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Abstract

When a multicultural team is formed of say six individuals of different cultural backgrounds, there will be potential conflicts and greater varieties. However, there will be a “normal” curve forms the range and permissible boundaries of a team. In concept, this normal distribution is the “calm” state when the team is not active (norms). The potential is the range of team members’ abilities/differences (divergences). To be able to reach the potential and perform is part of the team’s goal (convergences & attributions). But to expect something more than expected is cultural synergy (break the original boundaries).

The factors that will be considered as diverging forces are the differences that are born (already exists) when the team is formed. In order to model these cultural factors and estimate these cultural differences, Hofstede cultural dimensions are used. The factors that will be considered as converging forces are what each individual believe in such as perspective taking and self-leadership. These values are projected from the assessments of team individuals. The factors that will be considered as supporting forces (attribution factors) are how each member interacts with one another during the process. These are each individual behavior and personality.

Therefore, from the perspective of divergence and convergence to see how cultural differences influence the teams and talk about their possible behaviors and reasons behind them is a conceptual way to look at the team. Based on the concept described above, the analysis of these different forces on multicultural teams is conducted. Using these factors, the paper explains/examines:

- Cultural and individual values differences
- Wish to base on the findings from the research to make helpful inferences on the learning and performance of multicultural teams.
- Cultural divergent factors
- Individual convergent factors
- Individual attribution factors
- Cultural synergy
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I. Introduction

Just like Japanese industrial success of 1980s has made the emphasis of individuals into teams, globalization has made transformation of homogenous teams into multicultural ones. A team with different cultures lever more complexity in exchange of potential for greater creativity. This thesis aim to conceptualize the driving forces required in the multicultural team in a condition where the team is already accepted the cultural differences.

Teams can make better decisions; develop better products and services, as well as formulate a more energized workforce than people who work alone. On the other hand, culturally diverse teams often perform either more or less effectively than their single-culture counterparts. (Kovach, 1976) Nonetheless, the multicultural team will go through the same process as a homogeneous team has, just like a society did.

Through socialization process, people are educated to follow a norm, and most people won’t oppose it. In homogeneous or multicultural teams, norming is reaching a “cultural” convention on how the members should conduct themselves, approach things, as well as roles and requirements. In other words, it is the process of reaching a balance. Even though, multicultural teams use more time and effort in creating cohesion than homogeneous ones, they do offer potentials for creativity and synergetic solutions that are in desperate needs of the ever-converging globalization world.

However, creativity comes from laying aside the rules. Only at that moment can one assemble what’s already there and be creative. Therefore, creativity puts forward an ideation of breaking up the boundaries, and valuing the differences. There are common traces seem to exist on those creative minds, who go extremes to look for “answers”. They “believe” in something, and willing to “deviate” from the social norm to expand range of views and explore possibilities. They are not necessary try to be “creative”, but rather, find a solution that helps. To be creative, one has to go divergent from the norm to the extremes. Similarly, for the team to perform, it is necessary to think divergently and look for options. And the first step in divergent thinking is to be open. However, the divergence factors are not only factors that diversify a team, but they also refer to a step conceptually when team is performing.

Basically, Hofstede’s cultural dimensions\(^1\), power distance (PDI), individualism (IDV), masculinity (MAS), and uncertainty avoidance (UAI), represent these collective values of divergent cultures. To see the possible difficulties and performance of a multicultural team, it is essential to use these general cultural factors

\(^1\) Hofstede proposed that cultural factors have two aspects: practices and values.
as a starting point. In contrast, convergence is the process of choosing the best alternatives perhaps after refining them. In order to select from the divergent possibilities that is not only creative but also practical, the union has to take place to reach an intelligent decision. The convergence factors, in another words, have to motivate individual team members to reach the group goal. And the intrinsic motivations that come from within are what really energizes and motivates individuals.

Thus, the convergence factors call attention to individual determinations. These determined motivations, like energy sources, seem to be the link among the divergence, convergence and attribution factors. Attribution factors, on the other hand, are complementing aspects that bring about team efforts. They encourage team commitment. Perspective taking, team player inventory as well as team roles can be good indications of these efforts. Therefore, attribution factors are forces that “manage” the divergence and convergence forces: Only with the attribution factors to manage diversity and motivations, a highly productive team is possible.

Nevertheless, Trompenaars classified specific and diffused oriented cultures. He thinks people in specific cultures tend to have a larger public area and small private area and more guarded. They are more direct and prefer to keep private life separate. On the contrary, in diffused cultures, the private space is usually larger while the public space is smaller and more guarded. They are more indirect and introvert, and also view private and work as linked, and the flexibility is very important to them.

The ultimate act of a multicultural team is to create cultural synergy, where in conception, the sum is greater than its parts combined. With every culture’s perspectives in mind, it is possible to create a cultural synergetic solution beyond the best existing alternatives. Multicultural team members learn from one another to enhance the overall team productivity and effectiveness. This is a process of combining and leveraging various cultures. With “cultural awareness”, the ideas won’t seem strange. As a result, synergy is more likely to occur in a multicultural team than a homogeneous team. In order for the multicultural team to perform, members have to converge into a norm to form a new convention. And to perform, the multicultural team has to diverge again to find the possible alternatives. On the path of diverging and converging, a multicultural team will have a wider range to look for that unexpected discovery.
II. Literature Review & Points of Departure

Culture influences people from how they think, how they behave, and what they value, into their sub consciousness. In a way, culture is the collectively held values, predominating attitudes, and behaviors that characterize the functioning of a group. Team, on the other hand, is formed by a small number of people with complementary skills. They hold each other accountable in a “common approach” toward “a common purpose and performance goals”. These are micro-level behaviors that “at the project level, when participants make decisions or coordinate with each other, their behavior is based on their values.” (Horii, Jin & Levitt, 1996)

What is Culture?

According to American Heritage Dictionary, the definition of culture is:

1. The totality of socially transmitted behavior patterns, arts, beliefs, institutions, and all other products of human work and thought.
2. Intellectual and artistic activity and the works produced by it.
3. Development of the intellect through training or education.
4. A high degree of taste and refinement formed by aesthetic and intellectual training.
5. Special training and development: *voice culture for singers and actors.*

Culture is very hard to define since it covers a whole range of scopes. It is obvious but also hidden in people’s subconscious. People from their own cultures sometimes can’t get the full perceptive and don’t know why their behaviors follow these “granted” patterns. Indeed, cultures influences individuals’ life from how they think to how they behave and what they value.
It maybe wrong to “stereotype” a culture, but it is a starting point before one can full embrace the extents of it. So Edgar Schein once said, “Culture is the deeper level of basic assumptions and belief that are shared by members of an organization, that operate unconsciously and define in a basic ‘taken for granted’ fashion an organization’s view of itself and its environment.” While others like Geert Hofstede views “Culture is the collective programming of the human mind that distinguishes the members of one human group from those of another.” Culture in this sense is a system of collectively held values. Then, similar to cultures, teams will develop collectively held values. In a sense, team will develop a “culture” like organization have organizational culture and this is a collective representation of individuals combined.

McShane & Von Glinow (2005) define teams are groups of two or more people who interact and influence each other, are mutually accountable for achieving common goals associated with organizational objectives, and perceive themselves as a social entity with an organization. There are some characteristics of a team. It is formed by a small number of people. Individuals with complementary skills are usually needed to form the team. Often, they hold each other accountable in a “common approach” toward “a common purpose and performance goals”. However, according to Peter Scholtes, there are ten common teaming problems such as floundering, overbearing participants, dominating participants, reluctant participants, unquestioned acceptance of opinions as facts, rush to accomplishment, attribution, discounts and “plops”, wanderlust: digression and tangents, and feuding members. Then, with these many possible drawbacks, why team? Why multicultural team?

**Why multicultural team?**

The importance of successful teams has been ascribed in winning organizations. Partly due to Japanese economic miracle of 1970s, there have been more and more teams replacing individuals as the basic working units. Meanwhile, it is widely believed that teams can make better decisions, develop better products and services as well as a more energized workforce than people who work alone. However, these effects can only be achieved, if the goals are common and team members have complementing skills. In general, working teams are better at identifying problems, developing and choosing alternatives than individuals can.

Because a good team share information and responds to the external environment, team is also good for knowledge management. For example, with team, superior customer service can be achieved because of more breadth of knowledge and expertise to customers than an individual can have. By enriched “job” contents, teams also have potential to energize and engage people, because team members are
“motivated” to bond as a group working towards a common goal. When people feel they are part of the group, the basic social needs are not only satisfied, but also motivate people to fulfill the common goals of the group. In a sense, a team setting with broader job scopes will let team members perform tasks that are too complex for an individual to deal with alone.

Telecommunication technologies like emails had made it possible to form a remote/virtual team with individuals from different parts of the world. In a global environment, it is unavoidable that specialties are gathered from individuals with different cultural background and nationalities. This is because there are inevitable needs to work with the locals who possess knowledge that is tacit².

Culturally diverse teams often perform either more or less effectively than their single-culture counterparts.³ (Kovach, 1976) With individuals from different cultures, if the cultural differences are communicated and understood, it is believed that multicultural team will be more “creative” to achieve the objectives. How much are the influence of the cultures on the teams and how much values had they added? If a team can generate more alternatives than an individual, a multicultural team will have more creative prospects than a homogeneous team can, even though the potential conflicts are great⁴. If individuals can be converged (normed) into a performing team, cultural divergent individuals may well as converged to outperform a homogeneous team. Multicultural team has the same kind of elements like team with more embedded cultural differences. From this point of view, cultures in essence are collective values that converged to a norm at a moment.

**Norming: Convention & Convergence**

A social norm is a socially “enforced” rule. Through socialization process, people are educated to follow a norm, and most people won’t oppose it. A person may feel social pressure if he/she does not follow a norm. It is even more evident when norms are not followed or broken. For example, an expatriate travel to another country finds himself/herself has to adjust to cultural differences where the norms are not the same.

In the meantime, “norms” are closely related to customs. They often originated

---

² Tacit knowledge are something that can only be learned from personal experience, or training. It is not something that can just learned from the book without practice. As indicated by Wikipedia encyclopedia, the tacit knowledge is embedded in group and organizational relationship, core values, assumptions and beliefs. It is hard to identify, locate, quantify, map or value.

³ It is less because if the multicultural team can’t normed (ex. Not enough time) it will perform worse.

⁴ Whether a multicultural team’s conflict is greater or a homogeneous team conflict is greater is not definite. This is because the conflicts are not necessary cause by the wider range of diversity. People who are more perspective taking or cultural sensitive might focus on problems more instead of minor differences in perspectives and values, and are more willing to understand and communicate. It is less effective because it takes longer time to converge perhaps?
from common sense, but they may vary over time as original context of society has changed. This “normative” course of action regulates the function of social activity within a cultural framework. Like stated in encyclopedia, “while there are always anomalies in social activity the normative effect of popularly-endorsed beliefs (such as family values or common sense) push most social activity towards a generally homogenous set, resulting in varying degrees of social stability.”

As a result, norms affect a broad range of human behavior. In social situations such as meetings, norms govern individual’s behavior reminiscent of unwritten rules. Likewise, import of foreign cultural ideas/products into a culture may confront her people with dissimilar norms than they are accustomed to. Therefore, cultural import may often be seen as a threat to cultural identity.

Likewise, team members develop relatively similar mental models, so they have common expectations and assumptions about how the teams should perform. If the team has reached the norms, there is a real sense of cohesion as team roles are established; and a consensus forms around group objectives. Therefore, norming is reaching a “cultural” consensus on how the members should behave, approach things, as well as explicit/implicit roles and requirements.

From a perspective, this is to converge all the differences into a calm state that one can call this a “convention”. Namely, one will tolerate another one’s way, views, cultures, or one will bring others differences more close to what he/she originally has. It is balance out, like a leveled water surface that covers the up and downs of rocks and pits below. The geography of the terrain is not changed, but accepting/cover up the differences by the leveled water.

From peer pressure, limited resource to increased uncertainty, the team has to scramble to come up with the result before a deadline if not more. Studies show that members of multicultural teams use “more of their time and effort in creating cohesion and solidarity than [do] members of homogeneous groups” (Punnett & Clemens, 1999) Meanwhile, multicultural teams’ higher levels of mistrust, miscommunication, and stress diminish their cohesion (Probst, Carnevale, & Triandis 1999) However, if the team members have at the first more open-minded about these cultural differences, can norming be more easier than a homogeneous team?

Performing: Creativity & Divergence

Some have considered the creativity as a legacy of evolutionary process,\(^5\) while others think it is a strike of lightening, a gift from God. According to Wikipeidia,

\(^5\) Since the time of Graham Wallas and his work of Art of Thought, published in 1926, some have considered creativity a legacy of the evolutionary process, which allowed humans to quickly adapt to rapidly changing environments. (thefreedictionary.com)
creativity can be assessed on several dimensions:

- **Intellectual leadership**: Create new and promising theories or exciting trends, which inspire others to follow up like a movement, school of thought or trend.
- **Sensitivity to problems**: Identify problems that challenge others and open up a new field of thought.
- **Originality**: Find ideas or solutions that no one else has been able to come up with.
- **Ingenuity**: Solve problems in a neat and surprising way that also reflects a new perspective of looking at the problem.
- **Unusualness**: See the remote association between ideas.
- **Usefulness**: Practical solutions or ideas are also considered more creative as the creator is able to meet the constraints of the problem while at the same time producing unusual and original solutions.
- **Appropriateness**: Ideas that are appropriate to the situation.

A lot of time our creativity is hampered by the ‘rule’ we think we are supposed to operate by. Be logical, don’t be messy, be structured, get it right, don’t be foolish, play is frivolous, be practical, and it must be relevant. Creativity comes from laying aside the rules – even for just a little while. Then we can assemble what’s already there and be creative. Creative seems to suggest an ideation of not confining, break up the boundaries, and value the differences.

George Balanchine, a known creative mind, says “There is no such thing as Creativity; you just assemble what’s already there.” (Impactfactory) It is already there, but it is how you look at from a different perspective that you are not usually think of, and cultural diversity give someone more opportunities to look at things in different ways. History has numerous examples of creative minds. This suggests why “crazy” scientist, “outrageous” behaviors from artists, and gays\(^6\) are more creative because they are not at the same norm as mainstream collective culture. Does “creative ways” also explain why it takes longer time for a creative person to achieve finer success? Is this because they need to be mentally prepared for the things and takes more efforts?

