Thesis.

It is acceptable to reflect time of your own choosing in this questionnaire as the emphasis is on working in IBL.

Q - Age and Country =

Next I will ask you to scale IBL by the following standards, your task is grade them from 1 to 5.

(1) How would you scale IBL by these standards?
(1 being the lowest and 5 the highest. On school grading scale.)

-Cooperation =
-Progress =
-Informal =
-Clear structure in meetings =
-Working environment =

(2) How would you scale IBL meetings by these standards?
(1 being the lowest and 5 the highest.)

-Clear =
-Confusing =
-Informal =
-Efficient =

Open-word part

(3) What would you improve in IBL?

-Clarify the way of leadership?
-More general meetings?
-Some other, what?
(Simply by describing an area is enough, for instance team-spirit.)
Appendix. 1 2 (2)

How do you answer the following statements?

(4) I could express anything I wanted.

(5) The group members did not always have the same opinion about problems.

(6) I perceived some misunderstandings between the group members.

(7) I did not succeed in accurately expressing what I wanted to say.

(8) Other students rarely behaved in a way or said things, which I did not expect.

(9) The reason why I like/ dislike working in IBL is...
Appendix.2 Leadership Questionnaire:

1: Could the group members express their opinions freely in IBL meetings? (If the members came to talk with you after a meeting, please describe the case in a few short words)

2: How problems usually occurred among the group members?

3: Was there signs of misunderstandings between the group members? (If, yes please describe them, which kind of signs there were? And were they solved immediately when seen?)

4: Between you and the whole team were there any problems in communication? (If, yes please describe them, and how the problems were solved? And how frequent these communication problems were?)

5: Did the group members usually understood each other, when communicating? (If, not how frequent it was? And did they try to reach an understanding, or avoid communication after? Did you try solve the problems? If, yes please describe)

6: How do you think multiculturalism is seen in IBL?

7: Do you believe IBL has created its own co-culture?

8: Your opinion on this questionnaire? (Free-word)