Common traces seem to exist that these creative minds go extremes internally or externally, implicit or explicit to look for “answers”. They “believe” in something and willing to “deviate” from the social norm to expand range of views and possibilities. From moderates to extremes and from extreme back to a new moderate that is practical. They are not necessary try to be “creative”, but rather find a solution that helps. To be creative, a team has to divergent from the norm to extremes. Whatever the creativity are defined or measured, it seems that it has to be diverged. Similarly,

\(^6\) The definition of gay originally does not mean homosexuality, but later it was emphasized because of the meanings in cultural and social practices.
for the team to perform, it is necessary to have divergent thinking. And “the first step in divergent thinking is to be open.” (changingminds.org)

**Divergence Factors:**

The divergence factors are not only factors that diversify a team, but it also refers to a conceptual step when team is performing. Namely, a team looks for ways to stimulate thinking by diversifying and exploring the alternatives. According to Joyce Wycoff, all divergence tools have five basic inherent action principles: (SWAMI)

- **Suppose:** Imagine a situation that will shift to new way of thinking.
- **Wander:** Wandering through new territory for connections and linkages.
- **Associate:** Deliberately link between ideas, events, people, objects, or processes that are not normally connected. By doing so, it might give a new direction on seeing things and new possibilities from new relationships.
- **Morph:** Change various aspects of the situations, making the unfamiliar things acquainted, and making the strange things familiar.
- **Inquire:** When questions are asked, the new “openings” are marked. It is often said that a great question can unravel a mystery. For some this is a learned skills based on some simple principles.

The divergent factors emphasize from cultural differences on multicultural teams. “Cultural differences have been found to be responsible for over 70% of the differences in leadership behavior. Thus, a focus on these differences seems legitimate.” (Reber, Jago, Auer-Rizzi, & Szabo, 2000) As a result, the Hofstede’s cultural dimensions are a good starting point.

**Hofstede Cultural Dimensions**

Hofstede’s cultural factors place a set of factors that describe a country’s values, norms and belief at a collective national level. Basically, four cultural dimensions represent these values: power distance, individualism, masculinity, and uncertainty avoidance. Hofstede rates these countries’ dimensions on a scale relatively from 1 to 100 (normally). To see the possible difficulties and performance of a multicultural team, it is necessary to use these general cultural factors as a starting point. These characteristics are engrained in cultural mindset. Therefore, to understand the nature of these dimensions will be a helpful indication of the multicultural teams at how

---

7 Applying Hofstede approach makes three basic assumptions about mean levels of values assessed by Hofstede: (a) accurate across life domains, (b) stable over time, and (c) relevant to individual-level assessment. (Horii) However, it is necessary to keep this in mind that for an individual from a certain culture with a certain cultural dimension values, it is very likely that this individual possess a range that is normed at this index value.

8 There is fifth factor that Hofstede named this Long versus Short-term Orientation (LTO).

9 Some country is below 0 to be negative or over 100, this is probably because the scale is relative to other countries and it might be easier to go over 100 than readjust all country’s dimensions.
diversified and differences the team is. For example, Germany, Switzerland, and U.S. will be considered as more task-oriented cultures whereas Latin America, the Middle East, and Southern Europe are more relationship-oriented cultures.

**Power distance (PDI):** Power distance measures how much a culture has respect for authority, namely, the degree of equality. Hofstede indicates a high power distance ranking societies allow inequalities of power and wealth while a low power distance ranking societies de-emphasize the differences between people’s power and wealth. Therefore, in a high PDI country, it is acceptable for a superior to assert authority and rarely socialize and interact with workers. The subordinates won’t get important job but usually take the blame if something goes wrong. Malaysia (104) is the highest; Philippine (94) is also very high and countries like Indonesia (78) is also considered high in the power distance index. In a low power distance culture, a superior is expected to treat employees respectfully, and managers socialize and interact with workers more often. Subordinates may be delegated with important job, but the authority will take the blame if something goes wrong. Austria (11) is the lowest; and countries like Sweden (31) and Canada (39) are considered low.

Logically, in a multicultural team, potential conflicts will occur between high and low PDI members. High PDI members will want a strong and clear direction more than low PDI members. If a high PDI member becomes a leader (implied or pointed), he/she will become quite dominant that low PDI members will have problem to cooperate. If a low PDI member is a leader\(^{10}\), high PDI members will think less of the leadership because the assertion is not strong enough. The emphasis here is the difference between high and low PDI will result in potential conflicts, therefore, longer converging time to be normed. Nevertheless, once this team is normed, PDI is not a source of conflict. Then when teams try to perform, PDI turns into a value-adding factor in the diverging process.

**Individualism (IDV):** IDV measures the degree on the integration of individuals into the group. For an individualist culture like US (with the highest score of 91) or Netherlands (80) and Canada (80), individuality and individual rights are ingrained. It emphasizes the personal achievement with competition. For a collective culture like Guatemala (lowest of 6) or countries like Indonesia (14), South Korea (18), Taiwan (17) and Thailand (20), collective natures (close ties between individuals) are paramount. It emphasizes family and work group goals. Hence, in individualistic cultures, “I” is the key. They are more independent with his or her goals, and are encouraged to stand out, to be unique and expressive. There are less needs to conform to the group or society, nor is there much distinction between in-group and out-group. Meantime, people are encourage to do things on their own, and not dependent on

---

\(^{10}\) Assume the leader will have more influence.
others.

In collective cultures, “we” is the center. Individuals are encouraged to conform to society, and to reach group goals. There is stronger distinction between in-group and out-group. People are “independent” of others and it is not wise to openly express their beliefs or opinions. In general, people in collective cultures will have a strong fear for rejection while people in individualist cultures are more prone to loneliness.\(^{11}\)

In summary, Hofstede (1980) defined individualism as a focus on rights above duties; a concern for oneself and immediate family; and emphasis on personal autonomy, self-fulfillments, and one’s identity on personal accomplishments. Schwarz (1990) defined individualistic societies as fundamentally contractual, consisting of narrow primary groups and negotiated social relations, with specific obligations and expectations focusing on achieving status.

Logically, in a multicultural team, potential conflicts will occur between high and low IDV members. High IDV members will want more freedom to express and independent thinking/working styles than low IDV members. A high IDV member will want personal goals to align with group goals, while low IDV members will have problem to speak out what he/she really thinks. The emphasis here is the difference between high and low IDV will result in potential conflicts, therefore, longer time to be normed. And even if it is normed, it is more than likely that this norm is more under the influence of individualistic team members. Nevertheless, once this team is normed, IDV is not a source of conflict. Then when teams try to perform, IDV is a value-adding factor in the diverging process. After all, high IDV individuals are more eager to find unique ways of solving problems and looking out of the box. And low IDV individuals can offer what high IDV individuals overlooked.

**Masculinity (MAS):** MAS focuses on the degree that a traditional male role has in a culture. A high masculinity cultures like Japan (highest score of 95), Philippine (64) or US (62) demonstrates a high degree of gender differentiation, where male dominates the society’s power structure. It is also believed that it is more important for men to have a career job in addition to culture-wide tendency to admire achievement and wealth. Men are “live to work”, while the conflicts are solved by “aggressions” in politics. On the other side, the more feminine cultures such as Sweden (lowest score of 5), Netherlands (14), Thailand (34), or South Korea (39) present low level of differentiation between genders. In these cultures, women have “equal” access to professions as men, and the nurturance and environmental protection are admired. There are significant representations of women in politics, and

\(^{11}\) It is not wise to assume that a culture to be collective without individualism influence. For example: China is considered to be a collective society with heavy influence under Confucianism. However, the individualist thinking of Lao Zi, who emphasizes the happiness of individuals as the basis for a good society, has nonetheless profound influence in Chinese.
the conflicts are usually solved by negotiations. It is believed that people should “work to live” instead of accumulation of wealth.

Logically, in a multicultural team, potential conflicts will occur between high and low MAS members. High MAS members will want a strong (male) / subdued (female) traditional role than low MAS members. If a high MAS member (most likely male) becomes a leader (implied or pointed), his leadership styles will be unacceptable to that of low MAS members. If a low MAS member is a leader, high MAS members will have to learn to deal with leader (male or female) in an adapted manner. The emphasis here is the difference between high and low MAS will result in potential conflicts, therefore, longer converging time is needed to be normed. Nevertheless, once this team is normed, MAS is not a source of potential conflict. Then when teams try to perform, MAS turns into a value-adding factor in the diverging process.

**Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI):** UAI measures the level of tolerance on uncertainty and ambiguity of cultures. High uncertainty avoidance countries like Greece (with the highest score of 112), France (86), Japan (92), Poland (93), and South Korea (85) dislike taking risks in business. These societies set up rules, regulation and laws in order to assert more control over uncertainty. Contrary, low UAI cultures tend to be more acceptable to changes and greater risks. For example, Singapore (lowest score of 8) and Sweden (29) are more open for variety of opinions. Overall, countries with longer history tend to be high on uncertainty avoidance. They mainly consist of homogeneous population, and certain degree of xenophobia is common. There is low tolerance for “innovation”, and risk in business is avoided. Traditional routines and practice are preferred. On the other side, characteristics of low UAI cultures include more frequent innovation, diverse population, as well as the assimilation of minorities and foreigners.

Logically, in a multicultural team, potential conflicts will occur between high and low UAI members. High UAI members will proceed in a safer traditional way, while low UAI members would like to find/explore new broad methods. If a high UAI member becomes a leader (implied or pointed), low UAI members will be less motivated to perform, since their style tends to be repressed. If a low UAI member is a leader, high UAI members will have to learn to believe it is worth a try. The emphasis here is the difference between high and low UAI will result in potential conflicts; therefore, longer converging time is needed to be normed. Nevertheless, once this team is normed, UAI is not a source of potential conflict. Then when teams try to perform, UAI turns into a value-adding factor in the diverging process.

The think pattern above are sequential, but people in a team apart from working on his or her own does not necessary have to do what he or she is not comfortable
with. Learn to deal with other members in an adapted manner is part of norming. Therefore, the divergence factors before the team is normed will serve as what the potential of the team will reach as is. “For this class/task, the ability of the most or the least competent member determines the team’s potential productivity. Or for some tasks, the combination of abilities of all members determines the team’s potential productivity?” (Alder, 2002)

Hofstede emphasized that his country-level analysis of IND could not explain individual behavior, which he regarded as a theoretically distinct problem. Hofstede also warned that his own results were not stable but rather shaped by the economic and historical circumstances of the 1970s, (then the cultural shifts….) so he had also adjust these cultural dimensions. Like what he had done on Japan when it stems from a developing country into a developed one, IND value has raised higher. Therefore, it is helpful to look at individual difference.

**Individualism (IND) and Collectivism (COL) at individual levels:**

In a multicultural team, an individual will not necessarily “normed” at the same “values” as his/her cultural norms. Then it is necessary to take these individual differences into consideration. Nonetheless, it is more likely that if an individual is under the influence of a culture, it is more likely his or her norm is more closely align with his/her cultural norms and the range deviation normally wouldn’t be too wide.

For example, an individual from a high IDV country like Netherlands (80) compare to someone from how IDV country like Taiwan (17). Within a team, it is very likely that the range of individual from Netherlands (80 + or -) will still be representative of high IDV cultures, while Taiwanese member (17 + or -) will be the low IDV embodiment.

In summary, divergence factors are mainly affected by cultural differences and individual differences may have been indicated by his or her culture(s). Meanwhile, divergence factors also set the originally boundaries of the team from individual team members diversified ranges of differences.

On the other side, “team members from diverse cultures often disagree over the meaning of important issues, such as the cause of particular events, how to determine admissible evidence, how to assess the relevance of specific information, and the possible conclusions that can be drawn.” (Hayles, 1982) Then, there ought to be some convergence forces to get these diversified fields to a norm to perform, and they are convergence factors.
Convergence Factors:

Convergence factors are mainly from individuals of the team. Convergence is the process of choosing the best alternatives, perhaps after refining them. In order to select from the divergent possibilities that is not only creative but also practical, the convergence has to take place to reach an intelligent decision. According to Joyce Wycoff, all convergence tools have five basic inherent action principles: (SOARS):

- **Sort**: Possibilities need to be grouped into meaningful categories. Categories might be related to time, feasibility, market demand, availability of resources, type of possibility, or any other category that would bring order out of the chaos.

- **Order**: The preference and pre-established criteria arrange the rank and order of these possibilities.

- **Adapt**: After possibilities have been identified, they can be further expanded and adapted to create even better ideas.

- **Refine**: These possibilities will be purified from the weak points.

- **Select**: Ideas are only ideas until they are being implemented. Therefore, it is critical to have the right people implementing the ideas.

Furthermore, individuals have motives for achievement, power and affiliation. Meanwhile, the team motivations are affected by these factors such as purpose, challenge, camaraderie, responsibility, growth and leadership. The two-factor motivation theory depicts extrinsic motivation that are environmental is a force that will de-motivate. On the other side, the intrinsic motivation, from job itself, will really energize and motivate individuals. Tangible drives and surroundings factors are different each scenario while intangible forces from individuals’ characters can be shown someone’s locus of control, self-efficacy, and self-leadership.

**Locus of Control**

The locus of control is a concept developed by psychologist Julian Rotter. It refers to that people tend to have generalized beliefs that whether they are in control of their fate, or it is up to external factors such as luck or environment. People with internal locus of control believe they can control their destiny and they themselves are responsible for their own actions and outcomes. People with external locus of control think that success or failure is determined by the external factors instead of from within.

According to McShane and Von Glinow (2005) “People perform better in most employment situations when they have a moderately strong internal locus of control.

---

12 There are differences between motives and motivation. Motivation is an internal state or condition (desires/needs) that serves to activate or energize behavior and give it direction (see Kleinginna and Kleinginna, 1981a)
They tend to be more successful in their careers and earn more money than their external counterparts. Internals are particularly well suited to leadership positions and other jobs requiring initiative, independent action, complex thinking, and high motivation. Internals are also more satisfied with their jobs, cope better in stressful situations, and are more motivated by performance-based reward systems.

Meanwhile, people who are internal locus of control believe they have control over their work environment. They prefer participative and achievement-oriented leadership styles and may become frustrated with a directive style. People with an external locus of control believe that their performance is due more to luck and fate, so they tend to be more satisfied with directive and supportive leadership.

Logically, in a multicultural team, it is better to have more members who are internal locus of control. These are converging forces that push a team to perform.

**Self-Efficacy:**

Perceived self-efficacy according to Alberta Bandura (1994) is defined as people's beliefs about their capabilities to produce designated levels of performance that exercise influence over events that affect their lives. People who have high self-efficacy will approach task as challenge to be tackle with and mastered, while people with low self-efficacy will try to avoid it. Below is a table of the difference between people with high self-efficacy and low self-efficacy regarding choice/behavior, motivation, thoughts patterns & responses and the idea about one's destiny:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices regarding behavior</th>
<th>High Self-Efficacy</th>
<th>Low Self-Efficacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More inclined to take on a task</td>
<td>Avoid task</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Expand more effort and persist longer</td>
<td>An incentive to learn more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thought patterns &amp; responses</td>
<td>A wider picture of a task in order to take the best routine</td>
<td>Poor task planning, Increased stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged by obstacles to greater effort</td>
<td>Become erratic and unpredictable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Destiny Idea</td>
<td>In control of their own life; their own actions, and decisions shape their lives</td>
<td>Out of their hands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bandura points out four factors that affecting self-efficacy: experience, modeling,
social persuasions, and physiological factors. The most effective way of creating a strong self-efficacy is through mastery experiences. This means success builds or reinforces self-efficacy, while failure demolishes or undermines it. Modeling happens when someone see other people’s success, their self-efficacy will rise, but when he/she sees someone fail, he or she will somehow turn into lower self-efficacy. This is most influential when someone is not so sure about him/herself. Social persuasions refer to if people have been told what it takes to be successful, and they believe in it. They are more likely to make effort than harbor self-doubt to sabotage themselves. Physiological factors, such as emotions and moods, can alter someone’s self-efficacy. Positive mood enhances perceived self-efficacy, and pessimistic mood lowers it.

Logically, in a multicultural team, members who have high self-efficacy are more motivated, and believe they are able to accomplish the task. Compare to other members who have lower self-efficacy, they are stronger converging forces that push a team to perform

**Self-Leadership:**

Self-leadership refers to the process of influencing oneself to establish the self-direction and self-motivation needed to perform a task. (McShane & Von Glinow 2005) There are five main elements in self-leadership process. They are personal goal setting, constructive thoughts, designing natural rewards, self-monitoring, and self-reinforcement.

The personal goal setting is different from what a team goal in that it is set by oneself instead of by others. With personal goal setting, one will be more focused on what they do. Research reports by Strickland, Galimba and others had shown that students are more effective, use better learning strategies and develop stronger self-efficacy when they rely on personal goal settings. In short, McShane and Von Glinow indicates setting specific, challenging, and relevant goals for your own work effort can help you to focus on key performance areas and motivating yourself.

Constructive thoughts include self-talk and mental imagery. According to McShane and Von Glinow, self-talk refers to talking to ourselves about our own thoughts or actions, for the purpose of increasing our self-efficacy and navigating through decision in a future event. Mental imagery means mentally practicing a task and visualizing its successful completion. Positive self-talk and mental imagery can prepare you in accomplishing tasks by anticipating and evaluating your situations.

Designing natural rewards is a set of mind that motivating oneself to be enjoyable on the process of achieving his or her goal. People have preferences. And by altering a bit to suit their needs will help they accomplish their tasks.

Self-Monitoring is a process of keep adjusting oneself/things to be on track of the process. It is feedback within oneself from the current performance so he or she
can make adjustment to be better geared toward the final goal.

Self-Reinforcement is giving oneself reward if certain positive performance is reached at certain stage of the project. The cueing strategies component of self-leadership relates to the process of self-managing the antecedents (cues) of behavior and further on behavior modification. (McShane & Von Glinow, 2005) In self-leadership, cueing strategies are self-set or self-controlled antecedents rather than introduced and controlled by others.

Logically, in a multicultural team, members have high self-leadership are more well prepared and perhaps more suitable on team-works. They are stronger converging forces that push a team to perform better. In a self-directed team, self-leadership is valuable. In a team of peers when no one has formal authority over anyone, self-leadership counts toward achieving objectives.

The convergence factor of the locus of control refers to the generalized beliefs of whether people are in control of their fate; or it is up to external factors such as luck and environment. People with internal locus of control believe they can control the destiny, and are responsible for their own actions and outcomes. The convergence factor of perceived self-efficacy is people’s beliefs about their capabilities to produce designated levels of performance and change events that affect their lives. People who have high self-efficacy will approach tasks as challenges. Meanwhile, the convergence factor of self-leadership refers to the process of influencing oneself to establish the self-direction and self-motivation needed to perform a task.

Therefore, the convergence factors looking from the individual perspectives call attention to individual team member’s determinations. The determinations to explore the possibilities, the motivation to make more efforts, to persist, and the will to overcome the obstacles are team’s crucial path to achieve objectives.

Nonetheless, motivation seems to be the link between the divergence and convergence. It also seems to be the link between divergence and attribution factors, as well as between convergences and attribution factors.

**Attribution Factors:**

Attribution factors are complementing factors that result in team effort: The formation of a multicultural team, however, does not guarantee that members will exert the effort required to complete team assignments. Namely, a meaningful task is required but not sufficient condition for encouraging team effort and commitment. An understanding of what drives team effort will be critical because one can take action to promote greater effort and member commitment. Perspective taking, team player inventory as well as team roles can be a good indication on team efforts.
**Cognitive Empathy:**

Empathy is a sensitive understanding of other people’s thoughts, feelings as well as set your own foot in other’s situations. Cognitive empathy refers only to the thinking part of empathy excluding emotions. Therefore, this component is also called perspective taking, which is more of intellectual part of understanding. People who possess higher cognitive empathy are more sensitive to external cause of someone else’s behavior, thus minimize fundamental attribution errors. An active listener empathizes with a speaker or other team members and takes them into consideration.

Logically, in multicultural team, members who are high on perspective taking will help the team concentrate on the tasks instead of individual difference. This will help on getting other team members ideas understood and not ignored. This build relationship to face whatever difficulties lie ahead.

**Team Role Preference:**

Some roles help the team achieve the goal while others help to maintain the relationship of team members so the team can function. If the roles are not assigned, team members usually take on different roles from time to time. This could be from each team member’s value or personality. However, it is during the forming stage of the team building that team members “develop” their preferred roles inside the team. People have their preference on type of role they represent. Meantime, researches have indicated that teams require a balance of roles.

The team role preference scale identifies someone’s preferred roles in meetings and team activities. According to McShane, encourager praises and supports the ideas of other team members, thus showing warmth and solidarity to the group. Gatekeeper encourages all team members to participate in the discussion. Harmonizer mediates intra-group conflicts and reduces tension. Initiator identifies goals for the meeting, including ways to work on those goals. Summarizer keeps track of what was said in the meeting.

Logically, in multicultural team, members who like to be on certain role will be more likely to take on that role in the team. However, if there is more than one member in the team that would also prefer to take on that role, then, who is going to do what is not clear unless specified. First, it is more important that in a team that there is certain level of willingness that each roles functions are taken care of. So in general, it is better to have a level of medium to stronger willingness on each role in the team. Meanwhile, there is also possibility that a member likes every roles and a member don’t like to be any of these roles. This can show there are possible dominant

---

13 Fundamental attribution error is the tendency to attribute the behavior of other people more to internal than to external factors. (McShane & Von Glinow) Internal factors refer to the cause of an event is due to someone’s “internal” “dysfunctions” instead of some external causes.
individual or individual that is not going to express his or her own opinions. If this is the case, a team’s potential probably won’t be reached. This becomes less of a team. In situation when the roles are not specified, if a individuals strongest two or three preferences are happened to be “taken” by someone who even has “stronger” preferences, then, individuals may have to take on the roles that he or she is not normally willing to do when he works alone. However, this also gives him or her an opportunity to grow. This is an opportunity growth, which may result in something more than one could expect or perhaps some cultural synergetic solutions. So, it is probably not a problem if someone is up for all roles, but it will be a problem if one is not up for any roles. There will be also problems if one of the roles is not being performed due to there is no one in the team that is willing to take on this role. But more than likely, when the team is performing, this will be “appointed” somehow.

It is important that attribution factors are what help the team concentrate on the tasks instead of individual difference. This will help on getting other team members ideas understood and not ignored. This build relationship to face whatever difficulties lie ahead.

**Team Player Inventory:**

The team player inventory self-assessment is designed to estimate the extent to which people are positively predisposed to work in teams. When someone is a team player, more than not, he or she has at least developed certain soft skills. Cognitive empathy is considered a kind of soft skills. However, there are some soft skills that are more cultural specific. Individuals who claim that they are a team player, in a multicultural environment, these “soft skills” probably have to adjust. However, there is certainly universal “truth” on working in a team. If there is a member in the team that is not really interested in working in a team, this does not suggest that this individual will not make efforts on his part of work. However, this suggests that this individual will more than likely to avoid the meetings, less openly and eagerly exchange information as well as getting feedbacks from other members. This in itself, is not a deciding factor of the team’s “success”, but it is indeed a factor that will help team to reach his potentials or beyond.

Therefore, attribution factors are forces that “manage” the divergence and convergence forces: “Highly productive and less-productive teams differ in how they manage their diversity, not, as is commonly believed, in the presence of absence of diversity in the team. When well managed, diversity becomes an asset and a productive resource for the team.” (Alder, 2002)

**Public vs. Private**

In the multicultural team, members interact with one another from different
cultures. The degree of interaction and whether it is appropriate depend on personal space of different cultures. Each individual is custom to what is considered private and what is public space in his or her own cultural domain. Trompenaars has indicated two categories of culture regarding private and public. He classified them as specific vs. diffused oriented cultures.

People from specific cultures analyze from the specific elements separately before they put them together. In this kind of cultures, the whole is merely the sum of the parts. Individual’s life has different “segments” like work, family, and friends are different segments of one’s life. Interactions are within each segment and with defined purposes. Because of these, the public area of his or her life is much larger than the private area. People interact easily in the public sphere but it is very hard to get into the private sphere of that person, since the specific culture individuals consider each segment separate from one another. They stress on the facts, standards, and contracts.

People from diffusely oriented cultures see things from the whole picture, then to individual parts. All parts are somehow related. These relationships among them are more important than merely the individual parts. In this kind of cultures, the whole is more than the sum of parts. As a result, individual from diffused oriented culture will have a large private sphere and a small public one. It is not easy to enter into this culture’s individual’s life and it takes time. But once you are accepted, one will be admitted into “all” levels of this individual’s life. You will be a friend in all aspects from work to family. These roles are not separated, and this kind of culture values trust and understanding.

In summary, specific cultures people tend to have a larger public area; and small, more guarded private area. They are more direct and prefer to keep private life separate. In diffused cultures, the private space is usually larger, while the public space is smaller and more guarded. They are more indirect and introvert, and also view private and work are linked. However, the flexibility is very important to them.

Cultural differences in private and public spaces make communicating more difficult. The slight unintentional offense may cause further conflicts. As the result, the motivation is also simple and complex immediately. Simple, in that it explains much of what we see happening in human behavior, yet complex when it poses contradictions. However, there are some general principles that help to explain. So as we attempt to understand motivation, Grazier, P. says, “we need to appreciate the subtleties that exist in human behavior, and focus our attention on general principles of motivation that have wider application.”

**Cultural Synergy**

Synergy from the dictionary defines, “the interaction of two or more agents or
forces so that their combined effect is greater than the sum of their individual effects.” Nonetheless, synergy is “the behavior of whole systems that can’t be predicted by the behavior of any parts taken separately. In order to really understand what is going on, we have to abandon starting with parts, and we must work instead from whole to particular” (Fuller, 1981)

In multicultural team, after members took every culture’s perspectives into account, it is possible to not only choose the best alternatives on hand but also develop something that is “creative”. Culturally synergistic solutions are not what a particular culture’s method. It is transcended from these existing methods, behaviors and patterns to some novel ones.

For multicultural team, members learn from other cultures to enhance the overall team productivity and effectiveness. This is a process of combining and leveraging various cultures’ ways (working, thinking & etc.). The first step is to develop cultural self-awareness (an understanding of the other cultures’ assumptions and patterns of behaviors). (Adler, 2002) Only after the understanding of involved cultural dynamics can someone propose “changes” that won’t seem to be absurd. Meanwhile, synergy is more likely to occur in a multicultural team than a homogeneous team. This is because in the multicultural team, people are more open to hear the new ideas simply because when the ideas are proposed from someone that is different from you own culture, it is easier to hear than reject it at the first place.

In order for the multicultural team to perform, members have to converge into a norm to form a new convention. But to perform, the multicultural team has to diverge again to find the possible alternatives. On the path of diverging, a multicultural team will have more alternatives than a homogenous team and have more aspects have to take into considerations. The drawback is that this process might take longer time. But if it has the potential to come with a cultural synergetic solution, then, its values outweigh much more than time spent.\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{14} A multicultural team or any team should be careful on when to diverge and when to converge. “Trying to diverge and converge at the same time makes people crazy and sucks the juice out of the creative process, leaving you with pale, lifeless ideas.” (innovation tools)
III. Objectives & Approaches:

Objectives:

The objectives of this case study are to conceptualize the divergence, convergence and attribution factors of multicultural teams, and to observe the possible impact of cultural differences on team performance.

The sub-objectives are:

- The observations on 6 multicultural teams.
- The graphical representations of this conceptual model.
- Cultural synergy and the changes after the team is adjourned.

Approach:

From the points of departures with support from the literature review, the research method consists of two parts. One is from Hofstede cultural dimensions, and the other is from assessments of individual dimensions on topics of individualism, collectivism, locus of control, self-efficacy, empathy, self-leadership, team role, and team player inventory.

The first part is to observe the cultural difference base on these dimensions within and among multicultural teams. Assume people works better in “the preferred coordination mechanism” (Hofstede, 1991) with limited complexity. These cultural dimensions suggest a member’s preferred conditions.

The second part is to measure the individual level and to correlate this assessment with individual outcomes, behaviors, attitudes, and beliefs. This approach avoids some assumptions required to apply as Hofstede cultural dimensions. However, this will assume that cultural frame is a form of declarative awareness that respondents can “report”. Nonetheless, cultural aspects can be subtle and implicit practices of social structures, and some practices are intertwined into everyday life or become part of living. The members probably are not aware of these. The direct assessment approach does not consider these sets of underlying subtleties.

In observational (non-experimental) studies, no attempts are made to control or influence the variables of interest. The results are analyzed using statistical and graphical methods. Below are some methods:

I. Basic Frequency Analysis:

Data Analysis: (frequency analysis, charts and raw data) See Appendix A & C.

II. Scatter Diagram

A scatter diagram is a graphical presentation of the relationship between
two quantitative variables.

III. Graphs

Steps:
The research uses 6 steps to develop a concept to form a conceptual model of a multicultural team.

There are 38 students in International Organizational Behavior class by Professor Gary Hu at National Sun Yat-Sen University, in fall semester 2005. These students are from 13 different countries that including Canada, France, Indonesia, Japan, South Korea, Netherlands, Philippine, Poland, Sweden, Taiwan, Thailand, US and Vietnam. With 13 students having Taiwanese cultural background is the largest segment, followed by Philippine and Vietnam both with 5 students, and Netherlands with 4 students. The rest ethnic groups are less than 4 people in total. These 38 students are divided into 6 teams, working on a team project regarding a specific country. The textbook used in this class is *International Dimensions of Organizational Behavior 4th Edition* by Nancy J. Adler. The class is conducted in English. The objectives of the course according to course syllabus are:

a. To understand the impact of culture on organizations, describes the ways in which cultures vary, how that variance systematically affects organizations, and how people can recognize, manage, and effectively use cultural variance within their own work environment.

b. To leverage cultural diversity, presents an integrated approach to managing in multicultural work environments, investigates cross-cultural problem solving and organizational development, presents the dynamics of multicultural teams, reviews approaches to leading, motivating, and decision making from a global perspective, and summarizes global approaches to resolving conflict and to negotiating.

c. To manage global managers, presents a series of issues that are unique to global management, addresses the human resource management dilemmas involved in managing one’s life and career while moving across international borders.

As a result, these students are more open-minded on cultural difference already.

1. **The first step is to find out each team members’ nationality and apply Hofstede’s cultural dimensions of each country.** For example, in TEAM V, there are members from South Korea, Philippine, Sweden, Taiwan, U.S and Vietnam. For TEAM V member, apply values of PDI equals 31, IDV is 71, MAS is 5 and UAI is 29 from the Hofstede’s cultural dimensions.
The second step is to give questionnaires to these people. There are total of 7 questionnaires are given out. They are Individualism-Collectivism Scale, Identifying Your Locus of Control, Assessing Your General Self-Efficacy, Assessing Your Perspective-Taking (Cognitive Empathy), Assessing Your Self-Leadership, Team Role Preference Scale and Team Player Inventory. The description and purpose of each questionnaire are as follows:


A score of 8~22 is low individualism, 23~30 is moderate individualism, and 31~40 is high individualism. Likewise, a score of 8~22 is low collectivism, 23~30 is moderate collectivism, and 31~40 is high collectivism.

Directions:
- "Individualism refers to the extent that you value independence and personal uniqueness. Highly individualist people value personal freedom, self-sufficiency, control over their own lives, and appreciation of their unique qualities that distinguish them from others."
- "Collectivism refers to the extent that we value our duty to groups to which we belong, and to group harmony. Highly collectivist people define themselves by their group membership and value harmonious relationships within those groups."

b) Identifying Your Locus of Control: The source of this scale is: Copyright Paul Spector. (1988).

A score of 16~42 is internal locus, 43~69 is in-between locus, and 70~96 is external locus.

Directions:
- "Individuals who feel that they are much in charge of their own destiny in the workplace have an internal locus of control."
- "Individuals who think that events in their work life are due mainly to fate/luck or powerful others have an external locus of control."


A score of below 24 is low self-efficacy, 24~27 is below average, 28~31 is average, 32~34 is above average, and above 34 is high self-efficacy.

Directions:
- "Self-efficacy refers to a person’s belief that he or she has the ability,
motivation, and resources to complete a task successfully. This particular scale is called a “general” self-efficacy scale because it estimates a person’s self-efficacy in a broad range of situations. The average general self-efficacy score varies from one group of people to the next. For example, managers tend to have a somewhat higher general self-efficacy than do young undergraduate psychology students.”

- “Score on the general self-efficacy range from 8 to 40. Higher scores indicate that you have a higher general self-efficacy.”

d) **Assessing Your Perspective-Taking (Cognitive Empathy):** The source of this scale is M. Davis. (1980)

A score of 7~15 is low perspective taking, 16~25 is moderate perspective taking, and 26~35 is high perspective taking.

Definitions:

- “Empathy refers to a person’s understanding of and sensitivity to the feelings, thoughts, and situations of others. The “understanding” part of empathy is called perspective taking or cognitive empathy. It represents an intellectual understanding of another person's situational and individual circumstances”

- “Perspective taking is an important part of the perceptual process because it makes us more aware of the external causes of another person's performance and behavior. It also improves the communication process by helping us to put the words of other people in their proper context.”

- “A higher score indicates a higher level of perspective taking (also called cognitive empathy). The average score in recent studies across several Canadian and U.S. groups of people is approximately 20. Also, women tend to score about 1.5 points higher than man on this perspective taking scale.”

e) **Assessing Your Self-Leadership:** The source of this scale is from C. Manz. (1992)

A score of 18~64 is low score, 65~72 is average score, and 73~90 is high score.

Definitions:

- “Self-leadership is the process of influencing yourself to establish the self-direction and self-motivation needed to perform a task. It recognizes that individuals mostly regulate their own actions through various behavioral and cognitive (thought) activities. The six
components of self-leadership measured in this scale are personal goal setting, mental practice, designing natural rewards, self-monitoring, self-reinforcement, and cueing strategies.” A score of 3~7 is low score, 8~12 is average score, and 13~15 is high score.

- **Personal Goal Setting:** Self-leadership includes the practice of setting your own performance-oriented goals and, more specifically establishing specific, challenging, and relevant goals. A higher score indicates a higher level of personal goal setting.”

- **Mental Practice:** (called mental imagery) involves mentally rehearsing future events. Mental practice includes thinking through the activities required to perform the task, anticipating obstacles to goal accomplishment, and working out solutions to those obstacles before they occur. Mentally walking through the activities required to accomplish the task helps us to see problems that may occur. A higher score indicates a higher level of mental practice.”

- **Designing Natural Rewards:** is the process of altering tasks and work relationships to make the work more motivating. This might involve changing the way you complete a task so the activity is more interesting. Or it might involve making slight changes in your job duties to suit your needs and preferences. A higher score indicates a higher level of designing natural rewards.”

- **Self-Monitoring:** is the process of keeping track of your progress toward a goal. It includes consciously checking at regular intervals how well you are doing. A higher score indicates a higher level of self-monitoring.”

- **Self-Reinforcement:** is the practice of rewarding yourself after successfully completing a task. It occurs whenever you have control over a reinforcer but don’t “take” the reinforcer until completing a self-set goal. A higher score indicates a higher level of self-reinforcement”

- **Cueing Strategies:** relates to the process of self-managing the antecedents (cues) of behaviors on behavior modification. In self-leadership, cueing strategies are self-set or self-controlled antecedents rather than introduced and controlled by others. A higher score indicates a higher level of cueing strategies.”

f) **Team Roles Preferences Scale:** The source of this scale is from S. McShane. (2005)

A score of 3~7 is low preference, 8~11 is moderate preference, and
12~15 is strong preference.

Definition:

- “The Team Role Preferences Scale estimates your preferred roles in meetings and similar team activities. Some roles help focus the team on its objectives, such as giving and seeking information, elaborating ideas, coordinating activities, and summarizing the discussion or past events.”
- “Encourager: People who score high on this dimension have a strong tendency to praise and support the ideas of other team members, thereby showing warmth and solidarity to the group. The average score in a sample of MBA students is 10.25.”
- “Gatekeeper: People who score high on this dimension have a strong tendency to encourage all team members to participate in the discussion. The average score in a sample of MBA students is 10.0”
- “Harmonizer: People who score high on this dimension have a strong tendency to mediate intra-group conflicts and reduce tension. The average score in a sample of MBA students is 9.85.”
- “Initiator: People who score high on this dimension have a strong tendency to identify goals for the meeting, including ways to work on those goals. The average score in a sample of MBA student is 9.79.”
- “Summarizer: People who score high on this dimension have a strong tendency to keep track of what was said in the meeting (i.e., act as the team’s memory). The average score in a sample of MBA students is 8.44.”

g) **The Team Player Inventory**: The source of this scale is from T. Kline. (1999)

A score of 10~20 is low preference for teamwork, 21~39 moderate preference for teamwork, and 40~50 is strong preference for teamwork.

Definition:

- “The Team Player Inventory estimates the extent to which you are positively predisposed to working on teams. Some people would like to work in teams for almost everything, whereas other people would like to keep as far away from teams as possible. Most of us fall somewhere in between.”

3. The third step is to collect the questionnaires and input the scores from the questionnaires. **Quantitatively analyze** the data by finding out the average, upper scores, lower scores, and range within the team and the class. (See Appendix A & C) **Qualitatively analyze** the results by changing the numbers into different
degree of levels such as high, medium, and low on each character. (See Appendix B) Then, draw the graph to easier compare them. (See Figures IVs)

4. Through observations, applying points of departures on applicable results.

5. Develop conceptual models.
IV. Observations & Discussion

Choosing multicultural teams of students as a target group study is more relevant than it might appear on the surface because they do allow us to observe these highly important cultural differences more closely. Research has revealed demographic differences such as age, function or tenure (although maybe relevant statistically) are not nearly as influential as cultural diversity.¹⁵

For factors in divergence forces, the diversities with wide ranges of cultural differences suggest creative potentials. However, it could also means the longer time needed to be normed and potential conflicts are greater. For other factors in convergence forces, the stronger value from the assessment may suggest more important for the team than the average value of the team. It will be useful to use the multicultural teams in this study to further explain them more specific.

Furthermore, in general when teams have same ranges, what makes a team more “appealing” than the others if the teams have the same ranges? There are few areas that we can take a look at. First, if the team is normed at the average point, the span between the upper and lower will be different. It is possible that the middle average point will be much closer to one end of the scale than to the other. Logically speaking, it is “better” to be closer to the middle point that has the equal spans between the two extremes. The differences between these spans can be indicators of the time required to be normed; and the smaller the difference between the two spans the “better”.

Below are observations on multicultural teams with regard to the factors mentioned in the literature review and points of departures:

---

¹⁵ Reber, et al. (2000) have also conducted comparative studies on leadership behavior with managers, university professors of management and students in Finland, Austria and the USA which proved that differences in behavior existed between the three cultures but not between the different groups in one cultures.
Case Observations:

Divergent Cultural Factors:

Figure IV-1: PDI Ranges & Norms (Moderate range is [46–66], see Appendix A & B)

**Power distance (PDI):** Power distance measures how much a culture has respect for authority, namely, the degree of equality. The data/graph indicate that in TEAM II, TEAM IV, TEAM VI, and TEAM V, there are member(s) {Philippine (94) & Indonesia (78)} who are from a high power distance ranking societies; therefore, they are used to have a superior asserting authority. On the contrary, in low power distance cultures, a superior is expected to treat team members respectfully, socialize and interact with each other more often. Sweden (31) and Canada (39) are two cultures that can be found in these teams. Logically, in a multicultural team, potential conflicts will occur between high and low PDI members. High PDI members will want a strong and clear direction more than low PDI members. Therefore, longer converging time is needed to be normed. Nevertheless, the diversified teams have the potential to be more creative.

From the above six teams, the PDI difference in TEAM V has the widest range of all, and it happens to be the widest range possible in the class. In concept, this suggests that TEAM V will be the most creative team judging from the PDI only, while inevitable it will take longer time for TEAM V to be able to come up with this result. And it is “expected” that perhaps the TEAM V will be the “first” team to be able to break the originally defined boundaries to possible expand it further; that in other words, perhaps, be more creative by creating some kind of cultural synergetic solutions. During the observation, the member with highest PDI and with lowest PDI
can be seen to take on works that is preferable on this type of cultures. For example: Since members are open minded to other culture’s differences, the highest PDI member takes on the work when it is needed like in organizing the final presentation, be assertive on what should be done, while the lowest PDI member really gets everyone to agree on who is responsible for what area and plan things ahead and getting team together to reach the goal before the predetermined deadlines.

However, it is necessary to have the concept that the team is rest on an agreed upon norm, favorable, or logically speaking, on the average of all members’ cultural dimensions. It will be understandable that it is “preferred” to reach a norm at the medium. The reason is for a team to be able to reach either extreme of the two; it is almost a “natural” rule that to rest on a middle point than resting on one extreme. For one, it is easier to be reached by both sides; second, it is also easier to start from there. For example, if one team is normed at low in a certain index, while for a task, it requires the team to shift the style to be “high” on this index. Then, the team has to exert more effort each time on trying to be at this level than starting from a “medium” norm.

TEAM IV Team is the only team with the norm on PDI is High and all others are at Medium. (See Appendix B) As a result, if TEAM IV team is normed at “High”, then the member who is low on PDI will have the most difficult time try to cope with the behaviors of this team. Therefore, even though TEAM V is most diversify (potential conflicts) on PDI, but the TEAM IV team, because of the possible norm at “high” will have more potential conflicts because TEAM V is normed at Medium.

Meanwhile, TEAM III Team is special in this case when compare to the other multicultural teams. This team has very narrow range on power distance cultural factor; thus, less diversified, and requires less time on converge to a norm. (Less conflicts) However, this team will also face possible fewer alternatives and require stronger diverging forces when trying to find cultural synergetic solutions (break their own boundaries). Since TEAM VI, TEAM IV, and TEAM II all have the same ranges, the difference between the two spans are 6 (25:31), 4 (30:26), and 4 (26:30) respectively.

To rank these multicultural teams from PDI dimension

Most diversified: (Creative Potential) {Divergent}

1. TEAM V
2. TEAM VI 2. TEAM IV 2. TEAM II
5. TEAM II

In TEAM I, there is a member that has two cultural backgrounds, Poland and Canada. PDI on Poland (68) and Canada (39) are both within the team’s maximum and minimum values. Therefore, it is safe to
Individualism (IDV): IDV measures the degree on the integration of individuals into the group. Individualist cultures like US (91), Netherlands (80) and Canada (80), emphasize the personal achievement with competition. Collective cultures like Indonesia (14), South Korea (18), Taiwan (17) and Thailand (20) emphasize family and work group goals. Hence, in individualistic cultures, “I” is the key. There are less needs to conform to the group or society nor is there much distinction between in-group and out-group. People are encouraged to do things on their own, and not dependent on others. In collective cultures, “we” is the center. Individuals are encouraged to conform to society and to reach group goals with stronger distinction between in-group and out-group. People are not to openly express their beliefs or opinions. In general, they will have a strong fear for rejection.

Logically, in a multicultural team, potential conflicts will occur between high

use average of these two cultural dimensions for this member regarding cultural dimensions.
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and low IDV members. High IDV members will want more freedom and desire personal goals to align with group goals. Low IDV members will have problem to speak out what he/she really thinks. The difference between high and low IDV will result in potential conflicts, therefore, longer time to be normed. And even if it is normed, it is more than likely that the norm is more under the influence of individualistic team members. Nevertheless, once this team is normed, IDV is not a source of conflict. Then when teams try to perform, IDV is a value-adding factor in the diverging process. After all, high IDV individuals are more eager to find unique ways of solving problems and looking out of the box. And low IDV individuals can offer what high IDV individuals overlooked.

From the six multicultural teams, all teams have members with high as well as low IDV, which suggest that every of these multicultural teams is indeed more diversify in this IDV factor alone compare to other homogeneous teams. Plus, all teams seem to be normed at medium, which suggest a good “calm” state for the all the team members involved. But in this index, there is need to look closer regarding the same ranges that occur in multicultural teams.

TEAM II, TEAM V, and TEAM VI team have high collectivism norm. And since TEAM VI, TEAM IV, TEAM II and TEAM I all have the same ranges, it becomes necessary to look at the location of the average points lie between the team upper and team lower. It looks like the span on higher IDV seems to be wider than the team lower part. This suggests that if the team is indeed normed at the average point, the members are dispersed more widely on the team upper part compare to the lower part. And almost for certain that for those members at team upper part will have to take more efforts to adjust themselves to this norm. Therefore, by doing so, we can suspect the potential problems/conflicts that will occur more for this reason. So, to see these possibility, one-way is to look at the difference between the two spans to decide how much problematic the team might be. The differences between the two spans are 26 (19:45), 7 (28:35), 25 (19:44), and 13 (25:38) respectively for TEAM VI, TEAM IV, TEAM II, and TEAM I. Since TEAM III and TEAM V both have the same ranges, the differences between the two spans are 18 (18:36) and 24 (15:39) respectively.

To rank these multicultural teams IDV dimension:

Most diversified: (Creative Potential) {Divergent}

1. TEAM VI 1. TEAM IV 1. TEAM II 1. TEAM I
5. TEAM V 5. TEAM III

Unproblematic to be normed: (Time)

1. TEAM III
2. TEAM V
Masculinity (MAS): MAS focuses on the degree that a traditional male role has in a culture. A high masculinity cultures like Japan (95), Philippine (64) or US (62) demonstrates a high degree of gender differentiation, where male dominates the society’s power structure. There is culture-wide tendency to admire achievement and wealth. Men are “live to work”, while the conflicts are solved by “aggressions” in politics. On the other side, the more feminine cultures such as Sweden (5), Netherlands (14), Thailand (34), or South Korea (39) present low level of differentiation between genders. Women have “equal” access to professions as men, and the nurturance and environmental protection are admired. There are significant representations of women in politics, and the conflicts are usually solved by negotiations. It is believed that people should “work to live” instead of accumulation of wealth.

Logically, in a multicultural team, potential conflicts will occur between high and low MAS members. High MAS members will want a strong (male) / subdued (female) traditional role than low MAS members. If a high MAS member (most likely
male) becomes a leader (implied or pointed), his leadership styles will be unacceptable to that of low MAS members. If a low MAS member is a leader, high MAS members will have to learn to deal with leader (male or female) in an adapted manner. The emphasis here is the difference between high and low MAS will result in potential conflicts, therefore, longer converging time is needed to be normed. Nevertheless, once this team is normed, MAS is not a source of potential conflict. Then when teams try to perform, MAS turns into a value-adding factor in the diverging process.

The class norm in MAS cultural factor is “Low”\(^{17}\) instead of “Medium” in other cultural and individual factors. Then it is understandable that there are four teams, TEAM I, TEAM II, TEAM V and TEAM VI are normed at “low”, while there are only two teams, TEAM III and TEAM IV, normed at “Medium”. In these situations, the “norm” is not that normal and the deviation is more amplified if it is the opposite extreme of the class norms. For example: in TEAM IV team, there are three members who are high on MAS and two members are low on this factor. The team is normed at “medium” but the class norm is “low”. The complexity is added on with this situation. Further, in the situation of TEAM V, TEAM VI, and TEAM II, there are member(s) in each team that is “high” on MAS while the team norm is “low”, thus leave these members much harder to adjust and less effective.

Meanwhile, it can be seen that all teams except TEAM III have much longer span on Team Lower part, and the span of TEAM III’s more MAS team upper is 3 times wider than the team lower. Think the reason cause TEAM III team this situation and derive certain kind of concept from this. First, this means the high MAS is probably “rare”, only one or two members, but because of this one or two high values that causing the span to be this wide. From this point, we can think of how uncomfortable this individual might be and doubt how much are the other members willing to accommodate the styles of this member before the team is normed. And from this, we can also think of that if the span is longer, the “mass “within is less. Here, the mass means the members are actually in this span. If we view this as a distribution curve, the area of the upper and the lower should be the same (thus the mass is the same), while because the different spans of the two extremes confine the curves into different shapes.

Since TEAM VI, TEAM IV, and TEAM II all have the same ranges, the differences between the two spans are 8 (29:21), 16 (33:17), and 4 (27:23) respectively.

To rank these multicultural teams from MAS dimension

\(^{17}\) Why the class average of MAS on Hofstede cultural dimensions is low?
Most diversified: (Creative Potential) {Divergent}

1. TEAM III
2. TEAM V
3. TEAM I
4. TEAM VI 4. TEAM IV 4. TEAM II

Unproblematic to be normed: (Time)

1. TEAM II
2. TEAM VI
3. TEAM IV
4. TEAM I
5. TEAM V
6. TEAM III

Figure IV-4: UAI Ranges & Norms (Moderate range is [52~81], see Appendix A & B)

Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI): UAI measures the level of tolerance on uncertainty and ambiguity of cultures. High uncertainty avoidance countries like France (86), Japan (92), Poland (93), and South Korea (85) dislike taking risks in business. These societies set up rules, regulation and laws in order to assert more control over uncertainty. There is low tolerance for “innovation” and risk in business is avoided. Traditional routines and practice are preferred. Contrary, low UAI cultures
tend to be more acceptable to changes and greater risks. Sweden\textsuperscript{18} (29) is one that will
be more open for variety of opinions with more frequent innovation.

Logically, in a multicultural team, potential conflicts will occur between high
and low UAI members. High UAI members will proceed in a more safe traditional
way while low UAI members would like to find/explore new board methods. If a high
UAI member becomes a leader (implied or pointed), low UAI members will be less
motivated to perform, since their styles tend to be repressed. If a low UAI member is
a leader, high UAI members will have to learn to believe it is worth a try. The
emphasis here is the difference between high and low UAI will result in potential
conflicts; therefore, longer converging time is needed to be normed. Nevertheless,
once this team is normed, UAI is not a source of potential conflict. Then when teams
try to perform, UAI turns into a value-adding factor in the diverging process.

TEAM III with the widest ranges of high and low uncertainty avoidance;
however, also have an average of uncertainty avoidance that is the highest of six
teams. This seems to cause a conflict; because in theory, the higher the uncertainty
avoidance level, the more likely a team will take on more traditional way of doing
things. Interestingly, TEAM III team somehow is still at the medium range of
uncertainty avoidance level just like five other teams. (See Appendix B) This seems to
suggest that indeed, team is “better” than an individual in that, a team (multicultural
or homogeneous) will norm individuals into an average/medium norm that ease the
effect of individual’s shortcomings, in this case, the high uncertainty avoidance.

Since TEAM V and TEAM II both have the same ranges, the difference between
the two spans are 10 (23:33) and 8 (32:24) respectively.

To rank these multicultural teams from UAI dimension

Most diversified: (Creative Potential) \{Divergent\}
1. TEAM III
2. TEAM V 2. TEAM II
4. TEAM IV
5. TEAM I
6. TEAM VI

Unproblematic to be normed: (Time)
1. TEAM VI
2. TEAM I

\textsuperscript{18}Can one individual member from a low uncertainty avoidance culture be an indication that this team
will be creative because this individual will emphasize on innovation based on his or her cultural
background? Of course, this is possible, but this is an indication from individual points, however, we
have been looking from the diversity of the team’s perspective. Therefore, this innovation factor may
well be part of converging forces include in the factors like self-efficacy, or self-leadership.
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3. TEAM IV  
4. TEAM II  
5. TEAM V  
6. TEAM III

Most diversified: (Creative Potential) {Divergent}

From PDI dimension:
1. TEAM V 2. TEAM VI 2. TEAM IV 2. TEAM II 5. TEAM I 6. TEAM III

From IDV dimension:
1. TEAM VI 1. TEAM IV 1. TEAM II 1. TEAM I 5. TEAM V 5. TEAM III

From MAS dimension:
1. TEAM III 2. TEAM V 3. TEAM I 4. TEAM VI 4. TEAM IV 4. TEAM II

From UAI dimension:
1. TEAM III 2. TEAM V 2. TEAM II 4. TEAM IV 5. TEAM I 6. TEAM VI

*Assigning points rule: 1. (6) 2. (5) 3. (4) 4. (3) 5. (2) 6. (1)

**If there are more than one team at the same rank, average the points out and assign evenly to these teams.

Table IV-1: Multicultural teams’ creative potential ranking points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TEAM I</th>
<th>TEAM II</th>
<th>TEAM III</th>
<th>TEAM IV</th>
<th>TEAM V</th>
<th>TEAM VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PDI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDV</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Ranking:
1. TEAM V  
2. TEAM II  
3. TEAM III  
4. TEAM IV  
5. TEAM I  
6. TEAM VI

Unproblematic to be normed: (Time)

From PDI dimension:
1. TEAM III 2. TEAM I 3. TEAM IV 4. TEAM II 5. TEAM VI 6. TEAM V

From IDV dimension:
1. TEAM III 2. TEAM V 3. TEAM IV 4. TEAM I 5. TEAM II 6. TEAM VI

From MAS dimension:
1. TEAM II 2. TEAM VI 3. TEAM IV 4. TEAM I 5. TEAM V 6. TEAM III

From UAI dimension:
1. TEAM VI 2. TEAM I 3. TEAM IV 4. TEAM II 5. TEAM V 6. TEAM III

*Assigning points rule: 1. (1) 2. (2) 3. (3) 4. (4) 5. (5) 6. (6)

**If there are more than one team at the same rank, average the points out and assign evenly to these teams.

Table IV-2: Multicultural teams’ unproblematic to be normed ranking points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TEAM I</th>
<th>TEAM II</th>
<th>TEAM III</th>
<th>TEAM IV</th>
<th>TEAM V</th>
<th>TEAM VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PDI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDV</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lower total value means the team will be easier to be normed. Therefore, the ranking from

1. TEAM I
2. TEAM IV
3. TEAM II
4. TEAM III
5. TEAM VI
6. TEAM V

This also suggests if it is harder for the team to be normed due to the diversities result from cultural dimensions, the convergence forces required to get the TEAM V (for example) to norm will have to be greater compare to other teams if this team wants to take the same time to be norm as the other teams. Or TEAM V will simply take longer time to be normed.
Divergent Individual Factors:

Figure IV-5: IND Ranges & Norms (Moderate range is [23–30], see Appendix A & B)

Individualism (IND) at individual levels: In a multicultural team, an individual will not necessarily “normed” at the same “values” as his/her cultural norms. There are discrepancies between the IND/COL of individuals and IDV from Hofstede cultural dimensions. Then it is necessary to take these individual differences into consideration. Nonetheless, it is more likely that if an individual is under the influence of a culture, it is more likely his or her norm is more closely aligned with his/her cultural norms and the range deviation normally wouldn’t be too wide.

In summary, divergence factors are mainly affected by cultural differences and individual differences may have been indicated by his or her culture(s). Meanwhile, divergence factors also set the originally boundaries of the team from individual team members diversified ranges of differences.

Since TEAM VI and TEAM III both have the same ranges, the differences between the two spans are 2 (4:6) and 1 (5:6) respectively.

To rank these multicultural teams from Individualism at individual level:

Most diversified: (Creative Potential) {Divergent}

1. TEAM IV
2. TEAM I
3. TEAM VI
3. TEAM III
5. TEAM II
Collectivism (COL) at individual levels: In a multicultural team, an individual will not necessarily “normed” at the same “values” as his/her cultural norms. Then it is necessary to take these individual differences into consideration. Nonetheless, it is more likely that if an individual is under the influence of a culture, it is more likely his or her norm is more closely aligned with his/her cultural norms and the range deviation normally wouldn’t be too wide.

In summary, divergence factors are mainly affected by cultural differences and individual differences may have been indicated by his or her culture(s). Meanwhile, divergence factors also set the originally boundaries of the team from individual team members diversified ranges of differences.

Since TEAM VI and TEAM V both have the same ranges, the differences...
between the two spans are 2 (4:2) and 2 (2:4) respectively.

To rank these multicultural teams from Collectivism at individual level:
Most diversified: (Creative Potential) {Divergent}
1. TEAM IV
2. TEAM I
3. TEAM II
4. TEAM III
5. TEAM VI
5. TEAM V

Unproblematic to be normed: (Time)
1. TEAM VI
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2. TEAM V
3. TEAM III
4. TEAM II
5. TEAM I
6. TEAM IV

To rank these multicultural teams from Individualism at individual level:
Most diversified: (Creative Potential) {Divergent}
1. TEAM IV
2. TEAM I
3. TEAM VI
3. TEAM III
5. TEAM II
6. TEAM V

Unproblematic to be normed: (Time)
1. TEAM V
2. TEAM II
3. TEAM III
4. TEAM VI
5. TEAM I
6. TEAM IV

To rank these multicultural teams from Collectivism at individual level:
Most diversified: (Creative Potential) {Divergent}
1. TEAM IV
2. TEAM I
3. TEAM II
4. TEAM III
5. TEAM VI
5. TEAM V

Unproblematic to be normed: (Time)
1. TEAM VI
1. TEAM IV
1. TEAM II
1. TEAM I
5. TEAM V
5. TEAM III

Compare to the results from IDV cultural dimensions analysis earlier:
Most diversified: (Creative Potential) {Divergent}
1. TEAM VI
1. TEAM IV
1. TEAM II
1. TEAM I
5. TEAM V
5. TEAM III

Unproblematic to be normed: (Time)
1. TEAM III
2. TEAM V
3. TEAM IV
4. TEAM I
5. TEAM II
6. TEAM VI

\[19\] Putting TEAM VI ahead of TEAM V to be a team that is easier to be normed is based on that the average of TEAM VI team is closer to class average compare to TEAM V.
The result from IDV cultural dimension has TEAM VI, TEAM IV, TEAM II\textsuperscript{20}, and TEAM I all at the first place for the most diversified team. And TEAM IV and TEAM I are on the top 2 teams of the results from IND and COL assessments of individual team members. Otherwise, this seems to suggest, cultural dimensions on cultural differences have certain degree of truth on that. And individual assessments seem to further rank these four teams. More obvious is that TEAM V and TEAM III have been lower diversified team regarding Individualism vs. collectivism dimension.

Therefore, \textit{the cultural dimension is a valid indicator on the degree of how much the team is diversified.}

On the other side, “team members from diverse cultures often disagree over the meaning of important issues, such as the cause of particular events, how to determine admissible evidence, how to assess the relevance of specific information, and the possible conclusions that can be drawn.” (Hayles, 1982) Then there must be some convergence forces to get these diversified fields to a norm to perform, and they are convergence factors.

After knowing the potential creative of the teams, how diversified the multicultural team is and possible more conflicts and time that may required for these teams, the next will be look at the converging factors of these multicultural teams.

\textsuperscript{20}The possible reason for TEAM II is not on the top 4 is probably because there are two team members’ data unavailable at the time.
Convergent Individual Factors:

Figure IV-7: LC Ranges & Norms (In-Between range is [43~69], see Appendix A & B)

Locus of Control: The locus of control refers to that people tend to have generalized beliefs that whether they are in control of their fate or it is up to external factors such as luck or environment. People with internal locus of control believe they can control their destiny, and they themselves are responsible for their own actions and outcomes. People with external locus of control think that success or failure is determined by the external factors.

Logically, in a multicultural team, it is better to have more members who are internal locus of control. These are converging forces that push a team to perform. All six teams average values are at In-between internal and external locus range. It is safe to say that these teams have the converging forces necessary on this locus of control factor to perform as a team\(^{21}\). Further, since TEAM IV team leads with 4 members with internal locus of control\(^{22}\), compare to 2 members for TEAM I, TEAM V and TEAM VI, and only one member for TEAM II\(^{23}\) and TEAM III team.

As the result, to rank these multicultural teams base on the locus of control:

1. TEAM IV (4)

\(^{21}\) If the team is averaged external locus of control, this strongly suggest that most likely team will be less motivated on reaching the goals and too cautious on taking actions necessarily to get the job done.

\(^{22}\) Why no one from these multicultural teams’ locus of control is external?

\(^{23}\) There are two members in TEAM II that the data on locus of control assessment are not available at the time this paper is written.
2. TEAM VI
3. TEAM V
4. TEAM I (2)
5. TEAM III
6. TEAM II (1)

Figure IV-8: EFF Ranges & Norms (Average range is [28~31], see Appendix A & B)

Multicultural Teams' Self-Efficacy Ranges & Norms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teams</th>
<th>EFF</th>
<th>Beyond Scale</th>
<th>Beyond Class</th>
<th>Beyond Team</th>
<th>Team Lower</th>
<th>Team Upper</th>
<th>Beyond Team</th>
<th>Beyond Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEAM V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEAM VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEAM I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEAM III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEAM II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEAM IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Self-Efficacy:** Perceived self-efficacy is people’s beliefs about their capabilities to affect their lives. People who have high self-efficacy will approach task as a challenge to be tackled with and mastered, while people with low self-efficacy will try to avoid it.

Logically, in a multicultural team, members who have high self-efficacy are more motivated and believe that they can accomplish the task. Compare to other members who have lower self-efficacy, they are stronger converging forces that push a team to perform. Assign values into each member’s assessed self-efficacy; 5 for high, 4 for above average, 3 for average, 2 for below average, and 1 for low. The group with the highest accumulated points will be the one with the strongest self-efficacy.

However, since there are seven members in TEAM I team and TEAM II team compare to only 6 members for the rest. It is the born advantage for these teams that is still within the “workable” size range of a team.

As the result, to rank these multicultural teams base on the self-efficacy:

1. TEAM VI (22)
2. TEAM I²⁴ (22)

²⁴ While TEAM VI and TEAM I have the same score of 22, I rank TEAM VI before TEAM I because...
3. TEAM III (21)
4. TEAM IV (19)
5. TEAM V (17)
6. TEAM II (16.8)

Can the diversity (wide range) in self-efficacy as a source for creative drive? Or this wide range is merely just taking off time to reach a norm? And is there need for self-efficacy to reach a norm within a group? Well, consider in a team, when a member has a self-efficacy of 40 (high) and another is 23 (low) like in the TEAM IV team. High self-efficacy individual would like to solve a problem but the low self-efficacy member would like to avoid it. If this task/program has to take the whole team to solve it, the low self-efficacy might have to learn to deal with the problems and learn from other members who have higher self-efficacy. If the task requires only individual efforts, the high-efficacy individual will “perform” better and more likely to take on the work. Therefore, if it is a converging factor like self-efficacy, even though there are differences in strength, but the difference between high and low will be less of a problem on team compare to diverging factors.

Figure IV-9: SL Ranges & Norms (Average range is [65~72], see Appendix A & B)

there are only 6 members in TEAM VI and there are 7 members in TEAM I. Although there might have one more member available to work on the project but the time required to coordinate the work will take away the benefit.

For TEAM II team, there are data not available, so, the solution is taking the average of the existing members then multiple 7 to get the estimate overall efficacy strength.
**Self-Leadership:** Self-leadership refers to the process of influencing oneself to establish the self-direction and self-motivation needed to perform a task. There are five main elements in self-leadership process. First, with personal goal setting, one will be more focused on what they do. Second, positive self-talk and mental imagery can prepare one in accomplishing tasks by anticipating and evaluating your situations. Third, designing natural rewards or altering preferences motivate someone to be enjoyable on the process of achieving the goal. Self-Monitoring is a process of keep adjusting oneself/things to be on track of the process. Self-Reinforcement is giving oneself reward if certain positive performance is reached at certain stage of the project.

Logically, in a multicultural team, members have high self-leadership are more well prepared and perhaps more suitable on team-works. They are stronger converging forces that push a team to perform better. In a self-directed team, self-leadership is even more valuable. In a team of peers when no one has formal authority over anyone, self-leadership counts toward achieving objectives. The determinations to explore the possibilities, the motivation to make more efforts, to persist, and the will to overcome the obstacles are team’s crucial path to achieve objectives.

Assigning points on the qualitative self-leadership on team individuals, 3 points for medium, 5 for high, and 1 for low.

As the result, to rank these multicultural teams base on the self-leadership:

1. TEAM VI (25.2)
2. TEAM II (21)
3. TEAM IV (20)
4. TEAM I (19)
5. TEAM III (15)
6. TEAM V (14)

In summary:

Rank base on the locus of control:

1. TEAM IV 2. TEAM VI 2. TEAM V 2. TEAM I 5. TEAM III 5.
   TEAM II

Rank base on the self-efficacy:

   TEAM II
Rank base on the self-leadership:

1. TEAM VI 2. TEAM II 3. TEAM IV 4. TEAM I 5. TEAM III 6. TEAM V

Therefore, the rank these multicultural teams overall:

Table IV-3: Convergence factors ranking points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TEAM I</th>
<th>TEAM II</th>
<th>TEAM III</th>
<th>TEAM IV</th>
<th>TEAM V</th>
<th>TEAM VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Leadership</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, to rank the strength of the convergence forces of these teams:\n
1. TEAM VI
2. TEAM IV
3. TEAM I
4. TEAM III
5. TEAM II
6. TEAM V

After knowing the convergence strength of these multicultural teams, and compare them among teams, we have rough idea the relative strength available in these teams to solve the problem. This also suggest the time and effort need to converge will be more. Take TEAM V as an example, the team is the most diversified team and the convergence strength is the lowest of six teams. Even though the team has the potential but the team will not necessary reach the potential on the limited time. However, since TEAM VI team is less diversified, and the team’s convergent forces happen to be the strongest, it is very possible given the same time to all teams, this team will reach its potential first and possible break through their original boundaries. It is a learning process and the attribution factors can be the reasons behind. Furthermore, even though TEAM VI team can reach the potential perhaps faster, but this does not necessary mean that the TEAM VI team will perform better than the TEAM V. For one, the performance is hard to define and unique in each cases.

---

26 It is almost interesting to see why the rank of the converging forces is the opposite that of the divergence forces from cultural dimensions. This maybe a coincident and so far I have no clue how to explain this.

27 The task complexity, on the other side, will influence the teams’ final results. The more complex a task is, the longer time it requires; and less diversified team and stronger convergent forces will have advantages in the same time frame.
And second, the most important concept relevant to this concept model is that TEAM V may well find a “way” well within the originally boundaries that is out the boundary of the TEAM VI team. Next, the attribution factors of these multicultural teams will be examined.
**Attribution Factors:**

Important enough that attribution factors are what help the team concentrate on the tasks instead of individual difference. Therefore, the team player inventory estimates the extent to which people are positively predisposed to work in teams. When someone is a team player, more than not, he or she has at least developed certain soft skills. However, some soft skills are more cultural specific. Individuals who claim that they are a team player, in a multicultural environment, these “soft skills” probably have to adjust. Certainly, there are universal elements/skills on working in a team. Empathy is a sensitive understanding of other people’s thoughts and feelings. More specific, cognitive empathy is more of intellectual part of understanding that excluding emotions. People who possess higher cognitive empathy are more sensitive to external cause of other’s behavior, thus minimize fundamental attribution mishaps. Meantime, researches have indicated that teams require a balance of roles. The team role preference refers to someone’s preferred roles in meetings and team activities. McShane has identified roles like encourager, gatekeeper, harmonizer, initiator, and summarizer.

Figure IV-10: EMP Ranges & Norms (Average range is [16~25], see Appendix A & B)

![Multicultural Teams' Cognitive Empathy Ranges & Norms](image)

**Cognitive Empathy:** Empathy is a sensitive understanding of other people’s thoughts, feelings and other’s situations. This perspective taking is more of intellectual part of understanding. An active listener echoes with a speaker or other
team members and takes them into consideration. People who possess higher cognitive empathy are more sensitive to external cause of someone else’s behavior, thus minimize fundamental attribution errors.\textsuperscript{28} When a member is not performing well within a group, blaming won’t help. If a member with high cognitive empathy understands what is bother him and what is the problem, the not performing so well member may have better chance motivated to catch up with the group besides difficulties outside the team. Logically, in multicultural team, members who are high on perspective taking will help the team concentrate on the tasks instead of individual difference. This will help on getting other team members ideas understood and not ignored. This build relationship to face whatever difficulties lie ahead.

Assigning points on the qualitative cognitive empathy on team individuals, 3 points for medium, 5 for high, and 1 for low. As the result, to rank these multicultural teams base on the cognitive empathy:

1. TEAM II (32.2)
2. TEAM III (24)
3. TEAM I (23)
4. TEAM VI (22)
5. TEAM IV\textsuperscript{29} (20)
6. TEAM V (20)

It is interesting to see that TEAM V even though have the lowest cognitive empathy, but this team also have a member that poses the highest empathy of the whole class. For attribution factors, is the overall perspective taking of the team more important than an individual?

First, if we compare the two teams between TEAM I and TEAM II (See Appendix A & B), it is not hard to make judgment that TEAM II team will have better attributions than TEAM I with four members score high on this perspective taking scale. However, the question rises, does a team need four members who are all high on this cognitive empathy ability? The answer is probably not. More than likely, this team with one or two individual with this ability is satisfactory.

However, we can view this as a chemical catalyst or a lubricant for machines. The satisfactory is good enough for the performance but better effect could possible be also achieved with more of these attribution forces. Therefore, perhaps, it is easier when looking at this factor; we look at insufficient side instead of the abundance of

\textsuperscript{28} Fundamental attribution error is the tendency to attribute the behavior of other people more to internal than to external factors. (McShane & Von Glinow, 2005) Internal factors refer to the cause of an event is due to someone’s “internal” “dysfunctions” instead of some external causes.

\textsuperscript{29} Both TEAM IV and TEAM V have 20 points. However, since TEAM IV have two members with high cognitive empathy, this will help team more than having only one member that has high cognitive empathy in TEAM V.
these attribution forces. After all, a chemical reaction won’t happen if the chemical catalyst does not exist or the machine won’t function is lubricants ran out.

All six multicultural teams have members possess cognitive empathy abilities. Therefore, there is less worry that members won’t interact with each other in the “right” direction.

**Team Role Preference:** (See Appendix C)

Some roles help the team achieve the goal while others help to maintain the relationship of team members so the team can function. If the roles are not assigned, team members usually take on different roles from time to time. This could be from each team member’s value or personality. However, it is during the forming stage of the team building that team members “develop” their preferred roles inside the team. People have their preference on type of role they represent. Meantime, researches have indicated that teams require a balance of roles.

The team role preference scale identifies someone’s preferred roles in meetings and team activities. Encourager praises and supports the ideas of other team members, thus showing warmth and solidarity to the group. Gatekeeper encourages all team members to participate in the discussion. Harmonizer mediates intra-group conflicts and reduces tension. Initiator identifies goals for the meeting, including ways to work on those goals. Summarizer keeps track of what was said in the meeting.

The research by A. Robers and R. Nason (2000) revealed that a diversity of ideas was more likely to emerge from within balanced groups than from within random groups, particularly when the random groups where heavily skewed toward one team role preference. This also explains why balanced groups may lead to better knowledge-building activity.

Logically, in multicultural team, members who like to be on certain role will be more likely to take on that role in the team. However, if there is more than one member in the team that would also prefer to take on that role, then, who is going to do what is not clear unless specified. First, it is more important that in a team that there is certain level of willingness that each roles functions are taken care. So in general, it is better to have a level of medium to stronger willingness on each role in the team.

Meanwhile, there is also possibility that a member likes every roles and a member don’t like to be any of these roles. This can show there are possible dominant individual or individual that is not going to express his or her own opinions. If this is the case, a team’s potential probably won’t be reached. This becomes less of a team. In situation when the roles are not specified, if a individuals strongest two or three preferences are happened to be “taken” by someone who even has “stronger”
preferences, then, individuals may have to take on the roles that he or she is not normally willing to do when he works alone. However, this also gives him or her an opportunity to grow. This is an opportunity growth, which may result in something more than one could expect or perhaps some cultural synergetic solutions. So, it is probably not a problem if someone is up for all roles, but it will be a problem if one is not up for any roles. There will be also problem if one of the role is not being performed due to there is no one in the team that is willing to take on this role. But more than likely, when the team is performing, this will be “appointed” somehow.

It is important that attribution factors are what help the team concentrate on the tasks instead of individual difference. This will help on getting other team members ideas understood and not ignored. This build relationship to face whatever difficulties lie ahead.

Figure IV-11: TP Ranges & Norms (Moderate range is [21~39], see Appendix A & B)

**Team Player Inventory**: The team player inventory self-assessment is designed to estimate the extent to which people are positively predisposed to work in teams. When someone is a team player, more than not, he or she has at least developed certain soft skills. Cognitive empathy is considered a kind of soft skills. However, there are some soft skills that are more cultural specific. Individuals who claim that they are a team player, in a multicultural environment, these “soft skills” probably have to adjust.

However, there is certainly universal “truth” on working in a team. If there is a
member in the team that is not really interested in working in a team, this does not suggest that this individual will not make efforts on his part of work. However, this suggests that this individual will more than likely to avoid the meetings, less openly and eagerly exchange information as well as getting feedbacks from other members. This in itself, is not a deciding factor of the team’s “success”, but it is indeed a factor that will help team to reach his potentials or beyond.

All six teams team player inventory are average at medium. And no one has low team player inventory in the study\(^{30}\) (See Appendix B).

**The Apollo Syndrome:**

Dr. Meredith Belbin discovers a phenomenon where teams of highly capable individuals can perform badly collectively. He finds these teams spent excessive time on destructive debate, then abort what they had talked about. They try to persuade other team members to their perspectives, therefore, encounter difficulties in decision-making points. The team members also favor their own way of doing things, act on their own without considering what other team members has been doing. Furthermore, in some cases, teams realize that there are problems but they somehow avoided the confrontations, which cause further delay on decision-makings.

There is a saying that, the determinations are up to men but the success is up to God. Certain factors are out of the control that can’t predict the exact performance of the team. However, what we can do is try to see what kind of potential problems the team might have from the beginning, and by knowing so, we might know what we needed in the process, thereby, increase the chance of success better.

By selecting talents with ability will not guarantee the success of a team or a multicultural team. In other words, a multicultural team with larger diversified scopes and strong convergence forces won’t achieve desired potential without the attribution factors. “To maximize team effectiveness, members should be selected to be homogeneous in ability levels (thus facilitating accurate communication) and heterogeneous in attitudes (thus ensuring a wide range of solutions to problems)” (Triandis, Hall, & Ewen, 1965)

**Language Barriers:**

Team members often find themselves more attracted to people from their own culture than to people from other cultures. (Triandis, Hall, & Ewen, 1965) This is somewhat true in the multicultural team. This is more because of the language that

---

\(^{30}\) Why no one has low team player inventory? Perhaps, students today have been educated to participate in team. And the class in itself is full of multicultural exchange students, they are mentally prepared for different cultures and are open minded about others.
members use to communicate. English is the language used here for the team communication. For some people, it is obvious that their English proficiency is better than some others. I had observed that people seems to talk to someone that they feel comfortable talking to, namely, someone they think it is easier to communicate. For members from the same cultures, they can use the first language to communicate. This certainly isolates themselves from others who can’t understand the language. However, this effect is minimized at the beginning of the group forming when most teams do not have the members from the same cultures. On the other side, members tend to communicate to other that their English “speaking” level is about the same, or above a level that communication is not an extra effort.

When all members do not fluently speak the team’s working language, communication is slowed down. (Hayles, 1982) For multicultural teams in the study, language skills affect a lot of things from the students’ ability to express themselves, communicate their ideas to others, to feel fit in psychologically. Often time, it is more of the speaking part rather than hearing or writing part. Nonetheless, speaking part dominates what is observed. To be strictly, you might think less of someone’s ability simply because you don’t like the tone of the voice. This further complicate what are needed later for the team to function.

To study multicultural teams, this language barriers exist and hard to know the extent of its effect due to the scope of the study and observation effect. We know this will affect the team, but to what extent is hard to estimate and not the scope of this study. While we know in cultural diversified teams, languages is a problem, but this is not the only one we can look at as an indication to team’s performance.

Evolution Changes of Team Members:

“The Perfect Score” is a movie about a couple of students, who don’t know each other at all. Somehow come up with a common goal, try to steal SAT answers to get high scores. No one is sure about doing this in the beginning until they set their mind into it. Problems come up one after another, unanticipated, but somehow, someone in the team happens to have certain skills/abilities to be able to solve them. In the end, even though they are able to get the SAT answers, no one wants to use it. Why? They changed during the whole process. They succeed their goal, but the goal is not important anymore. They have changed, by working hard together; they find something else more important in their lives. You experienced and know what had been through; somehow, you get something from the whole process, from team

For, it is often the case the students who can’t “speak” well but actually do quite well on their classes, and get high grades. In multicultural team, or any team, being silent does not necessary mean that the member is not participating in the team, rather, he/she might be doing some other roles and work extra harder on some other areas.
members, from working as a team, from achieving something. Therefore, a successful teamwork will expand members’ views and possible change the team members afterwards.

In multicultural teams, this is almost an expected “unexpected” result. Initially, members are dependent on one another’s experiences as well as abilities for the project. The information and knowledge have been exchanged and communicated. Conflict is a process of learning. Perhaps members are not necessarily know that they are learning something at the time, simply trying to solve what is right before them. And team members motivate each other to perform and get through. It seems like if there is motivation, there is possibility for growth. Learning from the multicultural team amplifies these possibilities to a much greater degree for these cultural diversified members bring much more “shocks” to be absorbed\(^{32}\).

Take an example that actually happened in one of the multicultural team. A team member is used to finish the work on the very last minutes. This kind of habit is from the educational backgrounds as well as working experience in the fields. In the same multicultural team, there is another member from another culture that emphasizes scheduling everything beforehand, follow the preset goals, as well as getting things done way ahead of the deadlines to have ample time to do modifications. The team has somehow normed to follow this culture’s styles. As the result, the members had finished the project two weeks before it is due. Actually this is the first time for some members to finish the project so early that the “feel” of relief and time to still think what more can be done. From this, I believe, this experience has changed some members. This new experience stays with all the members, who pick up different things from different members.

\(^{32}\) Even if the result is bad, I believe that the team members have learned something from the experience.
V. **Modeling**

**Propositions:**

From the literature reviews and point of departures, to observation of these multicultural groups and discussions, we can come with the following propositions:

1. **Proposition 1:** *Individuals join together to form a team. With the right conditions on certain task, the team will have more resources than an individual to perform better with more alternatives. If a team is more diversified, a team will have potential to be more creative.*

   Imagine you only have one hand to type on the computer; it is almost certain it will take more time and effort. Then if you use two hands, this seems to be the best combination with the size of the keyboard. Now, say, if you have three hands, this is not necessarily better.\(^{33}\) For the right condition on certain task, in addition to multiplying effects, team gathers resources needed or what an individual lacks. One difference between someone working alone and in a team is that one can hardly have ability to do different things at the same time or to be a different role at the moment. Multitasking can’t replace team works. A person will feel hard enough trying to listen to the news on the radio and read a book. This is when more is more.

   When more individuals join to form a team, the widening individual differences result in the more diversified team. Thus, the team is more “creative” because it has potential to offer alternative solutions than an individual can. Even though diversity causes problems by disrupting communication. Nonetheless, diversity is the sources for creativity if the team is normed. With the right condition on certain task, team will have more resources to come up with possible better alternatives than an individual.

2. **Proposition 2:** *The multicultural team is more diversified than a homogenous cultural team. And the multicultural team differs more in cultural dimensions than in individual dimensions from a homogeneous cultural team.*

   The multicultural team is more “creative” because it is yet more diversified than a homogeneous team. Within a culture, there are individuals with different personalities and behaviors. An individual is a collection of “characters”; and a
culture is in essence an aggregate norm of individual characters. Most people from the same culture display certain traits and behaviors. Some characters are universal or can be found in another culture, but some are very unique to this particular culture. Nonetheless, when a multicultural team is formed, there are cultural dimensions and individual dimensions to be considered.

Compare to a homogeneous cultural team, cultural dimensions is one extra element add in diversity and complexity in multicultural team. A homogeneous cultural team is formed with several individuals with different characters from the same culture. But they all still have normed in a language or two as well as normed in values such as power structure, individualist or collectivist preference, gender differences, uncertainty avoidance and the like. However, in a multicultural team, perhaps language is somewhat normed, but all other factors are not normed at the initial stage.

On the other side, the individual dimensions such as self-efficacy, self-leadership, and locus of control are convergent factors that motivate teams both in homogeneous team or multicultural team. The individual dimensions such as perspective taking, team role preferences and team player inventory are attribution factors that smooth the team norming and performing process in both homogenous team as well as multicultural ones. Therefore, the diversities mostly lie in cultural dimensions of a multicultural team; and these diversities expand the potentials for “creative” performance. Meanwhile, a multicultural team has less group think compare to a homogeneous team. And team members aware of the cultural difference will have more understanding about individual differences as well, thus, more willing to listen, compromise or finding a solutions that satisfy all.

3. Proposition 3: For a team to be able to perform, the individuals of the teams have to converge into a “norm”. And a multicultural team through the same convergence factors of a homogeneous team will reach a “cultural” norm, most likely at moderate/average range.

A society can’t exist without certain laws or customs. A man will be clueless without assured principles and beliefs. In between, a team has to have norms to be able to perform. Some say life is like a game\textsuperscript{34}. To play this game, there are certain rules that have to follow, certain skills have to be learned, so the game can continue and win. As a result, for a team to perform, it has to be normed.

\textsuperscript{34} Game depends on norms. One fundamental norm of games is the norm of establishing who wins and loses.
And for a multicultural team to be able to perform, it also has to be normed.

Team members in a homogeneous team or multicultural team are individuals that have a set of values that they all have to communicate to reach a norm, cultural or not. To reach a “cultural” norm, however, the sets of values needs to be communicate and understood. After having a common goal, there are details have to work and behaviors have to be normed and balanced; and performing is a constant struggle to diverge and converge.

In a multicultural team, it is possible that some members are more influential and the norm won’t be necessary at the middle. For example, in initial meetings, team members often inappropriately judge their colleagues from the most economically developed countries the most favorably. (Ferrari, 1972) These members are more likely to exert more influence at the beginning. However, as time goes, with other members’ influences, and the norm will fall into somewhat medium/average range of the team’s differences. “Averages” become a norm with ranges in multicultural teams. The norm does not have to be exactly at the average point; however, this point should be where it takes the least effort for all the members to reach a norm. All others will be theoretically taking longer time.

A civilization has a birthplace(s) and fountain spring has an origin(s). A team is formed with an objective goal in mind. Everything has a starting point. A norm, cultural or not is where the team should be before it can start divergent process again.

4. Proposition 4: With a multicultural team being more diversified by cultural divergent factors, it will require sufficient individual convergence factors, attribution factors and time to “norm” and perform.

The reason why multicultural team performs better or worse than a homogeneous team, is that if the multicultural team is “performing”, it will come up with better result compare to a homogeneous team. But if the multicultural team is not “performing”, it will be less effective than a homogeneous team. The reasons for multicultural team not performing can be that there are not enough convergence forces and time to get more “cultural” diversified team to be normed. Meanwhile, if the convergent forces like self-efficacy are low in a multicultural team, members are easily get discouraged and will try to avoid the task. Furthermore, even if the multicultural team is with high convergence

---

35 Average is not necessary a point, but rather, a range that will be consider as average. Like other approaches, priming is limited by lack of data comparing results using the different techniques leading to ambiguity as to the robustness of findings across measurement paradigms. Does this mean that “norming” is a process of getting to this medium point?
factors like high self-leadership or internal locus of control, the lack of the attribution factors can result in Apollo Syndrome, where talents individuals insist on his or her own views without taking other members perspectives. “The most productive multicultural teams learn to use their diversity when it enhances performance and to minimize the impact of diversity when it diminishes performance.” (Alder, 2002)

5. Proposition 5: Whereas everything else is the same, the divergence factors set the boundary/potentials of the team, while the convergence factors and attribution factors show how good the team can perform.

A team is more diversified than an individual on numbers and abilities. A multicultural team is more diversified than a homogeneous team on values and experiences. The divergence factors within one individual could not cover the divergences factors of all the other team members combines. And a culture’s rich contents can’t totally enclose another culture’s uniqueness. Therefore, the divergence factors are the sources for creativity potentials of the team. On the other hand, the diversity itself is not a guarantee for creativity and performance. Divergence merely is not enough; equally strong convergence forces are needed to be able to perform. Convergence factors come from individuals who have high self-leadership, high self efficacy and are internal locus of control. Individuals with stronger convergence factors will prevail over an individual with low self-efficacy, and low self-leadership. They are more motivated and determined to triumph. However, when individuals form the team, the complexity is multiplying. A very strong leader can lead the team to success, but a very strong leader without the cooperation of the team member will not get anywhere. If the work itself requires the teamwork, the team has to works. The interactions among members are what attribution factors are all about. For a multicultural team, individuals are from different cultures that interaction in each culture has different meanings, styles, and importance. Then, in addition to be a team player, one ought to be open, to have more perspective taking abilities. The balanced team roles of the team will count. Without doubt, the convergence factors and attribution factors show how good the team can perform.

6. Proposition 6: The cultural synergy is born on the process of converging and diverging, when a whole multicultural team’s convergence and attribution forces are strong enough to break the individual boundaries set by members’ divergence factors.
7. Proposition 7: Members of a multicultural team will gain something from this multicultural team experience after the team has adjourned.

In concept, think about each individual in the multicultural team is a collective of some values. And in a two-dimensional graph, think or assume this as a circle. Then, for a multicultural team of six members, there are six circles that on this two-dimensional graph “overlapping” each other. The circles are formed by the diverging factors of each individuals, while within each circles are the convergence and attribution forces of each members. Because of these divergent, convergent, and the attribution factors that the circles are shaped. Then, in a performing multicultural team, convergence and attribution forces from other members will “come” within a member’s circle and help this particular circle expands the boundaries set by its own cultures. In a way, the boundaries that the circles’ overlaps are not definite anymore, it is more permissible and slowly dissolving. The same will happen to other five circles. Then what is inside each circle is more or less flow out into others. After the boundaries are broken, the originally outer boundaries set by six circles will have to change as well, because the force within are not the same anymore. Parts will be expanding (diverging further), because now the total convergence forces and attribution factors within have much stronger power to do that. Cultural synergy is greater than the sum of the sum of their individual effects that confined in each individual’s boundaries. (See Figure V-13)

Culturally synergistic solutions are not what a particular culture’s method. It is transcended from these existing patterns to some novel ones. For multicultural team, members learn from other cultures to enhance the overall team productivity and effectiveness. This is a process of combining and leveraging various cultures’ ways. The first and crucial step is to develop cultural self-awareness. In order for the multicultural team to perform, members have to converge into a norm to form a new convention. But to perform, the multicultural team has to diverge again to find the possible alternatives. On the path of diverging and converging, a multicultural team will evolve as well as team members, to so, a cultural synergy materialize.
Conceptual modeling:

The purpose of this part is to use graphs, one after another, lead to the conceptual models of this paper.

First, from Figure V-1 to V-4 are the Hofstede cultural dimensions on International Organization Behavior class students. The class consists of students from 13 different cultural backgrounds. The complexity of multicultural teams form by 13 different cultures can be seen as follows:

Figure V-1: The differences in Hofstede’s PDI cultural dimension.

![Figure V-1: Power Distance (PDI)](image)

Figure V-2: The differences in Hofstede’s IDV cultural dimension.

![Figure V-2: Individualism vs. Collectivism (IDV)](image)
With individuals from these thirteen countries, there are four cultural dimensions on each. Then, form six teams with six or seven members in one group. Each team is a multicultural with members from different cultures. Use TEAM V as an example to continue. TEAM V has members from Sweden, Taiwan/US, Vietnam, Philippine, S. Korea, and Taiwan. Figure V-5 is a scatter diagram that shows team members PDI, IDV, MAS, UAI on the same graph. On Figure V-5, it is easier to see an individual member’s different cultural values. While Figure V-6, it is easier to compare the same cultural dimension of the TEAM V members.
With all the cultural dimensions values of TEAM V available, average these cultural dimensions and find the “average” “norm” of the team. Meanwhile, find the minimum and maximum value of each dimension. Together, it forms the ranges and
average graph of the TEAM V with the comparison to class and world ranges. Figure V-7 is the example of TEAM V’s power distance range and average. Figure V-8 is a radar graph of TEAM V power distance values.

Figure V-7: TEAM V power distance ranges and average.

![TEAM V's Power Distance Ranges & Norms](image)

Figure V-8: TEAM V members’ power distance values on a radar graph.

![TEAM V PDI](image)

What are the distances of each member’s cultural values from the team averages? Figure V-9 shows TEAM V member’s power distance index from the “norm”. If a
member is farer away from the norm, which means it is harder for him or her to adjust to the team norm.

Figure V-9: TEAM V members’ power distance index from the “norm”.

Then combine all four cultural dimensions together into one graph; we get TEAM V members’ cultural dimensions on a same radar graph.

Figure V-10: TEAM V members’ cultural dimensions.
Likewise, put all member’s cultural values’ distance from the team average norms together into one graph, we get TEAM V members’ cultural dimensions’ from the “norm”.

Figure V-11: TEAM V members’ cultural dimensions’ from the “norms”.

Combine all the members’ cultural dimensions’ maximum and minimum of values on each dimensions, we get the Figure V-12, TEAM V members’ cultural dimensions’ range in one graph.

Figure V-12: TEAM V members’ cultural dimensions’ ranges.
Below is a conceptual model of multicultural team creating cultural synergy by breaking up the individual members boundaries.

Figure V-13: Team evolution from Individuals.

If each “circle” embodies an individual from different cultures: The boundaries of each individual from each culture are different. This are set by the divergent factors

If six individuals join together to form a multicultural team:

Above, the individuals are not open yet. But because of the forming of the multicultural team, the cultural self-awareness come into place and individuals realize the differences. Below, the individuals’ boundaries are open up for other team members’ influence.

The team members have overlap parts. And because the boundaries now become permissible, the interactions start. The convergence factors and attribution factors of other members now able to come into one member’s boundaries and help him/her develop what he has not had from his original cultural dimensions.
The characters and values of other members had “flow” into this member, so are this member’s characters and values “flow” into others. It becomes that there is part of others inside this member and others members has part of this member’s. Because of this stronger divergent and attribution forces from other members results in the expanding of this individual’s boundary.

Therefore, the boundaries of the team also expand.

The sum is greater than the individuals combined; the cultural synergetic solutions are possible. And after the team adjourned, each member has changed. With a bit of other members’ “culture” in him/her, the experience itself adds something into the individuals.
VI. **Conclusion**

A team is formed by individuals join together. With the right conditions on certain task, the team will have more resources and alternatives than an individual to perform better. Thus, if a team is more diversified, a team will have potentials to be more creative.

Nonetheless, culturally diverse teams often perform either more or less effectively than their single-culture counterparts. Namely, the diversity in itself is not the guarantee for creativity in a team setting. Therefore, the objectives of this thesis are to conceptualize the divergence, convergence and attribution factors of multicultural teams, and to observe the possible impact of cultural differences on team performance. From the observations on six multicultural teams and the graphical representations of these conceptual models, the affairs of the multicultural team are explained conceptually. Further, the mysteries of cultural synergy also unfold on the basis of the proposed divergence, convergence, and attribution factors. Nonetheless, the evolved changes of team members after the team is adjourned suggest members will gain more from this multicultural experience than working alone.

First, Hofstede cultural dimensions describe cultural norms, belief, and values. By assuming an individual team member is representative of cultural values, there is a starting point for the assessment of a multicultural team. A multicultural team’s diversified dimensions span ranges more than an individual or a homogeneous team can reach. And it is found that the multicultural team differs more in cultural dimensions than in individual dimensions from a homogeneous cultural team. However, because it is more diversified, it also encounters more potential problems to reach a new norm.

For the multicultural team to perform, members have to converge into a norm to form a new convention. Norming is reaching a “cultural” convention on how the members should conduct themselves, approach things, as well as roles and requirements. It is a process of balancing team members’ values. And a multicultural team through the same convergence factors of a homogeneous team will reach a “cultural” norm, most likely at moderate/average range.

Meanwhile, with a multicultural team being more diversified by cultural divergent factors, it requires sufficient individual convergence factors, attribution factors and time to “norm” and performs. The reason why multicultural team performs better or worse than a homogeneous team, is that if the multicultural team is “performing”, it will come up with better result compare to a homogeneous team. But if the multicultural team is not “performing”, it will be less effective than a
homogeneous team. One reason can be that there are not enough time and convergence forces to get more “cultural” diversified team to be normed. Furthermore, even if the multicultural team is with high convergence factors like high self-leadership or internal locus of control, the lack of the attribution factors can result in Apollo Syndrome, where talents individuals insist on his or her own views without taking other members perspectives into consideration.

Namely, the divergence factors set the boundary or potentials of the team, while the convergence factors and attribution factors show how good the team can perform. The convergence factors call attention to individual determinations. Attribution factors, on the other hand, are complementing aspects that bring about team efforts. They encourage team commitment. They help the team concentrate on the tasks instead of individual difference. Therefore, attribution factors are forces that “manage” the divergence and convergence forces: Only with the attribution factors to manage diversity and motivations, a highly productive team is possible.

On the other hand, to be creative, one has to go divergent from the norm to the extremes. Similarly, for the team to perform, it is necessary to think divergently and look for options. And the first step in divergent thinking is to be open. Divergence also means stimulating new thinking by diversifying and exploring. In contrast, convergence is the process of choosing the best alternatives perhaps after refining them. In order to select from the divergent possibilities that is not only creative but also practical, the union has to take place to reach an intelligent decision. The convergence factors motivate individual team members to reach the group goal. This is a process of combining and leveraging various cultures. On the path of diverging and converging, a multicultural team will have a wider range to look for that unexpected discovery.

Creativity comes from laying aside the rules. It puts forward an ideation of breaking up the boundaries, and valuing the differences. The ultimate act of a multicultural team is to create cultural synergy. And the cultural synergy is born on the process of converging and diverging, when a whole multicultural team’s convergence and attribution forces are strong enough to break the individual boundaries set by members’ divergence factors.

Multicultural team members learn from one another to enhance the overall team productivity and effectiveness. After the team has adjourned, members of a multicultural team have changed. They had this cultural experience that more or less expand their dimensions.
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## Hofstede Cultural Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Average</th>
<th>61.6</th>
<th>37.7</th>
<th>42.6</th>
<th>58.2</th>
<th>27.8</th>
<th>30.3</th>
<th>46.5</th>
<th>30.2</th>
<th>24.8</th>
<th>68.2</th>
<th>33.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### TEAM I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PDI</th>
<th>IDV</th>
<th>MAS</th>
<th>UAI</th>
<th>IND</th>
<th>COL</th>
<th>LC</th>
<th>EFF</th>
<th>EMP</th>
<th>SL</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>TP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1 Netherlands</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Thailand</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* C3 Vietnam</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** C4 Poland</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>COL</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>EFF</td>
<td>EMP</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** C5 Taiwan</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6 Taiwan</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7 Sweden</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TEAM II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PDI</th>
<th>IDV</th>
<th>MAS</th>
<th>UAI</th>
<th>IND</th>
<th>COL</th>
<th>LC</th>
<th>EFF</th>
<th>EMP</th>
<th>SL</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>TP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* F1 Vietnam</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2 S. Korea</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3 Taiwan</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4 Philippine</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5 France</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6 Netherlands</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F7 Taiwan</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Team Average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>53</th>
<th>42</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>55</th>
<th>29.3</th>
<th>29.4</th>
<th>45.0</th>
<th>30.4</th>
<th>23.7</th>
<th>68.0</th>
<th>35.3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TEAM II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PDI</th>
<th>IDV</th>
<th>MAS</th>
<th>UAI</th>
<th>IND</th>
<th>COL</th>
<th>LC</th>
<th>EFF</th>
<th>EMP</th>
<th>SL</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>TP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* F1 Vietnam</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2 S. Korea</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3 Taiwan</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4 Philippine</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5 France</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6 Netherlands</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F7 Taiwan</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>64</th>
<th>36</th>
<th>41</th>
<th>62</th>
<th>22.8</th>
<th>31.8</th>
<th>49.8</th>
<th>28.2</th>
<th>26.6</th>
<th>66.2</th>
<th>33.5</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Vietnam is the estimate value

** With more than one country backgrounds, take the average of those values.
### Hofstede Cultural Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>PDI</th>
<th>IDV</th>
<th>MAS</th>
<th>UAI</th>
<th>IND</th>
<th>COL</th>
<th>LC</th>
<th>EFF</th>
<th>EMP</th>
<th>SL</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>TP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team III</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1 Vietnam</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J2 Japan</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J3 Thailand</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J4 Taiwan</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J5 France</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J6 Taiwan</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>PDI</th>
<th>IDV</th>
<th>MAS</th>
<th>UAI</th>
<th>IND</th>
<th>COL</th>
<th>LC</th>
<th>EFF</th>
<th>EMP</th>
<th>SL</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>TP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team IV</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N1 Indonesia</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N2 Netherlands</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N3 Philippine</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N4 Philippine</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N5 Poland</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N6 Taiwan</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Vietnam is the estimate value
** With more than one country backgrounds, take the average of those values.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Hofstede Cultural Dimensions</strong></th>
<th><strong>Individual Dimensions</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEAM V</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1 Sweden</td>
<td>31 71 5 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S2 Taiwan</strong></td>
<td>49 54 54 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S3 Vietnam</strong></td>
<td>70 20 40 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S4 Philippine</strong></td>
<td>94 32 64 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S5 S. Korea</strong></td>
<td>60 18 39 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S6 Taiwan</strong></td>
<td>58 17 45 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>60 35 41 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>94 71 64 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>31 17 5 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>63 54 59 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEAM VI</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T1 Indonesia Canada</strong></td>
<td>59 47 49 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2 Taiwan</td>
<td>58 17 45 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3 Taiwan</td>
<td>58 17 45 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4 Philippine</td>
<td>94 32 64 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5 Netherlands</td>
<td>38 80 14 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T6 Vietnam</strong></td>
<td>70 20 40 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>63 36 43 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>94 80 64 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>38 17 14 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>56 63 50 39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Vietnam is the estimate value

** With more than one country backgrounds, take the average of those values.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Upper</th>
<th>94</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>95</th>
<th>93</th>
<th>38</th>
<th>36</th>
<th>61</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>87</th>
<th>42</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class Lower</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4 Poland</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total average</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>standard devia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>23.86</td>
<td>18.32</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>variance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>277.73</td>
<td>569.1</td>
<td>335.5</td>
<td>369.791</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coefficient of variance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N1 Indonesia</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherland</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2 Taiwan</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1 Indonesia</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In-between locus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-between locus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External locus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-22 16-42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-30 23-36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 31-46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-27 7-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-31 16-25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-34 26-35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73-90 Strong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50 Above 34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self-efficacy refers to a person's belief that he or she has the ability, motivation, and resources to complete a task successfully. Self-efficacy is usually conceptualized as a situation-specific belief. But here it is estimated someone's general self-efficacy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEAM I</th>
<th>PDI</th>
<th>IDV</th>
<th>MAS</th>
<th>UAI</th>
<th>IND</th>
<th>COL</th>
<th>LC</th>
<th>EFF</th>
<th>EMP</th>
<th>SL</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>TP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1 Netherlands</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium High</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Thailand</td>
<td>Medium Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>T'ween</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 Vietnam</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>T'ween</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4 Poland Canada</td>
<td>Medium High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5 Taiwan</td>
<td>Medium Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>T'ween</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6 Taiwan</td>
<td>Medium Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>T'ween</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7 Sweden</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>T'ween</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>T'ween</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEAM II</th>
<th>PDI</th>
<th>IDV</th>
<th>MAS</th>
<th>UAI</th>
<th>IND</th>
<th>COL</th>
<th>LC</th>
<th>EFF</th>
<th>EMP</th>
<th>SL</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>TP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1 Vietnam</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>T'ween</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2 S. Korea</td>
<td>Medium Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>T'ween</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3 Taiwan</td>
<td>Medium Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>T'ween</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4 Philippine</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>T'ween</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5 France</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>T'ween</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6 Netherlands</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>T'ween</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F7 Taiwan</td>
<td>Medium Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>T'ween</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>T'ween</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEAM I</th>
<th>PDI</th>
<th>IDV</th>
<th>MAS</th>
<th>UAI</th>
<th>IND</th>
<th>COL</th>
<th>LC</th>
<th>EFF</th>
<th>EMP</th>
<th>SL</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>TP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1 Netherlands</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium High</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Thailand</td>
<td>Medium Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>T'ween</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 Vietnam</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>T'ween</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4 Poland Canada</td>
<td>Medium High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5 Taiwan</td>
<td>Medium Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>T'ween</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6 Taiwan</td>
<td>Medium Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>T'ween</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7 Sweden</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>T'ween</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>T'ween</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEAM II</th>
<th>PDI</th>
<th>IDV</th>
<th>MAS</th>
<th>UAI</th>
<th>IND</th>
<th>COL</th>
<th>LC</th>
<th>EFF</th>
<th>EMP</th>
<th>SL</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>TP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1 Vietnam</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>T'ween</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2 S. Korea</td>
<td>Medium Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>T'ween</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3 Taiwan</td>
<td>Medium Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>T'ween</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4 Philippine</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>T'ween</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5 France</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>T'ween</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6 Netherlands</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>T'ween</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F7 Taiwan</td>
<td>Medium Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>T'ween</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>T'ween</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEAM II</td>
<td>PDI</td>
<td>IDV</td>
<td>MAS</td>
<td>UAI</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>COL</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>EFF</td>
<td>EMP</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1 Vietnam</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>tween</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J2 Japan</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>tween</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J3 Thailand</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>tween</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J4 Taiwan</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>tween</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J5 France</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J6 Taiwan</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>tween</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>tween</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEAM IV</th>
<th>PDI</th>
<th>IDV</th>
<th>MAS</th>
<th>UAI</th>
<th>IND</th>
<th>COL</th>
<th>LC</th>
<th>EFF</th>
<th>EMP</th>
<th>SL</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>TP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N1 Indonesia</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N2 Netherlands</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>tween</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N3 Philippine</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N4 Philippine</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N5 Poland</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>tween</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N6 Taiwan</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>tween</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Upper | Low | Low | Low | Low | Low | Medium | Medium | Medium | Low | Low | Low | Low | Medium |
| Lower | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium |

<p>| Range | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 18 | Medium | Medium |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEAM V</th>
<th>FDI</th>
<th>IDV</th>
<th>MAS</th>
<th>UAI</th>
<th>IND</th>
<th>COL</th>
<th>LC</th>
<th>EFF</th>
<th>EMP</th>
<th>SL</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>TP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>Philippine</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>S. Korea</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEAM VI</th>
<th>FDI</th>
<th>IDV</th>
<th>MAS</th>
<th>UAI</th>
<th>IND</th>
<th>COL</th>
<th>LC</th>
<th>EFF</th>
<th>EMP</th>
<th>SL</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>TP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>Philippine</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Upper | Low | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 12 |
| Lower | Low | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium | High | High | Average | Medium | Medium | Medium |

Medium = Below Average + Average + Above Average class "norm" is not Medium different from the class "norm"
In-Between = empty space means data are not available
BA = Below Average 2 levels higher from team "norm" AA = Above Average 2 levels lower from team "norm" but offset 1 level by class "norm"
### Appendix C

#### Team Role Preference Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEAM I</th>
<th>10.25</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>9.85</th>
<th>9.79</th>
<th>8.44</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourager</td>
<td>Gatekeeper</td>
<td>Harmonizer</td>
<td>Initiator</td>
<td>Summarizer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Netherlands</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Thailand</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 Vietnam</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4 Poland</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5 Canada</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6 Taiwan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TEAM II

| F1 Vietnam      | 10.0  | 10.5 | 9.8  | 11.0 | 9.3  | 50.5  |
| F2 S. Korea     | 9     | 9    | 8    | 8    | 10   | 44    |
| F3 Taiwan       | 11    | 12   | 12   | 11   | 12   | 54    |
| F4 Philippine   | 11    | 12   | 12   | 11   | 12   | 54    |
| F5 France       | 11    | 12   | 12   | 11   | 12   | 54    |
| F6 Netherlands  | 11    | 12   | 12   | 11   | 12   | 54    |
| Average         | 10.0  | 10.5 | 9.8  | 11.0 | 9.3  | 50.5  |
| Upper           | 11    | 12   | 12   | 13   | 11   | 59    |
| Lower           | 9     | 9    | 8    | 8    | 8    | 44    |
| Range           | 2     | 3    | 4    | 5    | 3    | 15    |
### TEAM III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vietnam</th>
<th>J1</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J2</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J3</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J4</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J5</td>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J6</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average:**

|   | 10.8 | 8.8 | 9.3 | 8.5 | 8.8 | 46.0 |

**Upper:**

|   | 12   | 12  | 12  | 12  | 12  | 60   |

**Lower:**

|   | 9    | 6   | 5   | 4   | 6   | 31   |

**Range:**

|   | 3    | 6   | 7   | 8   | 6   | 29   |

### TEAM IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Indonesia</th>
<th>Netherlands</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>52</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N3</td>
<td>Philippine</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N4</td>
<td>Philippine</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N5</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N6</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average:**

|   | 9.8 | 10.7 | 9.8 | 9.8 | 8.5 | 48.7 |

**Upper:**

|   | 13   | 12   | 12  | 12  | 10  | 55   |

**Lower:**

|   | 7    | 10   | 7   | 8   | 4   | 37   |

**Range:**

<p>|   | 6    | 2    | 5   | 4   | 6   | 18   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEAM V</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>Philippine</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>S. Korea</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEAM VI</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>Philippine</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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